

WALTER H. PATER

NOT INCLUDED IN THE LIBRARY EDITION OF HIS WORKS

Reviews, Articles, Introductions
An Essay *and* An Imaginary Portrait

edited by E. J. MOREIRA DA SILVA

VOLUME 3: CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES



WALTER H. PATER

**Reviews, Articles, Introductions
An Essay and an Imaginary Portrait**

NOT INCLUDED IN THE LIBRARY EDITION OF HIS WORKS

3. Critical and Explanatory Notes

Pater, Walter, was born in London, Aug. 4, 1839, and educated at The King's School, Canterbury. He entered the University of Oxford, at Queen's College, in 1858; took B. A. degree (2nd class in Classics) in 1862; was elected to an open Fellowship at Brasenose, in which college he has since held various offices, and took the degree of M. A. in 1865. His first contribution to literature was an essay on the Writings of Coleridge, in The Westminster Review Jan. 1866. In 1873 he published "The Renaissance a series of studies in art and poetry; 4th edition, 1893. In 1885 appeared Marino "On Epicurean: His Sensations and Ideas"; 2nd editions for England and America were printed the same year; 3rd edition in 1892. In 1887 he published "Imaginary Portraits" (2nd edition in 1891), and in 1890, "Appreciations, with an Essay on Style," reprinted the same year; and in 1893, "Plato and Platonism as a Series of Lectures".

WALTER H. PATER

Reviews, Articles, Introductions
An Essay *and* An Imaginary Portrait

NOT INCLUDED IN THE LIBRARY EDITION OF HIS WORKS

3. Critical and Explanatory Notes

EDITED, WITH TEXTUAL, CRITICAL, AND EXPLANATORY NOTES, BY
E. J. MOREIRA DA SILVA



PONTA DELGADA | AÇORES
2022

Walter H. Pater

Reviews, Articles, Introductions
An Essay and an Imaginary Portrait

NOT INCLUDED IN THE LIBRARY EDITION OF HIS WORKS

Edited
with Textual, Critical, and Explanatory Notes
by E. J. Moreira da Silva

Vol. 3: Critical and Explanatory Notes

CEHu
Centro de Estudos Humanísticos

Universidade dos Açores
UAc

PONTA DELGADA | Açores
2022

ISBN 978-989-53747-2-4

Graphic and layout design
by E. J. Moreira da Silva

Type: ARNO PRO 12 | 10 pt

Editor's Prefatory Note

This is the third volume of the Editor's collection of the writings of Walter Pater that were not included in the New Library edition of his works.

As its cover and its title page show, it contains the critical and explanatory notes to those texts.

The major concern of the Editor, while preparing this third and last volume, was the same that motivated him to proceed as he did in preparing the first two volumes: to offer the reader the possibility to *experience* Pater's texts as much as possible as one is led to assume that he himself, Pater, would like them to be *experienced*.

The Editor, therefore, tried to provide the reader with all the information that Pater, it is to be assumed, took for granted that his coeval readers were in possession of. And, as a result, refused to pass over *in silence* any aspect of Pater's texts which he estimated to require the reader's, and thus his own, attention—even when he saw himself forced to confess to have been unable to find this or that needful information.

In the Editor's case, as likewise in Pater's, when he thought of his readers, the word "reader" cannot but be, however, excessively generic.—With the result that the Editor had to decide for himself which specific class of readers he should take most into account.

For instance: Should he provide the readers of Pater's texts with information concerning William Shakespeare? Or Dante? Or Goethe?

And, if he did, what would possibly be the reaction of the readers for whom such writers are even more familiar than, for example, Steve Jobs, Steven Spielberg, or Joe Biden?

The Editor was of the view that, in the present case, it would be better to sin by excess than by omission—and he thus begs his *knowing* readers just to pass over any information that they may think to be unnecessary.

The following notes are, however, as much explanatory—informative—as critical notes.

Now, all criticism is, as the Greek etymology of the word proves, an instance of judgment (*Urteil*), and, as such, belongs properly to the faculty of judgment (*Urteilkraft*). Judgments, however, may be either absolutely logical or aesthetic (judgments of taste), and these either absolutely aesthetic or both logical and aesthetic.

Now, the kind of aesthetic judgment that is naturally responsible for literary criticism (and, thus, for literary critical annotation) is the latter (both logical and aesthetic), which produces an aesthetic no less than an intellectual *satisfaction* (*Wohlgefallen*), but which in no way is universal, in opposition to judgments purely logical. As Kant states, in his third *Critique* (in the translation of Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews): “To be sure, taste gains by this combination of aesthetic satisfaction with the intellectual in that it becomes fixed and, though not universal, can have rules prescribed to it in regard to certain purposively determined objects. But in this case these are also not rules of taste, but merely rules for the unification of taste with reason”.

The purpose of the last two paragraphs is just to point out that, in truth, literary criticism is not produced by objective or universal judgments—and that, therefore, the notes that follow could not but be determined, so to speak, by a *personal* view of Pater’s work: a view which, as such, may well not be endorsed (perhaps not even apprehended) by all those who may happen to read them.

Pater, who, of course, was cognizant of the true nature of literary criticism, would be in total agreement with what has just been said.—For otherwise he would not have given to Matthew Arnold’s famous words the twist he gave to them:

“To see the object as in itself it really is,” has been justly said to be the aim of all true criticism whatever; and in aesthetic criticism the first step to seeing one’s object as it really is, is to know one’s own impression [by

the object] as it really is, to discriminate it, to realize it distinctly.

Well, this is exactly what the Editor attempted to do, whenever he judged that his readers might benefit from his effort to look at the impression produced in him by this or that particular passage of the writings that he annotated and “to discriminate it, to realize it distinctly”. That is to say (to continue in the footsteps of Pater himself), to “distinguish, to analyse, and separate from its adjuncts, the virtue by which” Pater’s writings are for the Editor the source of certain impressions, but not of others.

Perhaps, after all, Pater’s writings produce in the Editor impressions which they do not produce in some, or all, of Pater’s other readers—this being the reason why such hypothetical readers may eventually feel inclined to decide that the “virtues” the Editor ascribes to those same writings are no more than “virtues” *far flung from abroad*.

The Editor, of course, will not dispute with them the right to be on the right.

Impressions—we all know that—are, by nature, as much relative to the subject (who receives them) as they are to the object (which produces them).

And it may well be, after all, that what Pater himself affirmed of *The English School of Painting*—a book on English art by a French, a foreign, author—be true also of the present collection of some of his own writings: “this somewhat English book ... tells us, perhaps, little that none but a foreigner could, and has certainly no foreign absurdities.”

Likewise, perhaps what Arnold stated in his essay “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time” does also apply in the present case: “The English critic of literature ... must dwell much on foreign thought, and with particular heed on any part of it, which, while significant and fruitful in itself, is for any reason specially likely to escape him.”

The Editor also considers the possibility that some readers of the notes that follow complain of a lack in them of that highly respectable *high seriousness* in the absence of which few critics will escape being branded as *not respectable* and, that being the case, as critically *uncritical*.

He therefore ends the present Note placing himself, once more, under the protection of *his* author—Walter Pater,—who, in “Coleridge’s Writings”, lucidly pointed out that:

There is a certain shade of levity and unconcern, the perfect manner of the eighteenth century, which marks complete culture in the handling of abstract questions. [...] A kind of humour is one of the conditions of the true mental attitude in the criticism of past stages of thought. Humanity cannot afford to be too serious about them, any more than a man of good sense can afford to be too serious in looking back upon his own childhood. ... Plato, as we remember him, a true humanist, with Petrarch and Goethe and M. Renan, holds his theories lightly, glances with a blithe and naïve inconsequence from one view to another, not anticipating the burden of meaning “views” will one day have for humanity.

Ponta Delgada, Açores.

Table of Contents

I. REVIEWS

1. COLERIDGE'S WRITINGS (1866)
Page 3.
2. POEMS BY WILLIAM MORRIS (1868)
Page 35.
3. CHILDREN IN ITALIAN AND ENGLISH DESIGN (1872)
Page 73.
4. RENAISSANCE IN ITALY: THE AGE OF THE DESPOTS (1875)
Page 79.
5. LOVE IN IDLENESS (1883)
Page 95.
6. THE ENGLISH SCHOOL OF PAINTING (1885)
Page 105.
7. VERNON LEE'S JUVENILIA (1887)
Page 109.
8. THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF GUSTAVE FLAUBERT (1888)
Page 115.
9. THE COMPLETE POETICAL WORKS OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH
[AND TWO OTHER BOOKS OF THE SAME] (1889)
Page 129.
10. A POET WITH SOMETHING TO SAY (1889)
Page 139.

11. IT IS THYSELF (1889)

Page 143.

12. CORRESPONDANCE DE GUSTAVE FLAUBERT (1889)

Page 151.

13. A NOVEL BY MR. OSCAR WILDE (1891)

Page 169.

14. MR. GEORGE MOORE AS AN ART CRITIC (1893)

Page 183.

II. ARTICLES

1. ENGLISH AT THE UNIVERSITIES (1886)

Page 195.

2. M. LEMAÎTRE'S SERENUS, AND OTHER TALES (1887)

Page 197.

3. TOUSSAINT GALABRU (1889)

Page 241.

4. A CENTURY OF REVOLUTION (1889)

Page 247.

III. INTRODUCTIONS

1. SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE (1880)

Page 261.

2. TO THE PURGATORY OF DANTE ALIGHIERI (1892)

Page 293.

IV. ESSAY

ON WORDSWORTH (1874)

Page 335.

V. IMAGINARY PORTRAIT

AN ENGLISH POET (1931)

Page 389.

List of Works Cited

Page 401.

Onomastic Index

Page 415.

3.

Critical and Explanatory Notes

I. Reviews

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

5:21–23. JULIAN: Flavius Claudius Julianus (331–363 A.D.), Roman Emperor from 361 to 363; ST. LOUIS: Louis IX (1214–1270), king of France from 1226 to 1270 and leader of the Seventh Crusade to the Holy Land, in 1248–1250; LUTHER: Martin Luther (1483–1546), the Augustinian Friar who broke with the Catholic Church and became the founder of Protestantism; DR. MEWMAN: John Henry Newman (1801–1890), who, after much doubt and vacillation, converted from Anglicanism to Catholicism in 1845, later (1879) becoming Cardinal; LACORDAIRE: Jean-Baptiste Henri-Dominique Lacordaire (1802–1861), the restorer of the Dominican Order in post-revolutionary France.

5:21–23.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

For Pater, all these five men had been, in one way or another, *actors* in “the spectacle of the reserve of the elder generation exquisitely refined by the antagonism of the new” (11–13), Julian, the reinstator of Paganism, having become known in the Christian tradition as “Julian the Apostate”.

In “M. Lemaître’s *Serenus, and Other Tales*,” Pater quotes the following words from the short story “Pauvre Âme”: “Father Montarcy was one of those generous hearts with a superficial mind often to be found in the order of St. Dominic. He had all the beautiful illusions of Lacordaire...”

5:29–30. The Greek philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 535–c. 475 B.C.)

7:9. Plato. *Phaedrus*, 247c (“true being... without color or shape, that cannot be touched”, in R. Hackforth’s translation).

7:14. The German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), to whom Pater refers repeatedly (either as Göthe or Goethe), in particular in his *Renaissance* essay “Winckelmann”.

7:32. *Lyrical Ballads* was published in 1798 (as *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems*), 1800 (as *Lyrical Ballads*,

8:2. *with Other Poems*), and 1802 and 1805 (as *Lyrical Ballads, with Pastoral and Other Poems*).

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

8:2. “[H]eavenly alchemy”. William Shakespeare. “Sonnets”, no. 33, l. 4.

8:3–11. Pater quotes from the poem *The Excursion* (*Being a portion of The Recluse*), which was first published in 1814. Pater quotes lines 62–66 and 68–71 of the “Preface”; he skips line 67 (“Theme this but little heard of among men”).

8:19–20. The full title of the poem is: “Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye during a Tour, July 13, 1798”.

8:21–22. “Felt in the blood and felt along the heart”. William Wordsworth. “Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye during a Tour, July 13, 1798”, l. 29.

8:22–23. “My whole life I have lived in quiet thought”. William Wordsworth. “Resolution and Independence” (1807), VI, l. 1. Wordsworth wrote “pleasant thought”; not “quiet thought”.

8:27–28. Pater seems to have had in mind Aristotle’s words (ἀεὶ ἐν ὀρέξει σφοδρᾷ ...) in *Nicomachean Ethics* VII, xiv, 6—where, speaking of “persons of an excitable nature”, Aristotle says (in H. Rackham’s translation) that “their temperament” keeps them “in a constant state of irritation” (ὀρεξις, “earning”, “longing”, “lust”) and causes “their appetites” to be “continually active” (σφοδρός, “active”, “strong”, “excessive”).

8:30–9:4. “Dejection: An Ode”, III.

9:17. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. *Gott und Welt* (*God and World*) (1827).

10:27. The Greek word, *gnōsis*, means “knowledge”.

11:14–16. Pater mentions four “true humanist[s]”: the Greek philosopher PLATO (428?–348? B. C.), the Italian poet FRANCESCO PETRARCA (1304–1374), the German writer Johann Wolfgang von GOETHE (1749–1832), and the French Orientalist and Semitic scholar Joseph Ernest RENAN (1823–1892).

11:20–21. Pater had in mind the story told by Herodotus, in his *Histories* (I, 30–33), concerning the indignation felt by Croesus (king of Lydia from 585 to 547/6 B. C.) at the un-

readiness of the Athenian statesman Solon (c. 630–c. 560 B.C.) to appraise him not only the richest man on Earth, but also the happiest: “By saying this, Solon did not at all please Croesus, who sent him away without regard for him, but thinking him a great fool, because he ignored the present good and told him to look to the end of every affair.” (A. D. Godley’s translation.)

11:25–26. Maybe influenced by Schelling’s writings, Coleridge employs the term “distinctity” in the sense of “diversity” or “multiplicity” (e.g., the multiplicity “the Father,” “the Son,” and “the Holy Spirit,” as triad), as opposed to “unity” (e.g., the Trinity or Tri-Unity). For instance, on page 123 of the third volume of the first edition (1840) of his *Literary Remains* (see below, note to 26:25–26), one comes across this statement: “Donne had not attained to the reconciling of distinctity with unity,—ours, yet God’s; God’s, yet ours.”

He employs the term “enucleation” (*ex- + nucleus*) either in the sense of “purification” or of “elucidation”—“explication”. For example, in *On the Constitution of Church and State, According to the Idea of Each* (chapter XI, “The Relation of the Potential to the Actual—The Omnipotence of Parliament;—of what Kind”) he states: “Of the Christian Church, I say, not of Christianity. To the ascertainment and enucleation of the latter, of the great redemptive process which began in the separation of light from Chaos (*Hades*, or the indistinction) and has its end in the union of life with God, the whole summer and autumn and now commenced winter of my life have been dedicated.”

As to the phrase “pentad of operative Christianity”—in which “pentad”, of course, means “group of five”—, one comes across it right at the beginning of *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures*, of 1840 (see below, note to 34:19–20), in a section titled: “The Pentad of Operative Christianity”.

Coleridge’s pentad is formed by: (i) a Prothesis (Christ, the Word), (ii) a Mesothesis Indifference)—which, being a mediator, reconciles (iii) a Thesis (the Scriptures) and (iv) an Antithesis (the Church)—(v) a Synthesis (The Preacher).

11:34–35. Concerning these, Coleridge himself explains: “The Scriptures, the Spirit, and the Church, are co-ordinate; the indispensable conditions and the working causes of the perpetuity, and continued renaissance and spiritual life of Christ still militant. The Eternal Word, Christ from everlasting, is the *Prothesis*, or identity;—the Scriptures and the Church are the two poles, or *Thesis* and *Antithesis*; and the Preacher in direct line under the Spirit, but likewise the point of junction of the Written Word and the Church, is the *Synthesis*.”

Coleridge gives this same “Pentad” in his “Notes on Donne,” which were included in *Literary Remains* (see below, note to 26:25–26).

11:34–35. Sir Alexander John Ball (1757–1809) had a significant role, as Civil Commissioner of Malta, in the diplomatic and military events that brought Malta under British rule; Dr. Joseph Bell (1837–1911) was a Scottish surgeon and lecturer at the medical school of the University of Edinburgh; “Dr. Boyer” refers to the Rev. James Bowyer, the headmaster of Christ’s Hospital, the school where the young boy Coleridge went to live after the death of his father. “Blue-coat School” still is the nickname of Christ’s Hospital, and comes from the blue coats worn by the students.

12:6. S. T. Coleridge. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character*. London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825.

12:7. “Archbishop Leighton” refers to Robert Leighton (1611–1684), Principal of the University of Edinburgh from 1652 to 1662, Archbishop of Glasgow from 1671 to 1671, and the author of (i) *An Exposition of the Creed, Lord’s prayer and Ten Commandments*, (ii) *Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life*, and (iii) *A Modest Defence of Moderate Episcopacy* — which appeared posthumously.

12:8–9. “[T]he pulse of the God’s blood”. The Editor was unable to find the source of this quotation.

12:10–11. It is possible that Pater is referring to “Page 208” of the 1852–edition of *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each* (London, Edward Monxon), where a fragment begins which is part of “Notes on the

History of Enthusiasm | Demosius and Mystes” (p. 197). It flows into page 209, and runs thus:

12:11.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

My Dear—,

In emptying a drawer of rose-leaf bags, old (but too many of them) unopened letters, and paper scraps, or brain fritters, I had my attention directed to a sere and ragged half-sheet by a gust of wind which had separated it from its companions, and whisked it out of the window into the garden.— Not that I went after it. I have too much respect for the numerous tribe, to which it belonged, to lay any restraint on their movements, or to put the Vagrant Act in force against them. But it so chanced that some after-breeze had stuck it on a standard rose-tree, and there I found it, I was pacing my evening walk alongside the lower ivy-wall, the bristled runners from which threatened to entrap the top branch of the cherry tree in our neighbour's kitchen garden. I had been meditating a letter to you, and as I ran my eye over this fly-away tag-rag and bob-tail, and bethought me that it was a by-blow of my own, I felt a sort of fatherly remorse, and yearning towards it, and exclaimed, [sic] ‘If I had a frank for—, this should help to make up the ounce.’ It was far too decrepit to travel *per se*—besides that the seal would have looked like a single pin on a beggar's coat of tatters—and yet one does not like to be stopped in a kind feeling, which my conscience interpreted as a sort of promise to the said scrap, and therefore (frank or no frank) I will transcribe it. A dog's leaf at the top was worn off, which must have contained, I presume, the syllable Ve—

12:11. S. T. Coleridge. *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each*. London, Hurst, Chance and Co., 1830.

12:13–32. Pater transcribes pages 246 (two lines) to 247 of volume 1 of the 1847-edition of *Biographia Literaria*. (Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 1.)

12:33–34. **12:33–34.** Pater quotes pages 321 to 322 of the second volume of the 1847-edition of *Biographia Literaria*. (ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 2, pp. 321–322), which are part of the “Biographical Supplement” therein included. The paragraph from which Pater quotes is headed: “In a note written in after life [*sic*] Mr. Coleridge speaks of this period of his life in the following terms”—“this period” being “From October 1778 to 1779”.

13:4–11. Pater seems to be quoting an “observation” on Coleridge’s feelings “when he first left home,” which James Gillman transcribes, in a footnote to *The Life of Coleridge* (London, William Pickering, 1838, vol. 1, pp. 11–12): “When I was first plucked up and transplanted from my birth place and family, at the death of my dear father, whose revered image has ever survived in my mind, to make me know what the emotions and affections of a son are, and how ill a father’s place is likely to be supplied by any other relation, Providence . . .”

13:13–14. Pater quotes pages 329 to 330 of the second volume of the 1847 edition of *Biographia Literaria*. (ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 2, pp. 321–322), which are part of the “Biographical Supplement” therein included. The exact words he quotes are: “Conceive what I must have been at fourteen; I was in a continual low fever.”

13:21. The Lake-poet Robert Southey (1774–1843).

13:31. “Stael” refers, of course, to Madame de Staël—Anne-Louise Germaine Necker, Baroness of Staël-Holstein (1766–1817)—the famous author, among many other writings, of *De l’Allemagne* (which was first published in 1813, in London).

In a letter addressed to Miss Barker, dated October 8, 1818, Robert Southey wrote: “I took Coleridge to Madame de Stael on Monday, and left him there in the full spring-tide of his discourse.” In *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, of 1856, the editor—John Wood Warter, Southey’s son-in-law—states in a note (volume two, page 332) that “It was after this interview that Madame de Stael said of Coleridge: ‘Pourtant,

pour Mr. Coleridge, il est, toute-a-fait, *un monologue!*” (“As for Mr. Coleridge, however, he is truly a *monogue!*”).

13:f.n. The *Biographical Supplement of the Biographia Literaria of S. T. Coleridge*—which was published with the latter work in 1847—was begun by Henry Nelson Coleridge (1798–1843), the poet’s nephew, and finished, after his death, by his widow, Sara Coleridge (1802–1852), the poet’s only daughter. The first part, written by Henry Coleridge, contains thirty letters by Coleridge.

14:8–10. Pater quotes a letter addressed to the publisher Joseph Cottle, dated 14 Apr., 1798: “I am much better, and at present at Allfoxden, and my new and tender health is all over me like a voluptuous feeling.”

14:18–19. “Pantisocratic” is the adjectival form of the noun “Pantisocracy”, which Coleridge coined from the Ancient Greek, and means “government” (*-cracy*) “by all” (*pan-*) “equally” (*iso-*).

In 1794, the poet Robert Southey (1774–1843) was introduced to Coleridge, a student at Cambridge University, and the two soon became close friends. They ended up marrying sisters, in 1795. Southey married Edith Fricker, and Coleridge married Edith’s sister, Sarah Fricker. Soon after, the four of them planned to move to America, where they would free themselves of the injustice and corruption of established society by putting in practice their “Pantisocratic scheme”.

14:22–23. Jean-Jacques ROUSSEAU (1712–1778); Jacques-Henri Bernardin de SAINT-PIERRE (1737–1814); François-René de CHATEAUBRIAND (1768–1848).

14:26. The Susquehanna River forms from two main branches: the North Branch, which rises in Coopers town, New York, and the West Branch, which rises in western Pennsylvania and joins the main branch near Northumberland, in central Pennsylvania.

Apparently, Pater is quoting James Gillman’s *The Life of Coleridge* (London, William Pickering, 1838, 2 vols) without notifying the reader, contrary to what he does afterwards, in the footnote in page 17. Gillman states (vol.1, p. 69): “Much has been written on the proposed scheme of settling in the

14:33–34.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

wilds of America;—the spot chosen was Susquehannah,—this spot Coleridge has often said was selected, on account of the name being pretty and metrical, indeed he could never forbear a smile when relating the story.”

14:33–34. The Brocken (also known as the Blocksberg) is the highest peak in Northern Germany, between the rivers Weser and Elbe.

15:2–4. The “One” Pater here refers to was William Hazlitt, who, when he was twenty, went to hear Coleridge preach, “in the spiritual charge of” the Unitarian chapel at Shrewsbury. Hazlitt gave an account of this event in 1832, in *The Liberal*. James Gillman, who Pater seems to quote, transcribes his words, in his *The Life of Coleridge* (London, William Pickering, 1838, vol. 1, pp. 110–111). Hazlitt wrote: “It was in January, 1798, that I rose one morning before daylight, to walk ten miles in the mud, to hear this celebrated person preach. [...] When I got there, the organ was playing the 100th psalm; and, when it was done, Mr. Coleridge rose and gave out his text,— ‘He departed again into a mountain *himself alone*.’ As he gave out this text, his voice ‘rose like a stream of rich distilled perfumes;’ and when he came to the two last words, which he pronounced loud, deep, and distinct, it seemed to me, who was then young, as if the sounds had echoed from the bottom of the human heart, and as if that prayer might have floated in solemn silence through the universe.”

15:4–5. “[A]nother” refers to Lord Egmont (John James Perceval, 3rd Earl of Egmont), according to John Campbell Colquhoun, who, in the fifth sketch of his *Scattered Leaves of Biography* (London, William Machintosh, 1864, p. 240), gave the following account: “He [Coleridge] had conciliated the esteem of the principal persons living in the neighbourhood; and his conversation was regarded as an exquisite treat; though most men felt like Lord Egmont, who said, at this period of his life, to Mr. Poole, ‘At any rate, let him do something, for at present he talks like an angel, and does nothing at all. What a pity if this man were, after all, to vanish like an apparition, and you, I, and a few others, who have witnessed his grand bravuras of dis-

play, were to have the usual fortune of ghost-seers, in meeting no credit for any statements that we might vouch on his behalf.”

15:7. “Socinian theology”: the doctrine proposed by the Italian theologian Lello Francesco Maria Socinus (1525–1562) and his nephew Fausto Paolo Sozzini (1530–1604), which was based on an intellectual, rather than an ecclesiastical, interpretation of the Gospels.

15:7–8. The “philosophy of Hartley”—David Hartley (1705–1757), the founder of the Associationist school of psychology and the author of the influential work *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations* (1749)—became known as “associationism”, which holds that ideas consist mainly in the association of one mental state with its successor states, mental states supposedly being made up (as for most empiricist and sensationist philosophers) of sensations or simple feelings.

15:8–10. These words of Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667)—the so-called “Shakespeare of Divines”—are from chap. III, sect. v, parag. 2 of his *The Worthy Communicant; or a Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the worthy receiving of the Lords Supper* (1660). Coleridge quotes them in *Aids to Reflection*, at the beginning of Aphorism XX.

15:32. Frederick II (1712–1786), King of Prussia from 1772 until his death and cultivator of the arts and the Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*), is best known as Frederick the Great (*Friedrich der Grosse*).

16:1. The empiricist philosopher John LOCKE (1632—1704); the Church of England cleric and writer JEREMY TAYLOR (1613–1667).

16:8. The term “Ultramontanism” comes from the Latin expression *papa ultramontano*, which was used in the Middle Ages to refer to any pope who, not being Italian, was from “beyond the mountains” (the Alps). In the sixteenth century, after the Protestant Reformation, the term came into use once more, in France, but with the opposite meaning: to refer to Italy as the seat of the Pope “beyond the mountains”—the Pope considered as the Head of the Catholic Church. As a result, the French noun *Ultramontanisme* was coined, to designate the stance of

16:14–15.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

the Catholics who supported papal authority in French affairs, and who, therefore, were considered by their opponents to be non-patriotic French citizens. Thus, the noun “Ultramontanism” came to be used in contrast with the noun “Gallicanism” (derived from *Gallia*, Gaul), which refers to the opposite stance within the Church of Rome: the stance of those who, being French patriots (*Gallicans*), believe that civil authority over the Church (the monarch’s or the State’s authority) is on a par with that of the Pope.

16:14–15. Pater quotes Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (X, i, 3–4): τὸ διορίζειν... οὐκ ἔστι τῶν πολλῶν (“... the mass of mankind cannot discriminate”, in H. Rackham’s translation). Pater himself immediately afterwards paraphrases these words: “fine distinctions are not for the majority”.

16:19. Pope Pius IX (from 1846 to 1878), born Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti (1792–1878). Pater was writing in 1865.

17:13. The “letter” Pater mentions, and quotes from, is the one that Coleridge addressed to John Cottle on 27 May, 1814. Pater omits the following words, which fall between “the soul of man” and “The consolations”: “I have had more than a glimpse of what is meant by death and outer darkness, and the worm that dieth not—and that all the hell of the reprobate is no more inconsistent with the love of God, than the blindness of one who has occasioned loathsome and guilty diseases, to eat out his eyes, is inconsistent with the light of the sun. But the consolations....”

17:f.n. Gillman’s *Life of Coleridge*: James Gillman. *The Life of Coleridge*. London, William Pickering, 1838, 2 vols. It is the first detailed biography of the poet to have been written. Although it brings the account of Coleridge’s life down only to about 1817, it was not superseded during the five decades following its publication.

18.1–2. Of the words that Thomas De Quincey (1785–1859) wrote on Coleridge, those which Pater quotes here first appeared in the second instalment of “Samuel Taylor Coleridge, by the English Opium-eater”, published in the issue of *Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine* NS for October, 1834 (vol., p. 593). They

run thus: “Coleridge, to speak in the words of Cervantes, wanted better bread than was made with wheat.”

The “words of Cervantes”, which are to be read as uttered by Don Quijote’s niece, almost at the end of chapter VIII of *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, are the following: “¿No será mejor estarse pacífico en su casa, y no irse por el mundo a buscar pan de trastrigo...?” (“Won’t it be better to stay peacefully in your own house, instead of roaming the world in search for bread made out of wheat that cannot be eaten...?”) A single word, then, *trastrigo* (*wheat beyond wheat*, or *wheat yet to be harvested*), is the source of the expression “better bread than was made of wheat”.

18:2–3. Of the words Charles Lamb (1775–1834) wrote on Coleridge, those which Pater here quotes were written in a private literary album, on request of the owner, who much admired Lamb. The request was made soon after Coleridge’s death, in 1834, and Lamb generously decided to write of his dead friend, instead of himself. What he then wrote, which was made public by John Forster, in his article “Charles Lamb; His Last Words on Coleridge” (*The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, vol. 43 (1835), I, p. 198), begins thus: “When I heard of the death of Coleridge, it was without grief. It seemed to me that he long had been on the confines of the next world—that he had a hunger for eternity. I grieved then that I could not grieve.” Considered as a paraphrase, instead of a quotation, Pater’s words (“he hungered for eternity”) may not be said to miss the point.

18:7–9. Clifford Pyncheon: the pitiable and almost imbecilic elderly brother of Hepzibah Pyncheon, the *current* resident of the gloomy New-England mansion to which the title of the “beautiful romance” *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851)—by the American novelist Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804–1864)—refers. Clifford, indeed, is to be imagined as having served a sentence for the murder of his uncle, old Jaffrey Pyncheon, as a result of having been framed by his cousin, the young Jaffrey Pyncheon. Pater’s understanding of Clifford as “the born Epicurean” finds justification in Clifford’s love of beauty and dainty objects. On the other hand, Pater’s under-

18:14–16.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

standing of him as “the victim of a division of the will” seems to derive from the contrast, in the novel, between Clifford’s native character and the transformation it has gone through over the thirty years of his imprisonment. It should also be noted that Pater’s reference to *The House of the Seven Gables* as a “romance”, instead of as a novel, is not idiosyncratic—for the author himself (Hawthorne) declares, at the beginning of the Preface, that he had meant it to be such: “When a writer calls his work a Romance, it need hardly be observed that he wishes to claim a certain latitude, both as to its fashion and material, which he would not have felt himself entitled to assume had he professed to be writing a Novel.”

18:14–16. James Gillman. *The Life of Coleridge*. London, William Pickering, 1838, vol. 1, p. 303 (note).

18:18–19. One of the Books in the *Bildungsroman Wilhelm Meister’s Apprenticeship* (*Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, 1795–1796), by Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749–1832), bears the title “Book Six: Confessions of a Beautiful Soul” (*Sechstes Buch: Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele*)—the beautiful soul being the putative author of the spiritual autobiography so titled, the aunt of the actress Mariane.

During the eighteenth century, and in great measure due to the writings of Kant and Schiller, the designation “Beautiful Soul” (*schöne Seele*) was uttered/written in order to bring to the mind of the hearer/reader either the Christian (Pietist) ideal of Moral Perfection or the Hellenic (Pagan) ideal of *Kalokagathia* (of human beauty–and–goodness), and therefore became synonymous with such expressions as “moral beauty”, “human excellence”, and “culture” (*cultura hominis*).

The ideal of *Kalokagathia* is imaginatively expounded by Pater in the chapter of *Plato and Platonism* called “The Republic”—where he associates it with the concept of the Beautiful Soul. There, we read, concerning the artisans, “those who labour all day” in “Plato’s City of the Perfect”: “With more or less of asceticism, of a “common life,” among themselves, they will be the peculiar sphere of the virtue of temperance in the State, as being the entirely willing subjects of wholesome rule. They represent... the social organism, the bodily appetites of the in-

dividual, its converse with matter, in a perfect correspondence, if all be right there, with the conscience and with the reasonable soul in it. Labouring by system at the production of perfect swords, perfect lamps, perfect poems too, and a perfect coinage... they would constitute the beautiful body of the State, in rightful service, like the copper and iron, the bronze and the steel, they manipulate so finely, to its beautiful soul—to its natural though hereditary aristocracy, its 'golden' humanity, its kings, in whom Wisdom, the light, of a comprehensive *Synopsis*, indefectibly resides...."

"[A] comprehensive *Synopsis*". "[I]f all be right *there*!"

In his *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures*, Coleridge lets the reader know that those Confessions of his had been inspired by the "Confessions of a Beautiful Soul" that constitute book VI of *Wilhelm Meister*: "I employed the compelled and most unwelcome leisure of severe indisposition in reading *The Confessions of a Fair Saint* in Mr. Carlyle's recent translation of the *Wilhelm Meister*, which might, I think, have been better rendered literally *The Confessions of a Beautiful Soul*. This, acting in conjunction with the concluding sentences of your letter, threw my thoughts inward on my own religious experience, and gave immediate occasion to the following Confessions of one who is neither fair nor saintly, but who, groaning under a deep sense of infirmity and manifold imperfection, feels the want, the necessity, of religious support".—S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* ("Letter I"). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, p. 3.

18:22–33. Pater quotes a "note of Coleridge's" that the poet's first biographer transcribes (James Gillman. *The Life of Coleridge*. London, William Pickering, 1838, vol. 1, pp. 310–311).

19:12–13. In *The Critique of Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, A 12), Kant explains the specific meaning that he gave to the term "transcendental" in the context of the designation "transcendental philosophy": "I call *transcendental* all knowledge which is primarily occupied not so much with objects as with *our mode of knowing objects*, in so far as it necessarily be a mode possible *a priori*." ("Ich nenne alle Erkenntnis

19:34–35.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

transzendental, die sich nicht so wohl mit Gegenstände, sondern mit *unserer Erkenntnisart* von Gegenstände, *so fern diese a priori möglich sein soll*, überhaupt beshäftigt.)

Following on the footsteps of Kant, but replacing Kant's Subjective Idealism by his own brand of Absolute Idealism (both subjective and objective), Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775–1854)—the major source of inspiration for Coleridge and his “transcendental philosophy”—begins the Introduction to his *System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800) thus: “All knowledge is founded upon the coincidence of an objective with a subjective. [...] Hence there are only two possibilities. *Either the objective is made primary, and the question is: how a subjective is annexed thereto, which coincides with it? [...]* Alternatively, *the subjective is made primary, and the problem is: how an objective supervenes, which coincides with it? [...]* To make the *objective* primary, and to derive the subjective from that, is... the problem of *nature-philosophy*. If, then, there is a *transcendental philosophy*, there remains to it only the opposite direction, that of *proceeding from the subjective, as primary and absolute!* and *having the objective arise from this.*” (The translation is by Peter Heath.)

“[T]here remains to it”—transcendental philosophy—“only... *proceeding from the subjective, as primary and absolute!* and *having the objective arise from this.*”

Here is, in a nutshell, the mode of thinking “the subjective” which so much provoked Pater's dislike. And, therefore, his dislike not only of “Schelling's ‘Philosophy of Nature’”, but also of all forms of “Schellingism”—including Parmenides's, Giordano Bruno's, and, of course, Coleridge's.

19:34–35. Intending to remind his readers of “the charge brought against” Coleridge “of unacknowledged borrowing from” Schelling, Pater makes mention of these ironic words of Heinrich Heine (1797–1856): “Die Italiener behaupten, Herr Schelling habe dem alten Bruno seine besten Gedanken entlehnt und sie beschuldigen ihn des Plagiats. Sie haben unrecht; denn es gibt kein Plagiat in der Philosophie.” (“The Italians think that Mr. Schelling may well have borrowed his best ideas from the old Bruno, and accuse him

of plagiarism. They are wrong—for there is no such thing as plagiarism in philosophy.”)

19:36. Giordano Bruno (1548–1600)—the “Dominican brother” whose reassertion, on the footsteps of Parmenides, of “God’s identity with the world” motivates Pater to acquaint the readers of the seventh chapter of *Gaston de Latour* with these reticent thoughts of his, which he redirects to the putative mind of Gaston: “Only, were joy and sorrow also, together with another distinction, always of emphatic reality to Gaston, for instance, to be added to the list of phenomena really ‘coincident,’ or ‘indifferent,’ as some intellectual kinsmen of Bruno have claimed they should?”

Pater meant, no doubt, the “distinction” between beauty and ugliness, propriety and indecorum, good and evil.—The “distinction” for which he could find no sanction on the part of the well-known “hegelian formula” (see the note after the next).

19:f.n. Heinrich Heine (1797–1856). *On the History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany*, book 3. This book by Heine was first published in French, in the magazine *Revue des deux Mondes*, in 1834.

20:29–31. This “Hegelian formula” appears almost at the end of the Foreword that Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) appended to his book on the Philosophy of Right (*Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*), first published in 1821. Hegel’s words mean exactly what Pater says they mean: “Whatever is, is according to reason; whatever is according to reason, that is.”

Why did Pater dislike such a formula as much as he disliked all forms of Parmenidean thought? Because, no less than Schelling’s *Philosophy of Nature*, it too asserts the “coincidence” of idea and reality, and, therefore, the indifference between beauty and ugliness, between what may happen to be, *qua* accident *sub specie* “reality”, and what, in idea, it ought to be. Let us hear Hegel himself: “‘What is rational is real; and what is real is rational.’ Upon this conviction stand not philosophy only but even every unsophisticated consciousness. From it also proceeds the view now under contemplation that the spiritual universe is the natural. [...] Against the doctrine

21:10–11.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

that the idea is a mere idea, figment or opinion, philosophy preserves the more profound view that nothing is real except the idea." (Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. *Philosophy of Right*. Transl. S. W. Dyde, London, George Bell, 1896, p. xxvii.)

"[N]othing is real except the idea." All along his life, Pater stood firmly against such a way of conflating mind and matter, thought and reality.

21:10–11. A proper understanding of the "extreme inwardness of temperament" that Pater detected in the German mystic Jakob Böhme (1575–1624) may, perhaps, be facilitated by the realization that Böhme, like Coleridge, "hungered for eternity", and that, as a result, he, too, "wanted better bread than was made of wheat": "And thirdly we find in the life of our souls, that there is in it a greater hunger after another higher and better life, viz. after the highest good, which is called the divine life; insomuch that the soul is not contented with its own food, but it desires, with great longing and panting, the highest and best good, not only for a pleasant habitation, but in a hunger for a food." (These words are from paragraph five of the first chapter of Böhme's *The Threefold Life of Man*. The translation is by John Sparrow.)

As for Pater's realization that, in the thought of Jakob Böhme, "the old Greek conception" "of a mind latent in nature" "has taken root and sprung up anew", it is enough, here, to point out: on the one hand, that Böhme did, in fact, understand the deity as cosmic consciousness eternally striving for self-awareness, and, therefore, as both unity (identity) and opposition (non-identity) between "the subjective" as such and "the objective" (Nature)—understood, the latter, as objectual self-oppositing (as *natura naturata* or non-Ego, *qua* seat of impermanence and evil) on the part of God's subjectual self-positing (on the part of God *qua natura naturans*, or Ego, and seat of permanence and goodness); on the other hand, that, if the philosophies of Nature of Schelling and Hegel consist, in great part, in a reconsideration of Böhme's idea of the self-unfolding of God, this is so because, in fact, the latter's theology had a pervasive influence on post-Kantian German idealism.

Let us, now, hear, briefly, Jakob Böhme himself: “God is the eternal One, or the greatest gentleness [stillness], so far as he exists in himself independently of his motion and manifestation. But in his motion he is called a God in trinity, that is, a triune Being, where we speak of three and yet but of one, and in accordance with which he is called the eternal Power and Word. This is the precious and supreme ground, and thus to be considered: The divine will shuts itself in a place to selfhood, as to power, and becomes active in itself; but also by its activity goes forth, and makes for itself an object, *viz.* wisdom, through which the ground and origin of all beings has arisen.” (This excerpt is taken from paragraph 44. of the third chapter of Böhme’s *On the Divine Intuition*. The translation is by John Rolleston Earl.)

21:12–15. See above, note to 12:33–34.

21:16. Plotinus (c. 204–270 A. D.), perhaps the first great synthesizer of Plato’s philosophy with Aristotle’s, is, in Pater’s “The Lower Pantheism” (the last chapter of *Gaston de Latour*), together with Parmenides and Giordano Bruno, one of the minds “congenial” to what, in the present writing (21:2–3), Pater himself calls “the suspicion of a mind latent in nature”: “The Dominicans would seem to have had well-stocked, and liberally-selected, libraries; and this curious youth [Bruno], in that age of restored letters, read eagerly, easily, and very soon came to the kernel of a difficult old author, Plotinus or Plato,—to the real purpose of thinkers older still...; Parmenides, above all, that most ancient assertor of God’s identity with the world. The affinities, the unity, of the visible and the invisible, of earth and heaven, of all things whatever, with one another, through the consciousness, the person, of God the Spirit, who was at every moment of infinite time, in every atom of matter, at every point of infinite space; aye! was everything, in turn: that doctrine—*l’antica filosofia Italiana*—was in all its vigour there, like some hardy growth out of the very heart of nature, interpreting itself to congenial minds with all the fulness of primitive utterance.”

21:17. Synesius of Cyrene (c. 370–c.415 A. D.)—Cyrene having been the north-eastern part of modern Libya— was a Neoplatonic thinker who converted to Christianity and be-

21:22.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

came bishop of Ptolemais. His hymns seem to have influenced both the hymns of the Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus' (c. 410–485 A. D.) and the letters of Dionysius the Pseudo-Aeropagite (5th–6th centuries): the so-called Pseudo-Dionysius.

21:22. The Greek word, *anámnēsis*, means “reminiscence”. Pater, however, is using it here in the Platonic sense of “reminiscence, or ‘recovery’, ‘from within’”. That is to say, in the specific sense of “acquisition of awareness of knowledge that one already possessed without being conscious of it”.

21:24. The English mathematician, physicist, astronomer, and theologian Isaac NEWTON (1642–1726/27); the French naturalist and zoologist Jean Léopold Nicolas Frédéric, Baron CUVIER (1769–1832).

21:37–38. S. T. Coleridge. “Comment” on “Aphorism XXXVI”.—*Aids to Reflexion*. Ed. H. N. Coleridge, London, William Pickering. 1839, pp. 81–82. (“Let us carry ourselves back, in spirit, to the mysterious week, the teeming work-days of the creator: as they rose in vision before the eye of the inspired historian of the generations of the heaven and the earth, in the days that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens. And who that hath watched their ways with an understanding heart, could, as the vision evolving, still advanced towards him, contemplate... and not say to himself, Behold the shadow of approaching humanity, the sun rising from behind, in the kindling morn of creation.”)

22:16–17. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), whose SUBJECTIVE IDEALISM motivated, as a reaction, both the ETHICAL IDEALISM of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) and the absolute idealism of Schelling and Hegel. The reference to “Kant’s fine-spun theory of the transformation of sense into perception”, to Kant’s transcendentalism or apriorism, cannot but be, to a certain extent, derogatory. Nonetheless, a thorough and informed study of Pater’s *philosophic* writings—above all, “Coleridge’s Writings”, the “Conclusion”, and “Style”—will most certainly reach the conclusion that, though he never reaches the point of acknowledging it, Pater abided by Kant’s (subjective) idealism.

22:24. “Hartley”. See above, note to “the philosophy of Hartley” (15:7–8).

22:f.n. It is thought that, despite its etymology from the Ancient Greek, the term *esemplastic* was modelled by Coleridge on Schelling’s noun *Ineinsbildung*—which is decomposable in *in-Eins-Bildung* (formation-into-one) and was meant to express the temporally discontinuous process by means of which an homogeneous series of real entities (e.g., the homogeneous series successively formed by all men that now exist, that ever have existed, and that ever will exist), as a series resulting from the successive instantiation of a certain concept (e.g., the concept *MAN*), gradually gives rise to the unity of ideal (concept) and real (intuition) which Schelling calls “Idea” (*Idee*).

That the term *esemplastic* expresses, in its adjectival form, the notion which the noun *In-Eins-Bildung* expresses is, by the way, exactly what Pater, following Coleridge, intends to evince by means of decomposing it in its etymological components: εἰ-ἔν-πλάτειν: *shape* (πλάσσειν) *into* (εἰ) *one* (ἔν).

In itself, however, the noun *Ineinsbildung* immediately suggests the notion “formation into one” no less than the German noun *Einbildungskraft* suggests when it is divested of all “Schellingism” and retains only the meaning Kant accrued to it: *Ein-Bildungs-Kraft*: the faculty of shaping diversity into unity. That is to say, the faculty of imagination, considered, as Kant considered it, as the faculty responsible for the production of the sensible unity-in-diversity that we, humans, intuit *qua* real and undividable entities. E.g., a *rose*, instead of the qualities which go into its constitution, considered as isolated qualities: *colour, odour, extension, solidity*. Or, to put it as Pater himself put it, in the “Conclusion”: a *rose*, instead of “a group of impressions—colour, odour, texture—in the mind of the observer.”

Now, in face of the fact that the term *esemplastic* was coined, as Coleridge lets us know in his *Biographia Literaria*, to designate the capacity (“the living power”), on the part of the *primary imagination*, of shaping the material diversity which is given in sensible intuition (*sinnliche Anschauung*) into conceptual unity, and thus the capacity, according to Schelling, of making actual the indifference between ideality-unity (homo-

23:15.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

genicity) and reality-diversity (heterogeneity), which characterizes the Idea *qua exhibitio originaria* in the mind of “the infinite I AM”—now, in face of this fact, should one not wonder why mere awareness of the meaning that the German term *Einbildungskraft* (“imagination”) acquired after Kant, as well as awareness of the twist Schelling gave to the Kantian concept of “productive imagination” (*produktive Einbildungskraft*), would not suffice to suggest to Coleridge the “pedantry” of coining “a fanciful Greek name” to operate as a modern equivalent to it?

23:15. Bearing in mind, perhaps, the “Schellinguist” understanding of life and reality as a universal work of art by the divine mind, Pater seems to be anticipating here Oscar Wilde’s dictum: “life imitates art far more than art imitates life”.—For “taste”, literary or otherwise, most certainly is part of life, and Pater speaks of “a change in taste” which is enforced not by a life change in itself, or by a causal change in the way of conceiving life or art, but by literary “productions which realize immediately a profound emotion”. And which, therefore, become themselves the cause of the effect “change in taste”.

The “change in taste” that Goethe’s novel, *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (*Die Leiden des jungen Werther*, 1874), enforced is, of course, to be identified with the change in sentiment which brought about the so-called “romantic posture”, not only in the literary representation of life, but also in life as an actualization of such a representation (*Darstellung*)—For, as it is well known, after the publication of the novel, young men unfavoured in love soon began to wear blue coats and yellow waistcoats in imitation of Goethe’s heart-sick protagonist, and, as if this “boundless delirium of extravagance” (as Thomas Carlyle put it into the introduction to the 1827 English version) were not enough, committed suicide by means of shooting themselves or of jumping from the ledges of towering buildings.

As to the “change in taste” enforced by *Emile, or On Education* (*Émile, ou De l’éducation*, 1762), by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), one is somehow compelled to think that Pater meant by it the change in political “taste” that brought about the *romantic* belief (according to Nietzsche) in the possibility of an egalitarian society bound indifferently by natural

instinct and the improvement of its members by means of education or culture (*Bildung*). That is to say, bound by an harmonious synthesis of self-indulgence and virtue: by an exquisite combination of democratic egotism and aristocratic altruism (taking both qualifiers in their etymological sense).

23:22–23. S. T. Coleridge. *Biographia Literaria*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge. London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 1, p. 217. Pater misquotes from the following words: “Poetry also is purely human; for all its materials are from the mind, and all its products are for the mind. But it is the apotheosis of the former state, in which by excitement of the associative power passion itself imitates order, and the order resulting produces a pleasurable passion, and thus it elevates the mind by making its feelings the object of its reflexion.”

23:23–24. S. T. Coleridge. *Biographia Literaria*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 2, pp. 70–71. (“First... the metre itself should be accompanied by the natural language of excitement. Secondly... the traces of present volition should throughout the metrical language be proportionably discernible. Now these two conditions must be reconciled and co-present. There must be not only a partnership, but a union; an interpenetration of passion and of will, of spontaneous impulse and of voluntary purpose. Again, this union can be manifested only in frequency of forms and figures of speech, (originally the offspring of passion, but now the adopted children of power), greater than would be desired or endured, where the emotion is not voluntarily encouraged and kept up for the sake of that pleasure, which such emotion, so tempered and mastered by the will, is found capable of communicating.”)

24:8–12. Pater says as much of the dramatic art of William Shakespeare (1564–1616) in his essay “Shakespeare’s English Kings”: “Like some melodiously contending anthem of Handel’s, I said, of Richard’s meek ‘undoing’ of himself in the mirror-scene; and, in fact, the play of *Richard the Second* does, like a musical composition, possess a certain concentration of all its parts, a simple continuity, an evenness in execution, which are rare in the great drama-

24:15–16.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

tist. With *Romeo and Juliet*, ... it belongs to a small group of plays, where, by happy birth and consistent evolution, dramatic form approaches to something like the unity of a lyrical ballad, a lyric, a song, a single strain of music.”

24:15–16. S. T. Coleridge. *A Course of Lectures*, Lecture VII (“Beaumont, Fletcher”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 1, p. 104.

24:19–23. *Idem. Ibidem*, pp. 103–104.

24:24–34. S. T. Coleridge. *Shakespeare, With Introductory Matter on Poetry* (“Shakespeare’s Judgment Equal to his Spirit”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 2, pp. 67–68.

25:23–24. “[B]ehind the veil”. Pater made use of this phrase once more, in *Marius the Epicurean II* (chapter XVIII, “The Ceremony of the Dart”): “If there be... a provident soul... ‘behind the veil,’ truly, even to him [Marcus Aurelius], even in the most intimate of those conversations, it has never yet spoken with any quite irresistible assertion of its presence.”

Most probably, Pater had in mind, when putting that phrase to use between quotation marks, either the last stanza of section LVI of Tennyson’s *In Memoriam* (“O life as futile, then, as frail! | O for thy voice to soothe and bless! | What hope of answer, or redress? | Behind the veil, behind the veil.”) or the poem by Henry Newman with that same phrase as its title (which is of 1833 and ends thus: “Lord, grant me this abiding grace, | Thy Word and sons to know; | To pierce the veil on Moses’ face, | Although his speech be slow”).

The phrase reappears in stanza XXXIV of Omar Khayyám’s *Rubáiyát*. However, Pater could not have known that while writing “Coleridge’s Writings”, for Edward Fitzgerald only included it in the 1872 version of his translation: “Then of the Thee in Me who works behind | The Veil, I lifted up my hands to find | A Lamp amid the Darkness; and I heard, | As from Without—’The Me within Thee blind!’”

25:27–29. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781). *Emilia Galotti* (1772), I, iv.

Pater’s memory, however, leads him into mistaking “Michael Angelo” for “Raffael”. Conti, a painter, is showing Hettore

Gonzaga, Prince of Guastalla, the portrait of Emilia Galotti he has painted. Talking of himself as the author of the painting, Conti tells the Prince: “Alas! that we cannot paint directly with our eyes! On the long journey from the eye through the arm to the pencil, how much is lost! But, as I have already said, though I know what is lost, and how and why it is lost, I am as proud and prouder of this loss than of what I have preserved. For by the former I perceive more than by the latter, that I am a good painter, though my hand is not always so. Or do you hold, Prince, that Raffaele would not have been the greatest of all artists even had he unfortunately been born without hands?” (The translation is by B. Dillon Boylan.)

25:30–33. Joseph Ernest Renan (1823–1892). *La Vie de Jésus* (1863).

At the end of chapter IV (“Premiers aphorismes de Jésus. Ses idées d’un Dieu père et d’une religion pure. Premiers disciples) of his *Life of Jesus*, Renan argues that, if the Gospel had not portrayed Jesus as a practitioner of miracles, “he would have become lost amid the mass of the great, unknown souls, the best of all; truth would not have been promulgated, and the world would not have profited from the immense moral superiority that is Father had imparted on him.”

It is immediately after he comments this, that, in writing the words Pater here quotes, Renan compares the importance which the deed acquires in morals with the importance it acquires in art: “Dans la morale, comme dans l’art, dire n’est rien, faire est tout. L’idée qui se cache sous un tableau de Raphaël est peu de chose; c’est le tableau seul qui compte.”

One should note that this analogy contradicts Conti’s assertion, in *Emilia Galotti*, that a Raphael without hands would still be a great painter (see note immediately above).

26:9. Robert Browning (1812–1889). *Sordello* (1849). As Browning wrote to his friend J. Milsand, in 1863, the poem’s stress falls “on the incidents in the development of a soul”—that of Sordello da Goito, a 13th-century Lombard troubadour.

26:10. *Sorrows of Werther*. See above, note to 23:15.

26:25–26. The Literary Remains of Coleridge could be known to Pater in one of the (first) three compilations to

26:30–31.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

appear: (i) *The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Collected and Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq. MA.* London, William Pickering, 1836–39, 4. vols. (ii) *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare and Some of the Old Poets and Dramatists, with Other Literary Remains of S. T. Coleridge, Edited by Mrs. H. N. Coleridge.* London, William Pickering, 1849, 2. vols. (iii) *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Edited by Professor W. G. T. Shedd, with an Introductory Essay upon his Philosophical and Theological Opinions.* New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853, 7 vols.

This first edition of Coleridge's *Complete Works* contains versions (i) and (ii), above, of his *Literary Remains*: (i) appears in vol. 5; (ii) appears in vol. 4.

26:30–31. “Where there is no humour, but only wit, or the like, there is no growth from within.” This Editor was unable to find the source of this quotation. He therefore transcribes the following passage of Coleridge's writings, in which Coleridge treats of “humour” and “growth from within”: “... in Smollett's Strap, his Lieutenant Bowling, his Morgan the honest Welshman, and his Matthew Bramble, we have exquisite humour,—while in his Peregrine Pickle we find an abundance of drollery, which too often degenerates into mere oddity; in short, we feel that a number of things are put together to counterfeit humour, but that there is no growth from within.” (S. T. Coleridge. *A Course of Lectures*, Lecture IV (“On the Distinctions of the Witty, the Droll, the Odd, and the Humorous; the Nature and Constituents of Humour;—Rabelais— Swift— Sterne”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 1, p. 134.)

26:31–32. S. T. Coleridge. *A Course of Lectures*, Lecture XIII (“On Poesy or Art”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 1, p. 221.

26: 33. Dante Alighieri (1265–1321).

26:33–35. S. T. Coleridge. *A Course of Lectures*, Lecture X. (“Donne—Dante—Milton *Paradise Lost*”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 1, p. 221.

26:35. John Milton (1608–1674). *Paradise Lost* (1667).

26:35–37. S. T. Coleridge. *A Course of Lectures*, Lecture X. (“Donne—Dante—Milton *Paradise Lost*”). *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, vol. 1, p. 172.

27:24. The following are some of the influential theological writings of the German writer Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781): *The Christianity of Reason* (*Das Christentum der Vernunft*), 1751–1753; *On the Origin of Revealed Religion* (*Über die Entstehung der geoffenbarten Religion*), 1784; *On the Religion of Christ* (*Die Religion Christi*), 1784; *On the Reality of Things Outside God* (*Über die Wirklichkeit der Dinge außer Gott*), 1795.

28:6. Jeremy Bentham (1748–1747), the so-called “founder of modern Utilitarianism”.

In her book *Democratising Beauty in Nineteenth-century Britain. Art and the Politics of Public Life* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, p. 113), Lucy Hartley states that the quotation “enlightened principle of self-preservation.” is “a quotation” which is “unusually, ... accurate”. Nonetheless, the Editor was unable to ascertain its source.

28:11–13. S. T. Coleridge. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character*. (“Reflections Respecting Morality”). London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825, p. 57. (“I have hitherto considered Prudence and Morality as two Streams from different sources, and traced the former to its supposed confluence with the latter. And if it had been my present purpose and undertaking to have placed Fruits from my own Garden before the Reader, I should in like manner have followed the course of Morality from its Twin Sources, the Affections and the Conscience, till (as the main Feeder into some majestic Lake rich with hidden Springs of its own) it flowed into, and became one with, the Spiritual Life.”)

28:21–29:5. *Idem. Ibidem* (“Comment” to “Aphorism VI”), pp. 68–69. (Not just “p. 68”, which is Pater’s referencing).

29:29. S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (“Letter IV”). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, p. 69.

Here is the paragraph (pp. 68–69) from which Pater quotes: “The first Christian martyr [Stephen] had the form and features of an ordinary man, nor are we taught to believe that these features were miraculously transfigured into superhuman symmetry; but *he being filled with the Holy Ghost, they that looked steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel*. Even so has it ever been, and so it ever will be, with all who with humble hearts and a rightly disposed spirit scan the Sacred Volume. And they who read it with *an evil heart of unbelief*, and an alien spirit—what boots for them the assertion that every sentence was miraculously communicated to the nominal author by God himself? Will it not rather present additional temptations to the unhappy scoffers, and furnish them with a pretext of self-justification?”

30:4. St. Augustine or Augustine of Hippo (354–430 A. D.)

30:4–5. The *Imitation* refers to the devotional book *The Imitation of Christ* (c. 1418–1427), which is supposed to have been written by the German–Dutch canon regular Thomas à Kempis (c. 1380–1471).

30:5. St. Francis (François) de Sales (1567–1622), bishop of Geneva from 1602 until his death and author of *Introduction to a Devout Life* (*Introduction à la vie dévote*, 1609).

30:26. St. Stephen, a deacon in the early Church of Jerusalem and the first martyr of Christianity, according to the Acts of the Apostles—which relate that, having incurred in the wrath of the members of various synagogues, as a result of his Christian teachings, and denounced the Jewish authorities who judged and accused him of blasphemy, he was condemned and stoned to death. The phrase “like the face of an angel” appears in Acts 6:15: “All who were sitting in the Sanhedrin looked intently at Stephen, and they saw that his face was like the face of an angel.” Coleridge quotes it in his *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* (see above, note to 29:29).

31:15. Baruch the SPINOZA (1632–1677); Jeremy BENTHAM (1748–1747); John AUSTIN (1790–1859). A Dutch philosopher, an English philosopher, jurist and social reformer, and an English legal theorist.

31:17. Theodore Parker (1810–1860), the American Transcendentalist and reforming minister of the Unitarian church.

31:27–28. René DESCARTES (1596–1650); George BERKELEY (1685–1753); Francis BACON (1561–1629); John LOCKE (1632–1704).

32:8–10. Kant distinguishes between the theoretical reason (*theoretische Vernunft*) and the practical reason (*praktische Vernunft*). In the *Critique of Pure Reason* (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*), he treats of the first; in the *Critique of Practical Reason* (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*), he treats of the second. The “three categories of totality, God, the soul, and the universe” are, according to Kant, constitutive Ideas (*konstitutive Ideen*), as opposed to regulative Ideas (*regulative Ideen*), such as the Ideas of (the perfection of) Man, State, etc. The Idea of God is, for Kant, the ultimate *focus* and limit of all our thought, for it is the Idea of absolute (and therefore undetermined) totality (Idea of the *absolute Einheit der Bedingungen aller Gegenstände des Denkens überhaupt*)—which, then, must include the two relatively undetermined Ideas of (the totality of) Nature (the material world) and of the (totality of) the Soul (the spiritual world).

32:17–33:2. Heinrich Heine (1797–1856). *On the History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany*, book 3.

33:6–7. S. T. Coleridge. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character* (“Aphorisms on Spiritual Religion”). London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825, p. 208.

33:7–8. S. T. Coleridge. *The Statesman's Manual; or, the Bible the Best Guide to Political Skill and Foresight: A Lay Sermon, Addressed to the Higher Classes of Society, with an Appendix, Containing Comments and Essays Connected with the Study of the Inspired Writings* (“Appendix B”). Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853. In. —. *Complete Works*. Ed. W. G. T. Shedd, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853, vol. 2, p. 456.

33:8. *Idem. Ibidem*, p. 458.

33:9. S. T. Coleridge. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character* (“Aphorisms on Spiritual Religion”, “Aphorism VIII”). London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825, p. 209.

33:10.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

33:10. Pater seems to be misquoting the words “the faculty of adapting means to proximate ends”—which appear in: S. T. Coleridge. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character* (“Aphorisms on Spiritual Religion”, “Comment” to “Aphorism IV”). London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825, p. 235.

33:15–16. S. T. Coleridge. *The Friend; A Series of Essays*. London, Gale and Curtis, 1812. The half-title page says; *The Friend; | A Literary, Moral, and Political | Weekly Paper | Excluding Personal and Party Politics and | The Events of the Day | Conducted | By S. T. Coleridge | of | Grasmere, Westmorland.*

Numbers 1–27, with a supernumerary number between numbers 20 and 21, were issued from 1 June 1815 to 15 March 1810—including contributions by Wordsworth and others, but containing above all compositions by Coleridge.

Volume 4 of *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Edited by Professor W. G. T. Shedd, with an Introductory Essay upon his Philosophical and Theological Opinions* (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853) reprints *The Friend*, as edited by H. N. Coleridge and published in 1837 (London, William Pickering), in 3 volumes.

Since Pater refers the reader here to “the third volume of *The Friend*”, it is to be assumed that he had in mind the third volume of the 1837 edition (the third), in the course of whose numbers of *The Friend* Coleridge does, indeed, use several times the word “deduction”; however, always in contexts that do not permit to pinpoint which of them Pater might have in mind (if any).

33:25. The main character in Molière’s *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*. Pater mentions him once more, in his *Guardian*-essay “English Literature. Four Books for Students of English Literature” (1886).

34:3. τρίτον εἶδωλον (*trítōn eídōlon*). Pater is quoting the Seventh Letter of Plato, in which (342 a–342 b) Plato enumerates the “three classes of objects [of thought] through which knowledge about” “everything that exists” “must come” (the translation is by L. A. Post). These “three classes of objects”, Plato states, are: “first, a name” (ἔν... ὄνομα); “second,

a description” (δεύτερον... λόγος); “third, an image” (τρίτον εἰδωλον, *trítion eídōlon*).

Pater, then, seems to have read *trítion* (“third”) not as an adverb (in the third place), but as an adjective (third)—in the sense “a third image”. Likewise, in using the phrase in the context he uses it (“it is the shadow of a shadow, a mere τρίτον εἰδωλογ, twice removed from substance and reality”), he seems to have in mind foremost Plato’s *Republic* 602c—where Socrates asks Glaucon: “this business of imitation is concerned with the third [*trítion*] remove from truth, is it not?” (The translation is by Paul Shorey.)

34:7. Ferdinand Baur (1792–1860), the leader of the Tübingen school of theology.

34:19–20. These letters were first published posthumously, in 1840: *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures*, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Edited from the Author’s MS. By Henry Nelson Coleridge Esq. MA. London, William Pickering, 1840.

34:22–23. The German word that Lessing coined is *Bibliolatrie*. In the Introduction to an unfinished work titled *Bibliolatrie*—which H. H. Bernard translated in *Cambridge Free-thoughts and Letters on Bibliolatriy, Translated from the German of G. E. Lessing* (London, Trübner and Co., 1862, pp. xxxix–xl),—Lessing wrote: “By Bibliolatriy, I understand that veneration which, at divers times, in divers manners, has been claimed for the Bible, and particularly for the books of the New Testament. I take *Latry* therefore not in the sense of the Catholic Church, according to which it denote veneration and a service, as they belong only to God; and am far from having formed the whole compound word *Bibliolatriy* after *Idolatriy*.”

34:35. For “finds”, see below, note immediately after the next.

35:7–36:4. S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (“Letter I”). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, pp. 9–10. Coleridge’s exact text is the following: “There is a Light higher than all, even *the Word that was in the beginning*; the Light, of which light itself is but the *shechinah* and cloudy

34:7.

Coleridge’s Writings (1866)

35:8–9.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

tabernacle; the Word that is light for every man, and life for as many as give heed to it. If between this Word and the written Letter I shall anywhere seem to myself to find a discrepancy, I will not conclude that such there actually is; nor on the other hand will I fall under the condemnation of them that would *lie for God*, but seek as I may, be thankful for what I have—and wait.”

35:8–9. *Idem. Ibidem* (“Letter II”), p. 13.

Again, Pater misquotes his source: “In my last Letter I said that in the Bible there is more that *finds* me than I have experienced in all other books put together; that the words of the Bible *find* me at greater depths of my being; and that whatever *finds* me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit. But the doctrine in question requires me to believe that not only what *finds* me, but that all that exists in the sacred volume, and which I am bound to find therein, was—not alone inspired by, that is composed by, men under the actuating influence of the Holy Spirit, but likewise—*dictated by an Infallible Intelligence; that the writers, each and all, were divinely informed as well as inspired.*” (The italics have been added.)

35:10. *Idem. Ibidem* (see note immediately above).

35:11–13. *Idem. Ibidem*, pp. 16–17.

35:13–15. *Idem. Ibidem* (“Letter V”), p. 63. (“And to make the Bible, apart from the truths, doctrines, and spiritual experiences contained therein, the subject of a special article of faith, I hold an unnecessary and useless abstraction.”)

35:17. The “Cabbalists” are the theosophical interpreters of the Hebrew scriptures, “Kabbalah” (“reception”, “tradition”, “correspondence”) being the name for an esoteric method characteristic of Jewish mysticism, as well as for the school of those who practice and the discipline they study.

35:17–23. S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (“Letter III”). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, p. 31.

35:19–20. In respect of Memnon and the reason why Coleridge mentioned his “colossal... head”, consider the following information, transcribed from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: “Memnon, in Greek mythology, son of Tithonus (son of Laomedon, legendary king of Troy) and Eos (Dawn) and

king of the Ethiopians. He was a post-Homeric hero, who, after the death of the Trojan warrior Hector, went to assist his uncle Priam, the last king of Troy, against the Greeks. He performed prodigies of valour but was slain by the Greek hero Achilles. [...] In Egypt the name of Memnon was connected with the colossal (70-foot [21-metre]) stone statues of Amenhotep III near Thebes, two of which still remain. The more northerly of these was partly destroyed by an earthquake in 27 B. C., resulting in a curious phenomenon. Every morning, when the rays of the rising sun touched the statue, it gave forth musical sounds like the twang of a harp string. This was supposed to be the voice of Memnon responding to the greeting of his mother, Eos. After the restoration of the statue by the Roman emperor Septimius Severus (AD 170) the sounds ceased; they were attributed to the passage of air through the pores of the stone, caused chiefly by the change of temperature at sunrise."

35:24. S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* ("Letter III"). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, p. 37.

35:24–29. *Idem. Ibidem* ("Letter IV"), p. 48.

36:7. Pater continues to refer to *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* (1840).

36:8–9. S. T. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures* ("Letter I"). Edited by Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840, p. 4 ("the following Confessions of one who... loves Truth... with an indescribable awe").

36:9–11. *Idem. Ibidem.*

36:12–13. Pater was writing in 1865; the *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* were first published in 1840; hence, "the light which twenty-five years have thrown back upon them".

36:24–25. In speaking of "the results of M. Renan's investigations", Pater must have had foremost in mind the six volumes of *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme: La Vie de Jésus* (1863); *Les Apôtres* (1866); *Saint Paul* (1869); *L'Antéchrist* (1873); *Les Évangiles et la seconde génération chrétienne* (1878); *L'Église chrétienne* (1879); *Marc Aurèle ou la fin du monde antique* (1883).

36:26–27.

Coleridge's Writings (1866)

36:26–27. See above, note to 36:12–13..

37:12. See above, note to 18:2–3.

37:16–17. All three of them were depicted as sensitive, passionate young men, and became known as an epitome of the *romantic posture*: the hero of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812–18), by the English poet George Gordon Byron (1788–2824); the protagonist in *The Sorrows of Young Werther* (*Die Leiden des jungen Wether*, 1874), by the German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832); the protagonist in *René*, by the French writer François-René de Chateaubriand (1768–1848).

37:26–27. ἀβρότης, χλιδῆς, χαρίτων, ἡμέρου, πόθου πατήρ (*habrōtētos, chlidēs, charitōn, himerou, pōthou patēr*) is how, in Plato's *Symposium* (197d7), Agathon describes “father”—πατήρ *Pater!*—*Eros* (*Love*): “the father of delicacy, daintiness, elegance, and grace, of longing and desire” (in Michael Joyce's translation).

For all reasons, Pater could not but be over-conscious that his surname (Pater) meant “father” in Ancient Greek—including the fact that, as Thomas Wright says (in volume I, chapter IX, of his *The Life of Walter Pater*), this had been pointed out to him even as he was a boy: “Among the boys in the Fifth Form to which Pater had by this time risen was a Pope and also an Abbot; and Mr. Wallace [the Rev. George Wallace, the Head Master of King's School, Canterbury], who called them his ‘three fathers,’ used to observe that it was a singular circumstance that in a form consisting of only a dozen boys three should be called ‘father’ in different languages.”

In his edition of the *Symposium* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980), Sir Kenneth Dover states that “the last section (197d1–e5)” of Agathon's speech “consists of a chain of laudatory phrases organised in pairs or series, with a high degree of symmetry, rhyme and assonance (p. 123). Some lines ahead (p. 124), he comments: “Plato has taken considerable trouble to give Agathon's peroration a poetic character”.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

Poems by William Morris (1868)

“There is a slight air of mystery”, Samuel Wright says, on page 164 of his *A Bibliography of the Writings of Walter Pater*—“There is a slight air of mystery about the 1868 Morris review. From time to time Pater supplied lists of his writings to enquirers, but never listed the review. The Bodleian Library hold a holograph ‘biography’ written by Pater”—the autograph which is reproduced on page ii of the present book—and this item is not given in it. Further when his friend and literary executor Charles L. Shadwell published the posthumous *Miscellaneous Studies* in 1895 he provided ‘a brief chronological list of his published writings’ in which he includes “Aesthetic Poetry”, written 1868. First published 1889 in *Appreciations* with no mention of the Morris review. Ferris Greenslet in his book *Walter Pater* (Heinemann: 1900) also appended a ‘Chronology’ and merely copied Shadwell’s entry.”

Furthermore, in a letter addressed to Herbert Horne in May 1890, after the appearance of the second edition of *Appreciations*, Lionel Johnson wrote, referring to Pater: “He said, he suppressed his Aesthetic Poetry essay, because ‘there were things in it’; which some people, pious souls! thought profane, yes! profane” (*Ap*: Denis Donoghue. *Walter Pater: Lover of Strange Souls*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1995, p. 78).

What sort of “things” did Pater have in mind? “Things” that he was *sure* to have been thought “profane” (as Johnson, no doubt, thought)? Or “things” that he *feared* would likewise be thought “profane”, if they became “things” publicly known?

Perhaps some of the notes that follow will contribute to shed light (even if it be faint light) on the causes of such “a slight air of mystery”—for, in Pater’s days, the church somehow still remained The Church, and (as it still is the case today, paradoxically) the slightest allusion to intercourse—shagging—might definitely place one’s bread and butter in jeopardy: as it actually did in the case of Pater.

That is to say, perhaps some of the notes that follow will lead the reader—it will depend on him or her—to wonder whether or not, in coming to name the first half of “the 1868 Morris review” “Aesthetic Poetry”, Pater was, with a vengeance, thinking of the qualifier “aesthetic” in its etymological sense (αἰσθητικῶς, “capable of being perceived by the senses”, “sensible”), instead of in the modern sense (derived from Baumgarten): “related to beauty”.

After all—Pater certainly was cognizant of this,—all poetry (even bad poetry) is, by its nature, aesthetic (in the latter sense of the word).—With the result that there is as much sense in speaking of “Aesthetic Poetry” as there is in speaking, for instance, of “wet water”.

In Pater's mind, *Aesthetic* and *Greek* must have been, therefore, qualifiers quite synonymous.

41:1–52:19. This part of the review, which corresponds to *Westminster*, pp. 300–309, is the part that became the essay “Æsthetic Poetry”, in the 1889 edition of *Appreciations* (pp. 213–227); 52:34–56:15, corresponding to *Westminster*, pp. 309–312, is the part that became the “Conclusion”, in the 1873 edition of *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (pp. 207–213).

41:28–29. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), to whom Pater refers repeatedly (either as Göthe or Goethe), in particular in his *Renaissance* essay “Winckelmann”.

The drama *Götz von Berlichingen* was first published in 1773, and first performed in 1774. Based on the memoirs of the adventurer-poet Gottfried or Götz von Berlichingen (c. 1480–1562), also known as “The Iron Hand” (“Die Eisenhand”), the drama portrays its hero as a free spirit unable to accommodate himself into the deceitful and over-refined society of the Germany of his time; furthermore, as a man who succumbs to abstract notions of “law” and “justice”, and tragically pays the price for his outsideness and rebellious stance.

Goethe wrote the drama *Iphigenia in Tauris* (*Iphigenie auf Tauris*) first in prose, and then in blank verse. The prose version was written, and first performed, in 1779; the blank

verse-version was first published in 1787, and first performed in 1800. The drama is a reworking of the ancient Greek drama *Iphigenis in Tauris* (written between 414 and 412 B. C.), by Euripides (c. 480–406 B. C.)

42:1. The Scottish historical novelist, poet, playwright and historian Sir Walter Scott (1771–1832).

42:3. The Italian poet and prose writer Dante Alighieri (1265–1321).

42:4. St. Louis: Louis IX (1214–1270), king of France from 1226 to 1270 and leader of the Seventh Crusade to the Holy Land, in 1248–1250.

42:5. In the Arthurian Romance-cycle, Lancelot is depicted as a brave knight raised in the fairy realm by the Lady of the Lake (hence, his epithet “Lancelot of the Lake”), who, afterwards, becomes King Arthur’s close companion and one of the greatest Knights of the Round Table. Nonetheless, he is unable to withstand his “romantic love” for Queen Guenevere, Arthur’s wife, with the result that his “rebellious flesh” compels him to commit adultery with her.

William Morris’ poem “The Defence of Guenevere” (one of the poems Pater is reviewing) consists of Guenevere’s defence of the charge of having committed adultery with Lancelot.

42:6. The French theologian and philosopher Pierre Abélard (1079–1142).

Having become a private tutor to Héloïse, an unusually well educated woman (she spoke and read Latin, Greek and Hebrew), who was the niece of Canon Fulbert (one of the clergy of the cathedral of Paris), he and her fell prey to “romantic love”, their “rebellious flesh” having produced a son before they could marry secretly. Héloïse, to escape the wrath of her uncle Fulbert, withdrew into the convent of Argenteuil, outside Paris, and Abélard, after he suffered castration at Fulbert’s instigation, embraced the monastic life, at the royal abbey of Saint-Denis, near Paris.

Abélard and Héloïse became famous mainly through the letters they afterwards wrote (in Latin) to each other, in the first of which—known as *Historia calamitatum* (“History of My

42:6.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

Troubles”)—he described his career in detail. These letters, the so-called *Letters of Abelard and Heloise*, were first published in 1616 (in Latin) and 1693 (in French). The English poet Alexander Pope (1688–1744) drew from them inspiration for his verse-epistle “Eloisa to Abelard” (1717).

In “Two Early French Stories”, the essay where Pater mentions Abelard most, Pater not only stresses that “Abelard’s struggle” against the Scholasticism of his time was an important part of the “sincere and generous play of the forces of human mind and character”, but also recounts Abelard’s famous story (in a way which makes the reader aware that, while writing the present review, his mind was constantly reminded of “sorceresses” and the poetry of “the *Trouvères*”):

Every one knows the legend of Abelard, a legend hardly less passionate, certainly not less characteristic of the middle age, than the legend of Tannhäuser; how the famous and comely clerk, in whom Wisdom herself, self-possessed, pleasant, and discreet, seemed to sit enthroned, came to live in the house of a canon of the church of Notre-Dame, where dwelt a girl, Heloise, believed to be the old priest’s orphan niece; how the old priest had testified his love for her by giving her an education then unrivalled, so that rumour asserted that, through the knowledge of languages, enabling her to penetrate into the mysteries of the older world, she had become a sorceress, like the Celtic druidesses; and how as Abelard and Heloise sat together at home there, to refine a little further on the nature of abstract ideas, ‘Love made himself of the party with them.’ You conceive the temptations of the scholar, who, in such dreamy tranquillity, amid the bright and busy spectacle of the ‘Island,’ lived in a world of something like shadows; and that for one who knew so well how to assign its exact value to every abstract thought, those restraints which lie on the consciences of other men had been relaxed. It appears that he composed many verses in the vulgar tongue: already the young men sang them on the quay

below the house. Those songs, says M. de Rémusat, were probably in the taste of the *Trouvères*, 'of whom he was one of the first in date, or, so to speak, the predecessor.' It is the same spirit which has moulded the famous 'letters,' written in the quaint Latin of the middle age.

42:8. The French poet, novelist, essayist, and playwright of the Romantic movement Victor Hugo (1802–1885), whom Pater mentions repeatedly in his writings, above all in the present essay and in the essay "Postscript"—which, significantly, was originally titled "Romanticism".

42:9. The German poet and essayist (Christian Johann) Heinrich Heine (1797–1856).

42:11. "[T]en years ago". Pater was writing in 1868; by the, *The Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poems* had been published ten years before (in 1858).

42:14. "Guenevere defending herself from the charge of adultery". See above, note to 42:5.

42:21. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778).

The "experience of Rousseau" is here—as Pater will soon make evident—the experience of "religion shad[ing] into sensuous love, and sensuous love into religion", which occurs whenever "sentiments whose natural direction is towards objects of sense" are redirected towards "an imaginary object", such as "God", "Christ" or the "Virgin Mary".

42:29. "Provençal poetry" is the name given to the body of poetry that was produced in the southeast of France, from the 11th to the 14th centuries, in the language of Provence (the Provençal language) and of its neighbouring regions. Characteristically, its main theme is courtly, or chivalric, love.

43:7. "Zeus at Olympia" refers to the statue of the Greek god Zeus that once stood at Olympia, a city in the western part of the Peloponnese. It was made by the great Greek sculptor Phidias, around 435 B. C., and erected in the Temple of Zeus at Olympia. It was about 12 m tall.

At the beginning of chapter XXIII of *Marius the Epicurean*, Pater refers to "the Zeus of Olympia" as one of the "instances of the summing up of an entire world of complex asso-

43:7–8.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

ciations under a single form”, such “instances” being presented by “The more highly favoured ages of imaginative art”. And, in the chapter of *Greek Studies* titled “A Study of Dionysus”, he notes that the Greek historian Arrian of Nicomedia (c. 86–c. 146/160 A. D.) has pronounced it “a calamity”, “to die without having seen the Zeus of Olympia”.

43:7–8. “Athena in the Acropolis” refers to a magnificent statue of the Greek goddess Athena (the city protectress, goddess of war, handicraft, and practical reason, whom the Romans identified with their goddess Minerva) that once stood in the Parthenon, at the Acropolis (in Athens). Named *Athena Parthenos* and attributed to the great sculptor Phidias, it was described by Pausanias, in the first volume of his *Description of Greece* (24. 5) thus: “The statue... is made of ivory and gold. On the middle of her helmet is placed a likeness of the Sphinx... and on either side of the helmet are Grypes [Griffins] in relief.... The statue of Athena is upright, with a tunic reaching to the feet, and, on her breast, the head of Medusa is worked in ivory. She holds a statue of Nike [Victory] about four cubits high, and, in the other hand, a spear; at her feet, lies a shield, and near the spear is a serpent. This serpent would be Erichthonios. On the pedestal, is the birth of Pandora in relief”. (The translation is by W. H. S. Jones.)

43:12. “[T]he idyll of Theocritus” is Idyll II of the *Idylls*—the bucolic poems that were written by the Sicilian Greek poet Theocritus (c. 300–after 200 B. C.)

Idyll II is titled *Φαρμακεύτριαι* (*Pharmakeutriai*), a word which J. M. Edmonds, for example, translates as “The Spell”—but which might perhaps be converted, more appropriately, into “Magic Medicine”. The idyll tells of the spell that Simaetha, a young woman, goes on reciting, while preparing it, to attempt to conjure the return *unto her* of her lover (Delphis), who has stopped visiting her and, therefore, has left her dependent on her own *resources!*

The line Pater quotes partially is repeated by Simaetha after each of the first ten stanzas or so of the monologue. Theocritus, therefore, meant it to be as much significative as Pater’s elisions—of the vocative Wryneck (Ἰνυγξ), at the beginning,

and of the phrase *that man* (τὸν ἄνδρα), at the end—seem to be. The whole line, Ἰυγξ, ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα, may be translated in many ways, including “Turn, magic wheel, draw homeward him I love”, and “Magic Wheel, drag to my house this man of mine.” Therefore, Pater’s partial quote (... ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα) may well be understood to mean:—“... drag *him* into mine *house*.” (Ἰυγξ is sometimes translated as *Wryneck*, under the impression that witches used to tie such a *neck* to their turning wheels, instead of—turning it round and round, in and out—directly to *themselves*.)

43:22–23. The love of which Pater speaks here is incompatible with marriage because it is love for a “chevalier who never comes”, or love “of the serf for the chatelaine”, or love of “the rose for the nightingale”... or the love “of Rudel for the Lady of Tripoli”.

After having quoted Theocritus’ Idyll II, Pater naturally had in mind—such are the laws of association—Robert Browning’s poem “Rudel to the Lady of Tripoli”: a poem in which, so to put it, Simaetha’s *wryneck* becomes “the gracious Sun”, and Simaetha’s *house* becomes “a Flower” “underneath the Mount”—the mount!—that the mediaeval *Minnesänger* use to think of as the *Venusberg* (Mount of Venus or *mons pubis*).

Presumably, the knights who had returned from the Holy Land spoke with enthusiasm of a beautiful Countess of Tripoli, a lady who had dispensed them the most generous hospitality.

Presumably, Geoffrey Rudel (Jaufre Rudel), Prince of Blaye and a troubadour of the early–mid 12th century, having heard of such an account, fell deeply in love with the Countess without ever having set his eye on her; and prevailed upon one of his friends, Bertrand d’ Allamanon, a Troubadour like himself, to accompany him to the Levant (the word is here quite meaningful).

Such is the *Leitmotiv* of Browning’s poem, which indeed shares Rudel’s favourite theme: the theme of “love from afar” (*amour de loin*), but *quite at hand*:—a kind of love (should one, like Nietzsche, call it a “*Träum*”?) of which Pater himself, no doubt, was a proficient practitioner.

43:28. For “Rousseau”, see above, note to 42:21.

44:5. The historic novel *Notre Dame de Paris* was first published in 1831. Hugo's story is set in the Paris of the end of the 15th century, in, and in connection with, the Cathedral of Notre-Dame, situated in the Île de la Cité, amidst the river Seine. The plot deals above all with an unusually beautiful Gypsy woman, de dancer Esmeralda, and the different kinds of love she fuels in two no less different men: the deformed adoptee Quasimodo and the priest-chemist, the archdeacon, Claude Frollo. The man Esmeralda loves passionately, however, is the womanizer Phoebus de Châteaupers.

44:7. "The English poet" Pater is referring to is obviously William Morris.

44:8. "King Arthur's Tomb" is, in William Morris' *The Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poems*, the first of the "other poems".

44:11. The phrase "scarlet liles" appears in l. 82 of Morris' poem "King Arthur's Tomb". Lancelot is telling of a night when, Guenevere having fallen asleep on his breast ("There lily-like she bow'd her head and slept"), he too fell asleep, only to awake and see her facing him: "before me one | 'Stood whom I knew, but scarcely dared to touch. | 'She seemed to have changed so in the night | 'Moreover she held scarlet liles, such | 'As Maiden Margaret [Saint Margaret] bears upon the light | 'Of the great church walls".

44:13-14. "Sir Galahad, a Christmas Mystery" is, in William Morris' *The Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poems*, the second of the "other poems". It is doubtful that Pater did not give the correct title of the poem by mistake. One should, therefore, be wary, in reading *Sir Galahad: a Mystery* (in Pater's formulation) for "Sir Galahad, a Christmas Mystery". Furthermore, one should keep in mind that, in Morris' poem, Galahad no longer is portrayed as the chaste, sinless young man who is destined from birth (as it happens in the romances of the so-called "Lancelot-Grail cycle) to attain the beatific vision of the Grail. Indeed, Morris' Galahad is, Faust-like, a man of a double-edged soul, and, therefore, a slave of passions perennially at strife and in debate. "In me", says Goethe's Faust, "Two souls, alas, are dwelling in my breast, |

And one is striving to forsake its brother. | Unto the world in grossly loving zest, | With clinging tendrils, one adheres; | The other rises forcibly in quest | Of rarefied ancestral spheres.” (The translation is by Walter Kaufmann.)

44:16. “[T]he Grail”: the Holy Grail or Sangraal (as Pater figuratively refers to it at the end of “Coleridge’s Writings”). Since the Middle Ages, since Robert de Boron’s *The Great History of the Grail* (*La grant estoire dou graal*), it was seen as the vessel used by Christ at the Last Supper, as well as the container in which Joseph of Arimathea (in the Bible, a rich man charged with taking care of Christ’s dead body) was supposed to have collected Christ’s blood, at the Deposition.

As Pater himself proves, by transforming the Grail, the most Christian of all motives, in an allegory of “the Greek Spirit”, at the end of “Coleridge’s Writings”, “the Grail” came to mean figuratively (in great part as a result of the Arthurian romances dedicated to the motive of ‘the Quest’) *that which, because most life-giving, most is searched for*.—So that, in T. S. Eliot’s *Waste Land*, for instance, “the young man carbuncular”, “the expected guest”, too seems to have his own Grail: “The typist home at teatime”, “On the divan... (at night her bed)”, on top of her, “Stockings, slippers, camisoles, and stays”.

44:17. “The Blue Closet” is, in William Morris’ *The Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poems*, the seventeenth of the “other poems”. It owes its title to Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s watercolour *The Blue Closet* (1857), which served as a source of inspiration for Morris and apparently was so named in virtue of the blue tiles on the walls of the *closet* that is depicted in it.

“The Blue Closet” is about the four women depicted in Rossetti’s watercolour, who have been imprisoned in an isolated and untended tower. Once every year, on Christmas eve, they are given permission to enter a Blue Closet, there to sing of the visit Arthur had paid to them in a distant past. In truth, they cannot expect Arthur to *come* to them anew, for, by then, he had already shown himself “with hands full of snow”—which “snow”, his “eyes” “grey with time”, “small and dry”, he had “sprinkled... over [the] head” of the damozell called Louise. Therefore, the soft music that swells out of the “gold

44:20—

Poems by William Morris (1868)

strings” and tumid “keys” of their instrument is, and forever will remain, the sole “key | Of the happy golden land!”

In the land of dreams, nonetheless, nothing that be not dreamt of does really matter: “O, sisters, cross the bridge with me. | ... | What matters that I cannot see, | If ye take me”—“by the hand?”

And thus the togetherness of the four Damozels’ timorous singing really does come—to transmute the wind’s solo “knell for the dead” in the more than mysterious togetherness of the Holy Communion:—In response, of course, to the prayer: “Dear Lord, that loves me, I wait to receive | Either body or spirit this wild Christmas-eve.”

44:20–45:2. Pater quotes—“perhaps”, indeed, “for the enjoyment of the few” who *can read*—lines 36–58 of Morris’ “The Blue Closet” (pp. 196–197).

45:35. Claude Charles Fauriel. *Histoire de la Poésie Provençale*. Paris, Benjamin Duprat, 1847, vol. 2, p. 94. Pater refers to the following two paragraphs (which are given here in G. J. Adler’s translation):

Among the prodigious variety of popular songs, which the Greeks possessed for all the occasions of private and domestic life, there were some which were designated by the generic name of songs of the night, and which were intended to be sung at night by lovers, under the window or at the door of their lady-loves. Of these songs there were various kinds, according to the hour at which they were expected to be sung. There were those which were sung at midnight; these were the songs inviting to sleep and on that account were denominated *κατακοιμητικά*, songs of slumber or lullabies, as we should call them. Others again were sung at the dawn of day, and these were termed *διεγερτικά*, waking-songs.

The literature of all the nations of southern Europe contains songs which seem to be but an echo of these ancient lays; and this can be said more particularly of the *serenas* and the *albas* of the Troubadours, which correspond exactly to the night-songs of the Greeks, except

that in the former we recognize at the first glance the characteristic modifications of the poetry of chivalry. Thus the aubades of the Troubadours were intended to wake up at the dawn of day the chevalier who had spent the night with his lady, and to admonish him to withdraw speedily, in order to escape detection. The Troubadours sometimes put this song into the mouth of one of the companions of the lucky knight, who acts as his sentinel during the whole of the night, in order to watch and to announce the break of day. At other times again they put it into the mouth of one of the two lovers at the moment of parting. More often still the aubade is intended to be sung by the sentinel, who watches on the top of the the bell-tower and who is supposed to be a party to the sleeping lovers.

Pater, no doubt, wrote this footnote with tongue on cheek—for he well knew the kind of *music* or *song* that the Provençal *aubade* and *serenade* were meant to signify. That is to say, for he well knew (read his words) that the *serenade* was a midnight-song (a song “inviting to sleep”) as much as the *nocturn*, its name deriving not only from Latin *sera* (“evening”), but also from Latin *serenus* (“peaceful”, “calm”, “not excited”); and that the *aubade* was an *alba*-song, a dawn-song, because by then, in “the middle age” (40:7), it no longer remained a down one.

45:27–29. Pater, of course, had in mind Act III, Scene v, of Shakespeare’s play *Romeo and Juliet* (ll. 2098–2133)—in which Romeo pronounces himself quite sure that the *song* sung is of “the lark, the herald of the morn”, and that, therefore, he “must be gone and *live*”, since, otherwise, if he stay, he will end up *dying*; while Juliet pronounces herself sure that the *song* sung is of the nightingale, the herald of the night, but ends up agreeing with Romeo: “hie hence, be gone, away! | It is the lark that sings so out of tune”. “O, now be gone; more light and light it grows.”—Because, surely, “the lark” is here no less a bird than Romeo’s *sun* “in yonder east”. Hence, Juliet’s joke: “Yon light is not [yet] day-light”—“I know it!”—“It is some meteor [something hovering in the air] that the sun exhales [breathes out], |

45:30–31.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

To be to thee this night a torch-bearer, | And light thee on thy way to Mantua". Romeo ends up assenting to Juliet's expertise: "'Tis but the pale reflex of Cynthia's brow."—She being sure the *day* is yet too short for him to *die*: "Therefore stay yet; thou need'st not to be gone."

45:30–31. Epithalamium (*epithalamion*): "bridal song" (*epi*-, "at", "upon" + *thalamos*, "bridal chamber").

45:34. Pater quotes the passage in the second book of *Émile, ou De l'éducation*, where Émile reminisces concerning an episode of his life as a youth:

I was living in the country with a pastor called M. Lambercier. My companion was a cousin richer than myself, who was regarded as the heir to some property, while I, far from my father, was but a poor orphan. My big cousin Bernard was unusually timid, especially at night. I laughed at his fears, till M. Lambercier was tired of my boasting, and determined to put my courage to the proof. One autumn evening, when it was very dark, he gave me the church key, and told me to go and fetch a Bible he had left in the pulpit. To put me on my mettle he said something which made it impossible for me to refuse. I set out without a light; if I had had one, it would perhaps have been even worse. I had to pass through the graveyard; I crossed it bravely, for as long as I was in the open air I was never afraid of the dark.

This is the English translation by Barbara Foxley. In the original, the statement "I was never afraid of the dark" reads; "je n'eus jamais de *frayeurs nocturnes*". (The emphasis has been added.)

46:2–21. Pater quotes in its entirety Morris' "Summer Dawn" (p. 246). Notice the imaginative *sweetness* of Pater's commentary: "all the sweetness of the imaginative loves of the middle age... is in that!" In *that!*

46:26. Pater means to say: "The *Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poems*".

46:32. The Renaissance painter Paolo Veronese (c. 1528–1588).

Pater seems to have permanently associated the *chiaro* of Veronese's paintings with *clearness* and *firmness* ("masculinity") in literary style. In the last chapter of *Plato and Platonism* ("Plato's Aesthetics"), almost for sure thinking of himself as an artist, he writes:

What he [Plato] would promote, then, is the art, the literature, of which among other things it may be said that it solicits a certain effort from the reader or spectator, who is promised a great expressiveness on the part of the writer, the artist, if he for his part will bring with him a great attentiveness. And how satisfying, how reassuring, how flattering to himself after all, such work really is—the work which deals with one as a scholar, formed, mature and manly. Bravery—ἀνδρεία or manliness—manliness and temperance, as we know, were the two characteristic virtues of that old pagan world; and in art certainly they seem to be involved in one another. Manliness in art, what can it be, as distinct from that which in opposition to it must be called the feminine quality there,—what but a full consciousness of what one does, of art itself in the work of art, tenacity of intuition and of consequent purpose, the spirit of construction as opposed to what is literally incoherent or ready to fall to pieces, and, in opposition to what is hysteric or works at random, the maintenance of a standard. Of such art ἦθος rather than πάθος will be the predominant mood. To use Plato's own expression there will be here no παραλειπόμενα, no 'negligences,' no feminine forgetfulness of one's self, nothing in the work of art unconformed to the leading intention of the artist, who will but increase his power by reserve. An artist of that kind will be apt, of course, to express more than he seems actually to say. He economises. He will not spoil good things by exaggeration. The rough, promiscuous wealth of nature he reduces to grace and order: reduces, it may be, lax verse to staid and

47:4.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

temperate prose. With him, the rhythm, the music, the notes, will be felt to follow, or rather literally accompany as ministers, the sense,—ἀκολουθεῖν τὸν λόγον.

We may fairly prefer the broad daylight of Veronese to the contrasted light and shade of Rembrandt even; and a painter will tell you that the former is actually more difficult to attain.”

Think of “Rembrandt even”:—and you will but agree with Pater, that “An artist of that kind will be apt... to express more than he seems actually to say”!

47:4. It is difficult to state with certainty what Pater really meant when he wrote these words: “through the ‘open vision,’ open only to the spirit”. However, if we realise that he is here opposing a view “open only to the spirit” to a view “open only to the senses”, we may become fairly sure that he had these two opposed kinds of “view” in mind as antithetical but complementary aspects of a synthetic “view”:— a view “open... to the spirit” not less than “open... to the senses”.

Take, for instance, the watercolour by Dante Gabriel Rossetti (*The Blue Closet*) from which William Morris drew inspiration for his homonymous poem (“The Blue Closet”).

Perceiving that same watercolour through a *view* “open only to the senses” will, most probably, lead to interpreting it as the author himself (Rossetti) seems to have wished it to be interpreted by *the laity* (as a representation of “some people playing music”)—probably because, to quote John Donne, “‘Twere profanation of our joys | To tell the laity” its allegorical meaning.

On the other hand, perceiving that very same watercolour through a *view* “open only to the spirit” may not, presumably, but lead to an interpretation of it similar to that which Morris gives us in his poem (“The Blue Closet”).

The first of these two modes of perception will leave out all but that which is, indeed, capable of being perceived by the senses: colour, shape, light, shade or absence of light.

The second of these two modes of perception will, on the other hand, leave out all but that which is, indeed, capable

of being perceived by the spirit: idea, concept, image or analogon, meaning (symbolical, allegorical or otherwise).

Call the first a “sleeping dream”, and you will have, to invert Pater’s expression, “illusion, experience of mere sense, while the spirit and the spiritual meaning sleep”.

Call the second a “waking dream”, and you will have “delirium or illusion, “experience of mere soul while the body and the bodily sense sleep or wake with convulsed intensity”.

Only the third mode of perception, the synthetic one, will, therefore, occasion the experience of, so to put it, “the open secret”.

Following Pater, call it “imaginative reason”, and you will have “that complex faculty for which every thought and feeling is twin-born with its sensible analogue or symbol” (as he says in “The School of Giorgione”), which would give you “the constituent elements of” Rossetti’s watercolour “so welded together, that the material or subject no longer” would strike “the intellect only; nor the form, the eye or the ear only”—“form and matter, in their union or identity, present[ing] one single effect”.

Pater’s “monk in his cloister”, then, is a man whose mode of perception is *in transition* from one epistemological pole to its opposite: a man who dreams awake and who, in thus dreaming, “at last apprehend[s]” the “better”, but only “earthly”, “daylight” which only the “sleeping dream” can offer. That is to say, he is a man experiencing “a transition which, under many forms, is one law of the life of the human spirit, and of which what we call the Renaissance is only a supreme instance.”

Conversing with such a monk in the same way as he converses with Marius in the chapter of *Marius the Epicurean* that bears the title “A Conversation not Imaginary”—and thus ignoring the opposition, here delineated, between sleeping dreams and waking dreams,—Lucian might say to him: “As you dreamed, so largely, of those wonderful things, came Reason, and woke you up from sleep, a little roughly: and then you are angry with Reason, your eyes being still but half open, and find it hard to shake off sleep for the pleasure of what you saw therein.”

47:9–13.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

Now, in case one be very much interested in Pater's words without maintaining the slightest interest in Rossetti's *Blue Closet* and Morris' enacting, in his "Blue Closet", of the old dictum *ut pictura poesis*, one may always substitute for them one of Pater's own dicta.

Take, for instance, this one: "the great primary passions under broad daylight as of the pagan Veronese".

If one take it while dreaming asleep, one's imagination will, indeed, give one a fleeting, sensible image of a "broad daylight", as well as a no less fleeting and sensible image of the face of the painter Veronese—in case one be acquainted with his face.

On the other hand, if one take it while dreaming awake, one's reason (or understanding) will, indeed, give one true, deep, spiritual meanings for: "the great primary passions", "under broad daylight", and "the pagan Veronese".

However, if one take it through the "open vision" of the "imaginative reason", one will become very much aware, in the first place, of the fact that Pater—"full [of] consciousness of what one does, of art itself in the work of art"—has taken the care not to place a comma immediately after "daylight" ("the great primary passions under broad daylight as of the pagan Veronese").

That is to say, one's "imaginative reason" will immediately procure one the double-edged experience of (i) reasoning *the great primary passions under broad-daylight-ass of the pagan Veronese*, and, as a result, (ii) of imagining "the great primary passions under broad daylight[,] as of the pagan Veronese".

47:9–13. Pater is, no doubt, referring to the article "The English Mail-Coach, or the Glory of Motion", which Thomas de Quincey (1785–1859) first published in 1849 (*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*. Vol. LXVI, no. 408 (October, 1849), pp. 485–500).

It is not possible to say with certainty what, according to Pater, "De Quincey has called the 'glory of motion'"—for, in that article ("The English Mail-Coach, or the Glory of Motion"), De Quincey himself does not elaborate much on the meaning the phrase had for him.

Nonetheless, it becomes clear that it brought to his mind “unprecedented” “velocity”, “suggesting, at same time, an under-sense, not unpleasurable, of possible though indefinite danger”. And, since Pater speaks of “simple elementary passions” such as “fear”, it may well be that this particular “passion” was the one that the phrase “the glory of motion” most brought to his mind.

Even so, it is difficult, having read De Quincey’s words, not to conclude that Pater was referring in the first place to a state of feeling and emotion either purely internal or directly caused by the perception of some object and its “grand effects for the eye”. In the first case, it would be a state of being similar, in the words of De Quincey, to that of “some mighty orchestra, where a thousand instruments, all disregarding each other, and so far in danger of discord, yet all obedient as slaves to the supreme *baton* of some great leader, terminate in a perfection of harmony like that of heart, veins, and arteries, in a healthy animal organisation.” In the second case, it would be the internal effect caused by the perception, for instance, of the “animal beauty and power so often displayed in the class of horses selected for this mail service”.

One should note, however, that Pater is contrasting (i) “Complex and subtle interests... which the mind spins for itself” with (ii) “simple elementary passions—anger, desire, regret, pity and fear—and what corresponds to them in the sensuous world”. And that, therefore (the mind being the natural seat of abstraction, not the sensuous world), his assertion that “abstract fire, water, air, tears, sleep, silence” “correspond”, “in the sensuous world”, “to the simple elementary passions” cannot but be destitute of meaning.

47:20–26. Pater quotes lines 194–200 of book XI (p. 191) of *The Life and Death of Jason*.

The ship *Argo* having been drawn to land during the Winter, the Argonauts interrupt their labour, in order to rest. Concerning one of them (Argus), the narrator says: “at the dawn he dreamed, | Not wholly sleeping, and to him it seemed | That one said to him...” The visitor (such a “one”) ends her speech thus: “No dream I am, but lovely and divine, | Whereof let this

47:31–32.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

be unto thee a sign, | That when thou wak'st the many-coloured
bow | Across the world the morning sun shall throw, | But me
indeed thine eyes shall not behold.” Then, Argus awakes, and
discovers these words to be true, thus experiencing, Pater *dicit*,
the “most lovely waking with the rain on one’s face”.

47:31–32. The “ram with the fleece of gold” is the gold-
en-wooled and winged ram that, in Greek mythology, rescues
Phrixus from being sacrificed to the gods and brings him, on its
back, to Colchis—only to be sacrificed to Poseidon by Phrix-
us himself and have its fleece given to King Aeëtes (as a token
of Phrixus’ gratitude towards him), who hangs it in a tree of
a sacred grove situated in his kingdom (Colchis), and has it
guarded by a dragon that never sleeps.—Such a sacred grove
being, therefore, the place to which Jason and his companions
are compelled to travel, in order to obtain it.

That is to say, “the ram with the fleece of gold” is the
ram to which the Argument of Morris’ poem refers: “Jason,
the son of Aeson, king of Iolchos, having come to man’s estate,
demanded of Pelias his father’s kingdom, which he held wrong-
fully. But Pelias answered, that if he would bring from Colchis
the golden fleece of the ram that had carried Phryxus thither,
he would yield him his right. Whereon Jason sailed to Colchis
in the ship *Argo*, with other heroes, and by means of Medea, the
king’s daughter, won the fleece”.

Furthermore, Pater is right: “the centaur” does, indeed,
inhabit “the earlier world” of Morris’ poem.

48:2. In his essay “On Wordsworth” (see vol. 1, 225:26–
226:6), Pater wrote: “An intimate consciousness of the expres-
sion of natural things, which weighs, listens, penetrates, where
the earlier mind passed roughly by, is a large element in the
complexion of modern poetry. ... it has doubtless some latent
connection with those pantheistic theories which have largely
exercised men’s minds in some modern systems of philosophy;
it is traceable even in the graver writings of historians; it makes
as much difference between ancient and modern landscape as
there is between the rough masks of an early mosaic and a por-
trait by Reynolds or Gainsborough. Of this new sense the writ-

ings of Wordsworth are the central and elementary expression; he is more simply and entirely occupied with it than any other.”

48:10. The “song of the brown river-bird among the willows”. The “brown river-bird” seems to refer to the so-called “common sandpiper” (*Actitis hypoleucos*). In *Jason*, Morris names it, for instance, in book XVII, l. 708 (p. 341), where he speaks of “passionate silence ‘midst the *brown birds*’ tune”. (The italics have been added.)

48:12–13. Pater quotes lines 26–27 of book XIII (p. 220) of *The Life and Death of Jason*.

48:14–16. All the kinds of birds that Pater here refers to are named by Morris in *Jason*: (i) the fern-owl (*Caprimulgus europaeus*), which is also known as “nightjar” and “goatsucker”; (ii) the water-hen (*Common gallinule*); (iii) the thrush (of the family of the *Turdidae*); (iv) the gerfalcon or gyrfalcon (*Falco islandicus*); (v) the kestrel (*Falco tinnunculus*); (vi) the starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*); (vii) the peafowl (of the genera *Pavo*), the male of which is known as “peacock”, whereas the female is known as “pea-hen”.

In *Jason*, Morris refers to each of these seven different birds in, for instance, the following contexts:

(i) “Then Jason lay and trembled, while the sound | Grew louder through the moonlit woods around, | And died off slowly, going toward the sea, | Leaving the *fern-owl* wailing mournfully”. (book I, ll. 281–284, p. 11);

(ii) “So still she [Medea] stood, that the quick *water-hen* | Noted her not” (book XV, ll. 130–131, p. 265);

(iii) “...and from an oak-twig nigh | A *thrush* poured forth his song unceasingly” (book XV, ll. 133–134, p. 265);

(iv) “...and still the banks were fair, | But rising into scarp'd cliffs here and there, | Where screamed the great *ger-falcon*, as they passed” (book X, ll. 415–417, p. 181);

(v) “...and talked of this and that, | Or watched the restless fishes turn and wind, | Or the slim *kestrel* hanging in the wind” (book XI, ll. 7–9, p. 188);

(vi) “...some February mead, | Where thick the lust red *starlings* creep and feed” (book XVI, ll. 333–334, p. 312);

48:22–23.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

(vii) “And store of *pea-fowl* was roosting there,²⁴⁶ | Or moving lazily across the grass” (book XVII, ll. 246–247, p. 325). (In all the cases, the italics have been added.)

48:22–23. As it is well known, the Sirens are, in Greek mythology, beautiful creatures who, with their enchanting music and singing voices, lure sailors to shipwreck on the rocky coast of their island. Pater refers twice (48: 22–23 and 48:29) to book XIV of *Jason* as “the book of the Syrens”. This is because book XIV is where, in the poem, Jason and his companions, including Medea, the daughter of the king of Colchis, sight, on board of the *Argo*, the island of the Sirens, “that land of lies”. Nevertheless, who can read Pater on the “tranquil level of perfection” of the book without becoming aware that what he means to say, *secunda facie*, is that “the book of the Syrens” is *a true song of the Syrens?*—

There is a tranquil level of perfection in the poem, by which[,] in certain moods, or for certain minds, the charm of *it* might escape. For such [an *it*] the book of the Syrens is[,] a revealing example of the poet’s work.

The book opens with a glimpse of white bodies . . . *It comes to men*—readers— “nearing *home*, yet so longing for rest [on *it*] that they might well lie down before they reach *it*.”

Furthermore, notice that, deviating from Morris, Pater spells the word “Sirens” as “Syrens”. Why? To emphasize its etymological meaning?—Since “Siren” (σειρήνα) seems to have derived from *seirá* (σειρά), “cord”, “rope”, and, as a result, have conveyed the notion “binder” or “entangler”.

48:34–35. Noticing that, enticed by the beautiful bodies of the Sirens and their singing, the men on board the *Argo* are steering her to “that land of lies”, Medea challenges “Thracian Orpheus”, who went along with them, to change their hearts by means of his legendary singing and musical skill:

“O Thracian! if thou ere hast moved
Men’s hearts, with stories of the Gods who loved,
And men who suffered, move them on this day,
Taking the deadly love of death away,
That even now is stealing over them,
While still they gaze upon the ocean’s hem,
Where their undoing is if they but knew.”

The “deadly love of death”!
Steering the *Argo* away from the island, Jason, then, follows her example:

“Minstrel, shall we die,
Because thou hast forgotten utterly
What things she taught thee that men call divine,
Or will thy measures but lead folk to wine,
And scented beds, and not to noble deeds?
Or will they fail as fail the shepherd’s reeds
Before the trumpet, when these sea-witches
Pipe shrilly to the washing of the seas?
I am a man, and these but beasts, but thou
Giving these souls, that all were men ere now
Shall be a very God and not a man!”

Isn’t Pater right? Is not “the book of the Syrens” “a revealing example of the poet’s work”?—Unless, of course, one count among the “minds” for whom, “in certain moods”, “the charm of *it* might escape”.

49:1–12. Pater gives as an example of Morris’ song of Sirens lines 113–124 (pp. 236–237) of book XIV of *Jason*.

49:17. “[T]hose matchless lyrics” extend from line 125 to line 427 of the book (pp. 237 to 249), and are spun out of the words that Orpheus and the Sirens exchange.

49:38–50:1. It seems to be obvious that, in contrasting “the Hellenism” of the Ancient-Hellenic-Pagan poet Homer (c. 900 B. C.) with the “Hellenism” of the Mediaeval-English-Christian poet Geoffrey Chaucer (c. 1343–1400), Pater was not using the word “Hellenism”, in both contexts, in its it-

50:15.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

eral meaning of “Greekness”. Therefore, he could but mean, in relation to Homer, “Greekness” indeed, as well as *Greekness*; in relation to Chaucer, “imitation of the *Greekness* of Homer and of other Ancient poets”.

Now, Pater well knew not only that Chaucer, like Shakespeare after him, set some of his poems in ancient Greece (the “Knight’s Tale”, for instance, takes place in ancient Athens, ruled by Duke Theseus, as in Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, or *Troilus and Criseyde*, which recounts a Trojan love affair), but also that, Chaucer being a mediaeval poet, his knowledge of the Hellenic authors, as opposed to his knowledge of such Latin writers as Pliny and Boethius, was immensely limited, if not non-extant.

How could Pater, then, refer to “the Hellenism of Chaucer”?

Well, the answer seems to lie in the possibility of Pater having wished to mean by “Hellenism”, in both cases (that of Homer and that of Chaucer), the quality of “poetry treating the world according to the demand of the senses”—to quote Matthew Arnold’s essay “Pagan and Mediaeval Religious Sentiment”, where the phrase “the senses” means as much “the five senses” (*prima facie*) as it means “meanings conveyed or intended”, “imports”, “significations” (*secunda facie*).

And, indeed, who, for instance, can read, in Chaucer’s “General Prologue”, that the Prioress carried with her a string of beads “On which there was first write a crowned A, | And after *Amor vincit omnia*”—who can read this without realizing that “first” and “after” are meant to be read as temporal, not spatial, modifiers?

Well, probably most people who may happen to have read (even studied) the “General Prologue”!—Not, however, a Pater.—Who, otherwise, would not have referred to William Morris as “this Hellenist of the middle age” (47:27) simply on the basis of Morris’s use of a Greek story.

50:15. The “story of Cupid and Psyche”, which Pater retells (for his own advantage) in the fifth chapter of *Marius the Epicurean* (“The Golden Book”), is a story originally written by the Latin-language prose writer Apuleius—Lucius Apuleius Madaurensis (c. 124–after A. D. 170)—, to be told by an old

woman to Charite (a young girl locked by bandits in their cave), and overheard by Lucius (a lover of magic who accidentally has transformed himself into an ass), in his *Metamorphoses*, a book which is also known as *The Golden Ass* (*Asininus Aureus*). The title “Cupid and Psyche” is not given by the author, who simply narrates the story (as if told by such an old woman) along books IV, V, and VI of that great work of his. “Cupid” is the Roman name for “sensuous love”, the Greek Eros (Ἔρως), and “Psyche” (Ψυχή) is the Greek equivalent for Latin *anima* (soul). However, Apuleius—whom Pater *invites* as a guest of honour into the twentieth chapter of *Marius*—does not name these two characters “Amor” (love) and “Anima” (soul); he does, indeed, name them “Cupido” and “Psyche”.

As to Pater’s statement that “the story of Cupid and Psyche” is evidence to “that passionate stress of spirit which the world owes to Christianity”, it does not seem possible that it be more than the expression of a biased reading of the story. For, although it is certainly possible that Apuleius had awareness of the Christians (who, at his time, were mostly seen as members of a mere sect, a form of worship not recognized by the Roman Empire), it is definitely not the case that he was a Christian.—This being a fact which adds to the strong possibility that, in his works, Apuleius, a Neoplatonist, betray his endorsement of the most widespread anti-Christian accusations that were current in his time.

50:24. “Iolchos”: an ancient city in Thessaly, Greece; the kingdom of Aeson, Jason’s father, and, after he returns home with the Golden Fleece, of Jason himself (who, nonetheless, leaves for Corinth).

Jason and the Argonauts embark the ship *Argo* in Iolchos, in order to cross the Aegean Sea, enter the Bosphorus, and traverse the Black Sea to Colchis, where they were to obtain the golden fleece of the ram that had carried Phryxus thither (see above, note to 47:31–32).

50:29. From the 12th century on, Glastonbury, in Somerset, England, became associated with the legend of King Arthur, above all as a result of the announcement, by the monks of Glastonbury Abbey, that an excavation there had brought the

50:30–31.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

grave of Arthur and Guinevere to the light of day—and that, therefore, the place had been Camelot, the court and castle of Arthur himself.

50:30–31. In Greek mythology, Hylas is the arms-bearer and the beloved of Heracles. In the *Argonautica* cycle, Heracles takes Hylas with him to Iolchos, and both of them embark on board the *Argo*, thus becoming part of the Argonauts.

Just as Morris has it in his poem, when the Argonauts land on Mysia (on the southern shore of the Sea of Marmara), Hylas strays away from his companions, and the Naiads (or “seamymphs”, as Morris refers to them), sighting him from afar, lust after his beauty. It is then, that they conspire to get hold of his body, which they much long to embrace: one of them is to *chance* upon him in the woods and lure him into her companions.

After they meet, and much dalliance, the Naiad who has been chosen as *bait* draws him “to a place | Anigh the stream”, where she stops, to suggest soothing him with a “gentle murmuring song”. After Hylas complies, hoping to “dream of bliss | If... [he] should sleep”, she goes on singing for the length of some five stanzas (this being the “song ... of a garden enclosed” to which Pater refers), with the effect that he, in truth, falls into a deep sleep, and is dragged by all the Naiads into the soft bed of the bottom of the stream—there to “dream of bliss” for ever after, and indeed not to “forget... [her] kiss”.

Along with Polyphemus, Heracles searches for Hylas for a great length of time. The ship, however, soon sets sail without them—for “A figure standing, with wide wings of gold, | Upright, amid the weltering of the sea”, informs the Argonauts that Jove wills Heracles (Hercules) “in the Greek land still to stay”, and that Hylas “lies happily | Beneath the green stream”, where “he praises Jove that he was born, | Forgetting the rough world, and every care: | Not dead, nor living, among faces fair, | White limbs, and wonders of the watery world.”

50:34. Medea is, in the poem, the daughter of the king of Colchis; she leaves her father’s kingdom to accompany Jason, on board the ship *Argo*.

50:35. The “sorceress of the Streckelberg” refers to the purported witch that is called *Die Bernsteinhexe* (*the Amber*

Witch), in the the novel that the German writer Wilhelm Meinhold (1797–1851) had published in 1838: *Maria Schweidler, die Bernsteinhexe* (*Mary Schweidler, the Amber Witch*)

In the story, Mary, the daughter of a pastor, Abraham Schweidler, discovers a vein of amber on the Streckelberg hill, outside her village of Koserow, and becomes wealthy. When she spurns the affections of the local *Kommandant* and accepts those of Count Rudiger, the *Kommandant* contrives to have Mary accused of witchcraft and imprisoned, with the aid of his jealous servant Elsie, the leader of a local witch coven.

Maria Schweidler, die Bernsteinhexe, was published in Britain, in 1844, as *The Amber Witch*, in an English translation by Lady Lucy Duff-Gordon, and soon became very popular among Victorian readers. In 1861, it was made into an opera, also called *The Amber Witch*, by William Vincent Wallace, who managed to have it premiered at Her Majesty's Theatre on 28 February 1861. Pater, who was by then eighteen years old and at Oxford, is not likely to have attended the opera. However, besides having read the novel, he may well be supposed to have heard about it from people who actually had attended it.

On its turn, “the sorceress of the ... Blocksberg” does not seem to refer to any witch in particular, it being most probable that Pater meant the singular “witch” to denote its plural sense (“witches”).

The Blocksberg, or Brocken, the highest peak in the Harz Mountains, in Germany, has become connected with witches and devils even before the appearance, in 1668, of the work by the German historian Johannes Praetorius (1630–1680) entitled: *Blockes-Berges Verrichtung oder ausführlicher geographischer Bericht von den hohen trefflich alt und berühmten Blockes-Berge: ingleichen von der Hexenfahrt und Zauber-Sabbathe, so auff solchen Berge die Unholden aus gantz Teutschland Jährlich den 1. Maij in Sanct-Walpurgis-Nachte anstellen sollen...* (*Blocksberg enactment, or detailed geographical report of the high, appositely old and famous Blocksberg: as well as of the witches' journey and magic sabbaths that, on such mountains, the fiends from all over Germany are compelled to perform annually, on the night of the 1st of May or Night of Saint Walpurgis...*)

50:36. Pater had in mind, most probably, the long and detailed description of the Walpurgis Night, the night of the witches and evil spirits, that the German poet Johan Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) gives in the first part of his *Faust. Eine Tragödie* (*Faust. A Tragedy*), which first appeared in 1806.

50:36. Christabel is the main female character of *Christabel*, a long narrative ballad by the English poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834), who published the first two parts in 1797 and 1800, respectively, but never completed it.

51:1–13. Pater quotes lines 117–129 of book VII (p. 124) of *The Life and Death of Jason*—in which Morris begins his narration of Medea’s secret escapade to the woods, at night, there to obtain from Hecate, by means of her sorcery, and moved by love, the magic potion that will save Jason from sure death.

51:24–26. In Morris’ poem *The Earthly Paradise*, the Prologue (“Prologue: The Wanderers”) contains the narrative frame that confers unity to all the subsequent stories, and therefore plays a role similar to that which the “General Prologue” plays in Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*.

There, the reader learns in detail what, at the outset, the Argument summarizes. Namely, that “Certain gentlemen and mariners of Norway, having considered all that they had heard of the Earthly Paradise, set sail to find it, and after many troubles and the lapse of many years came old men to some Western land, of which they had never before heard: there they died, when they had dwelt there certain years, much honoured of the strange people.”

To quote Pater, such a “band of adventurers”, then, “sets out from Norway, most northerly of northern lands, where the plague is raging, and the host-bell is continually ringing as they carry the sacrament to the sick”. The course they first take, on board the *Fighting Man* and the *Rose-Crown*, leads them to the “the French and English strait”: “... O friends, if ye are of my mind, | When we are passed the French and English strait | Let us seek news of that desired gate | To immortality and blessed rest | Within the landless waters of the west, | But still a little to the southward steer.” (p. 16)

They think “it but wise to keep the open sea, | And give to warring lands a full wide berth”, for “at that time [they] had... heard certainly | Edward of England drew all men to him, | And that his fleet held whatso keel could swim | From Jutland to Land’s End” (p. 17).

Nonetheless, they do chance to come across the King of England’s fleet—which, presumably, is about to enter the *Battle of l’Écluse* (1340). Instead of holding the keels of the Fighting Man and the Rose-Crown to his fleet, he ends by allowing them to sail pass (“through”) his ships. And so it really comes to pass, that, as Pater says, “it is below the very coast of France, through the fleet of Edward III., among the painted sails of the middle age,” that the reader, who *follows* the Wanderers, enters the long stretch of sea and span of years that finally will lead him or her to the island, the Greek elders, and the stories that Pater himself conceives as a “reserved fragment of Greece.”—

Thus reminding us (Pater) of the “wild spot on the bay, the traditional site of a little Greek colony”, which, many years later, he would forge as resting-place for Marius and Flavian. “An epitome of all that was liveliest, most animated and adventurous, in the old Greek people of which it was an offshoot, it had enhanced the effect of theses gifts by concentration within narrow limits.” “How strong must have been the tide of men’s existence in that little republican town, so small that this circle of grey stones ... had been the line of its rampart!”

51:26–28. The Greek phrase (*theía týchē*), which had a long-standing use in ancient Greek literature and philosophy, means either “divine chance” or “divine good fortune”, and therefore expresses, somewhat like *theía moîra*, the idea “divine providence”: the idea “events that appear to be chance events, but that in reality occur because they are godsent good fortune”.— So that in Plato, for instance, *theía týchē* and *agathē moîra* (“good fate”) become somewhat synonymous.

51:30. “Rose Garland” is the name of the ship that the Wanderers acquire in the German city of Bremen, by the shore of the river Weser, after they set sail from Norway on the Fighting Man.

52:1–8.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

52:1–8. The first volume of *The Earthly Paradise*, the one Pater was reviewing, opens with (i) the “Apology” to the reader, which is followed by (ii) the “Prologue: the Wanderers”. Then, come (iii) two stanzas titled “The Author to the Reader”, after which the stories begin, two of them for each month (beginning with March, like the *Canterbury Tales*), the one of Nordic inspiration following that of Greek inspiration, some stories being preceded by a “Song” and narrative accounts connecting each one to the next.

The stories for the Spring are:

For March, (i) “Atalanta’s Race” and (ii) “The Man born to be King”;

For April, (i) “The Doom of King Acrisius” and (ii) “The Proud King”;

For May, (1) “The Story of Cupid and Psyche” and (ii) “The Writing on the Image”.

The Stories for the Summer are:

For June, (i) “The Love of Alcestis” and (ii) “The Lady of the Land”;

For July, (i) “The Son of Croesus” and (ii) “The Watching of the Falcon”;

For August, (i) “Pygmalion and the Image” and (ii) “Ogier the Dane”.

Pater, then, selects, as being pre-eminently evidence of “what is characteristic of the whole book” (“the loveliness of things newly washed with fresh water”): (i) the two stories for Spring (“Atalanta’s Race” and “The Man born to be King”); (ii) the first of the two stories for May (“The Story of Cupid and Psyche”) and the first of the two stories for April (“The Doom of King Acrisius”); (iii) “the episode of Danaë and the shower of gold” (which is to be found on pages 230–231 of the book).

The plot of “The Doom of King Acrisius” may be summarized thus: (i) Acrisius, king of Argos, is warned by an oracle that the son of his daughter Danaë should slay him; (ii) as a result, he shuts Danaë up in a brazen tower beside the sea; (iii); though no man could come into the tower, Danaë is visited by

Jove and bears a son to him; (iv) set adrift on the sea, Danaë and her new-born son come to the island of Seriphos; (v) grown to manhood, Danaë's son sets out of the island and performs several heroic feats; (vi) having saved and wedded Andromeda, daughter of Cepheus, Danaë's son returns to Seriphos, takes Andromeda thence, and makes for Argos; (vii), stormy weather, however, forces him to land in Thessaly; (viii) in Thessaly, at Larissa, he unwittingly slays Acrisius, his grand-father, thus accomplishing the prophecy which had led Acrisius to part with his daughter Danaë; (ix), Danaë's son founds the city of Mycenae, where he ends his days.

The episode to which Pater refers, "the episode of Danaë and the shower of gold", takes place when, looking one day out by the window in the tower where her father had imprisoned her, she looks round as Jove enters her room and the light which he emanates fills the place, as if it were a "shower of gold":

There on the sill she laid her slender hand,
And looking seaward, pensive did she stand,
And seemed as though she waited for the sun
To bring her news that evil days were done;
At last he came and cast his golden road
Over the green sea toward that lone abode,
And into Danaë's face his glory came
And lit her softly waving hair like flame.
But in his light she held out both her hands,
As though he brought her from some far-off lands
Healing for all her great distress and woe.

But yellower now the sunbeams seemed to grow
Not whiter as their wont is...

And, looking round about, could she behold
The chamber scattered o'er with shining gold,
That grew, till ankle-deep she stood in it.

Then through her limbs a tremor did there
As through white water runs the summer wind,
And many a wild hope came into her mind,
But her knees bent and soft she sank down there,
And on the gold was spread her golden hair,

52:1-8.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

And like an ivory image still she lay,
Until the night again had hidden day.

52:34–56:15. This part of the review, which corresponds to *Westminster*, pp. 309–312, is the part that became the “Conclusion”, in the 1873 edition of *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (pp. 207–213).

54:29. Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg). *Logologischen Fragmente* (1798), No. 15. In: —. *Novalis Schriften: die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs*. Ed. Paul Luckhohn and Richard Samuel, 3. ed., Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1997–, vol. II (*Das philosophische Werke I*), p. 526.

“Philosophiren ist dephlegmatisiren—Vivificiren. [...] Erst in den neuesten Zeiten hat man die Philosophie lebendig zu beobachten angefangen, und es Könnte wohl kommen, daß man so die Kunst erhielte *Philosophieen* zu machen. (“To philosophize is to overturn placidity—to vivify. [...] Only in modern times have we begun to see philosophy alive, and it may well come to happen, that art be henceforth embraced so as to make *philosophies*.”)

Pater may well have come across these words of the German poet and novelist Novalis (Georg Philipp Friedrich von Hardenberg, 1772–1801) in: *Novalis Schriften*. Ed. Ludwig Tieck and Friedrich Schelling, Berlin, G. Keimer, 1837, Part One, p. 256. (Or, of course, in a previous or posterior reprint of this work, which first appeared in 1805.)

55:22. The French philosopher Auguste COMTE (1798–1857), “the father of positivism”; the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich HEGEL (1770–1831).

55:25–26. To be precise, the words the French novelist Victor Hugo (1802–1885) wrote are these: “La philosophie est le microscope de la pensée”. This epigram is to be found in his historical novel *Les Misérables* (1862): part five (“Jean Valjean”), book two (“L’intestin de Léviathan”), chapter two (“L’histoire ancienne de l’égout”).

55:32–56:3. Pater probably had in mind such passages from Rousseau’s *Les Confessions* (1782) as these, from book six

(which are here given in the translation that was privately printed for the Members of the Aldus Society, London, in 1903):

“[I]magining it was the stroke of death, I went to bed” (“Je me crus mort; je me mis au lit”).

“[A] total privation of repose, with other alarming symptoms which have accompanied it, even to this time, persuaded me I had but a short time to live. ... and being persuaded I could not prolong life, determined to employ the remainder of it as usefully as possible.”

“I can truly say, I only began to live when I considered myself as entering the grave” (“Je puis bien dire que je ne commençai de vivre que quand je me regardai comme un homme mort”).

“I was convinced that my resolution to improve was good and useful in itself, but that it was necessary I should change my method.... Meditation supplied the want of knowledge, and a very natural reflection gave strength to my resolutions, which was, that whether I lived or died, I had no time to lose; for having learned but little before the age of five-and-twenty, and then resolving to learn everything, was engaging to employ the future time profitably. I was ignorant at what point accident or death might put a period to my endeavors, and resolved at all events to acquire with the utmost expedition some idea of every species of knowledge, as well to try my natural disposition, as to judge for myself what most deserved cultivation.”

As to Pater’s statement that Rousseau found a source of “intellectual excitement” in the “clear, fresh writings” of the French writer and philosopher Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet, 1694–1778), it must have been connected, in his mind, with the reading of such passages as this one, from book five:

The correspondence between Voltaire and the Prince Royal of Prussia then made a noise in the world, and these celebrated men were frequently the subject of our conversation.... The Prince of Prussia had not been happy in his youth, and it appeared that Voltaire was formed never to be so. The interest we took in both parties extended to all that concerned them, and nothing that Voltaire wrote escaped us. The inclination I felt for these

56:3–4.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

performances inspired me with a desire to write elegantly, and caused me to endeavor to imitate the colorings of that author, with whom I was so much enchanted. Some time after, his philosophical letters (though certainly not his best work) greatly augmented my fondness for study; it was a rising inclination, which, from that time, has never been extinguished.

56:3–4. Pater refers to these words, which appear in chapter three of Victor Hugo's *Le dernier jour d'un condamné* (1829): "Condamné à mort! Eh bien, pourquoi non? *Les hommes, je me rappelle l'avoir lu dans je ne sais quel livre où il n'y avait que cela de bon, les hommes sont tous condamnés à mort avec des sursis indéfinis.*" ("Condemned to death! Well, why not? *All men, I remember having read in I don't know which book where nothing else was worth reading, all men are condemned to death under indefinitely suspended sentences.*")

56:5–6. "[T]he wisest in art and song". One cannot but consider this a defiant statement—when one bears in mind, *with Pater*, both Corinthians 1:26–27 ("For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty") and Luke 16:8 ("And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for *the children of this world* are in their generation wiser than the children of light"). *With Pater*, most certainly—since, in the "Conclusion", he added, after "the wise": "at least among '*the children of this world*'". (The italics have been added.)

However, given that Pater is recommending "high passions", "ecstasy", a "quickened sense of life"—and given also that the "Conclusion" begins with an epigraph taken from *Cratylus* 402a ("Heraclitus is supposed to say that all things are in motion and nothing at rest"),—it may well be that Pater had as well in mind Socrates' definition of "wisdom", in Plato's *Cratylus* (412b):

“Σοφία (wisdom) is very dark, and appears not to be of native growth; the meaning is *touching the motion or stream of things*. You must remember that the poets, when they speak of the commencement of any rapid motion, often use the word ἐσύθη (he rushed), and there was a famous Lacedaemonian who was named Σοῦς (Rush), for by this word the Lacedaemonians signify rapid motion, and the touching (ἐπαφή) of motion is expressed by σοφία, for all things are supposed to be in motion.” (The translation is by Benjamin Jowett.)

In chapter four of part three of his *The New Republic* (1877), a satire which gives the reader Walter Pater in the guise of Mr. Rose, W. H. Mallock (1849–1923), most probably with these words in mind (“the wisest in art and song”), has “old Mr. Laurence” leave a letter to his nephew Laurence that also has much to say concerning “wisdom” and “the wise”:

“Now, ...that much maligned thing, Christianity... has entirely changed the whole complexion of life. [...] It has cunningly associated everything with the most awful or the most glittering conceptions with which the imagination can scare or intoxicate itself—with Hell, Heaven, Judgment, and so forth.... The infinitely beautiful, the infinitely terrible, the infinitely hateful meet us everywhere. Everything is enchanted, and seems to be what it is not. The enchantment quite deludes the vulgar; it a little deludes the wise; but the wise are for ever in various ways secretly undoing the spell, and getting glimpses of things as they really are. [...] Christianity, with a miraculous ingenuity, has confined and cramped... all the natural and true pleasures of life—poor tasteless things not worth living for, in themselves; but they have been so hidden away from us, and have come to be in such bad odour with the world, that only the wisest—for wisdom is but the detection of falsehood—see that they may be taken, and have the courage to take them; and the wisdom they are conscious of in doing this forms a delicious *sauce piquante* ... to these same poor pleasures, that can give us a real zest for them.

56:5–6.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

56:9–10.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

“Such a life of wisdom is, of course, only for the few. The wise must always be few, as the rich must. The poor must make fine food for the rich to eat. The fools must make fine follies for the wise to detect. We cannot all be happy in a rational way. It is at least best that some of us should be. But what I want to point out to you, my boy, is, that if society goes on as it is going on now, nobody will be able soon to be rationally happy at all.”

56:9–10. The “enthusiasm of humanity”. This expression of Comtean inspiration was used by the English historian and political essayist Sir John Robert Seeley (1834–1895), in his book *Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ* (London, Macmillan and Co., 1865). It gives the title to chapter XIV of the book (pp. 156–171), in which Seeley distinguishes between “enthusiasm of humanity” as an “edict” or “precept” and as “a living and infallible principle of morality in every man:

“But we shall soon be convinced that Christ could not design by a mere edict, however authoritative, to give this passion of humanity strength enough to make it a living and infallible principle of morality in every man, when we consider, first, what an ardent enthusiasm he demanded from his followers, and secondly, how frail and tender a germ this passion naturally is in human nature.” That is to say, to “make this outraged and enslaved passion predominant ... required much more than a precept. The precept had its use; it could make men feel it right to be humane and desire to be so, but it could never inspire them with an *enthusiasm of humanity*.” (The italics have been added.)

Hellenic in spirit, and therefore much more akin, perhaps, to Pater’s notion of a true “enthusiasm of humanity”, is the enthusiasm which naturally goes hand in hand with the definition of “humanity” that Seeley gives immediately afterwards: “Humanity... is neither a love for the whole human race, nor a love for each individual of it, but a love for the race, or for the ideal of man, in each individual.”

Nevertheless, it is to be considered that, by “enthusiasm of humanity”, Pater may have meant not only “enthusiasm for the ideal of man, in each individual”, but also, though in a lower key, enthusiasm for the “belief” which (in “Pico della Mirandola”) he stated to constitute “the essence of humanism”: “he[Pico] is a true humanist. For the essence of humanism is that belief of which he seems never to have doubted, that nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vitality—no language they have spoken, nor oracle beside which they have hushed their voices, no dream which has once been entertained by actual human minds, nothing about which they have ever been passionate, or expended time and zeal.”

56:12–13. The “love of art for art’s sake”. In the 1893 edition of *The Renaissance*, Pater changed this designation into “the love of art for its own sake”. Destined to become more and more popular among writers and literary people, this designation (“art for art’s sake”) was not used for the first time by Pater. Neither did he use it again, nor changed it into “art for its own sake” for the first time in 1891, for he had already done that in the essay “The Character of the Humourist. Charles Lamb”, which was first published in 1878 (in *The Fortnightly Review*): “Of this number of the disinterested servants of literature, smaller in England than in France, Charles Lamb is one. In the making of prose he realises the principle of *art for its own sake*, as completely as Keats in the making of verse.” (The italics have been added.)

The use or adoption of one and the same expression by several speakers does not imply, of course, that all of them conceive of its meaning in an equal or even identical manner. One should therefore realise that, as his use of the qualifier “disinterested” (in the phrase “the disinterested servants of literature”) indicates, Pater’s understanding (concept) of “art for art’s sake” derived *directly* from Kant’s third *Critique* (*Kritik der Urteils-kraft*, 1790), instead of *indirectly*, via, for instance, Charles Baudelaire (1821–1867), Théophile Gautier (1811–1872) or Charles Swinburne (1837–1909).

Although, indeed, Pater did not use the expression “art for art’s sake” again, his works abound in aesthetic observations

56:12–13.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

and reflections which more than elucidate what he meant to say by means of the words “love of art for art’s sake”—a love which, for him, was, in fact, “disinterested” “love” or “service” of art, but, nonetheless, and before that, *interested* “love” or “service” of life, understood *qua art*:

Every moment some form grows perfect in hand or face; some tone on the hills or sea is choicer than the rest; some mood of passion or insight or intellectual excitement is irresistibly real and attractive for us for that moment only. Not the fruit of experience but experience itself is the end.

While all melts under our feet, we may well catch at any exquisite passion, or any contribution to knowledge that seems by a lifted horizon to set the spirit free for a moment, or any stirring of the senses, strange dyes, strange flowers and curious odours, or work of the artist’s hands, or the face of one’s friend.

To burn always with this hard gem-like flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life. Failure is to form habits.

Indeed, if it is true that, for Pater, “Art, as such, as Plato knows, has no purpose but itself, its own perfection”, it is no less true that, for him, art, as such, is, first of all, at the *service* of life:

The aesthetic critic, then, regards all the objects with which he has to do, all works of art, and the fairer forms of nature and human life, as powers or forces producing pleasurable sensations, each of a more or less peculiar or unique kind. This influence he feels, and wishes to explain, by analysing and reducing it to its elements. To him, the picture, the landscape, the engaging personality in life or in a book, *La Gioconda*, the hills of Carrara, Pico of Mirandola, are valuable for their virtues, as we say, in speaking of a herb, a wine, a gem; for the property each has of affecting one with a special, a unique, impression of pleasure. Our education becomes complete

in proportion as our susceptibility to these impressions increases in depth and variety. And the function of the aesthetic critic is to distinguish, to analyse, and separate from its adjuncts, the virtue by which a picture, a landscape, a fair personality in life or in a book, produces this special impression of beauty or pleasure, to indicate what the source of that impression is, and under what conditions it is experienced.

Primarily, then, Pater conceived Art, not less than Nature, as a *medium*, a *tool*, for the achievement in one's self, and for the sake of one's self, of *cultura hominis, paideia* or *Bildung*.

Matthew Arnold and Walter Pater, Mallock's Mr. Luke and Mr. Rose, agreed more than they would probably be willing to concede.

56:12–13.

Poems by William Morris (1868)

Children in Italian and English Design (1872)

59:1. *The Portfolio, An Artistic Periodical*, was a British monthly art magazine published in London from 1870 to 1893. 59:1.

Sidney Colvin's book is divided in four parts. Part I, which is called "The Italians", had appeared (titled "Part I" in the August issue of 1871 of that periodical (vol. I, pp. 120–124); of Part III, which is called "The English", "Part III. Blake" had appeared (titled "Part II. Blake") in the September issue of 1871 (vol. I, pp. 138–143); "Part III. Sothard" had appeared (titled "Part III. Stothard") in the October issue of 1871 (vol. I, pp. 154–159); "Part III. Flaxman" had appeared (titled "Part IV. Flaxman") in the December issue of 1871 (vol. I, pp. 192–196); Part IV had appeared (titled "Concluding Observation") in the April issue of 1872 (vol. 2, pp. 61–74).

59:5–6. The English poet, painter, and printmaker William BLAKE (1757–1827); the English painter, illustrator, and engraver Thomas STOTHARD (1755–1834); the English sculptor and draughtsman John FLAXMAN (1755–1826).

59:11–14. Pater quotes from page 17 of Colvin's book. Between "justly called" and "a modern sentiment", he omits the parenthesis "(so far as any earlier expression of it is concerned)".

59:15:21. Pater quotes from page 54 of Colvin's book.

59:21. The English painter Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792).

59:26. Sir Sidney Colvin (1845–1927), the author of the book Pater reviews here, was an English literary and art critic, as well as a curator.

He served as Slade Professor of Fine Art at Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1873–85, as Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum (the art and antiquities museum of the University of Cambridge) from 1876 to 1884, and as Keeper of Paintings and Drawings at the British Museum from 1884 to 1912.

59:27–28. In Addition to the book Pater reviews here, *Children in Italian and English Design*, Colvin edited the Edinburgh edition of the works of his friend R. L. Stevenson, and wrote two biographies for Macmillan’s “English Men of Letters” series: the life of the essayist Walter Savage Landor (*Landor*, 1881) and the life of the poet John Keats (*Keats*, 1887).

Pater and Colvin were friends during the 1870s, the latter having written an unsigned review of *The Renaissance* for the *Pall Mall Gazette* issue of the first of March, 1873 (pp. 11–12).

59:27:28. Pater misquotes the following passage in page 2 of Colvin’s book: “when it is a type which we are seeking, an accepted or instinctive mode of designing childhood generally”.

59:29. Pater again quotes freely from page 2 of Colvin’s book (“Design, therefore, of the independent or ideal kind”).

60:1. Once more, Pater quotes from page 2 of Colvin’s book.

60:2. The poet William Blake published his collection of poems *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* in 1789. He illustrated the book with thirty-one coloured designs, which he himself created.

60:3–5. The two plates Pater refers to are: (i) (a detail from) the plate (the title page) “Preludium to the *Book of Urizen*” (1794); (ii) (a detail from) plate no. 9 of *America: A Prophecy* (1793).

60:6. It is possible that Pater was referring to the following edition of Blake’s *Songs of Innocence: William Blake. Songs of Innocence and Experience, and Other Poems*. Ed. Richard Herne Shepherd, London, Basil Montagu Pickering, 1866. This book appears to have been reprinted in 1868.

60:20–38. Pater quotes from pages 35–36 of Colvin’s book. Colvin refers to the following biography of Stothard: Anna Eliza Bray. *Life of Thomas Stothard, R. A, with Personal Reminiscences*. London, Bradbury & Evans for John Murray, 1851.

61:7–10. Pater quotes from page 42 of Colvin’s book.

61:10–13. Pater quotes freely from page 45 of Colvin’s book (“... in it [Flaxman’s ‘Italian phase’] a Roman mother and her child, or children, are usually treated in a mode which is the extreme, the exaggeration of that which I have called architec-

tonic—their limbs being conceived as masses for adjustment in something like rigid geometrical or architectural figures.”

61:13–18. The “list of Illustrations” in Colvin’s book starts thus: “1. The Mothers—Flaxman—Frontispiece”. The “few words” Colvin writes “on page 46”, concerning this “design of Flaxman’s”, are the following:

“What may be the motive or meaning of the design is hard to tell. Is it only a sculptor’s chance experiment at a monumental scheme of figures, or has it some further significance that one may find out?—say, motherhood in honour and motherhood in dishonour, with Charity coming between the two to proclaim them equally, worthy? For Flaxman was not only a moral but a moralising artist with a distinctly didactic turn in his imagination.... And a meaning like that seems to fit the exultation of the one mother over her strapping child, and the shrinking gesture of the other opposite as she half hides away her bald and swaddled one; while the central figure has clearly something of a sacred or symbolic character. The design reminds me of another not nearly so good, at University College, in which a forlorn mother crouches in the road, with one child between her knees and two others flung or resting huddle-wise about her arms and lap, and a rich lady, as it seems, charitably directing her beautiful daughter to them from an open doorway on the right. Meaning or no meaning, however, the design of the three female figures and two children may stand as typical of Flaxman’s mastery with pen-and-ink; the reproduction considerably reduces and confuses it; but it is no artist short of one of the greatest who can do so much with so little....”

61:25–27. Pater quotes from page 3 of Colvin’s book (“Now it is evident, in the first place, that children may be taken either naturally as what they are, or artificially as types and figures of something which they are not. A school may either see and care about them in their common human relations, or refer them to other and more remote relations suggested by religion and imagination”).

61:27–29. Pater quotes freely from page 7 of Colvin’s book (“The burden of the supernatural, which is always in

61:35–36.

Children in Italian and English Design (1872)

some degree the unnatural, rests inevitably upon this fair population of worshipping angel-children”).

61:35–36. Pater mentions “the House Beautiful” here, in “Two Early French Stories”, in “Wordsworth”, and in “Post-script”. In this latter essay, he writes: “The words, classical and romantic, although, like many other critical expressions, sometimes abused by those who have understood them too vaguely or too absolutely, yet define two real tendencies in the history of art and literature. Used in an exaggerated sense, to express a greater opposition between those tendencies than really exists, they have at times tended to divide people of taste into opposite camps. But in that *House Beautiful*, which the creative minds of all generations—the artists and those who have treated life in the spirit of art—are always building together, for the refreshment of the human spirit, these oppositions cease; and the *Interpreter* of the *House Beautiful*, the true aesthetic critic, uses these divisions, only so far as they enable him to enter into the peculiarities of the objects with which he has to do.”

62:13. The French Rococo painter Jean Honoré Fragonard (1732–1806), who was reputed for the lack of seriousness and the eroticism of his characteristic paintings. Hence, the “act of historical justice” to which both Pater and Colvin refer.

Here is the “clear characterisation of” this “obscure artist” “that Mr. Colvin gives us ... by the way, on page 16”:

... again, another Frenchman, Honoré Fragonard of all in the world, made some drawings which I have seen, full of exquisite perception along the same line; groups of playing or listening boys and girls about the knees of the mother or elder sister, simply composed and as full of sweetness and delicate expression as need be. That sounds out of keeping with the reputation and improper predilections of Fragonard; but so it is; and his was one of those alert and adroit spirits which lose no impression that is brought across them, and one which, distinctly preferring vice on its own account, could nevertheless see and interpret, not without delightfulness and a touch of poetry, the grace and gestures of the innocent. So

much by way of historical justice, and in case any of our Englishmen (as can scarcely be proved likely) may have in any sort caught the lovely gift which we shall prize in them from a French predecessor or contemporary, we shall still see grounds for our boast, that the Englishmen have done this thing best of all.

62:13.

Children in Italian and English Design (1872)

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

65:1–4. Symonds' major work, *Renaissance in Italy*, is composed of seven parts. Part I (*The Age of the Despots*), the volume which Pater reviews, appeared in 1875; Part II (*The Revival of Learning*) and Part III (*The Fine Arts*) appeared in 1877; Part IV (*Italian Literature I*) and Part V (*Italian Literature II*) appeared in 1881; Part VI (*The Catholic Reaction I*) and Part VII (*The Catholic Reaction II*) appeared in 1886.

65:10. John Addington Symonds (1840–1893), the author of the book Pater reviews here, was an English poet, biographer, historian and literary critic.

In 1858, he entered Balliol College, Oxford, where he won prizes for his writing and, in 1862, obtained a first in *Litterae Humaniores*. In the same year, he was awarded an open fellowship at Magdalen College, Oxford, but soon after suffered a breakdown and left for Switzerland, where he wrote most of his books, including biographies of the English poets Percy Bysshe Shelley (1878), Philip Sidney (1886), and Ben Jonson (1886), several volumes of poetry and essays, and a translation of *Vita di Benvenuto di Maestro Giovanni Cellini fiorentino, scritta, per lui medesimo, in Firenze*, the autobiography of the Italian artist Benvenuto Cellini (1887).

In Switzerland, too, he completed his study of the Renaissance, the work for which he is chiefly remembered and of which the book Pater reviews is the first volume. He had a passion for Italy, and, for many years, spent the autumn in Venice.

In spite of his poor health, Symonds remained extraordinarily active throughout his life. Indeed, his writing remained unbroken to the last, two of his works, a volume of essays titled *In the Key of Blue* and a study of the American poet Walt Whitman (*Walt Whitman, a Study*) having been published in the year of his death (1893).

65:13–14. John Addington Symonds. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. London, Smith, Elder & Co., 2 vols., 1873 and 1876.

65:1–4.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

65:19–22.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

65:19–22. Here, Pater, of course, follows Symonds, who, at the beginning of chapter II (“The Age of the Despots”), states: “The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries may be called the Age of the Despots in Italian history, as the twelfth and thirteenth are the Age of the Free Burghs, and as the sixteenth and seventeenth are the Age of Foreign Enslavement.” (p. 34)

65:24–25. Pater quotes from page 39 of Symonds’ book. Symonds writes (pp. 38–39): “Under the Italian despotisms we observe nearly the opposite of all the influences brought to bear in the same period upon the nations of the North. There is no gradual absorption of the great noble houses in monarchies, no fixed allegiance to a reigning dynasty, no feudal aid or military service attached to the tenure of the land, no tendency to centralize the whole intellectual activity of the race in any capital, no suppression of individual character by strongly biased public feeling, by immutable law, or by the superincumbent weight of a social hierarchy. Everything, on the contrary, tends to the free emergence of personal passions and personal aims.”

65:27–28. The Italian mercenary captain (*condottiero*) FRANCESCO SFORZA (1401–1466), who founded the Sforza dynasty in the duchy of Milan by forcing the Milanese republic to accept him, in 1450, as its fourth duke; the Dominican monk, preacher, and reformer Girolamo SAVONAROLA (1452–1498) who, after having described the Catholic Church as a whore, was excommunicated by Pope Alexander VI and burned as a heretic in Florence; the Italian statesman, historian, and writer Niccolò MACHIAVELLI (1469–1527), who became famous above all for his political treatise *Il Principe* (*The Prince*), which he wrote around 1513 but remained unpublished until 1513; he who was born RODRIGO BORGIA (1431?–1503), fathered several children by his mistresses, and was head of the Catholic Church from 1492 until his death, as Alexander VI.

In *The Renaissance*, Pater speaks of “Savonarola’s famous ‘bonfire of vanities’”, by means of which the Reformer, who was “for spiritualising the papal sovereignty”, also destroyed “love-songs in the vulgar tongue”. And in *Plato and Platonism* he compares Machiavelli’s understanding of the State with Plato’s: “Remember! the question Plato is asking

throughout *The Republic*, with a touch perhaps of the narrowness, the fanaticism, or ‘fixed idea,’ of Machiavel himself, is, not how shall the state, the place we must live in, be gay or rich or populous, but strong—strong enough to remain itself, to resist solvent influences within or from without, such as would deprive it not merely of the accidental notes of prosperity but of its own very being.”

65:28–30. The Italian sculptor and goldsmith **BENVENUTO CELLINI** (1500–1571), who became famous by his autobiography, *Vita di Benvenuto di Maestro Giovanni Cellini fiorentino, scritta, per lui medesimo, in Firenze*; the Italian cardinal and mercenary captain (*condottiero*) **CESARE BORGIA** (1475–1507), who was born an illegitimate son to Pope Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia) and whose fight for power was a major inspiration for Machiavelli’s *The Prince*; the renowned Humanist, and patron of art and learning, **FREDERICO DA MONTEFELTRO** (1422–1482), Count of Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino from 1474 until his death, and one of the most successful mercenary captains (*condottieri*) of the Italian Renaissance.

The appellation “good Duke of Urbino” does not appear in Symonds’ book, who refers to “the good Duke Frederick” (p. 105). Pater, who, some paragraphs ahead (67:12–13), changes it into “the ‘good duke Frederic of Urbino,’” may have come across it either indirectly or directly.

Indirectly, Pater may have found the appellation in the third volume of a work to which Symonds confesses himself “principally indebted” (p. 105). It is the third volume of James Dennistoun’s *Memoirs of the Duke of Urbino* (London, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1851), where the author writes of “an incident characteristic of the age” (p. 267):

The venal conduct of Duke Francesco Maria’s Spanish followers having brought to a sudden close his attempt to regain his patrimonial states, ... one of their number resented an imputation to that effect, cast upon his comrades by some gentlemen of Ferrara. A challenge was the result, each party selecting a bravo to maintain their cause. This duel by deputy took place on the Neapolitan

66:2.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

territory, and, of the combatants, who fought naked with swords, the Spaniard was left dead on the field. The victor returned to be fêted in the capital of the d'Esto; and Ariosto composed his thirty-fifth sonnet upon "Ferrara's true paladin, of truth, genius, worth, and valour, who has cleared up the Spaniard's slippery trick upon *the good Duke of Urbino*, and testified to Italian bravery." (The italics have been added.)

Directly—it is now obvious,— Pater may have found the appellation the "good Duke of Urbino" (in fact, "buon duca d' Urbino") in Ludovico Ariosto's *Rime*, although not in "his thirty-fifth sonnet", but in his "Sonneto XXX": "Ecco, Ferrara, il tuo ver paladino | Di fè, d' ingegno, di prodezza e còre; | Ecco quel c' ha chiarito il fatto errore | D' alcun di Spagna al *buon duca d' Urbino*". (The italics have been added.) (See: *Opere Minori di Ludovico Ariosto*. Ed. Filippo Luigi Polidori, Firenze, Felice le Monier, 1857, vol. 1, p. 307).

66:2. Symonds' "first chapter" (pp. 1–33) is titled "The Spirit of the Renaissance".

66:2–6. Throughout his book, Symonds uses several times the noun "emancipation" in connection with the Renaissance, thus reminding the reader of Immanuel Kant's assertion (in *What is Enlightenment?*) that enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) consists in man's self-emancipation; "man's release from his self-incurred tutelage" ("Ausgang des Menschen aus seiner selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit"). Symonds, for instance, declares that the "the real quality of the Renaissance... was the emancipation of the reason for the modern world" (p. 6), speaks of "the final emancipation of art from ecclesiastical trammels" (p. 20), and states that, if it is true that "Christianity... was never seriously imperilled by the classical enthusiasm of the Renaissance", it is also true that, "on the other hand... the progressive emancipation of the reason [was not] materially retarded by the reaction [on the part of Christianity] it produced" (p. 27).

66:6–7. The "next two chapters" are chapter II ("The Age of the Despots") and chapter III ("The Republics").

66:15–18. Pater refers to: *Philosophy of Art in Italy* (*Philosophie de l'art en Italie*, Paris, Germer–Ballière, 1866), by the French historian, critic, and philosopher Hippolyte Taine (1828–1893), who, like Pater, was a proponent of literary historicism; *History of Painting in Italy* (*Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, Paris, Didot, 1817, 2 vols.), and *Italian Chronicles* (*Chroniques italiennes*, Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1855), by the French writer Marie-Henri Beyle (1783–1842)—who became better known by his pen name, Stendhal.

Stendhal's *Italian Chronicles* (*Chroniques italiennes*) is composed of writings which he had previously published separately, and which had been inspired by the Italian manuscripts that he had discovered and had had copied in 1833. The title was created posthumously by Stendhal's literary executor, for one of the seventeen volumes of the 1855 edition of the writer's *Complete Works* (*Oeuvres complètes*, Paris, Michel Lévy, 17 vols., 1853–1855), and refers to tales (*nouvelles*) such as “Vanina Vanini,” “Vittoria Accoramboni,” “Les Cenci,” etc.

66:25–26. The words which Symonds chose for the “the motto of his title-page” appear at the end of the first book (chapter VII) of Machiavelli's *Florentine Histories* (*Istorie fiorentine*, Florence, 1532), in which, as the title indicates, the author deals with the history of Florence.

Those same words (*Di questi adunque oziosi principi, e di queste vilissime armi, sarà piena la mia istoria*) signify: “Of these idle princes, then, and of these most vile armies, my history will be replete”—“idle princes” having reference to men in power who were not dignified enough to fight their battles in command of their own armies, and “most vile armies” being, here, armies fighting under the command of mercenary captains (*condottieri*).

Symonds calls these words of Machiavelli's “the contemptuous phrase with which he”, Machiavelli, “winds up his analysis”: “Machiavelli, in a weighty passage at the end of the first book of his Florentine History, sums up the various causes which contributed to the disuse of national arms among the Italians of the Renaissance. The fear of the despot for his subjects, the priest-rule of the Church, the jealousy of Venice for

her own nobles, and the commercial sluggishness of the Florentine burghers, caused each and all of these powers, otherwise so different, to entrust their armies to paid captains. ‘Di questi adunque oziosi principi e di queste vilissime armi sara piena la mia istoria,’ is the contemptuous phrase with which he winds up his analysis.” (pp. 180–181)

66:33–67:6. “The spirit of the Renaissance proper, of the Renaissance as a humanistic movement” was, for Pater, the spirit of “the creative minds of all generations”, of artists like the Italian painter Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) and the Italian poet Torquato Tasso (1544–1595), as well as of “those who have treated life in the spirit of art”. That is to say, the spirit of “the Renaissance as a humanistic movement” was, for Pater, the spirit which continuously ensouls what he beautifully called the *House Beautiful*.

The *builders* of such a *House*, Pater argues here, could naturally have no affinity with “hater[s] of human life”, such has the murderous tyrant Ezzelino da Romano (1194–1259), who ruled over Verona, Vicenza and Padua for almost two decades, or for holy man of such unholy tastes as those of pope Alexander VI.

Just like Symonds, in his book, Pater wrote not “Leonardo”, but “Lionardo”—as he did in the first edition of *The Renaissance (Studies in the History of the Renaissance, 1873)*, but not thenceforth.

67:3–4. Pater quotes from Symonds’ sixth chapter (“The Popes of the renaissance”): “We find in the Popes of this period what has been already noticed in the despots—learning, the patronage of the arts, the passion for magnificence, and the refinements of polite culture, alternating and not unfrequently combined with barbarous ferocity of temper and with savage and coarse tastes” (pp. 304–305).

67:4–7. Pater’s words, “a sense of latent claims in things which even ordinary good men pass rudely by”, attest that, in speaking of “sympathy” here, he had in mind the sympathy which motivates the belief he calls “the essence of humanism” (in “Pico della Mirandola”): the belief “that nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vital-

ity” (and therefore its “latent claims”)—“no language they have spoken, nor oracle beside which they have hushed their voices, no dream which has once been entertained by actual human minds, nothing about which they have ever been passionate, or expended time and zeal.”

67:9–10. Pater here favourably distinguishes the “artists” and cultured men of the Renaissance from the popes of those times, even though it be true that, as Symonds states, even “the best” of them esteemed good conduct according to “aesthetic propriety” rather than according to “strict conceptions of duty.” Symonds’ words are from his seventh chapter, which is titled “The Church and Morality”: “The contradiction between the spiritual pretensions of the Popes and their actual worldliness was not so glaring to the men of the Renaissance, accustomed by long habit to the spectacle of this anomaly, as it is to us. Nor would it be scientific to imagine that any Italian in that age judged by moral standards similar to ours. Æsthetic propriety rather than strict conceptions of duty ruled the conduct even of the best, and it is wonderful to observe with what artless simplicity the worst sinners believed they might make peace in time of need with heaven” (p. 383).

67:11. In order to further distinguish the “artists” of the Renaissance from the *unsympathetic* princes and prelates of the time, Pater states, quoting Symonds, that “at least they never ‘destroyed pity in their souls’”—the words enclosed in single quotation marks appearing in Symonds’ chapter II, “The Age of the Despots”, and therefore having reference there to the despot of the Renaissance. Symonds’ phraseology is not destitute of a certain charm: “Isolated, crime-haunted, and timorous, the despot not unfrequently made of vice a fine art for his amusement, and openly defied humanity. His pleasures tended to extravagance. Inordinate lust and refined cruelty sated his irritable and jaded appetites. He destroyed pity in his soul, and fed his dogs with living men, or spent his brains upon the invention of new tortures” (pp. 55–56)

67:12–14. While referring to the “Softer touches” Symonds gives to the person of the Duke of Urbino, in stressing his “real courtesy and height of character”, Pater had in mind

67:14–15.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

the “portrait of the good Duke Frederick” that he, Symonds, sketches in chapter II (pages 105–114)—which, significantly, is titled “The Age of the Despots”.

In regard to the appellation the “good duke Frederic of Urbino”, see above, note to 65:28–30.

67:14–15. It is on pages 115–12, that Symonds concentrates his attention on *The Book of the Courtier* (*Il Libro del Cortegiano*), a famous dialogue in imitation of Plato written by the Italian courtier–diplomat Baldassare Castiglione (1478–1529) and first published in Venice, by the Aldine Press, in 1528. The book, which contains a philosophical conversation concerning the *perfection* of the courtier, is a memorial tribute to life in the the court of Guidobaldo da Montefeltro (Count of Urbino from 1482 on, after the death of Frederico, his father), as Castiglione experienced it during his stay there, as a youth, at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

67:15–17. Symonds treats of the *Treatise of the Family* on pages 174–179. He calls it the “Essay on the Family” and remarks that it “should be read side by side with Castiglione’s *Cortegiano*, by all who wish to understand the private life of the Italians in the age of the Renaissance.”

The *Treatise on the Family*, to use Pater’s accurate translation, was first published, under the authorship of the Florentine statesman, merchant and scholar Agnolo Pandolfini (1360–1446), in the eighteenth century (*Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*, Firenze, Tartini e Franchi, 1734), although it had been previously cited by the Accademia della Crusca. Since the nineteenth century, however—since the appearance, in 1866, of F. C. Pellegrini’s article “Agnolo Pandolfini e il *Governo della Famiglia*” (*Giornale storico letterario italiano*, 1866, pp. 1–52),— it has become accepted that Pandolfini’s manuscripts of the *Treatise* contain not an original work, but a copy of the third book of the treatise *I Libri Della Famiglia*, by the Italian architect, painter, and writer Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1474), which remained unpublished in its entirety until 1734.

67:17–19. Symonds’ “beautiful description... of the last days of Pietro Boscoli” occurs on pages 400–402 of *The Age of the Despots* (chapter VII, “The Church and Morality”)—the

Florentine Pietro Paolo Boscoli (1481–1513) having been accused of tyrannicide, condemned to death, and beheaded in 1513, as a result of the appearance of his name, together with others, including Machiavelli's, in a list of conspirators who, being opposed to the restoration to power of the Medici (in 1412), presumably were plotting to murder Giuliano, Lorenzo, and Giulio de' Medici.

67:19–23. Pater quotes from Symonds' "beautiful description ... of the last days of Pietro Boscoli" (pp. 100–401): "Luca della Robbia, the nephew of the great sculptor of that name, and himself no mean artist, visited his friend Boscoli on the night of his execution, and wrote a minute account of their interview. Both of these men were members of the Confraternità de' Neri, who assumed the duty of comforting condemned prisoners with spiritual counsel, prayer, and exhortation. The narrative, dictated in the choicest vernacular Tuscan, by an artist whose charity and beauty of soul transpire in every line in contrast with the fiercer fortitude of Boscoli, is one of the most valuable original documents for this period which we possess. What is' most striking is *the combination of deeply rooted and almost infantine piety with antique heroism in the young patriot.*" (The italics have been added.)

The attentive reader cannot but notice how Symonds' phraseology betrays his true thoughts: "charity and beauty of soul", as well as "deeply rooted and almost infantine piety" (della Robbia's) in contrast, but also "striking[ly in] ... combination", with "antique heroism in the young patriot" (Boscoli).

Add to this the assertion that, according to della Robbia's description, Boscoli's head was, "after death", "like that of an angel", together with the *in between-the-lines message*: "and Luca was, we know, a connoisseur in angel's heads"!—do this, and you won't miss (if you pay attention to its studied syntax) Pater's *tongue-in-cheek reply*: "a striking instance of 'the combination of deeply-rooted and almost infantine piety with antique heroism,' coming near as it happened, in his friend Luca della Robbia the younger, to an artist who could understand the aesthetic value of the incidents he has related."

A “striking instance... coming near... in his friend Luca della Robbia [*Lucas Rubius*]... to an artist who could understand the aesthetic value of the incidents he has related”. An artist who, indeed, “was, *we* know, a connoisseur in angel’s heads”!

Furthermore, notice Pater’s ironical *refusal* to quote Symonds’s “beautiful description”, understood as a specimen of his *style*—a *style* which “keep[s] the attention of the reader always on the alert” (68:24–25): “I quote a very different episode as a specimen of Mr. Symonds’ style”!

Della Robbia’s “narrative” (“Recitazione *del caso di PIETRO PAOLO BOSCOLI e di AGOSTINO CAPPONI, scritta da LUCA DELLA ROBBIA, l’anno MDXIII*”) is printed, as Symonds partially notes, in: *Archivio Storico Italiano*. Firenze, vol. I, 1842, pp. 283–309.

67:26–68:18. Pater quotes pages 23–24.

Symonds gives Infessura’s account as testimony to his assertion that the Renaissance had as much eagerness for the *relics* of Classical Age as the Crusaders had had for the *relics* of Holy Land: “What is most remarkable about this age of scholarship is the enthusiasm which pervaded all classes in Italy for antique culture. Popes and princes, captains of adventure and peasants, noble ladies and the leaders of the demi-monde, alike became scholars.”

Stefano Infessura (c. 1435–c. 1500) was an Italian humanist historian, lawyer, and a long-time secretary of the Roman Senate. The account Symonds gives is from his *Diarium urbis Romae* (*Diario della Città di Roma*), a chronicle, partly in Latin and partly in ancient Romanesco, of events at Rome from 1294 to 1494. (See: Oreste Tomasini, ed. *Diario della Città di Roma, di Stefano Infessura*. 2.ed., Roma, Forzani E. C. Tipografi del Senato, 1890.)

67:31. The Appian Way (*Via Appia*) was one of the earliest Roman roads of the ancient republic. It connected Rome to Brindisi, in southeast Italy.

68:1. The Capitol is the *Capitolium* or Capitoline Hill, one of the Seven Hills of Rome.

68:6. Innocent VIII, born Giovanni Battista Cibo (1432–1492), was Pope from 1484 to his death.

68:11. The Italian historian Francesco Matarazzo (1443–1518) too has a version of his own of the disinterment of Julia. He gives it, *en passant*, near the end of his *Chronicles of the city of Perugia, 1492–1503*. (See: Ariondante Fabreti, ed. *Cronaca della città di Perugia, dal 1492 al 1503, di Francesco Maturanzio*. In: *Archivio Storico Italiano*. I. Serie, vol. 16 (1850), parte 1, pp. 180–181):

Before that I come to tell you of new doings of the French king, I will spend a few words in relating an anecdote that will give my soul some solace and will not perhaps be tedious to you in the hearing, saying how in the year 14* there was discovered by certain Lombard masters in the ancient city of Rome a tomb in which was laid a well-preserved and beautiful maid whose name, as could be read in the epitaph, was Julia; and on her head was a tiara set with many jewels of great value, and her golden hair was bound with a fillet of green silk, and when they opened the tomb those masons carried off the tiara and much other jewellery. Now this body had been placed in a large quantity of liquid which had preserved the flesh free from decay so that she appeared newly dead; the tomb too was beautifully wrought and one of the lines of the epitaph ran thus: JULIA FILIA CLAUDI.” (Francesco Matarazzo. *Chronicles of the city of Perugia, 1492–1503*. Transl. Edward Strachan Morgan, London, J. M. Dent & Co., 1905, p. 199.)

“Nantiporto” is a shortening for the appellation “Il Notaio del Nantiporto”, which presumably means “notary of the outpost”, in reference, according to Anna Modigliani (the author of the entry “Pontani, Gaspare” in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 84, 2015), to one of the “notaries of the ringleaders of Rome” (“notai dei caporioni di Roma”).

“Il Notaio del Nantiporto” was the appellation given to the supposedly anonymous author of an important Roman diary, until, in the first decade of the twentieth century, the Italian scholar Diomede Toni brought forward evidence that the authorship of that diary belonged to the Roman notary Gaspare Pontani (c. 1440–c. 1515)—with the result that scholars nowadays refer to it as: *Il diario romano di Gaspare Pontani, già riferito al Notaio del Nantiporto*: 30

68:11.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

gennaio 1481–25 luglio 1492 (*The Roman diary of Gaspare Pontani, once attributed to the Notary of Nantiporto: 30th of January, 1481, to the 15th of July, 1492*).

In 1734, the Roman diary of the Notaio de Nantiporto was published by Ludovicus Antonius Moratorius, as the diary of an anonymous writer, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* (*Of the Works of the Italian Writers*), vol. III, pt. 2 (the title page reads: *Diarium romanum urbis | Ab anno MCCCCLXXXI ad MCCCXCII | Auctore | Anonymo synchronico | Notario de Antiportu*”).

In the text of this volume, which comprehends different works by different authors and is split in two columns successively numbered from page to page, the diary of the author Symonds refers to as “Nantiporto” (in fact, the diary of Gaspare Pontani) occupies columns 1069–1429—it being in column 1094, that our author gives his much shorter version of the disentanglement of “Julia Filia Claudius”:

Alli 18 fu trovato in un casale di S. Maria Nuova sopra Capo di Bove un corpo intero in un pilo di marmo. Alli 19 martedì fu portato il detto corpo in casa de’ Conservatori e andava tanta gente a vederlo, che pareva vi fosse la perdonanza. E fu messo in una cassa di legname e stava scoperto. Era corpo giovanile, mostrava da quindici anni, non gli mancava membro alcuno, aveva i capelli negri, come se fusse morto poco prima. Aveva una mistura, la quale si diceva l’aveva conservato, co i denti bianchi, la lingua, le ciglia. Non si sa certo, se fusse maschio o femmina. Molti credono, sia stato morto degli anni 170.

In translation:

In the 18th, a still-intact body was found within an urn of marble, in an hamlet in Santa Maria Nuova, on the upper side of Capo di Bove. In the 19th, Tuesday, the said body was carried into the house of the Custodians, and so many people went there, to see it, that it seemed the dispenser o pardon was there in person. And it was placed in a case made out of timber, which was left open. It was

the body of a youth fifteen years of age, no single limb was missing, had black hair, as if it had just died. There was some mixture, which was said to have kept it whole and fresh, with tongue and eyelashes, the teeth still white. It is not known if it was the body of a boy or of a girl. Many people believed it had been dead since the 170s.

68:27. “The Florentine Historians” is Symonds’ chapter IV (pp. 182–263).

68:30. The Greek philosopher ARISTOTLE (384–322 B. C.); the Roman lawyer, politician, writer, and orator Marcus Tullius CICERO (106–43 B. C.); the Roman historian and politician Publius Cornelius TACITUS (c. 56–c. A. D. 120)

68:32. The phrase “products of constructive skill” appears in Symonds’ book in the following context: “Varchi [the Italian historian Benedetto Varchi] in a weighty passage on the defects of the Florentine republic, points out that its weakness arose partly from the violence of factions, but also in a great measure from the implicit faith reposed in doctors of the law. The history of the Florentine Constitution, he says, is the history of changes effected by successions of mutually hostile parties, each in its own interest subverting the work of its predecessor, and each in turn relying on the theories of jurists, who without practical genius for politics make arbitrary rules for the control of state-affairs. Yet even Varchi shares the prevailing conviction that the proper method is first to excogitate a perfect political system, and then to impress that like a stamp upon the material of the commonwealth. His criticism is directed against lawyers, not against philosophers and practical diplomatists. In this sense and to this extent were the republics of Italy the products of *constructive skill* and great was the political sagacity educed among the Italians by this state of things” (The italics have been added.)

68:34. “The chapter on *The Prince*” (“the ‘Prince’ of Machiavelli”) is Symonds’ fifth chapter (pp. 264–302)—*The Prince* being, as is well known, Niccolò Machiavelli’s (1469–1572) treatise on how princes should rule. That is to say, on how to acquire power and govern a state without having to

69:1.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

face competition by rival political factions and fear of its consequences.

The treatise, in fact, testifies to Machiavelli's wish to provide princes with a guide for political action steered with strong commitment to avoiding the errors of past rulers and capable of taking into account his own experience as senior official in, and secretary to the Chancery of, the Florentine Republic—a wish that owed much to his conviction that politics has rules of its own no less than, for instance, the game of chess.

One of Machiavelli's main points is that, considered as an end, achievement of success as a ruler ought to justify the use of unjust and immoral means—this having so much appealed the readers of *The Prince*, that the adjectival form of his surname, “Machiavellian”, came to be used as a synonym for political maneuvers marked by cunning, duplicity, or bad faith.

While writing it, and while it circulated in manuscript form during the first decade of the sixteenth century, Machiavelli referred to his treatise in Latin, as *De Principatibus* (*Concerning the Rule of Princes*). However, when it came to be published, in 1532, five years after Machiavelli's death, it bore the title *Il Principe* (*The Prince*).

69:1. The fact that the word “Republic”, in the phrase “Plato's Republic”, has no inverted commas shows that Pater meant to refer not to the dialogue of Plato which tradition has misnamed *The Republic* (instead of naming it *Concerning the Government of the City*), but to the ideal *polis* that Socrates there builds in thought.—The *polis* which, in the chapter of *Plato and Platonism* entitled “Lacedæmon”, he himself calls “Plato's theoretic building”.

The study of Pater's *œuvre* shows him as a man divided between the satisfaction of the needs and interests of the senses and the satisfaction of those of the soul, reason, or the intellect. Hence, the awareness, in the Marius of the chapter which significantly is titled “The Tree of Knowledge”, that, although his “cherished religion of the villa” “seemed to make a claim [on him] of a quite exclusive character”, it inevitably defined “itself as essentially one of but two possible leaders of his spirit, the other proposing to him unlimited self-expansion in a world

of various sunshine": "The contrast was so pronounced as to make the easy, light-hearted, unsuspecting exercise of himself, among the temptations of the new phase of life which had now begun, seem nothing less than *a rival religion, a rival religious service.*" (The italics have been added.)

Indeed, Pater seems to have remained unable to stand by the rights and decrees of reason without flinching at the thought that this would put a low price, for him, on the life of the senses. And, as a result, one cannot listen to him diagnosing, for instance, the "real evil" of "constant exaggerated appetite for change in public institutions, bringing with it an incorrigible tendency of all the parts of human life to fly from the centre", without listening to him reviling, almost in one breath, as here, the "ruthless" bitterness of this or that among the few remedies available:—here, the "political idealism ... of Plato's Republic".

In the chapter of *Plato and Platonism* referred to above ("Lacedæmon"), Pater challenges the reader to imagine an Athenian traveller to Lacedæmon asking a local youth the question: "Why this strenuous task-work, day after day; why this loyalty to a system, so costly to you individually... this laborious, endless, education, which does not propose to give you anything very useful or enjoyable in itself?" A few lines ahead, he rephrases the question, giving it a discursive *physiognomy* that no intelligent reader of this modern world of ours will be able to forget for the rest of his or her whole life: "*To what purpose?* Why, with no prospect of Israel's reward, are you as scrupulous, minute, self-tasking, as he?"

The answer Pater gives to such a question, in the *persona* of "An intelligent young Spartan", is well known (although, most probably, not so well understood): "To the end that I myself may be a perfect work of art, issuing thus into the eyes of all Greece."

No doubt, Pater himself loved the beauty of it! Put a high price on it.—Otherwise, he would not have allowed into the *House Beautiful* "those who have treated life in the spirit of art".

Nonetheless, would he really be willing to pay the price that the "ruthless" "political idealism" of *his* "intelligent young Spartan" demanded—had to demand— of him?

69:6–9.

Renaissance in Italy: The Age of the Despots (1875)

It is he, Pater, too, who gives us the answer: “It is because they”, “those obscure ancient people”, “make us ask the question; puzzle us by a paradoxical idealism in life; are thus distinguished from their neighbours; that, like some of our old English places of education, though we might not care to live always at school there, it is good to visit them on occasion; as some philosophic Athenians, as we have now seen, loved to do, at least in thought”!

69:6–9. “The chapter on Savonarola” (“Savonarola”) is Symonds’ chapter VIII (pp. 428–471); the “interesting pendant on “Religious Revivals in Medieval Italy” is “Appendice No. IV” (pp. 544–560); “the last chapter”, on “Charles the Eighth in Italy” (chapter IX, “Charles VIII”), occupies pp. 472–525—Charles VIII (1470–1498), who had his army invade Italy in 1494, to lay claim to the Kingdom of Naples, and, by so doing, may perhaps have put his seal on the beginning of the end of the Renaissance, Charles VIII having been King of France from 1483 to his death, in 1498.

69:26–28. “I note the absence of... reserve in many turns of expression, in the choice sometimes of detail and metaphor”. Was Pater referring to “turns of expression” and “choice of... metaphor” such as these?—“and Luca was, we know, a connoisseur in angel’s heads”?

Of course, Pater himself was no stranger to “turns of expression” quite similar to those we find him criticising in Symonds. No:— He was not:—Perhaps because, like Symonds, he *was*. Therefore, one should pay attention to how deep, unmeasurable, was, indeed, the respect that he paid to the “reserve” which, if absent, could not but expose him to the perils of being interpreted as a disrespectful “*Interpreter of the House Beautiful*”.

Love in Idleness (1883)

73:1–2. Pater probably refers to hints such as the use of the first person of the plural in the first poem, “To Erato” (“Our love is love in idleness”, “Yet hath he [Love] given a day of rest, | Whereon *we* worship none the less | For that *we* toil not, neither jest”), and in the “Envoy” that immediately follows it (“Princess, this love is even *our* best; | Take it, Love’s sovereign votaress, | To whom *our* vows are now addressed: | *Our* love is love in idleness” (pp. 3–4). (The italics have been added.)

Either Pater did not in truth know, or just pretended not to know, who the author of *Love in Idleness* was—or the authors, as he makes us believe to suspect to be the case.

The title page of the book reads as follows: Love in Idleness | A Book of Poems | London | Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square | 1883.

The page immediately before exhibits two epigraphs.

One is a line of Euripides’ *Danae* (“Ἔρωσ γὰρ ἀργὸν καὶ τὶ τοῖς ἀργοῖς ἔφν), which is identified as part of “frag. 8.” It was translated into English by, among others, John Addington Symonds and Michael Woodhull. The first of them rendered it: “Love is a sluggard, and of sloth the twin” (John Addington Symonds. *Studies of the Greek Poets*. 2. ed., London, Smith, Elder, & Co., 1879, vol. 2, p. 297). The second rendered it: “Love is a slothful guest estranged from toil” (Michael Woodhull, transl. *The Nineteen Tragedies and Fragments of Euripides*. London, John Walker *et. al.*, 1809, vol 3., p. 316).

Somewhat paradoxically, it may not be evident to the reader why such a line should have been chosen to play the part of an epigraph in a book which not only bears the title *Love in Idleness*, but also opens with a poem (“To Erato”) whose refrain is: “Our love is love in idleness”!—above all if such a line be rendered thus: “For he idle *lies*, Love labours in idleness”. Or, a *bit* more prosaic: “Love is an idle lad; he labours in idle-

73:1–2.

Love in Idleness (1883)

73:1–2.

Love in Idleness (1883)

ness”. (For the *true*, subliminal, meaning, in *Love in Idleness*, of the words “idleness”, see below, note to 77:2.)

The second epigraph is an excerpt from the beginning of act IV, scene iii, of William Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labours Lost*: “By heaven I do loue; and it hath taught me to Rime, and to be mallicholie; and here is part of my Rime, and heere my mallicholie”.

On its turn, the page immediately after the title page informs the reader that the book is dedicated “To Andrew Cecil Bradley”—the English literary scholar, former student of Balliol College, Oxford, who came to be known above all as A. C. Bradley (1851–1935).

As to the authors of the book —indeed, the authors, or poets,—a reader in doubt or ignorance concerning them while reading their poems in 1883 might have found, although much later, who they were: by reading a book of poems they published about eight years later (*Loves’ Looking Glass: A Volume of Poems*, London, Percevall & Co., 1891), which would have informed him or her of the following: *Of the poems in this volume, those marked B in the Table of Contents are by H. C. Beeching, those marked M by J. W. Mackail, and those marked N by J. B. B. Nichols. Some of them have been already published in a volume by the same authors called Love in Idleness (1883), which is now out of print; some others have appeared in the Oxford Magazine; all the rest are now printed for the first time.*

And, if, by any chance, such a reader happened to read, in that same year (1893), *Arts and Crafts Essays, By Members of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society, With a Preface by William Morris*, he or she might have seen, on page 19 of the section titled “A Selection from the Recent Publications of Messrs. Percival”, the following *Times* announcement: “A little volume of poems entitled ‘Love in Idleness,’ was published a few years ago by three Oxford friends—Mr. J. W. Mackail, Mr. H. C. Beeching, and Mr. J. B. B. Nichols—and being speedily appreciated by all lovers of graceful and scholarly versification, it soon went out of print. The three writers now reappear in the same association in ‘Love’s Looking Glass,’ which contains the original poems, together with many additions.... The volume

should prove as attractive as its predecessor, for the new poems it contains are not less scholarly, melodious, and graceful than the old." --Times. 73:1-2.

The authors of the book Pater reviewed were, then, "three Oxford friends" that—to be more precise—had studied together at Balliol College. And that, having been, all of them, born in 1859, were twenty-four years old at the time they published *Love in Idleness* (1883). That is to say, were, by then, twenty years younger than Walter Pater, Fellow of Brasenose College.

"Mr. J. W. Mackail"—John William Mackail (1859–1945)—became Oxford Professor of Poetry from 1906 to 1911, as well as President of the British Academy from 1932 to 1936, and President of the Classical Association from 1923 to 1924. Furthermore, he became known above all as the official biographer of William Morris, of whom he was a close friend, and as the author of important works on the Roman poet Virgil, other Latin poets, the Icelandic sagas, Shakespeare, and Jesus. At the time of his death, all the books he had produced, both as a writer and as an editor, would have a long shelf for themselves, either in his own study or in a library: they amounted to the staggering number of about fifty volumes.

In April and May, 1885, Mackail reviewed *Marius the Epicurean* in the *Oxford Magazine*.

"Mr. H. C. Beeching,"—Henry Charles Beeching (1859–1919)—had taken holy orders the year before, in 1882, and published *Faith: Eleven Sermons with a Preface*. Afterwards, he wrote and edited several other books, including the anthology in two volumes *A Paradise of English Poetry* (1896), side by side with lecturing on poetry and holding the positions of Rector of Yattendon 1885–1900, Clark Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge, professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College, London (1900–1903), Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn (1900–1903), Canon of Westminster Abbey (1902–1911), and Dean (of the Chapter) of Norwich Cathedral (1911–1919).

"Mr. J. B. B. Nichols"—John Bowyer Buchanan Nichols (1859–1939)—became known above all as a poet and artist, as well as trustee of the (London Museum) Wallace Collection.

73:2–3.

Love in Idleness
(1883)

In 1883, besides contributing to *Love in Idleness*, he published the prize poem *Inez de Castro*. Later on, he edited *A Little Book of English Sonnets* (1903) and published two books written by himself: *Words and Days: A Table Book of Prose and Verse* (1895, edited by Logan Pearsall Smith) and *Poems by Bowyer Nichols* (1943, edited by his friend J. W. Mackail).

73:2–3. Most probably, some of the poems included in *Love in Idleness* had been previously published in the *Oxford Magazine*, to judge from the announcement that some of the poems in *Love's Looking Glass: A Volume of Poems* (1891) had “appeared in the Orford Magazine” (see note immediately above).

73:10. *Fritillaria meleagris* is a Eurasian species of flowering plant of the lily family *Liliaceae*. This flower is referred to simply as “fritillary” or as “snake’s-head”, in virtue of its bell-shaped corolla and arch-like position, which causes it to pend and nod as the wind blows. Fritillaries are either pink-and-purple-chequered or white. Today, both kinds are becoming rare in England. In Pater’s time, pink-and-purple ones were quite common, but the white ones, as he says, were not so common. Be as it may, Pater well knew why he jokingly chose to compare the poems to fritillaries, instead of, for instance, to titan arums (notice 73:17–18: “these writers have been scholars in deed, and no idlers”).

73:12. Judging from the translations from Greek into English which compose the last section of the book, Pater must have had in mind “good poetic models” such as the Greek poets Meleager (fl. 1st century B. C.), Sappho (c. 630–c. 570 B. C.), Alcman (fl. 7th century B. C.), Callimachus (c. 310c. 240 B. C.), Menander, Leonidas (3rd century B. C.), and Theocritus (c. 300–after 260 B. C.).

73:19. “Lines by a Person of Quality”, which studiously bears the same title of Alexander Pope’s 1773 poem, appears in the first section of the book (“Love in Idleness”), on page 77. It runs thus: “The loves that doubted, the loves that dissembled, | That still mistrusted themselves and trembled, | That held back their hands and would not touch; | Who strained sad eyes to look more nearly, | And saw too curiously and clearly, | What

others blindly clutch; | | To whom their passion seemed only seeming, | Who dozed and dreamed they were only dreaming, | And fell in a dusk of dreams on sleep ; | When dreams and darkness are rent asunder, | And morn makes mock of their doubts and wonder, | What should they do but weep?”

Pater interprets: “these writers have been scholars in deed, and no idlers; with a love very unlike that so well analysed in the “Lines by a person of quality”. Was he aware that the meaning of the poem depends on how “weep”, in the last line, is read? That is to say, was he aware that the kind of love that is “so well analysed” in the poem turns out to be quite different when the meaning of “weep” is understood denotatively (as it appears to have been understood by him), instead of connotatively?”

73:20–21. Pater means by “the original portion of the volume” all the first three sections: I. “Love in Idleness”; II. “Doggerel in Delft”; III. “Sonnets”. The “sonnet in Latin with which the third section “closes” is titled “The Nature of Things”, instead of, like Lucretius’ poem (*De Rerum Natura*), in Latin.

Already the first lines of the poem are not shy in revealing the sort of *things* the poet, or poets, had in mind: “Humana cuncta parent huicce legi | Non posse dici, ‘hoc vel hoc peregi, | Et illud cras perinde peragam.” *Grosso modo*: “All men must obey the law that states they cannot state: | “This one, or that one, have I pricked, | And tomorrow, likewise, will I those others prick”.

The author(s) seem to have had in mind the refrain of the Latin poem *Pervigilium Veneris* (*The Vigil of Venus*), which Pater has Flavian write, in *Marius the Epicurean* (“a poem he [Flavius] was then pondering—the *Pervigilium Veneris*—the vigil, or ‘nocturn,’ of Venus”): *Cras amet qui numquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet*: “Tomorrow, let him love—he who has never loved; tomorrow, let him love likewise—he who has loved”.

73:21–22. The translations that Pater refers to appear in the last section of the book (“Translations from the Greek”), and occupy pages 157–182.

73:24.

Love in Idleness (1883)

73:24. “Rose-leaves when the rose is dead” is the epigraph, taken from Percy Bysshe Shelley’s poem “Music when Soft Voices Die (To—)”, that appears on the recto of the dividing sheet which bears on its verso the subtitle: “Translations from the Greek”.

Pater speaks of such translations as “far from being mere ‘Rose-leaves when the rose is dead,’ as they modestly proclaim themselves.” He does not appear, therefore, to have been aware that dead roses cannot properly be said to bear leaves, and that, consequently, Shelley’s line may well have been appropriated to mean: “Rose leaves even when the rose is long dead”—the “rose” standing, of course, for each of the translated Greek (*dead*) poems; and its “leaves” for its translation into English.

74:15. Pater probably had in mind titles such as “Song”, “Rondeau”, and “Ballade”.

74:17. The front cover of the book shows no words at all, and seems to have had no dust jacket. *A Bookman’s Catalogue: the Norman Colbeck Collection of Nineteenth-century and Edwardian Poetry and Belles Letters in the Special Collections of the University of British Columbia* (Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 1987, vol. 1) describes it thus (p. 43): “*Love in Idleness. A volume of Poems.* Kegan Paul, 1883. Cream parchment, salmon pink board sides, all edges uncut.”

74:18–19. Pater seems to be alluding to the epigraph, from Aristotle’s *Poetics* (1448b, 5–6, 8–9), to the section (or “compartment”, as he calls it) “Doggerel in Delft”: τὸ γὰρ μιμεῖσθαι σύμφυτον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκ παιδῶν ἐστὶ... τὸ χαίρειν τοῖς μιμήμασι πάντα: “the instinct of imitation is implanted in man from childhood... and no less universal is the pleasure felt in things imitated” (the translation is by S. H. Butcher).

Indeed, it is quite possible that the very title (“Doggerel in Delft”) be an allusion to the so-called “English Delf”—tinglazed pottery made in the British Isles in imitation of the tinglazed pottery from the Netherlands, the most appreciated and famous of which was produce in the city of Delf between the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

74:20. As far as the Editor could find out, there is not, and there never was, a “Lurlei grotto”. For him, then, there

are only two possible expiations for this phrase. Either Pater meant to write (and perhaps did write) “Hurley Grotto”—the 130 feet-long tunnel, with a fortified entrance bearing the inscription *Tenebrosa Occultaque Cave* (perhaps *Be thou on guard against the dark and secret thing*), excavated in Scotland by Sir John Clerk of Penicuik (1676–1755); or he simply meant to play on the words “lur”–“lure” and the sound “lei”, in order to suggest “lay” (*shag* and *poem*)—a “lur” being a long, phallus-like wind instrument, made out of wood or bronze.

This second explanation seems, however, more plausible, since Pater gives as his first example of “much real humour” the piece “Half-way in Love”—in which, from first to last, one comes across much play on the verb “to come”.

74:30–31. As it has already been pointed out (see above, note to 73:1–2.), all the three authors of *Love in Idleness* were twenty-four years old at the time they published the book (1883), Pater being, by then, twenty years older than them.

74:33–34. The sonnet “Jealousy” appears on page 138; the sonnet “After Parting”, on page 142; the “longer piece” “In Scheria” belongs to the first section (“Love in Idleness”), and occupies pages 5–18.

74:35–36. Pater was writing in 1883. Two years later, J. W. Mackail would come to publish his translation of *The Aeneid* (London, Macmillan and Co., 1885), and six years later he would publish his translation of *The Eclogues and Georgics* of Virgil (London, Rivingtons, 1889).

74:37–75:1. “In Scheria” is composed of two parts.

The first part treats of Ulysses’ encounter with Nausicae, in the Island of Scheria, which takes place in Book VI of the *Odyssey*. It has for an epigraph ll. 93–95 of Book XIII of the *Odyssey*, which tell of the arrival in Ithaca of the ship that takes Ulysses from Scheria there.

The second part of the poem tells the “strange later story” to which Pater refers—the story of Ulysses’ return to Scheria “in after life”.

75:1–4. Right at the beginning of his review (73:2–3), Pater tentatively speaks of some of the contents of the book

having been printed before. Now, speaking of “In Scheria”, he shows himself sure that this poem “first appeared” in a “periodical collection”. Which periodical and which collection he had in mind, the Editor, however, was unable to find out.

75:5. The English writer Charles Kingsley (1819–1875).

75:7–8. The “sea-piece” which celebrates the English fight at Santa Cruz” is titled “Santa Cruz”, and occupies pages 94–100. It is the last poem of the first section (“Love in Idleness”), and, as the title and Pater tell, treats of the Battle of *Santa Cruz de Tenerife*, which took place on 20 April 1657, in the context of the Anglo–Spanish War (1665–1660), and was won by the English Admiral Robert Blake—whose mission was to attack the the Spanish treasure fleet.

75:11–12. Apparently, Pater refers to parts I and II of “Magdalen Gardens and Magdalen Bridge”, which appear on the section “Doggerel in Delft” and occupy, respectively, pages 143 and 144.

75:13. Pater refers to the two sections of “Ireland”, which bear, respectively, the undertitles “1821” and “1822”. They appear on the section “Doggerel in Delft”, on pages 146 and 149. The first part is addressed to “Ireland, the homeless sister of our shame”. Each of the two pieces seems to be “a really powerful utterance” on the social and political agitation that in those years brought about the near breakdown of law and order in Ireland, as well as the arrest, on 13 October, 1881, of the Irish nationalist politician, and Member of Parliament, Charles Stewart Parnell (1864–1891).

75:16. The English poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834). The poem *Luna Fatifera* (“Fatal Moon”) appears on the section “Love in Idleness”, and occupies pp. 53–54.

75:18. The poem *Loca senta situ* (“Places stained with decay”), whose title is taken from line 462 of Book VI of the *Aeneid*, appears in the section “Love in Idleness”, and occupies pages 49–50.

75:22. This line does not appear in the poem (*Loca senta situ*). It refers adequately to the place the poem describes, and seems to have been arrived at (by Pater) by conflating the ideas

which the two last lines express: “Around them [reeds] shivers the lonely wood, | And the lake id dry.”

75:34. *In Limine* appears in the section “Love in Idleness”, and occupies pages 27–29. “The Recompense” appears in the same section, and occupies pages 21–22.

76:1. Arsène Guillot is a young girl in the short story whose title is homonymous with her name, by the French writer Prosper Mérimée (1803–1870). *Arsène Guillot* was first published in 1840. In her extreme poverty, Arsène finds comfort and help in a pious but supercilious woman, Madame de Pien. Nevertheless, when the man Arsène desperately loves (Max) leaves her, she, a fallen woman, tries to commit suicide, and ends up dying in an hospital.—Not, however, without having given Mérimée the chance to show her moral superiority over her aristocratic consoler and supporter. In his essay “Prosper Mérimée”, Pater refers to the short story as one of “Mérimée’s quintessential pieces”, and states that its “simple pathos” gives it “a unique place in Mérimée’s writings”.

76:5. The sonnet “The Lost Self” appears on page 131.

76:12–13. The poem *Vigilate Itaque* (“Watch ye therefore”), whose title is taken from the Latin Vulgate (either from Matthew 25:23 or Luke 21:36) appears in the first section (“Love in Idleness”), and occupies pages 57–58; the sonnet “The Handmaid of the Lord” appears on page 151; the poem “The History of Philip the Deacon” appears in the first section (“Love in Idleness”), and occupies pages 65–74.

76:14–15. The English poet Christina Rossetti (1830–1894).

76:15–16. The English priest and poet John Keble (1792–1866), who was one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement and tutor and examiner at the Oxford University from 1818 to 1823.

76:19. “The Last Tennis-Party” appears in the section “Doggerel in Delft”, and occupies pages 118–121.

76:22. The German poet and essayist Christian Johann Heinrich Heine (1797–1856).

77:2. Concerning “the pretty cockle-boat on the title page”, see the image on page 72 of volume 1. Pater, who imme-

77:2-7.

Love in Idleness (1883)

diately afterwards speaks of “Art-Poems”, “pieces composed to poems”, was no doubt aware of the subliminal *message* it contains, of which the Greek HΘH—ESS = S, the reader's (hence, the refrain: “Our love is love in idleness”)—is most certainly, in connection with the English *words* IDLEnESS, a significative “point”—or cockle—cockie. Therefore, the reader should be wary of the kind of *volume* he or she holds, while perusing such a “Volume of Poems”. Less subliminal, but inky enough, is Pater's invitation for a (new?) *rendez-vous* “with *art*—with art and music too”!

77:2-7. Pater re-views the contents of the book:—in which he detects “again” and “again”:—clues to” where those future powers may in part lie”. Most of such contents, he recognises to be “Art-Poems”:—with an “art” that most readers, he well knew it, would *see* without ever coming to see it.

Nevertheless, “The ‘Art-Poems’” are most evidently: “For a Drawing” (pp. 80-81), “*On a Drawing of Lionardo in the Academy of Venice*” (pp. 75-76), “*On the Birth of Venus by Botticelli*” (p. 148), “*On a Drawing by Burne Jones*” (p. 149), “*On a Madonna and Child by Bellini*”! (p. 152) (The italics have been added.)

And, indeed, there is “music” too: besides several pieces titled “Song”, the reader has the opportunity to listen to “Nocturne—Chopin, OP 40, 2” (p. 45) and “Nocturne—Chopin, OP 37, 1” (pp. 46-48).

The English School of Painting (1885)

81:2–3. The National Art Training School, today the Royal College of Art, was founded in 1837, and was known, in the nineteenth century, by various names—the one that Pater uses (The National Art Training School) having come into force in 1853, and having been replaced by the one which is used nowadays (the Royal College of Art) in 1896. At the time Pater was writing (1885), the Principal of the school was John Charles Lewis Sparkes (c.1833–1907), who kept the position from 1875 to 1898..

81:3–4. Pater refers to the “series” “The Fine-Art Library”, which was edited by John Sparkes himself (see note immediately before). The half-title page of the book reads: The Fine-Art Library | Edited by John C. L. Sparkes | *Principal of the National Art Training School, South Kensington | Museum.*

81:6. The book Pater reviews had appeared in France three years before: Ernest Chesneau. *La Peinture Anglaise.* Paris, A. Quentin, 1882.

81:16–18. The “lively sketch” to which Pater refers is the one the author gives in his “Introduction” (pp. xiii–xliii). The “acute and entertaining Walpole” is, of course, the English writer, art historian, and antiquarian Horace (Horatio) Walpole (1717–1797). The “works of... Walpole” that Pater mentions are—Chesneau himself explains (p. 16)— the “forty volumes of unpublished notes” that the English engraver and antiquarian George Vertue (1684–1756) had collected, and that, having been left unpublished, “were later selected, arranged, and classified by Horace [Walpole], who completed and finally published them”.

81:19. The English painter, printmaker, pictorial satirist, social critic, and editorial cartoonist William Hogarth (1697–1764).

81:22. Ernest Chesneau (1833–1890), the author of the original version, in French, of the book Pater reviews, was a prolific French art historian and critic. Respected in his time

81:2–3.

The English School of Painting (1885)

81:24.

The English School of Painting (1885)

by his peers in the fields of art history and criticism, he tended to side with the lingering romantic tendencies of his early years and the realist *avant-garde* of the second half of the nineteenth century. His study *Peintres et Statuaires Romantiques* (*Romantic Painters and Sculptors*), of 1880, attests to his attachment to the former.

In his Preface to the book, Ruskin—the great and acknowledged English art critic John Ruskin (1819–1900)—confesses his concurrence with, and his confidence in, Chesneau critical assessment of English art: “My own concurrence with M. Chesneau’s critical judgment respecting all pieces of art with which we have been alike acquainted, has been enough expressed in my terminal lectures on the Art of England. My confidence in his power of analysing the characters of English art least known in France is sufficiently proved by my having commissioned him to write a life of Turner, prefaced by a history of previous landscape; to which I believe my own revision will have little to add in order to make it a just and sufficient record of my beloved Master.” (p. ix)

Nonetheless, Ruskin comments that, notwithstanding his disposition “to follow M. Chesneau, as far as” his own “knowledge permits”, in the “estimate of other really great painters”, he finds Cheneau “too ready to forgive the transgressions of minor genius, and to waste his own and the reader’s time in the search for beauties of small account, and the descriptions of accidental and evanescent fancy.” (pp. ix–x)

81:24. The Scottish painter, especially known for his genre scenes, Sir David Wilkie (1785–1841).

81:24–26. The book proper is divided into two parts. The first part (“The Old Masters.—1730–1850”) comprehends two chapters: (i) “Origin of the School—Portrait painting—Genre Painting” and (ii) “Landscape Painting”. The second part (“The Modern School.—1850–1882”) comprehends eight chapters: (iii) “Originality of the Modern School; (iv) “The Pre-Raphaelites; (v) “Pre-Raphaelite Landscape”; (vi) “Landscape and Rural Life”; (vii) “Historical Painting”; (viii) “Genre Painting”; (ix) “Painting in Water Colour”; (x) Caricature.

Pater quotes from the first chapter of the first part (p. 91).
82:9. The English painter Sir Joshua REYNOLDS (1723–1792); the English portrait and landscape painter, draughtsman, and printmaker Thomas GAINSBOROUGH (1727–1788).

82:10–13. Again, Pater quotes from the first chapter of the first part (p. 40).

82:19. Once more, Pater quotes from the first chapter of the first part (p. 108).

82:19–22. The English Romantic painter John Constable (1776–1837); the English Romantic landscape painter Richard Parkes Bonington (1802–1828); the English Romantic painter, printmaker and watercolourist Joseph Mallord William Turner (1775–1851).

82:23. The French painters Claude Lorraine (Claude Gellée) (1600–1682) and Ferdinand Victor Eugène Delacroix (1798–1863), the first of which lived and painted in Italy, and the second of which was a painter of the Romantic school.

82:25. The designation “Pre-Raphaelite” refers to the so-called “Pre-Raphaelite artists”—a group of English painters, poets, and art critics founded in 1848 by William HOLMAN HUNT (1827–1910), John Everett MILLAIS (1829–1896), DANTE Gabriel ROSSETTI (1828–1882), William MICHAEL ROSSETTI (1829–1919), James collinson (1825–1881), Frederic GEORGE STEPHENS (1827–1907), and Thomas WOOLNER (1825–1892).

82:30–31. Pater refers to the second chapter (“Landscape Painting”, pp. 109–165) of the first part (“The Old Masters.—1730–1850”).

82:31. “Barry” refers to the Irish painter James Barry (1741–1806), who is best remembered for his six-part series of paintings titled *The Progress of Human Culture*—in the Great Room of the Royal Society of Arts, in London.

82:34–37. The discovery, in 1855, by the French, of “the English artists of the day”—the Pre-Raphaelite painters—is thus recounted by Chesneau:

It was not until the time of the Paris Exhibition in 1855, when the English artists of the day first sent their

82:34–37.

The English School of Painting (1885)

productions across the Channel, that foreigners became aware of... [the] existence [of an English school of painting]. The surprise in France was great when the walls of the little temporary building in the Avenue Montaigne were seen lined with an extensive series of pictures belonging to no school familiar to French eyes. Until this time, not only genius, but even feeling—I mean practical art feeling—had been disallowed to the English. It could not be denied that, if she had no great painters, England could boast distinguished amateurs.... Owing, perhaps, as much to astonishment as to genuine admiration, the school whose existence was so suddenly revealed in 1855 was extolled somewhat beyond its merits. Had the works of the English painters of the eighteenth century been exhibited at the same time the revelation would have been still more startling, and more deserving of such an enthusiastic outburst of admiration. (pp. 2–3)

Vernon Lee's *Juvenilia* (1887)

87:1–3. The “ingenious prologue” that Pater speaks of occupies pages 3 to 22 of the first volume of *Juvenilia*. It is listed in the table of contents as: “Introduction: *Juvenilia*”. However, in the dividing page that precedes it (p. 1), as well as in its first page (p. 3), it bears the title: “*Juvenilia: To My Friend Carlo Placci*”. Thence, no doubt, the fact that Pater refers to it as being a “prologue”, instead of an Introduction.

The “friend” Carlo Placci (1861–1941) was an Italian writer. Having been born in London, he moved into Italy in his youth, and died in Florence. His constant travels in and out of the major literary and cultural centres of the Europe of his time, as well as his acquaintance with foreign writers and men of letters, seems to have gained him the role of a *link* between the literary and political *intellegentia* of the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. In the 1880s, he wrote several essays on English contemporary writers, such as Alfred Tennyson, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, William Morris, Robert Browning, and two books by Vernon Lee: *Euphorion: Being Studies of the Antique and the Mediaeval in the Renaissance* (1884), and the novel *Miss Brown* (1884).

The “peculiar sense” in which “we are to understand the term ‘*Juvenilia*’” is explained by the author of *Juvenilia* thus (vol. 1, pp. 3–5):

In calling this volume ‘*Juvenilia*,’ I do not intend to suggest that I consider myself as already and utterly in the sere and yellow....

My meaning is not that. Do you remember, among the allegories on the floor of Siena Cathedral, the little fifteenth-century figures representing the various ages of man? Among them is Youth: a boy holding a hawk. Now there is no reason why a hawk should not be held equally by a man of mature age.... But whereas to the mature

87:1–3.

Vernon Lee's *Juvenilia* (1887)

man hawking is but a mere holiday pastime; to the youth it and all similar sports are the most serious matters in the world; indeed, the only matter for which a serious creature can be expected to exist. Hence the hawk is on the wrist, not of the mature man, but of the boy....

Similarly in the case of these essays. I do not imagine that æsthetical questions are fit only for immature young people—forgive what seems a personal reflexion—nearer twenty than thirty. I mean that, in many cases, in my own case certainly, and in yours I suspect, they are, up to a certain age, the only, or very nearly the only, questions which seem thoroughly engrossing. Later we care for them still, and perhaps fully as much; but we care for other questions also. It is the case of the boy with the hawk; and for this reason I class such matters as “*Juvenilia*.”

Manifestly, the author of these words did not grasp the reason why people of the fifteenth century should represent “Youth” by means of “a boy holding a hawk”. This is, however, perfectly understandable, since, as *Wikipedia* so generously tells us, Vernon Lee was an “engaged feminist” who, nonetheless, “always dressed *à la garçonne*”—“a lesbian”, it is suspected, who “had long term intense relationships with three woman”.

Perhaps Pater did grasp it—this having been the reason why he politely speaks of an “ingenious prologue”.

87:3–4. “Vernon Lee” was the pseudonym of the author of the two volumes Pater reviews: the English writer Violet Paget (1856–1935)—who, having been born in France to British expatriate parents, made many visits to London, although she spent the majority of her life on the continent, particularly in Italy (Florence), and wrote primarily for an English readership. A prolific writer, and a *connoisseur* of the Renaissance on a par with Pater himself and John Addington Symonds, she also “wrote numerous essays about travel in Italy, France, Germany, and Switzerland, which”—to go on quoting *Wikipedia*—“attempted to capture the psychological effects of places rather than to convey any particular piece of information.”

She is supposed to have received inspiration for her pseudonym, Vernon Lee, from the name of her half-brother Eugene Jacob Lee-Hamilton—who was himself a poet.

Besides having been a friend of the famous British-American novelist and essayist Henry James (1843–1916), Violet Paget–Vernon Lee wrote letters—also copiously—to Walter Pater, whom she finally met, in England, in 1881 (six years before Pater wrote his review).

Actually, she stayed, then, with the Paters, as well as by the time of her second visit to England, in 1882. Referring to the event, Pater wrote to her, in a letter addressed to “My dear Miss Paget” on the 18th of November of that same year: “We often speak of your visit here in the summer. What a fund of conversation we had!” Two years later, she would dedicate her book *Euphorion* to Pater: To Walter Pater | In appreciation of that which, in expounding the | Beautiful things of the past, he has added to | The beautiful things of the present.

Pater and Miss Paget kept a cordial relationship until his death.

She wrote a short critical study on Pater’s achievement as critic and writer, to which she pays tribute, in the fourth section of “Valediction”, the last chapter of what she calls her “second book ... on Renaissance matters”: *Renaissance Fancies and Studies* (1895). In a footnote to her second chapter (“The Imaginative Art of the Renaissance”), she laments: “Alas! no longer among the living, though among those whose spiritual part will never die. Walter Pater died July 1894: a man whose sense of loveliness and dignity made him, in mature life, as learned in moral beauty as he had been in visible.”

87:6–8. *Euphorion: Being Studies of the Antique and the Mediaeval in the Renaissance* (London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1884, 2 vols.); *Baldwin: Being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations* (London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1886); *Belcaro, Being Essays on Sundry Aesthetical Questions* (London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1881); *The Countess of Albany* (London, W. H. Allen & Co., 1884); *Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy* (London, W. Satchell and Co., 1880).

87:20–22.

Vernon Lee's *Juvenilia* (1887)

87:20–22. Pater quotes from Vernon Lee's "ingenious prologue" (vol. 1, pp. 11, 10): "We were happier first. Decidedly; that is what I have been insisting all along. But while we were happy other folk were wretched; and this convenient division of property and class cannot be kept up for good."; "Little by little we begin to perceive that there are ugly things in the world: apathy, selfishness, vice, want, and a terrible wicked logic that binds them together in thousands of vicious meshes. And perceiving the ugly things in the world, we perceive for the first time, perhaps, the ugly things within ourselves: for of each there is somewhat in each of us."

87:23. Before 1887, the year of the publication of *Juvenilia*, Vernon Lee had published the following books or "predecessors": (i) *Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy* (1880); (ii) the novella *A Culture-Ghost; or, Winthrop's Adventure* (1881); (iii) *Belcaro, Being Essays on Sundry Aesthetical Questions* (1881); (iv) *Ottolie: An Eighteenth Century Idyl* (1883); (v) *The Prince of the Hundred Soups: A Puppet Show in Narrative* (1883); (vi) *Euphorion: Being Studies of the Antique and the Mediaeval in the Renaissance* (1884); (vii) the novel *Miss Brown* (1884); (viii) the biography *The Countess of Albany* (1884), the life of Princess Louise Maximilienne Caroline Emmanuele of Stolberg-Gedern, the wife of Charles Edward Stuart, the Jacobite claimant to the English and Scottish thrones; (ix) the novella *A Phantom Lover: A Fantastic Story* (1886); (x) *Baldwin: Being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations* (1886).

88:15–16. The first volume of *Juvenilia* contains five chapters: (i) "The Lake of Charlemagne"; (ii) "Botticelli at the Villa Lemmi"; (iii) "Rococo"; (iv) "Prosaic Music and Poetic Music"; (v) "Apolio the Fiddler".

Pater, then, quotes from the second chapter (pp. 79–129): "...this comparatively recent preoccupation about art has, while tending to surround ordinary men and women with beautiful furniture and accessories, at the same time induced a perfect habit of removing works of art from their natural and often beautiful surroundings in order to place them in a kind of artificial stony Arabia of vacuity and ugliness. I should call this the modern gallery-and-concert tendency" (pp. 116–117)

Why the author should speak of such “modern ... tendency” in a chapter titled “Botticelli at the Villa Lemmi”, becomes clear a few pages later in the book: “... I have called this modern tendency towards isolating art of life, the gallery-and-concert tendency; and it is very principally as a signal example of this gallery-and-concert tendency that I resent the removal of the Botticellis from the Villa Lemmi”.

88:16–20. Besides an “Epilogue”, the second volume of *Juvenilia* contains six chapters: (i) “The Immortality of the Maestro Galuppi”; (ii) “Perigot”; (iii) “Lombard Colour Studies”; (iv) “Don Juan (*con Stenterello*)”; (v) “Signor Curiazio”; (vi) “Christkindchen”.

Pater refers, then, to the second chapter (pp. 21–63), in which the “wholesome remarks” he speaks of appear on pages 56–47:

...can we of the end of the nineteenth century fairly judge what Shakspeare's art really is? In order to do so we must, so far as we can, remove the network of thoughts and feeling with which each succeeding generation of critics, of actors, and of readers have overlaid the original work. I sometimes doubt whether, even after all our trouble, we could see the real Shakspeare [*sic*], so utterly have we corrupted the text of what he represents to our soul. The many scholars and societies who labour to give us back the original word and meaning of what he wrote are, in reality, defeating their own object: every explanation is virtually an interpolation, an alteration; and Shakspeare's [*sic*] plays are by this time one mass of such interpolations and alterations. A book like that of Gervinus, for instance, is to my mind a perfect pest; and had Gervinus been a man of greater powers, it would have been a still greater one, if possible.

The besetting sin of all Shakspeare criticism, of all criticism, nay, of all intellectual manipulation whatsoever, is the mania for reducing a heterogeneous thing to a very simple formula. As our novelists seek to reduce the complexities of human character to one definable domi-

88:34.

Vernon Lees *Juvenilia* (1887)

nant character, so our critics seek to reduce the complexities of art to one very definable mission; whence arises that, as every definition means a number of omissions, as many definitions almost are possible as there are critics.

88:34. Pater quotes the last words (“Traurige Geschichte der Menschheit!”) of the tenth collection of letters (“Zehnte Sammlung”) in *Letters for the Advancement of Humanity* (*Briefe zu Beförderung der Humanität*, 1793–1797), by the German philosopher, theologian, and literary critic Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803):

Ein Mensch, sagt das Sprichwort, ist dem andern ein Wolf, ein Gott, ein Engel, ein Teufel; was sind die aufeinander wirkende Menschenvölker einander? Der Neger malt den Teufel weiß, und der Lette will nicht in den Himmel, sobald Deutsche da sind. “Warum gießest du mir Wasser auf den Kopf?” sagte jener sterbende Sklave zum Missionar.—“Daß du in den Himmel kommest.”—“Ich mag in keinen Himmel, wo Weiße sind,” sprach er, kehrte das Gesicht ab und starb. Traurige Geschichte der Menschheit!

In translation:

A man, says the proverb, is to another man a wolf, a god, an angel, a devil; what are to each other the human nations, that go on determining each other? The negro paints the devil white, and the Latvian does not want to go to heaven as soon as Germans are there. “Why do you pour water on my head?” said the dying slave to the missionary.—“That you may go to heaven.”—“I don’t want to go to any heaven where there are white people,” he said, turned his face away and died. Sad story of humanity!

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

91:2. Gustave Flaubert (1821–1880), the great nineteenth-century French novelist, about whose life and letters Pater has so much to say, so that all that could be sketched in this note concerning him would become superfluous, was born in Rouen, Normandie, and died, of an apoplectic stroke, in the village of Croisset, where he had lived with his mother until her death, in 1872, and then alone. 91:2.

Flaubert having been a meticulous writer —his search for *le mot juste* has become proverbial,—the titles of his works would have to fit in a few lines. They are the following: *La Peste à Florence* (*The Plague in Florence*), from 1836; *Rêve d'enfer* (*Dream of Hell*), from 1837; *Mémoires d'un fou* (*Memories of a Mad Man*), from 1838; *Madame Bovary*, from 1857; *Salammbô*, set in the time of the Punic Wars and published in 1862; *L'Éducation sentimentale* (*Sentimental Education*), from 1869; the play *Le Candidat* (*The Candidate*), from 1874; *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* (*The Temptation of Saint Anthony*), from 1874; *Trois Contes* (*Three Tales*), from 1877; the play *Le Château des cœurs* 1880; *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (*Bouvard and Pécuchet*), from 1881; *Dictionnaire des idées reçues* (*Dictionary of Received Ideas*), from 1911; *Souvenirs, notes et pensées intimes*, 1840-1841 (*Intimate Notebooks*, 1840-41), published posthumously, in 1965.

Flaubert's *Œuvres Complètes* (*Complete Works*) appeared, in eight volumes, in 1885. Another edition, in 10 vols., appeared in 1873–85. Flaubert's correspondence with George Sand (1804–1876) was published in 1884, with an introduction by Guy de Maupassant.

91:9–14. Pater translates from a letter addressed to M^{me} X., dated November 1847 (pp. 202–203). M^{me} X., Flaubert's lover, was the French poet and writer Louise Colet (1810–1876).

91:16–20. Flaubert's niece (1846–1931), to whom Pater refers as the editor of the volume he was reviewing, was

91:17. known by different names, although she signed the “Souvenirs Intimes” (“Intimate Memories”) which she had precede her uncle’s correspondence as Caroline Commanville. In fact, this came to be her name only after she married, at the advice of her uncle, a timber trader called Ernest Commanville— she having taken her father’s name, Hamard, as a child, after her mother (Caroline, Flaubert’s sister) died in giving her birth. Caroline Hamard–Commanville, however, later married a physician named Franklin-Grout, and, as a result, became known as Caroline Franklin-Gourt. She, who had at first fallen in love with an artist, a musician, was herself a painter.

Besides her uncle’s correspondence to other persons, Caroline Hamard also published—a fact Pater could not have known— the letters he had written to her (Gustave Flaubert. *Lettres a sa Niece Caroline*. Paris, Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1906).

The “Souvenirs Intimes” (“Intimate Memories”) occupy, in the volume Pater was reviewing, pp. i–xliii.

91:17. *Lettres de Gustave Flaubert a George Sand, Précédées d’une Étude par Guy de Maupassant*. Paris, G. Charpentier, 1884. Pater missed the correct date by only four years!

91:22. Rouen is an old city situated in Normandy, a historic and cultural region of northern France.

91:23. A *maison-Dieu* (“house of God”) was, in the Middle Ages, a building which served both as a monastery and a hospital run to treat the sick poor who might chance to live in its vicinities, as well as sick pilgrims. Flaubert’s niece, however, refers to “L’Hôtel-Dieu de Rouen” (p. xii), not to “La Maison–Dieux” de Rouen. Furthermore, she states (p. xii) that “L’Hôtel-Dieu de Rouen” was “a building of the last century” (“construction du siècle dernier”). Like a “Hôtel-Dieu”, however, a *maison-Dieu* is basically a hospital. Hence, the statement (p. xi): “A la mort de M. Laumonier, mon grand-père lui succéda comme chirurgien en chef de l’Hôtel-Dieu. C’est dans cette vaste demeure que Gustave Flaubert est né.” (“When M. Laumonier died, my grand-father succeeded him in the position of chief surgeon at the Hospital. It was in that huge building, that Gustav Flaubert was born.”)

91:30. Croisset is a hamlet in Normandy, situated nearby to Presqu'île Elie and south of the commune of Canteleu. It became famous as a result of Flaubert having lived there for thirty-five years, during which time he wrote most of his works near the river Seine, where he had the house he speaks of. As his niece says (p. xix), “Croisset, où nous habitons, est le premier village sur les bords de la Seine en allant de Rouen au Havre” (“Croisset, where we lived, is the first hamlet by the shore of the Seine, on the way from Rouen to Le Havre”).

92:1. This is how Pater translates the following words of Flaubert's niece (p. xix): “La maison, de forme longue et basse, toute blanche, pouvait avoir environ deux cents ans de date” (“The house, long and low, all white, might possibly be two-hundred years old”).

92:1–3. Pascal is not even mentioned in the book Pater was reviewing. It seems possible that Pater's memory, or notes, led him to confuse Pascal (1623–1662) with the Abbé Prévost (1697–1763)—given that M^{me} Commanville states: “La maison ... avait appartenu et servi de maison de campagne aux moines de l'abbaye de Saint-Ouen, et mon oncle se plaisait à penser que l'abbé Prévost y avait composé *Manon Lescaut*.—On sait que l'abbé Prévost passa plusieurs années chez les moines de l'abbaye de Saint-Ouen.” (“The house ... had belonged to, and been used as a country house by, the monks of Saint-Ouen abbey, and my uncle took pleasure in the thought that the Abbé Prévost had written *Manon Lescaut* there.—We know that the Abbé Prévost lived with the monks for many years.”) Besides, the fact that M^{me} Commanville links her uncle with the abbey Port-Royal-des-Champs (“he had something of a Port Royal solitary monk”), to which Pascal's name is directly associated, may well have brought “that great master of prose” (Pascal) to Pater's mind, thus having become the cause of his confusion—if indeed we are dealing here with confusion on the part of Pater.

92:10–14. The French poet, novelist, essayist, and playwright of the Romantic movement Victor Hugo (1802–1885).

Flaubert's father, Achille-Cléophas Flaubert (1784–1846), sent him to Paris, there to study law. Flaubert, however,

92:10–14.

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

missed his family, and seldom took part in the noisy activities of his fellow students. The only place in Paris where he felt relatively at home was the atelier of the sculptor Jean-Jacques Pradier. It was there, that he first met the Parisian artists and writers of the time—including Victor Hugo. As his niece says (p. xvii): “Un jour il y rencontre Victor Hugo.” (“One day, he met Victor Hugo there.”)

In a letter sent from Paris to his sister, dated January 1843, Flaubert recounts his meeting with the great writer. It is from this letter, that Pater translates here—freely, as usual, and imaginatively. Here are Flaubert’s words (pp. 64–65):

Tu t’attends à des détails sur Victor Hugo, que veux-tu que je t’en dise? C’est un homme comme un autre, d’une figure assez laide et d’un extérieur assez commun. [...] J’ai pris plaisir à le contempler de près; je l’ai regardé avec étonnement comme une cassette dans laquelle il y aurait des millions et des diamants royaux, réfléchissant à tout ce qui était sorti de cet homme assis alors à côté de moi sur une petite chaise, et fixant ses yeux sur sa main droite qui a écrit tant de belles choses. C’était là pourtant l’homme qui m’a le plus fait battre le coeur depuis que je suis né et celui peut-être que j’aimais le mieux de tous ceux que je ne connais pas.

(“You are expecting from me details about Victor Hugo. What do you want me to tell you concerning him? He is like any another man, looks quite plain, and his appearance is rather common. [...] I took pleasure in watching him from so close a distance; I contemplated him with astonishment, as if he were a casket in whose interior millions and royal diamonds were to be found, reflecting on everything that had come out of that man sitting in a little chair by my side, with his eyes fixed on his right hand, that has written so many and so beautiful things. And yet he who sat there was the man who more than any other has made my heart throb since the day I

was born, and perhaps, of all that I didn't know, the one I loved most.)

92:14–16.

92:14–16. What Pater says here about the young Flaubert, he himself, Flaubert, does, indeed, record—in a letter addressed to M^{me} X., dated October 4, 1846:

Sais-tu que pendant mon enfance les princesses arrêtaient leurs voitures pour me prendre dans leurs bras et m'embrasser? Un jour que la duchesse de Berry passait à Rouen et qu'elle se promenait sur les quais elle me remarqua dans la foule tenu dans les bras de mon père qui m'élevait pour que je puisse voir le cortège. Sa calèche allait au pas, elle la fit arrêter et prit plaisir à me considérer et à me baiser, mon pauvre père rentra bien heureux de ce triomphe. (p. 170)

(Are you aware that, while I was a child, princesses had their carriages stop, in order to take me in their arms and kiss me? One day, the duchess of Berry, having passed through Rouen, was driving along the quais; she noticed me in the crowd, in my father's arms, who was holding me up, so that I could see the procession. The horses pulling her carriage moved at walking pace, and she had them stop, to enjoy the pleasure of looking at and kissing me. My poor father returned home full of the happiness that this triumph procured him.)

92:22–27. Pater translates from a letter written on the 13th of May, 1845, in Milan (where Flaubert had gone, with his family, on the occasion of his sister's honeymoon), and addressed to the French poet and lawyer Alfred Le Poittevin (1816–1848), who, like Flaubert himself, was born in Rouen: "Pour moi je suis vraiment assez bien depuis que j'ai consenti à être toujours mal. [...] J'ai dit à la vie pratique un irrévocable adieu. Je ne demande d'ici à longtemps que cinq ou six heures de tranquillité dans ma chambre, un grand feu l'hiver, et deux bougies chaque soir pour m'éclairer." (pp. 86–87)

92:27–31. **92:27–31.** Again, Pater translates from a letter addressed to Alfred Le Poittevin, and written at Croisset on a “Tuesday night, 1845, at half past 10” (“Croisset, mardi soir 10 heures et demie, 1846”): “...ma vie maintenantme semble arrangée d’une façon régulière; elle a des horizons moins larges, hélas! moins variés surtout, mais peut-être plus profonds parce qu’ils sont plus restreints.” (p. 107)

93:13–14. Pater translates from a letter sent by Flaubert, from Paris, to his sister, dated the 14th of April, 1843: “Pour qu’on se plaise quelque part il faut qu’on y vive depuis longtemps. Ce n’est pas en un jour qu’on échauffe son nid et qu’on s’y trouve bien.” (p. 68)

93:22–25. The record of the journey Pater refers to was written by Flaubert and his travelling companion, the French photographer and journalist Maxime Du Camp (1822–1894). Flaubert finished his part of the work in 1848, but never managed to have it published during his life time. In fact, it came to be published for the first time only six years after his death: Gustave Flaubert. *Par les chemins et par le grèves (Voyage en Bretagne), Accompagné de mélanges et fragments inédits.* Paris, G. Charpentier et C^{ie}, 1886 (*By Paths and by Shores (Voyage in Britany), Together with Mixed Writings and Fragments*).

93:27–29. Pater translates from a letter written at Croisset, the 15th of June, 1845, and addressed to the French politician and magistrate Ernest Armand Chevalier (1820–1887): “Tu m’as parlé de la Corse.... C’est là un beau pays encore vierge du bourgeois qui n’est pas venu le dégrader de ses admirations, un pays grave et ardent, tout noir et tout rouge.” (p. 91)

93:30. Flaubert’s mother was Anne Justine Caroline Flaubert (1793–1872), whose maiden name was Fleuriot. She became a widow in 1846, when Flaubert was twenty five years old.

93:30–32. In 1849, Flaubert and his friend Maxime—the French photographer and journalist Maxime Du Camp (1822–1894)—left France, on a long journey to the East: to Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Asia Minor, Constantinople, and Greece, including Athens.

The epistolary account of that journey—the “record” Pater refers to—starts, in “the volume before us”, with a letter ad-

dressed by Flaubert to his mother, written in Malta and dated “7–8 Novembre [1849]”, and ends with a letter, also addressed to his mother, written in the island of Rhodes and dated “7 October, 1850”. The first of these two letters appears on pages 223–225; the other appears on pages 341–344—so that Pater would have been nearer the truth had he written “the last hundred and twenty pages”, instead of “the last hundred pages”.

In the course of his “journey to Syria and Egypt”, as Pater refers to it, Flaubert wrote plentiful notes concerning the places he visited. In 1910, his niece (by then, Caroline Franklin-Grout) published—a fact Pater could not have known— excerpts of those notes in the July–December issues of the Parisian monthly *Les Marges*. The same year, the full notes were published for the first time, as volumes IV and V of the writer’s complete works and under the title *Notes de Voyages* (Gustave Flaubert. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris, Louis Conard, 1910, vols. IV–V).

93:34–35. Flaubert’s father, Achille-Cléophas Flaubert, died on the 15th of January, 1846. Shortly after, in March, Flaubert’s sister, Caroline Hamard, died in giving birth to her daughter Caroline. On the 12th of December of that year, Flaubert completed his 25th birthday.

93:36–94:31. Pater translates from a letter sent by Flaubert from Croisset to his friend Maxime Ducamp. The letter is dated “March 1846”.

C’est hier, à onze heures, que nous l’avons enterrée, la pauvre fille. On lui a mis sa robe de noce, avec des bouquets de roses, d’immortelles et de violettes. J’ai passé toute la nuit à la garder. Elle était droite, couchée sur son lit, dans cette chambre où tu l’as entendue faire de la musique. Elle paraissait bien plus grande et bien plus belle que vivante, avec ce long voile blanc qui lui descendait jusqu’aux pieds. Le matin, quand tout a été fait, je lui ai donné un dernier baiser dans son cercueil. Je me suis penché dessus, j’y ai entré la tête et j’ai senti le plomb me plier sous les mains. C’est moi qui l’ai fait mouler. J’ai vu les grosses pattes de ces rustres la manier et la recouvrir de plâtre. J’aurai sa main et sa face. Je prierai Pradier de

94:1.

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

me faire son buste et je le mettrai dans ma chambre. J'ai à moi son grand châle bariolé, une mèche de cheveux, la table et le pupitre sur lequel elle écrivait. Voilà tout, voilà tout ce qui reste de ceux que l'on a aimés. [...] Arrivés là-haut, dans ce cimetière, derrière les murs duquel j'allais en promenade avec le collègue, Hamard sur les bords de la fosse s'est agenouillé et lui a envoyé des baisers en pleurant. La fosse était trop étroite, le cercueil n'a pas pu y entrer. On l'a secoué, tiré de toutes les façons, on a pris un louchet, des leviers, et enfin un fossoyeur a marché dessus, c'était la place de la tête, pour le faire entrer. [...] J'étais sec comme la pierre d'une tombe mais horriblement irrité. [...] Nous voilà revenus à Croisset depuis dimanche. Quel voyage! seul avec ma mère et l'enfant qui criait! La dernière fois que j'en étais parti, c'était avec toi, tu t'en souviens. Des quatre qui y habitaient, il en reste deux. [...] Ma mère va mieux qu'elle ne pourrait aller. Elle s'occupe de l'enfant de sa fille, la couche dans sa chambre, la berce, la soigne, le plus qu'elle peut. Elle tâche de se refaire mère; y arrivera-t-elle? La réaction n'est pas encore venue et je la crains fort. Je suis accablé, abruti; j'aurais bien besoin de reprendre ma vie d'art, tranquille et de méditation longue! (pp. 94-96)

94:1. An "immortelle" is a long-lasting flower arrangement placed on graves, in cemeteries. Originally, *immortelles* were made either from natural dried flowers or from artificial materials, such as china and painted plaster.

94:10. The French sculptor Jean-Jacques Pradier (1790–1852).

94:23–24. The "infant" was Caroline Hamard, Flaubert's infant niece.

94:33–34. Flaubert began writing *Madame Bovary* (see below, note to 119:8) more than five years later, in September 1851, and finished writing it in March 1856. The novel initially appeared in instalments in *La Revue de Paris*, between October and December 1856. Flaubert had it published in book form

in April 1857 (Gustave Flaubert. *Madame Bovary, Moeurs de Province*. Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1857).

94:35–36.

94:35–36. Pater translates from a letter sent by Flaubert from Rouen to his friend Ernest Chevalier —the French politician and magistrate Ernest Armand Chevalier (1820–1887)—dated April 5, 1846.

Eh bien, pauvre vieux, encore un. Tu n’as pas eu le temps de répondre à la lettre où je te parlais de la mort de mon père que je t’en envoie une autre où je te parle de celle de ma soeur! la prochaine sera peut-être pour te dire celle de ma mère! qui sait! je m’attends à tout, je suis comme un pavé de grande route, le malheur marche sur moi et piétine à plaisir. (p. 96)

95:1–5. Pater translates from a letter sent by Flaubert from Rouen to his friend Maxime Ducamp, the which is dated “March 1846”.

Et moi? J’ai les yeux secs comme un marbre. C’est étrange. Autant je me sens expansif, fluide, abondant et débordant dans les douleurs fictives, autant les vraies restent dans mon coeur âcres et dures; elles s’y cristallisent à mesure qu’elles y viennent. (p. 94)

95:6–12. See above, note to 91:16–20.

95:13–18. Pater translates from the “sketch” of Flaubert’s life that his niece titled “Souvenirs Intimes” (“Intimate Memoirs”) and had begun the first volume of his correspondence.

“Quand on a pris un livre, il faut l’avalier d’un seul coup. C’est le seul moyen de voir l’ensemble et d’en tirer du profit. Accoutume-toi à poursuivre une idée. Puisque tu es mon élève, je ne veux pas que tu aies ce décousu dans les pensées, ce peu d’esprit de suite qui est l’apanage des personnes de ton sexe.” (p. xxvi)

95:18–23. **95:18–23.** Again, Pater translates from M^{me} Commanville’s “sketch” of Flaubert’s life.

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

Je l’arrêtais quelquefois en lui demandant: “Était-il bon?” Et cette question s’appliquant à des hommes tels que Cambyse, Alexandre ou Alcibiade; il était embarrassé pour y répondre. “Bon... dame, ce n’étaient pas des messieurs très commodes, Qu’est-ce que cela te fait?” (xxiv)

Pater, of course, says that “The author of *Salammbô* taught” his niece “ancient history”, instead of saying, for instance that “Flaubert” did it, because *Salammbô* is set in the time of the Mercenary War (see below, note to 119:16), and, therefore, deals with “ancient history”.

95:28–31. Once more, Pater translates from M^{me} Commanville’s “sketch” of Flaubert’s life.

Ma grand’mère, très délicate, toussait, mon oncle disait: “Il est temps de retourner à la Bovary.” La Bovary? qu’était-ce? Je ne savais pas. Je respectais ce nom, ces deux mots, comme tout ce qui venait de mon oncle, je croyais vaguement que c’était synonyme de travailler, et travailler, c’était écrire, bien entendu. (p. xxxii)

Puis nous revenions à son travail de la journée. Là, il est heureux de me lire toute fraîche éclos la phrase qu’il vient de terminer; j’assiste, témoin immobile, à la lente création de ces pages si durement élaborées. (p. xxxv)

95:37–96:2. “Il relisait souvent la Bible. Ce verset d’Isaïe: ‘Qu’ils sont beaux sur les montagnes les pieds du messager qui apporte de bonnes nouvelles!’ lui paraissait sublime. ‘Réfléchis, creuse moi ça,’ me disait-il, enthousiasmé.” (pp. xxxiv–xxxv)

96:7. M^{me} Commanville informs the reader that, “in 1856, having decided to publish *Madame Bovary*, Gustave Flaubert went to live” in Paris, his house there being “42, Boulevard du Temple” (p. xxvii).

96:9–13. Pater translates from four different letters.

The first letter, addressed to Alfred Le Poittevin, is dated from April 2, 1845. The words Pater translates appear on page 74: “J’ai revu Paris ... et je ne sais pas pourquoi j’ai respiré à l’aise en me sentant au milieu de tout ce bruit et de cette cohue humaine.”

The second letter, addressed to Ernest Chevalier, is dated February 2, 1847. The words Pater translates appear on page 194: “L’homme est une si triste machine qu’une paille mise dans le rouage suffit pour l’arrêter.”

The third letter, addressed to M^{me} X., is dated September 4, 1846. The words Pater translates appear on page 149: “je vis comme un chartreux”.

The fourth letter, addressed, again, to M^{me} X., is dated October 17, 1846. The words Pater translates appear on page 177: “je ne suis rien qu’un lézard littéraire qui se chauffe toute la journée au grand soleil du beau.”

96:14–20. Here, Pater conflates separate passages of M^{me} Commanville’s sketch.

The first passage appears on page xxx: “Il lui fallait pour écrire une tension extrême et il lui était impossible de se trouver dans l’état voulu ailleurs que dans son cabinet de travail, assis à sa grande table ronde, sûr que rien ne viendrait le distraire.”

The second passage appears on page xiii: “Il aimait l’ordre avec passion”.

The third passage appears on page xi: “A cette époque mon oncle mangeait peu, surtout le matin, trouvant qu’une nourriture abondante alourdit et dispose mal au travail”.

The fourth, and last, passage appears, again, on page xiii: “Son énergie de vouloir, pour tout ce qui regardait son art, était prodigieuse”.

96:20–21. Pater translates from page xiii: “Il a toujours apporté une régularité extrême au travail de chaque jour; il s’y attelait comme un boeuf à la charrue, sans se soucier de l’inspiration don’t l’attente stérilise, disait-il.”

96:26–31. Pater translates from two letters.

One of them is addressed to Ernest Chevalier and bears the date: “Croisset, Wednesday, April 28, 1847. Pater translates

96:33–34.

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

the following words: “On a beau dire, les souvenirs ne peuplent pas, au contraire, ils élargissent votre solitude” (p. 193)—As well as these: “il me semble que les angles de ma vie se sont usés, sous les frottements déjà nombreux de tout ce qui a passé dessus.” (p. 192)

The other letter, dated 1846, without specification of the month and the day, is addressed to Mlle Gertrude Collier—who was born in Ireland but educated in France, before marrying the wealthy landowner Charles Tennant, in 1846, and returning to London as Mrs. Gertrude Barbara Rich Tennant (1819–1918), where, as a widow, she became a society hostess.

Flaubert’s niece informs the reader (pp. xiv–xv) that his uncle became acquainted with Gertrude Collier’s family—whose members “were all beautiful and intelligent”—in Trouville, where the Flauberts use to go on holidays.

Pater translates the following words: “Il y a ainsi maintenant sur la terre une foule de places où mon âme saigne quand j’y passe.” (p. 183)

96:33–34. Pater refers to the Franco–Prussian or Franco–German war (19 July 1870 to 28 January 1871), which, in France, is often referred to as the War of 1870.

Indeed, the 1870s were a difficult time for Flaubert. Besides having had his house occupied by Prussian soldiers during the war, his mother died in 1872, he subsequently having experienced financial difficulty, due to business failures on the part of Ernest Commanville, his niece’s husband.

96:36–37. Pater refers to the Prussian soldiers, who, during the Franco–Prussian or Franco–German war (1870 to 1871), invaded France and occupied Flaubert’s house.

97:1–2. Flaubert’s niece describes his study thus:

... à gauche, le cabinet de travail de mon oncle. C’était une large pièce, trop basse de plafond, mais très éclairée au moyen de ses cinq fenêtres don’t trois donnaient sur la partie du jardin s’étendant en longueur et deux sur le devant de la maison. (p. xx)

(...to the left, my uncle's study. It was a large room, with a ceiling quite low but full of light, as a result of its five windows— three of which opened to the side of the garden that spread lengthwise, and the other two to the front of the house.)

97:19–20. Although Pater indirectly attributes these words— “seriousness and passion that are like a consecration”—to “Madame Commanville”, and, in accordance, has them enclosed by quotation marks, he is quoting not her, not her uncle, Flaubert, but the author of “Qu’est-ce qu’un classique?”, the French writer and literary critic Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve (1804–1869):

Nous n’avons eu que des ébauches de grands poètes, comme Mathurin Regnier, comme Rabelais, et sans idéal aucun, sans la passion et le sérieux qui consacrent. (Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve. “Qu’est-ce qu’un classique?” In:—. *Causeries du Lundi*. Paris, Garnier Frères, 1852, vol. 3, p. 49.)

(We have had but sketches of great poets, like Mathurin Regnier, like Rabelais, without any ideal, without the seriousness and the passion that are like a consecration.)

Nonetheless, Pater’s intention, in quoting Saint-Beuve’s phrase here, is clearly to encapsulate and most vividly to express by means of it such statements of Flaubert’s niece as the following:

page x: C’était un fanatique que Gustave Flaubert; il avait pris l’art pour son dieu, et comme un dévot, il a connu toutes les tortures et tous les enivremments de l’amour qui se sacrifie. (He was a fanatic, Gustave Flaubert; he had made of art his god, and, like a devotee, knew all the sorrows and all the intoxications of a love that sacrifices itself.)

97:19–20.

The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert (1888)

page xv: Il admirait ce qui était beau dans la nature, l'art et la littérature et vivrait pour cela, disait-il, sans pensée personnelle (He admired that which was beautiful in nature, art, and literature, and would live for that, he used to say, without taking himself into account).

page xvii: De vocation il n'en avait que pour la littérature (His vocation was all about literature).

page xlii: Sa vie... ne fut, depuis l'éveil de son intelligence jusqu'à sa mort, que le long développement d'une même passion, la "littérature." Il lui sacrifia tout; ses amours, ses tendresses ne l'enlevèrent jamais à son art. (Since the awakening of his intelligence until his death, all his life was... nothing but the growth of a single passion: "literature." He sacrificed everything to it; his loves, his affections, could never take him away from his art.)

Pater—it should be noticed—had already quoted the phrase ("seriousness and passion that are like a consecration") in the chapter of *Marius the Epicurean* titled "Second Thoughts": "In the gravity of its conception of life, in its pursuit after nothing less than a perfection, in its apprehension of the value of time—the passion and the seriousness which are like a consecration—*la passion et le sérieux qui consacrent*—it [Cyrenaicism or Epicureanism] may be conceived, as regards its main drift, to be not so much opposed to the old morality, as an exaggeration of one special motive in it."

**The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth
[And Two Other Books of the Same] (1889)**

101:1–5. Pater refers to the three volumes he was reviewing, inverting the order in which they are given in the bibliographic caption: (i/iii) William Knight *et al.*, eds. *Selections from Wordsworth. With Preface and Notes*. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co, 1888. (ii) William Wordsworth. *The Recluse*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1888. (iii/i) William Wordsworth. *The Complete Poetical Works. With an Introduction by John Morley*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1889 [1888]. See below, note to 103:2–3.

Also in 1889, there appeared, edited likewise by William Knight, a selection of papers (on Wordsworth) read to the Wordsworth Society: William Angus Knight, ed. *Wordsworthiana: A Selection of Papers Read to the Wordsworth Society*. London, Macmillan & Co., 1889.

William Angus Knight (1836–1916) was a Scottish Free Church minister and author and Professor of Moral Philosophy at St Andrews University, Scotland.

In the second edition of *Appreciations* (1890), Pater added to the essay “Wordsworth”, on page 41, and in reference to the passage where he states that Wordsworth poetry would gain much from a selection of the “precious morsels” in it, the following footnote: “Since this essay was written [1874], such selections have been made, with excellent taste, by Matthew Arnold and Professor Knight.”

Thus, to the volume of selections from Wordsworth that was cited above, Pater added another: *Poems of Wordsworth. Chosen and Edited by Matthew Arnold*. London, Macmillan & Co., 1879.

101:5. John Morley, 1st Viscount Morley of Blackburn (1838–1923), the author of the Introduction of one of the books Pater was reviewing (*The Complete Poetical Works*), was a distinguished British Liberal statesman, writer and newspaper editor.

101:1–5.

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

101:11–12.

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

101:11–12. The English philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), whose defence of Utilitarianism (the view that “actions are right in the proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness”), in the footsteps of Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and of his father, the Scottish philosopher and economist James Mill (1773–1836), made him “so true a representative of the main tendencies of the spirit” of Pater’s day (see below, note to 236:5–11).

101:13–15. The recollection of John Stuart Mill must have been once more fresh in Pater’s mind at the time he was writing (or rewriting)—since the words by Mill he quotes, and those he paraphrases somewhat inaccurately, had been brought to the reading public’s attention once more that same year (1889). In fact, such words were quoted in W. L. Courtney’s *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (London, Walter Scott, 1889), where, on page 12, one may read: “His radical friends used to be very angry with him for loving Wordsworth. ‘Wordsworth,’ I used to say, ‘is against you, no doubt, in the battle which you are now waging, but after you have won, the world will need more than ever those qualities which Wordsworth is keeping alive and nourishing.’”

Mill’s words had been pronounced in casual conversation with John Morley (1838–1923), who, being the editor of the *Fortnightly Review* when the philosopher died (May 8, 1873), published there, in the following month (*Fortnightly Review*, NS, vol., XIII, no. 78, June 1, 1873, pp. 669–676), an article titled “The Death of Mr. Mill”, in the course of which he quotes some notes he had taken of their conversation, including (for the first time) those on Mill’s remark to his friends on Wordsworth: *His radical friends used to be very angry with him for loving Wordsworth . ‘Wordsworth,’ I used to say, ‘is against you no doubt in the battle which you are now waging, but, after you have won, the world will need more than ever those qualities which Wordsworth is keeping alive and nourishing’* (p. 675).

Twenty-eight years later, in 1917, John Morley would quote those exact words in his *Recollections*, adding: “The last time I saw him [John Stuart Mill] was a few days before he left

England (March 5, 1873). He came to spend a day with us in the country, of which the following rough notes happened to be written at the time in a letter to a friend". (John Viscount Morley. *Recollections*. London, Macmillan & Co., 1917, vol. 1, pp. 65–67.)

About one year after Mill's death and the publication of Morley's article, Pater published his essay "On Wordsworth"—likewise in *The Fortnightly Review* (NS, vol. XV, no. 88, April 1, 1874, pp. 455–465)—, parts of which he inserted (fifteen years later) in the present review. There, on page 465, he included a footnote, directing the reader to Morley's article ("Fortnightly Review, June, 1873. *The Death of Mr. Mill*.)

What Mill really meant to say, in the course of his conversation with Morley, may be gathered from the following statements, which are to be found in his *Autobiography*:

What made Wordsworth's poems a medicine for my state of mind, was that they expressed, not mere outward beauty, but states of feeling, and of thought coloured by feeling, under the excitement of beauty. They seemed to be the -very culture of the feelings, which I was in quest of. In them I seemed to draw from a source of inward joy, of sympathetic and imaginative pleasure, which could be shared in by all 'human beings; which had no connexion with struggle or imperfection, but would be made richer by every improvement in the physical or social condition of mankind. From them I seemed to learn what would be the perennial sources of happiness, when all the greater evils of life shall have been removed.

Compared with the greatest poets, he may be said to be the poet of unpoetical natures, possessed of quiet and contemplative tastes. But unpoetical natures are precisely those which require poetic cultivation. This cultivation Wordsworth is much more fitted to give, than poets who are intrinsically far more poets than he.

It so fell out that the merits of Wordsworth were the occasion of my first public declaration of my new way of thinking, and separation from those of my habitual com-

101:16–23.

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

panions who had not undergone a similar change. The person with whom at that time I was most in the habit of comparing notes on such subjects was Roebuck [John Arthur Roebuck (1802–1879)], and I induced him to read Wordsworth.... Wordsworth's [poetry], according to him, was... [poetry] of flowers and butterflies. We agreed to have the fight out at our Debating Society, where we ... discussed for two evenings the comparative merits of Byron and [Wordsworth], propounding and illustrating by long recitations our respective theories of poetry: Sterling [John Sterling (1806–1844)] also, in a brilliant speech, putting forward his particular theory. This was the first debate on any weighty subject in which Roebuck and I had been on opposite sides. The schism between us widened from this time more and more, though we continued for some years longer to be companions. In the beginning, our chief divergence related to the cultivation of the feelings. Roebuck was in many respects very different from the vulgar notion of a Benthamite or Utilitarian... .But, like most Englishmen who have feelings, he found his feelings stand very much in his way. [...]

While my intimacy with Roebuck diminished, I fell more and more into friendly intercourse with our Coleridgean adversaries in the Society, Frederick Maurice and John Sterling, both subsequently so well known.... (John Stuart Mill. *Autobiography*. 3. ed., London, Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1874, pp. 148–152 *passim*.)

101:16–23. In *The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, one of the books Pater was reviewing, the poet's poems are arranged in groups, each headed by the year in which the grouped poems were written (e.g., the first heading reads "1785 to 1797"; the last reads "1847"). In the several editions of *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* that the poet himself had published (e.g., the 1815, 1832, 1836, and 1846 editions), the poems, however, are grouped thematically, under headings

such as “Ecclesiastical Sketches”, “Poems of Sentiment and Reflection”, “Poems Referring to the Period of Old Age”, etc.

101:24–27. It is not easy to pinpoint in Morley’s introduction the passage or passages Pater, no doubt, had in mind. Presumably, however, Pater’s words point in the direction of statements like the following, although Morley does not directly relate what he says concerning Wordsworth with “the physiognomy” of the poet’s “work”:

In the Grasmere vale Wordsworth lived for half a century, first in a little cottage at the northern corner of the lake, and then (1813) in a more commodious house at Rydal Mount at the southern end, on the road to Ambleside. In 1802 he married Mary Hutchinson, of Penrith, and this completed the circle of his felicity. [...]

Their life was almost more simple than that of the dalesmen their neighbours. [...] Means were found for supporting the modest home out of two or three small windfalls bequeathed by friends or relatives, and by the time that children had begun to come, Wordsworth was raised to affluence by obtaining the post of distributor of stamps for Westmoreland and part of Cumberland. His life was happily devoid of striking external incident. Its essential part lay in meditation and composition. (p. liv)

One may say that Morley does indeed “dwell” much on “Wordsworth’s singular happiness” and on its relation to “the physiognomy of his work”—but only if one construes “happiness” as designating what Pater himself has termed (in the “Preface” to the *Renaissance*), in connection with “all works of art”, “virtues” or “powers or forces producing pleasurable sensations, each of a more or less peculiar or unique kind.”

Here is an example of Morley’s preoccupation with the “peculiar or unique kind” of effect to be found in Wordsworth’s poetry:

The question is whether Wordsworth, however unequal to Shelley in lyric quality, to Coleridge or to Keats in

101:28–29.

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

imaginative quality, to Burns in tenderness, warmth, and that humor which is so nearly akin to pathos, to Byron in vividness and energy, yet possesses excellences of his own which place him in other respects above these master-spirits of his time. If the question is to be answered affirmatively, it is clear that only in one direction must we look. The trait that really places Wordsworth on an eminence above his poetic contemporaries, and ranks him, as the ages are likely to rank him, on a line just short of the greatest of all time, is his direct appeal to will and conduct. "There is volition and self-government in every line of his poetry, and his best thoughts come from his steady resistance to the ebb and flow of ordinary desires and regrets. He contests the ground inch by inch with all despondent and indolent humours, and often, too, with movements of inconsiderate and wasteful joy." (*R. H. Hutton.*) That would seem to be his true distinction and superiority over men to whom more had been given of fire, passion, and ravishing music. Those who deem the end of poetry to be intoxication, fever, or rainbow dreams, can care little for Wordsworth. If its end be not intoxication, but on the contrary a search from the wide regions of imagination and feeling for elements of composure deep and pure, and of self-government in a far loftier sense than the merely prudential, then Wordsworth has a gift of his own in which he was approached by no poet of his time. (p. lxii)

101:28–29. In one of his periodical articles on Wordsworth, collected in the volume of his writings titled *Literary Reminiscences*, De Quincey wrote: "Having brought down the history of Wordsworth to the time of his marriage, I am reminded by that event to mention the singular good fortune, in all points of *worldly prosperity*, which has accompanied him through life. His marriage—the capital event of life—was fortunate; so were all the minor occasions of a prosperous life. He has himself described, in his 'Leech-Gatherer,' the fears that, at one time, or at least in some occasional moments of

his life, haunted him, lest at some period or other he might be reserved for poverty.” (Thomas de Quincey. *Literary Reminiscences*. Boston, Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1854, vol. 1, p. 344). (The italics have been added.)

102:12–14. The French essayist, novelist, and philosopher, Étienne pivot de SENANCOUR (1770–1846), who became famous primarily for his epistolary novel *Obermann* (1804); the French poet, dramatist, novelist, journalist, and art and literary critic Pierre Jules THÉOPHILE GAUTIER (1811–1872); the Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer Jean-Jacques ROUSSEAU (1712–1778); the French writer, politician, diplomat and historian François-René de CHATEAUBRIAND (1768–1848); the French poet, novelist, essayist, and playwright of the Romantic movement VICTOR HUGO (1802–1885).

102:20–21. The English painter Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792); the English portrait and landscape painter, draughtsman, and printmaker Thomas Gainsborough (1727–1788).

102:25. The poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822), one of the major English Romantic poets.

102:29–30. William Wordsworth was born on 7 April, 1770, in Cockermouth, Cumberland, in the region in north-western England which is known as the Lake District, and died on 23 April, 1850, at Rydal Mount, having been buried at St Oswald’s Church, Grasmere. When he died, he was, then, just sixteen days short of his eightieth birthday.

102:33–34. In the case of the Flemish, Pater refers to the so-called “Flemish Primitives”, who were active during the period of the Northern Renaissance (the 15th and the 16th centuries): artists who worked from the time of Robert CAMPIN (c. 1375–1444) and Jan VAN EYCK (before 1390–1441) to the time of Gerard DAVID (c. 1460–1523).

In the case of the Italians, Pater refers to the painters of the so-called “Proto Renaissance” (1300–1425) and “Early Renaissance” (1425–1495): artists like GIOTTO (c. 1267–1337) and ORCAGNA (c. 1308–1368), and, in the second period, those who worked from the time of MASSACIO (1401–1428) to

103:2–3. the time of Sandro BOTTICELLI (c. 1445—1510) and Giovanni BELLINI (c. 1430–1516).

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

103:2–3. On pages 234–235 of *The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (London, Macmillan and Co., 1889), preceding the text of *The Prelude*, there appears the following note by Wordsworth himself.

The following Poem was commenced in the beginning of the year 1799, and completed in the summer of 1805. [...] [It] was intended to be introductory to the RECLUSE, ... [which], if completed, would have consisted of Three Parts. Of these, the Second Part alone, viz. the EXCURSION, was finished.... The First Book of the First Part of the RECLUSE still remains in manuscript; but the Third Part was only planned.

After “manuscript”, there appears a footnote reference, directing the reader to the following observation: “Now printed, see p, 334.”—In which “now” indeed refers to pages 334–345, where the text of “The First Book of the First Part of *The Recluse*” is printed.

It seems, therefore, that the words “this newly published poem of *The Recluse*” refer to the printing of that poem not only in book form (*The Recluse*, London, Macmillan and Co., 1888), but also as part of *The Complete Poetical Works, With an Introduction by John Morley*.—Just like in the very beginning of the review (vol. 1, 101:1–5), in relation to the words: “The appearance of... Messrs. Macmillan’s collected edition of” Wordsworth’s “works in one volume, with the first book of *The Recluse*, now printed in its entirety for the first time, and a sensible introductory essay by Mr. John Morley”.

In the first edition of *Appreciations* (1889), on pages 44–45, Pater added to the essay “Wordsworth”, in the form of a footnote, the end of the present review (104:17–105:19):

In Wordsworth’s prefatory advertisement to the first edition of *The Prelude*, published in 1850, it is stated

that that work was intended to be introductory to *The Recluse*; and that *The Recluse*, if completed, would have consisted of three parts. The second part is *The Excursion*. The third part was only planned; but the first book of the first part was left in manuscript by Wordsworth—though in manuscript, it is said, in no great condition of forwardness for the printers. This book, now for the first time printed *in extenso* (a very noble passage from it found place in that prose advertisement to *The Excursion*), is included in the latest edition of Wordsworth by Mr. John Morley. It was well worth adding to the poet's great bequest to English literature. A true student of his work, who has formulated for himself what he supposes to be the leading characteristics of Wordsworth's genius, will feel, we think, lively interest in testing them by the various fine passages in what is here presented for the first time. Let the following serve for a sample:—

Thickets full of songsters, and the voice
 Of lordly birds, an unexpected sound
 Heard now and then from morn to latest eve,
 Admonishing the man who walks below
 Of solitude and silence in the sky:—
 These have we, and a thousand nooks of earth
 Have also these, but nowhere else is found,
 Now here (or is it fancy?) can be found
 The one sensation that is here; 'tis here,
 Here as it found its way into my heart
 In childhood, here as it abides by day,
 By night, here only; or in chosen minds
 That take it with them hence, where'er they go.
 —'Tis, but I cannot name it, 'tis the sense
 Of majesty, and beauty, and repose,
 A blended holiness of earth and sky,
 Something that makes this individual spot,
 This small abiding-place of many men,
 A termination, and a last retreat,

103:18.

The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (1889)

A centre, come from whereso'er you will,
A whole without dependence or defect,
Made for itself, and happy in itself,
Perfect contentment, Unity entire.

103:18. Presumably, Pater quotes the following words by Diogenes Laertius: “The Pythagoreans also assert, that the whole air is *full of souls*, and that these are those which are accounted dæmones, and heroes.” (Diogenes Laertius. “Pythagoras”. In: —. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, VIII, xxix. Transl. C. D. Young, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1915, p. 351). (The italics have been added.)

104:3–6. The “leech-gatherer” refers to the narratee in the poem “Resolution and Independence” (pp. 174–176); the “woman stepping westward” refers to the woman spoken of in the poem “Stepping Westward” (p. 192); “the aged thorn” refers to the thorn in the poem “The Thorn” (pp. 76–79); the “lichened rock on the heath” presumably refers to the unspecified rock Wordsworth speaks of when comparing to it the thorn in “The Thorn”: “It stands erect, and like a stone | With lichens is it overgrown. | | Like a rock or stone, it is o’ergrown, | With lichens to the very top” (ll. 10–13, pp. 76–77).

104:7. The main representatives of the so-called “Lake School” were three English poets who all lived in the Lake District of England (this being the origin of the name): William Wordsworth (1770–1850), Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834), and Robert Southey (1774–1843).

104:13. Surrey is a county in South East England which borders Kent to the east, East Sussex to the southeast, West Sussex to the south, Hampshire to the west, Berkshire to the northwest, and Greater London to the northeast. The country of Surrey is the cradle, among others, of the great Victorian poet Robert Browning (1812–1889).

In spite of what Pater states here, it remains a fact, that “Wordsworth’s genius” “found its true test” not in Surrey, but in Dorset, Somerset, and the Lake country.

104:17–105:19. See above, note to 103:2–3.

A Poet with Something to Say (1889)

109:10. The English poet Arthur William Symons (1865–1945) was also a playwright and a literary critic, having written for *The Athenæum*, *The Saturday Review*, and *The Savoy*—a literary magazine which published both art and literature and which he edited, together with the English illustrator Aubrey Beardsley (1872–1898) and the English publisher–bookseller Leonard Smithers (1861–1907), from late 1895 through 1896. He also contributed poems and essays to *The Yellow Book*—a leading journal of the British 1890s, to some degree associated with Aestheticism and Decadence.

Days and Nights was the first of Symons' several volumes of verse, of which he made a selection that appeared in 1901 and 1902, in two volumes, with the title *Poems*.

Besides having translated into English Gabriele D'Annunzio's novels *Il Piacere*, 1898 (*The Child of Pleasure*) and the *Città Morta*, 1900 (*The Dead City*), as well as Émile Verhaeren's *Les Aubes*, 1898 (*The Dawn*), Symons studied thoroughly such modern French writers as Paul Verlaine and Charles Baudelaire, a study which not only influenced his latter poetry, but also led to the composition of the several essays on French poets and novelists which he published with the title *The Symbolist Movement in Literature* (1899 and 1919).

Besides half a dozen plays and a dozen of verse volumes, Symons wrote and published many essays, from which *A Study of Walter Pater* (1932) deserves to be noticed here.

109:11–12. Pater quotes lines 51–52 (the end) of the “Prologue” (p. 4).

109:22. Pater's memory may have led him into mistakenly attribute these words to the French writer Stendhal. Or, faced with the difficulty of attributing them to a recognisable person, he may have decided to attribute them to him.

It was the French poet and essayist Charles Baudelaire, not Stendhal, who used the phrase, in his *L'Art Romantique*

109:10.

A Poet with Something to Say (1889)

109:23.

A Poet with Something to Say (1889)

(1868): “M. G., qui est dominé, lui, par une passion insatiable, celle de voir et de sentir, se détache violemment du dandysme. *Amabam amere*, disait saint Augustin. ‘J’aime passionnément la passion,’ dirait volontiers M. G.” (“M. G., who is dominated, more than anyone ever was, by one insatiable passion, the passion of seeing and feeling, steps back violently from dandyism. *Amabam amere*, said Saint Augustine. ‘I love passion passionately, M. G. might willingly say.”)—Charles Baudelaire. *L’Art Romantique*. Paris, Louis Conard, 1925, p. 61.

Now, “M. G.” is a fictional name, contrarily to the name Stendhal, and therefore is likewise a name Pater could not possibly introduce in the context in which he makes use of Baudelaire’s phrase.

Again, it may well be, nonetheless, that Pater thought that he was correct in attributing the phrase “J’aime passionnément la passion” to Stendhal—above all because the name of the author of *Le rouge et le noire* appears repeatedly in “L’oeuvre et la vie de Eugène de Delacroix”, the first part of *L’Art Romantique*.

Saint Augustine’s dictum (*Amabam amere*) appears in the *Confessions* (III, i): *Nondum amabam, et amare amabam... amans amare....* (“I loved not yet, yet I loved to love... in love with loving....”)

109:23. The Italian poet, writer and philosopher Dante Alighieri (c. 1265–1321), the author of *La Divina Commedia* (c. 1308–1320).

109:24. *Purgatorio* (*Purgatory*) is the second part of the three-part poem *La Divina Commedia* (*The Divine Comedy*): (i) *Inferno* (*Hell*), (ii) *Purgatorio* (*Purgatory*), (iii) *Paradiso* (*Heaven*). Dante Scholars have identified La Pia as Pia de’ Tolomei, an Italian noblewoman from Siena who was hurled down from the balcony of her house, in Maremma, by her husband—Nello, chief magistrate of Volterra and Lucca.

In Canto V of *Purgatorio*, Dante and Virgil encounter souls who repented at the time of their violent deaths and now reside in the second division of Ante-Purgatory, which is at the base of the mountain of Purgatory. La Pia’s brief words follow the violent stories of Buonconte da Montefeltro and Jacopo del Cassero. She says:

“Deh, quando tu sarai tornato al mondo,
 e riposato de la lunga via, [...]
 ricorditi di me, che son la Pia;
 Siena mi fé, disfecemi Maremma:
 salsi colui che ‘nнанellata pria
 disponando m’avea con la sua gemma.” (ll. 130–136)

Allen Mandelbaum translates these lines thus:

“Pray, after your returning to the world,
 when, after your long journeying, you’ve rested,

 may you remember me, who am La Pia;
 Siena made—Maremma unmade—me:
 he who, when we were wed, gave me his pledge
 and then, as nuptial ring, his gem, knows that.”

110:10–12. The poem “An Act of Mercy” appears on pages 127–129; the poem “A Revenge”, on pages 11–14; the poem “A Lover’s Progress”, on pages 154–167.

110:13–14. “Before me, all the Yea and Nay of life”, spoken by Faustus (p. 188), is line 79 of “Helena and Faustus” (pp. 183–199).

110:15–16. “Interlude of Helena and Faustus” is how Pater refers to Symons’ poem “Helena and Faustus” (pp. 183–199).

110:17. “The workings of the world Plato but dreamt of”, again spoken by Faustus (p. 188), is line 75 of “Helena and Faustus” (pp. 183–199).

110:22. “Thy speech hath not the largeness of my sires”—spoken, indeed, by Helena (p. 189), this is line 100 of “Helena and Faustus” (pp. 183–199).

110:32–33. The English poets George CRABBE (1754–1832) and William WORDSWORTH (1770–1850).

110:35. The poem “Esther Bray” appears on pages 120–123; the poem “Red Bredbury’s End”, on pages 5–8; the poem “Margery of the Fens”, on pages 43–47.

111:1–5. Pater quotes the tenth stanza (the last) of “Margery of the Fens” (p. 47).

111:8.

A Poet with Something to Say (1889)

111:8. “A Café-Singer” appears on pages 15–17. By “other Parisian grotesques”, Pater probably meant such poems as the following: “The Opium-Smoker” (p. 18); “The Street-Singer” (p. 90); “Scenes de la Vie de Bohème” (pp. 104–109); “Posthumous Coquetry.—From Gautier” (pp. 146–148); “Confession.—From Villiers de l’Isle-Adam” (p. 168).

111:12–13. The phrase “this soul at pawn”— not “the soul at pawn”— appears in the poem “The Opium-Smoker” (p. 18): “Also I have this garret which I rent, | This bed of straw, and this that was a chair, | This worn-out body like a tattered tent. | This crust, of which the rats have eaten part, | This pipe of opium; rage, remorse, despair; | This soul at pawn and this delirious heart.”

111:19–20. Pater quotes lines 45–46 (p. 202) of “Venus of Melos” (pp. 200–202), the last poem in the book.

111:31. Pater quotes line 23 (p. 2) of the “Prologue” (pp. 1–4): “... Art. | She stands amidst the tumult, and is calm; | She reads the hearts self-closed against the light; | She probes an ancient wound, yet brings no balm; | She is ruthless, yet she doeth all things right.”

112:4. The poem “A Village Mariana” appears on pages 31–39.

112:6. The English poet Robert Browning (1812–1889).

112:13–14. The English poets John DRYDEN (1631–1700) and Alexander POPE (1688–1744).

It is Thyself (1889)

115:1–5. These “pretty words on” the “title-page” of *It is Thyself*, as Paters refers to them, were originally written by the Persian poet Jalāl al-Dīn Muhammad Rūmī (1207–1273), who is more popularly known simply as Rumi. They form the beginning of a poem of his titled “Two Friends”, in which, accordingly, “One” and the “Beloved” appear as friends, without any specification concerning whether the reader must suppose them to be male and female, male and male, or female and female. In *The Essential Rumi* (New York, Harper, 1995, pp. 87–89), the translators, Coleman Barks *et al.*, render the the first twenty lines of the poem into English as follows:

115:1–5.

It is Thyself (1889)

A certain person came to the Friend’s door
and knocked.

“Who’s there?”

“It’s me.”

The Friend answered, “Go away.” There’s no place
for raw meat at this table.”

The individual went wandering for a year.

Nothing but the fire of separation

can change hypocrisy and ego. The person returned
completely cooked,

walked up and down in front of the Friend’s house,
gently knocked.

“Who is It?”

“You.”

“Please come in, my self,
there’s no place in this house for two.

The doubled end of the thread is not what goes through
the eye of the needle.

115:1–5.

It is
Thyself
(1889)

It's a single-pointed, fined-down, thread end,
not a big ego-beast with baggage."

Some lines ahead, the poet states:

Let's return to the two friends whose thread
became single,
 who spell with their two letters
the original word,
 BE.

B and *E* tighten around subjects and objects
that one knot may hold them. Two scissor blades
make one cut.

Therefore, this story really was intended to be about that which it could not but appear to be about: perception: the indissoluble synthesis between perceiver (*percipiens*) and perceived (*perceptum*), between the perceiving subject (*qua* thesis) and the perceived object (*qua* antithesis).—Above all, about *selfishness* (*Ichheit*), that ubiquitous and ever polished *mirror* which ever gives us back the image of our own ego as if it were the image of a non-ego. That is to say, as if it were, not an image, but a thing-in-itself (*Ding an sich*).

As the reference to “the original word, | BE”, shows, Rumi wrote his poem as a parable demonstrating the *friendship* between “subjects and objects” not primarily as an epistemological *friendship*, as the *friendship* that all perception inevitably entails, but rather as the ontological (pantheistic), Sufi, *friendship* between Man and God, and, therefore, between, I and Thou.

Now, Pater interprets the presence of Rumi's “pretty words” in the title page of Raffalovich's volume of poems as a sign that the author “seems modestly to disavow that difference from other people on which poets are apt to pride themselves”. And, as a result, the reader cannot but conclude that, although he manifestly did not take it very seriously, Pater quite rightly understood the epigraph in the title page of *It is Thyself* in the

true spirit of the author of the words composing it—if not in the true spirit of the author of *It is Thyself*.

Indeed, it seems quite plausible that, if one read “homosexuality” instead of “democracy”, one will come closer to the intentions of the author of *It is Thyself* in reading the following words of the American James Russell Lowell—which were written to illustrate Theodore Parker’s principle that “you are as good as I am”: “Theodore Parker said that ‘Democracy meant not *I’m as good as you are*, but *You’re as good as I am*.’ [...] A beautiful and profound parable of the Persian poet Jelaladeen tells us that ‘One knocked at the Beloved’s door, and a voice asked from within *Who is there?* and he answered *It is I*. Then the voice said, *This house will not hold me and thee*; and the door was not opened. Then went the lover into the desert and fasted and prayed in solitude, and after a year he returned and knocked again at the door; and again the voice asked *Who is there?* and he said *It is thyself*; and the door was opened to him.” (James Russell Lowell. “Democracy”. In: —. *The Writings of James Russell Lowell*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1890, vol. 6 (*Literary and Political Addresses*), pp. 20–21.)

Lowell’s comment on his own use of this story is worth transcribing here: “But that is idealism, you will say, and this is an only too practical world. I grant it; but I am one of those who believe that the real will never find an irremovable basis till it rests on the ideal.”

Of course, Lowell’s comment is absolutely to the point.—Although, manifestly, he does not show himself aware that Theodore Parker’s definition of “democracy” as *You’re as good as I am*—and therefore his own use of the declaration *It is thyself*—bags the question: “How good am I, anyway?”

This is, indeed, what makes all relevant statements about perception so interesting: in asserting the identity subject–object, they immediately assert the identity between their own meaning, *qua* object, and the subject who may happen to confer them meaning.

Consider, for instance, the following line engraving, by the English engraver Anker Smith (1759–1819).

115:1–5.

It is Thyself (1889)



What does it mean here, the statement “It is Thyself”?

Notice the caption: “A Smith *Fecit!*”: *Anker Smith Fecit!* (made it); *Anker Smith Feces!* (feces); *AS myth Fecit!* *AS myth Feces!* *A Smith Fecit!* *A Smith Feces!*

Just as Lowell did, the poet of *It is Thyself* has Rumi’s “Friend’s door” become “the Beloved’s door”. Is it possible that Samuel Waddington (1844–1923) was following their example?—when, after having walked the corridors of Brasenose College while Pater still was a newcomer there, he decided to composed this poetized version of Rumi’s story:

Love came to crave sweet love, if love might be;
 To the Beloved's door he came, and knocked:—
 'And who art thou?' she asked,—'we know not thee!
 Then shyly listened, nor the door unlocked.
 Love answered, 'It is I!' 'Nay, thee and me
 This house will never hold.'—'Twas thus she mocked
 His piteous quest; and, weeping, home went he,
 While thro' the night the moaning plane-tree rocked.
 Three seasons sped, and lo, again Love came;
 Again he knocked; again in simple wise,
 'Pray, who is there?' she asked,—'What is thy name?'
 But Love had learnt the magic of replies,—
 'It is Thyself!' he whispered, and behold,
 The door was opened, and love's mystery told.

It is Thyself (1889)

115:10. Concerning Pater's nonchalant assertion, here, that he "judged" the author of *It is Thyself* to be "a Russian, of French culture", Peter J. Vernon comments: "Pater's complex sentence cannot disguise his 'log-rolling.' Having known Raffalovich for at least three years he was perfectly aware of the latter's Russian-French background and his 'we judge' is evidently disingenuous." (Peter J. Vernon. "Pater's Letters to Andre Raffalovich". *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*. Volume 26, Number 3, 1983, p. 193.)

Peter J. Vernon, who estimates this review of Pater's "a favourable (though unsigned) review", tells us not only that "Pater's letters to Raffalovich were written over a two-year period from 1884-1886 when Pater was entering upon a period of fame and freedom", (p. 192) but also that Raffalovich himself had dined with the Paters some three years before the appearance, in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, of his friend's (Pater's) review of his fourth volume of poetry: "Violet Paget... visited him [Raffalovich] while she was staying with Pater in 1886... when they were both invited to dinner at Pater's". (p. 192)

115:10. More interesting, perhaps, is the circumstance that *our* reviewer had already reviewed privately, so to speak, Raffalovich's third volume of poems, *In Fancy Dress* (London, Walter Scott, 1886), and apparently had sent him word of this event, on Dec. 11th, 1886, "Tipped into [a copy of] *Plato and Platonism*" (see Peter J. Vernon's article, p. 195):

It is Thyself (1889)

My dear Raffalovich,

Your quaintly arranged book arrived yesterday. Many thanks! I have already found much in it that is charming and original, and reminds me very pleasantly of the author. Mrs. Churson seems to me to strike a new and very interesting note in poetry. I think some day you ought to expand this 'First book' into one almost six times as long. The mélange of sentiment and satire it presents is to me very fascinating. Much of it, however, is obscure. Sometimes, on the other hand, you seem to me to reach a quite perfect expression of difficult ideas; e.g. the stanza on the top of page 145. I think that perfectly expressed. There is a pleasant sense of flowers and gaiety everywhere in the volume, together with the suggestion of a capacity for serious things. Excuse these first thoughts, and

*believe me
Most truly yours
Walter Pater.*

Marc-André Raffalovich (1864–1934) was born into a wealthy Russian Jewish family, which, in 1863, had moved from Odessa, one of the most populous cities of Russian Ukraine, to Paris. In 1882, he being eighteen, his mother sent him to study in Oxford—where, a "young millionaire", he lived for some years in the company of "his governess" (to go on quoting a letter by Violet Paiget) "in a beautiful flat". Latter on, he settled down in London, where, in the 1980s, he opened a *salon*, just like his mother had done in Paris.

When he died, in 1934, Raffalovich was the author of about thirty books, among them five volumes of verse—*Cyril and Lionel, and Other Poems* (1884), *Tuberose and Meadow-*

sweet (1885), *In Fancy Dress* (1886), *It is Thyself* (1889), *The Thread and the Path* (1895)—, two novels, several plays, and an innovative essay concerning *inversion* or homosexuality: *L'uranisme. Inversion sexuelle congenitale. Observations et conseils* (1895, pseudonym, Alexander Michaelson).

Reviewing *Tuberose and Meadowsweet*, in the *Pall Mall Gazette* issue for March 27, 1885, Oscar Wilde stated: “To say of these poems that they are unhealthy and bring with them the heavy odours of the hothouse is to point out neither their defect nor their merit, but their quality merely.”

In 1892, Raffalovich met the poet John Gray (1866–1934), who was a literary *protégé* and perhaps a lover of Oscar Wilde, as well as purportedly the inspiration behind the title character in Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Four years later, in 1896, following Gray’s example, Raffalovich converted to Catholicism, and, after Gray finished his studies for the priesthood, moved with him to Edinburgh, Scotland, where he died four months before the dearest of all his many friends.

The following words by Peter J. Vernon deserve mention at the end of this note: “Raffalovich records that Sidney Colvin (1845–1927) warned him not to become acquainted with Pater. However, Raffalovich paid no attention to Colvin’s warning. He had an interview with Pater in hopes of entering Balliol College, and later he formed a friendship with Pater which lasted until Pater’s death in 1894. Pater presented his books to Raffalovich, and Raffalovich recalled a visit to the theatre together to see *The Magistrate*. Raffalovich also implied that he used to dine regularly with Pater.” (Peter J. Vernon. “Pater’s Letters to Andre Raffalovich”. *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*. Volume 26, Number 3, 1983, p. 192.)

There can be no doubt, then, that Mr. Walter Pater was being quite judicious—but not at all judgemental,— when he publicly stated that he “judge[d]” the author of *It is Thyself* to be “a Russian, of French culture”.

Tu le connais, critique,—Hypocrite critique!—The poet of “Au Lecteur” would willingly have exclaimed.—Were he to address himself “Au Critique”.

115:10.

It is Thyself (1889)

115:16. **115:16.** “[A]n anthology of the later Elizabethan or early Jacobean muse”—Therefore, an anthology of poetry produced either at the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558–1603) or at the beginning of the reign of James I of England (1603–1625).

It is Thyself (1889)

116:14. The English poet and Anglican cleric Robert Herrick (1591–1674).

116:21–23. “[W]e doubt whether the author has found in English verse the proper scope for his talents.” Compare this public statement with this private one, concerning Raffalovich’s volume of verses *In Fancy Dress* (see above, note to 115:10): *I think some day you ought to expand this ‘First book’ into one almost six times as long.*

Was Pater really thinking of Raffalovich’s book?

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

119:1–2. The Second Series (1850–1854) of Flaubert’s *Correspondance* appeared in 1889, the year Pater published his review; therefore, the volume Pater was reviewing could not, indeed, but have been, at the time he was writing, “just now published.” 119:1–2.

Pater had reviewed the First Series (1830–1850) of Flaubert’s *Correspondance* two years before (see vol. 1, pp. 89–97, and above, pp. 115–128).

119:8. Flaubert began writing *Madame Bovary* in September 1851, and finished writing it in March 1856. He had it published in book form in April 1857 (Gustave Flaubert. *Madame Bovary, Moeurs de Province*. Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1857).

Madame Bovary may be seen as a demystifying critique of romantic aspirations and the values and morals, the respectability, of provincial bourgeoisie.

The novel tells the story of Emma Bovary, a housewife disillusioned with marriage and marital love but full of illusions concerning *true* love out of wedlock, which she has gathered mostly from popular novels.

The daughter of a farmer, Emma, a dreamer by nature, is raised at the Ernemont convent, in Rouen. After she marries the country physician Charles Bovary, she quickly becomes bored, and realises that their relationship will not allow her to fulfil her dreams and aspirations. Then, the couple is invited to a ball at the Château de la Vaubyessard, and the monotony which had taken possession of Emma is for a while dissipated—while, at the same time, her discovery of a world she previously had no true knowledge of, a world of luxury and replete of exquisite enticements, deepens her dissatisfaction with the mediocrity of her life and the inadequacy of her husband, who remains ignorant of her true thoughts and feelings.

Emma becomes pregnant, and Charles, thinking that a change of air will be good for her, moves his residence and

119:8.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

practice to Yonville-l'Abbaye: but the new town proves itself to her as small, insignificant, and dispirited as the previous one, the town of Tostes.

At Yonville, Emma meets the clerk Léon Dupuis, with whom she begins a love affair, after her daughter, Berthe, is born. She falls in love with, and clings to, him—only to despair when he leaves Yonville, in order to pursue his law degree in Paris.

Later on, Emma is noticed by Rodolphe Boulanger de la Huchette, a relatively wealthy landowner, who becomes her lover, after he hastily declares his love for her, and is encouraged by Charles Bovary, the good husband, to keep her company. As a result, she becomes resolute in her intention to leave Yonville with him, and thus to abandon her husband. However, once more her search for true love and adventure is thwarted: a letter from Rodolphe arrives, informing her that, not wishing to cause her harm and make her unhappy, he has left town alone.

One night, Charles takes Emma to the theatre, at Rouen—where they reencounter Léon Dupuis, who, by then, has become a worldly man and is able to convince the good physician to leave his wife behind, in Rouen, for a day.

The next day, they take a long walk together—so long, that, in effect, it leads them to tire themselves to *death* in bed.

Inevitably, such walks become once more a habit—for Madame Bovary soon finds out how fond she really is not only of acquiring luxurious objects, but also of piano lessons in Rouen, away from her husband.

And then comes the day when she discovers that she still has Rouen, to roam around, as well as a lover and a bankrupt husband, but no more pins to pawn, and, consequently, no money at all to pay the debts she has contracted in the past pursuit of her happiness.

That is the day when, returning home from Rouen, she sees a public notice posted at her door, and learns that the belongings of the Bovary family are to be auctioned. She runs for Rodolphe Boulanger for help, but he, too, has no money. Léon Dupuis, her lover, is, indeed, in the possession of money, but, being a notary, is unwilling to testify to the payment of her

debts unless she accept his own terms, which prove to be so outrageous, that she declines his services.

Arsenic, then, offers itself as a solution. And, unwilling to abide by bourgeois values, resolved to dodge disgrace, Emma Bovary embraces suicide—exhaling her last breath only after having endured dreadful agony, despoiled of all dreams of longing without grief, love without loss, loyalty without allegiance.

Madame Bovary initially appeared in instalments in *La Revue de Paris*, between October and December 1856. The French government was quick to censor its publication, and Flaubert, his printer, and his publisher were tried together for blasphemy and for having offended public morals!

119:13–16. In 1849, Flaubert and his friend Maxime—the French photographer and journalist Maxime Du Camp (1822–1894)—left France, on a long journey to the East: to Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Asia Minor, Constantinople, and Greece, including Athens.

In the course of his journey, Flaubert wrote plentiful notes concerning the places he visited. In 1910, his niece (by then, Caroline Franklin-Grout) published—a fact Pater could not have known— excerpts of those notes in the July–December issues of the Parisian monthly *Les Marges*. The same year, the full notes were published for the first time, as volumes IV and V of the writer's complete works and under the title *Notes de Voyages* (Gustave Flaubert. *Œuvres complètes*. Paris, Louis Conard, 1910, vols. IV–V).

119:16. The historical novel *Salambô* was published in 1862. Its title is homonymous with the name of its protagonist—Salammbô being the purported name of the youngest of the three daughters of the Carthaginian general and statesman Hamilcar Barca (c. 275–228 B. C.), who was likewise the father of the military leaders Hannibal Barca (247–182 B. C.), Hasdrubal Barca (245–207 B. C.), and Mago(n) Barca (243–203 B. C.), as well as father-in-law to Hasdrubal, the Fair (c. 270–221 B. C.)

The novel, then, is set in the time of the Mercenary War (241–238 B. C.), the dispute over the payment of wages, long owed to them, by the mercenary troops that had fought for

119:16.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

Carthage in Sicily at the end of the First Punic War (254–241 B. C.)—Flaubert having followed closely the account of the war which was given by the Roman historian Polibus, in the third book of his *Histories*.

In the course of the war, the Libyan Mâtho, one of the leaders of the revolt, takes hold of the sacred robe of the goddess Tanit, the chief deity of Carthage. As a result, the fortunes of the Carthagians change for the worse, the grand-priest, Schahabarim, being forced to persuade Salammbô to go to the tent of Mâtho and bring back at all costs the robe of the goddess. Salammbô recovers the robe at the price of having to assuage the Barbarian's lust for her.

The Chartigians gradually win the war, with the help of the Numidian chieftain Naravas, who betrays the mutineers by re-joining the troops of Hamilcar. As a reward for his treason, he wins from Hamilcar his daughter Salammbô, who he is to marry. However, when the time comes for Naravas to place the wedding ring on Salammbô's finger, she sees the Libyan Mâtho approach them and kneel at her feet, bathed in blood, as result of having been delivered to the Carthaginian mobs, to be slaughtered by them. A priest of the god Moloch then plucks Mâtho's heart and offers it to the Sun—at the exact moment when, cursing and railing, her hair spread out to the wind, Salammbô inclines her head back, stares at the sky, and falls down on the floor, dead.

Flaubert concludes: "Thus died Hamilcar's daughter, for having touched the robe of the goddess Tanit."

"Hérodiad" is the title of the last of Flaubert's *Trois Contes* (*Three Tales*), from 1877.

Herodias (c. 15 B. C.—after A. D. 39) was a princess of the Herodian dynasty of Judea, during the time of the Roman Empire. However, in spite of Flaubert having given her name to the story, its heroine is not her, but (as in Oscar Wilde's play) her daughter Salome.

The story is well known.

Herod I, the Great (c. 72–4 B. C.), married five times. Among many other offspring, he had three sons by different wives: Phasaël II, Herod II, and Herod Antipas. Phasaell be-

came the father of Herodias, and his two brothers, therefore, became uncles to her.

Herodias had a daughter, Salome, by her marriage to her uncle Herod II. But, by the time Salome became a beautiful grown woman, Herodias divorced Herod II, in order to marry her younger uncle, Herod Antipas.

Flaubert's account begins on the morning of the birthday celebration of Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee—who has too eagerly submitted to the rule of the Romans. Many look to his second marriage, to Herodias, as an act of incest. Among them, is, foremost, John the Baptist, whom Herod Antipas truly believes to be the prophet who was to precede the arrival of the Messiah.

Herodias wants John the Baptist dead, for his insolence, and, to placate her, puny Herod Antipas has him imprisoned, believing that to have him executed would be sacrilege. Herodias, however, is so proud, so committed to having John the Baptist dead, that she sacrifices her daughter's innocence to achieve her ends: she has Salome come to the court and incenses her husband's passion for her, in order to obtain from him the head of the prophet: "Je veux que tu me donnes dans un plat... La tête de Iaokanann!"

A young girl had just entered.

... it was no apparition. It Was Salome, the daughter of Herodias, whom her mother had had trained far away from Machrerus to capture the Tetrarch's heart. The idea was a good one; she felt sure of it now.

The girl mimed the passionate desire which insists on being slaked. She danced like the Indian priestesses, the Nubians of the cataracts, the Maenads of Lydia...

Then she circled frenziedly, as if in a mad round of witches, about Herod's table; and he said to her "Come! come!" in a voice broken by sobs of passion. She went on turning; the timbrels crashed as if they would burst, and the crowd yelled. But the Tetrarch cried still louder: "Come, come to me! Thou shalt have Capernaurn! The plain of Tiberias—my citadels—the half of my kingdom!" [...]

119:19–25.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

A snap of fingers was heard in the balcony.

She went up there, came down again, and then brought out these words with a childish air, lisping a little: "I want you to give me, in a dish, the head..." She had forgotten the name, but began again, smiling: "The head of Iaokanan!" (The translation is by Arthur McDowall.)

119:19–25. Pater translates from a letter addressed by Flaubert to his mother, from Constantinople, on November 14, 1850.

Rien n'est plus gracieux que de voir valser tous ces hommes avec leurs grands jupons plissés et leur figure extatique levée au ciel. Ils tournent sans s'arrêter pendant une heure environ. Un d'eux nous a affirmé que, s'il ne fallait pas tenir ses bras au-dessus de sa tête, il est capable de tourner pendant six heures de suite. (p. 7)

120:1–20. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a "Sunday", at "4 o'clock", and addressed to M^{me} X.: the French poet and writer Louise Colet (1810–1876), Flaubert's lover.

J'ai vu des danseuses dont le corps se balançait avec la régularité ou la furie insensible du palmier. Cet œil si plein de profondeurs, et où il y a des épaisseurs de teinte comme à la mer, n'exprime rien que le calme, le calme et le vide comme le désert. Les hommes sont de même. Que d'admirables têtes! et qui semblent rouler, en dedans, les plus grandes pensées du monde! Mais frappe dessus et il n'en sortira pas plus que d'un cruchon sans bière ou d'un sépulcre vide. A quoi tient donc la majesté de leurs formes, d'où résulte-t-elle? De l'absence peut-être de toute passion. Ils ont cette beauté des taureaux qui ruminent, des lévriers qui courent, des aigles qui planent; le sentiment de là fatalité qui les remplit. La conviction du néant de l'homme donne ainsi à leurs actions, à leurs poses, à leurs regards un caractère grandiose et ré-

signé. Les vêtements lâches et se prêtant à tous les gestes sont toujours en rapport avec les fonctions de l'individu, avec le ciel par la couleur, etc., et puis le soleil! le soleil! C'est un immense ennui qui dévore tout." (pp. 182–183)

120:28–12:3. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, in August 1852, on a "Saturday evening", and addressed to M^{me} X.

Tu me dis que je t'ai envoyé des réflexions curieuses sur les femmes... Ce que je leur reproche surtout, c'est leur besoin de poétisation. Un homme aimera sa lingère et il saura qu'elle est bête qu'il n'en jouira pas moins; mais si une femme aime un goujat, c'est un génie méconnu, une âme d'élite, etc., si bien que, par cette disposition naturelle à loucher, elles ne voient pas le vrai quand il se rencontre, ni la beauté là où elle se trouve. Cette infériorité (qui est au point de vue de l'amour en soi une supériorité) est la cause des déceptions dont elles se plaignent tant! Demander des oranges aux pommiers leur est une maladie commune. (pp. 95–96)

Notice Pater's reticence... his softening of Flaubert's words. Not this: "This inferiority (which is a superiority from the point of view of love itself) is the cause..." But this: "This fault is the true cause..."

121:8–17. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a "Saturday night", at "1 o'clock", and addressed to M^{me} X.

Ton amour à la fin me pénètre comme une pluie tiède, et je m'en sens imbibé jusqu'au fond de tout mon cœur. N'as-tu pas tout ce qu'il faut pour que je t'aime? corps, esprit, tendresse? Tu es simple d'âme et forte de tête, très peu poétique et extrêmement poète; il n'y a rien en toi que de bon, et tu es tout entière comme ta poitrine, blanche et douce au toucher. Celles que j'ai eues, va, ne te valaient pas, et je doute que celles que j'ai désirées te

valussent. Je lâche quelquefois de m’imaginer ton visage quand tu seras vieille, et il me semble que je t’aimerai encore tout autant, plus peut-être. (p. 223)

Notice Pater’s silent elision. Not this: “Those I have had are not, let’s say, worth yourself, and I doubt that those I have desired are equal to you.” But this: “ .”

121:25–122:21. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a “Sunday”, at “4 o’clock”, and addressed to M^{me} X.

Moi, plus je sens de difficultés à écrire et plus mon audace grandit (c’est là ce qui me préserve du pédantisme, où je tomberais sans doute); j’ai des plans d’œuvres pour jusqu’au bout de ma vie, et s’il m’arrive quelquefois des moments acres qui me font presque crier de rage, tant je sens mon impuissance et ma faiblesse, il y en a d’autres aussi où j’ai peine à me contenir de joie, quelque chose de profond et d’extra-voluptueux débordé de moi à jets précipités, *comme une éjaculation de l’âme*. Je me sens transporté et tout enivré de ma propre pensée comme s’il m’arrivait, par un soupirail intérieur, une bouffée de parfums chauds. Je n’irai jamais bien loin, je sais tout ce qui me manque, mais la tâche que j’entreprends sera exécutée par un autre; j’aurai mis sur la voie quelqu’un de mieux doué et de plus né. Vouloir donner à la prose le rythme du vers (en la laissant prose et très prose), et écrire la vie ordinaire comme on écrit l’histoire ou l’épopée (sans dénaturer le sujet), est peut-être une absurdité, voilà ce que je me demande quelquefois; mais c’est peut-être aussi une grande tentative et très originale! [...] N’importe, j’aurai toujours valu quelque chose par mon entêtement, et puis, qui sait? peut-être trouverai-je un jour un bon motif, un air complètement dans ma voix, ni au-dessus ni au-dessous; enfin, j’aurai toujours passé ma vie d’une noble manière et souvent délicieuse. [...] Néanmoins, il y a une chose triste, c’est de voir combien les grands hommes arrivent aisément à l’effet en dehors

de l'art même; quoi de plus mal bâti que bien des choses de Rabelais, Cervantes, Molière et Hugo? mais quels coups de poing subits? Quelle puissance dans un seul mot! (pp. 188–189)

123:1–14.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

Again, notice Pater's silent elisions:

Not this: "something deep and extra-voluptuous overflows from me in sudden leaps, like an ejaculation of the soul" (*quelque chose de profond et d'extra-voluptueux déborde de moi à jets précipités, comme une éjaculation de l'âme*). But this: "something from the depths within me, for which 'voluptuous' is no word, overflows for me in sudden leaps."

Flaubert states: "overflows from me" ("déborde de moi"). Pater translates: "overflows for me"!

Flaubert states: "extra-voluptuous".

And, full to the lip of respect for the "hypocrite lecteur", overflowing with tact and fitful reserve—unlike the author of *The Renaissance in Italy* (see above, note to 69:26–28),—Pater translates: "for which 'voluptuous' is no word".

No! Full of pointless purpose!—For he most probably, most silently (to himself alone, actually), meant to say: *so vastly voluptuous, that even 'voluptuous' is a word not vast enough for it.*

123:1–14. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a "Thursday", at "half past 4 o'clock", and addressed to M^{me} X.

Enfin! pourvu que la cervelle reste, c'est le principal. Comme le néant nous envahit! à peine nés, la pourriture commence sur vous, de sorte que toute la vie n'est qu'un long combat qu'elle nous livre et toujours de plus en plus triomphant de sa part jusqu'à la conclusion, la mort. Là, elle règne exclusive. Je n'ai eu que deux ou trois années où j'ai été entier (de dix-sept à dix-neuf ans environ). J'étais splendide, je peux le dire maintenant, et assez pour attirer les yeux d'une salle de spectacle entière, comme cela m'est arrivé à Rouen à la première représentation de *Ruy Blas*. Mais depuis, je me suis furieusement détérioré...." (pp. 190–191)

123:11. **123:11.** *Ruy Blas* (1838): a drama, both tragic and comic, by the French writer Victor Hugo (1802–1885).

123:20. The ancient Greek tragedian Sophocles (c. 497–406 B. C.)

123:20–28. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a “Wednesday”, at “midnight”, and addressed to M^{me} X.

... il ne faut pas revenir à l’antiquité, mais prendre ses procédés. Que nous soyons tous des sauvages tatoués depuis Sophocle, cela se peut; mais il y a autre chose dans l’art que la rectitude des lignes et le poli des surfaces. La plastique du style n’est pas si large que l’idée entière, je le sais bien; mais à qui la faute? à la langue; nous avons trop de choses et pas assez de formes. De là vient la torture des consciencieux. Il faut pourtant tout accepter et tout imprimer, et prendre surtout son point d’appui dans le présent. (pp. 199–200)

124:1–11. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, in August 1852, on a “Saturday night”, and addressed to M^{me} X.

J’en conçois pourtant un... style qui serait beau, que quelqu’un fera à quelque jour, dans dix ans ou dans dix siècles et qui serait rythmé comme le vers, précis comme le langage des sciences, et avec des ondulations, des renflements de violoncelle, des aigrettes de feu. Un style qui nous entrerait dans l’idée comme un coup de stylet, et où notre pensée enfin voyagerait sur des surfaces lisses comme lorsqu’on file dans un canot avec bon vent arrière. La prose est née d’hier, voilà ce qu’il faut se dire. Le vers est la forme par excellence des littératures anciennes. Toutes les combinaisons prosodiques ont été faites, mais celles de la prose tant s’en faut.” (p. 95)

124:16–125:2. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a “Wednesday”, at “midnight”, and addressed to M^{me} X. 124:16–

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

Ce qui fait que je vais si lentement, c’est que rien dans ce livre [*Madame Bovary*] n’est tiré de moi, jamais ma personnalité ne m’aura été plus inutile. Je pourrai peut-être par la suite faire des choses plus fortes (et je l’espère bien), mais il me paraît difficile que j’en compose de plus habiles: tout est de *tête*; si c’est raté, ça m’aura toujours été un bon exercice; ce qui m’est naturel à moi, c’est le non naturel pour les autres, l’extraordinaire, le fantastique, la hurlade métaphysique, mythologique. Saint Antoine ne m’a pas demandé le quart de la tension d’esprit que la *Bovary* me cause; c’était un déversoir, je n’ai eu que plaisir à écrire et les dix-huit mois que j’ai passés à en écrire les 500 pages ont été les plus profondément voluptueux de ma vie. Juge donc, il faut que j’entre à toute minute dans des peaux qui me sont antipathiques, voilà six mois que je fais de l’amour platonique et en ce moment je m’exalte catholiquement, au son des cloches et j’ai envie d’aller à confesse! (pp. 198–199)

Notice, once more, how, when it came to sex or religion, Pater (who finally got his “hard”, “gemlike flame”, going only when he was geared in his nightgown) was careful to transform Flaubert’s staccato—here, heavily ironic—into his own legato.

Flaubert wrights: “right now, my exaltation is, all of it, catholicity brought out by the sound of bells, and I crave for confession!” (*en ce moment je m’exalte catholiquement, au son des cloches et j’ai envie d’aller à confesse!*)

Pater translates: “at the present moment my exaltation of mind is that of a good Catholic: I am longing to go to confession”!

124:25–26. Flaubert refers to his work *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* (Paris, Charpentier, 1874).

Inspired by a painting of the same title, then attributed to the Dutch painter Bruegel the Elder, as well as motivated

by his intention to do for France what Goethe had done for Germany—to forge a *Faust* in the French language,—Flaubert produced three versions of his own treatment of the temptations purportedly faced, as an anchorite in the Egyptian desert, by Saint Anthony the Great (c. 251–356), the Father of All Monks, whose life is mostly known through the account left by the Greek Church Father Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 296–373).

The first version was completed in 1849; the second, in 1856; the third, in 1872. Finally, Flaubert had a definitive version published in 1874.

Flaubert’s work reflects on the life of the saint and on his decision, inspired by the Bible, to become a hermit, but, in accordance with its title, focuses above all on the hallucinatory temptations which, enfeebled from fasting and convinced of wallowing in sin, the so-called “Anchorite of the Thebaid” is supposed to have experienced.

In the first place, Flaubert’s protagonist goes through, and manages to stand up to, a series of hallucinatory experiences that tempt him to succumb to the SEVEN DEADLY SINS.

In the second place, he goes through the temptations to disbelief which, under the guise of Hilarion, one of his former disciples, the Tempter confronts him with, by means of exposing him to the multitude of tenets, blasphemies and abominations of the HERESIARCHS of the third century (Elkesaites, Carpocratians, Valentinians, etc.)

In the third place, he faces the temptations to disbelief which he goes through by being transported by the Tempter into the company of CHRISTIAN MARTYRS condemned to the wild beasts, only to find them unwilling to sacrifice their lives and possessed by bigotry and insincerity.

In the fourth place, he faces temptations to disbelief in the excellence and evidence of miracles, which result from his being confronted with the hoaxes and tricks of a host of vain MAGICIANS, such as Simon Magnus, Helen of Tyre, and Apollonius of Tyana.

In the fifth place, he faces temptations to disbelief in the divinity, which result from the Tempter, once more in the guise

of Hilarion, exposing him the multitude of gods of the ancient world, who—monstrous, multiform, phallic, ithyphallic, fantastic, obscene, beautiful— either recount him their stories or parade for him their nudity and obscenity.

In the fifth place, he faces temptations to disbelief in Theism and Creationism, which result from his being lifted upon mighty wings and borne away beyond the world, above the Solar System, above the starry arch of the Milky Way, as well as from his having to suffer the Tempter reveal him all the future discoveries of SCIENCE.

In the sixth place, he faces temptations to indulge in lust and to disbelieve death, which result from his being confronted with the Tempter in the guise of the SPIRIT OF LUST and the SPIRIT OF DEATH—the first urging him to satisfy the needs of the senses; the other, convincing him of the truth of the continuity of life after death and of palingenesis, concomitantly with urging him to test such a truth by means of committing suicide.

In the seventh place, he faces the temptation to discover once for all the claims between matter and spirit, a temptation which takes hold of him when he starts meditating upon the monstrous symbols painted upon the walls of ancient temples—and, as a result, a phantasmagoria of MONSTERS begins to pass before his eyes: the figments of mythology, the abnormal creatures described by Pliny and Herodotus, the fantastic beings which were to appear, later, in mediaeval heraldry and illumination, the orgies, blasphemies, abominations of the Walpurgis Night.

In the eighth place, he faces the temptation to become one with the Pantheists' *Weltseele* (Goethe's *Erdgeist*), as a result of being confronted with the hallucinatory spectacle of all sorts of metamorphoses and, therefore, of continuity-in-change—the earth becoming water, forests of coral becoming forests of trees, plants becoming animals, inanimate matter becoming animate, etc.

Finally, the Tempter disappears, and the temptations cease. Hallucination gives place to reality. The Sun rises: darkness becomes day. The countenance of Christ comes to Anthony, and the saint kneels to the ground, in supplication.

125:3.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

The reader turns the last leaf. And the whole phantasmagory is forgotten—or it so happens that the Tempter does return, and Flaubert has won more than fun and fame in putting it, his phantasmagory, to paper.

125:3. The philosopher of the French Renaissance Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592), who is best known as the author of *Essais* (1580)—concerning which Pater has much to say in the chapter of *Gaston de Latour* titled “Suspended Judgment”.

125:6–15. Pater translates from a letter written by Flaubert at Croisset, on a “Wednesday night”, at “the hour after midnight”, and addressed to M^{me} X.

...la postérité du reste ne tarda pas à cruellement dé-laisser ces gens-là qui ont voulu être utiles et qui ont chanté pour une cause. Elle n’a souci déjà, ni de Chateaubriand avec son Christianisme renouvelé, ni de Béranger avec son philosophisme libertin, ni même bientôt de Lamartine avec son humanitarisme religieux. Le vrai n’est jamais dans le présent; si l’on s’y attache, on y pé-rit. A l’heure qu’il est je crois même qu’un penseur (et qu’est-ce que l’artiste si ce n’est un triple penseur?) ne doit avoir ni religion, ni patrie, ni même aucune conviction sociale. (p. 212)

Again:

Chateaubriand avec son Christianisme renouvelé: “Chateaubriand, and his resuscitation of mediaeval religion”;

...*un penseur... ne doit avoir ni religion, ni patrie, ni même aucune conviction sociale*: “a thinker... should have no convictions.”

125:8–10. The French writer, politician, diplomat and historian François-René de CHATEAUBRIAND (1768–1848); the French writer, poet, and statesman Alphonse de LAMARTINE (1790–1869); the French poet and songwriter Pierre-Jean de BÉRANGER (1780–1857).

125:21. “[I]ts predecessor” refers to the volume containing the First Series (1830–1850) of Flaubert’s *Correspon-*

dance, which Pater had reviewed two years before (see above, note to 119:1–2).

125:23–25. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Croisset, Sunday, 4 o’clock”.

On n’a nulle imagination en France si l’on veut faire passer la poésie, il faut être assez habile pour la déguiser. (p. 186)

125:26–29. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Croisset, Wednesday, midnight”.

Quand on est jeune, on associe la réalisation future de ses rêves aux existences qui vous entourent, à mesure que ces existences disparaissent les rêves s’en vont. (p. 113)

125:30–126:2. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Patras, 9 February, 1851”.

Il n’y a rien de plus inutile que ces amitiés héroïques qui demandent des circonstances pour se prouver. Le difficile, c’est de trouver quelqu’un qui ne vous agace pas les nerfs dans toutes les occurrences de la vie. (p. 37)

126:3–5. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Croisset, Sunday, 4 o’clock” (the same as above, note on 125:23–25).

La dimension d’une âme peut se mesurer à sa souffrance, comme on calcule la profondeur des fleuves à leur courant. (p. 188)

126:6–12. The same letter (“Croisset, Sunday, 4 o’clock”).

Autrefois on croyait que la canne à sucre seule donnait le sucre, on en tire à peu près de tout maintenant; il en est de même de la poésie, extrayons-la de n’importe quoi, car elle git en tout et partout. Pas un atome de

126:13–15.

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

matière qui ne contienne la poésie et habituons-nous à considérer le monde comme une œuvre d'art, dont il faut reproduire les procédés dans nos œuvres." (pp. 184–185)

126:13–15. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: "Croisset, Saturday night, 1852".

Pour avoir du talent il faut être convaincu qu'on en possède, et pour garder sa conscience pure, la mettre au-dessus de celles de tous les autres. (p. 111)

126:16–17. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: "Croisset, Friday, 1 o'clock".

...on garde toujours une petite rancune à qui nous instruit.... (p. 207)

126:18–20. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: "Croisset, Tuesday, 11 o'clock".

Ce qu'il y a de meilleur dans l'art échappera toujours aux natures médiocres, c'est-à-dire aux trois quarts et demi du genre humain. (p. 222)

126:21–23. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: "Croisset, Saturday, midnight".

...que nos ennemis disent du mal de nous, c'est leur métier, mais que les amis en disent du bien sottement, c'est pis.... (p. 262)

126:24–27. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: "Croisset, 7 July, 1853. Thursday night, 1 o'clock".

Les matérialistes et les spiritualistes empêchent également de connaître la matière et l'esprit parce qu'ils

scindent l'un de l'autre. Les uns font de l'homme un ange et les autres un porc. (p. 270)

126:28–

126:28–127:2. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Croisset, August 1852, Saturday night”

Plus il ira, plus l'art sera scientifique, de même que la science deviendra artistique; tous deux se rejoindront au sommet après s'être séparés à la base. (p. 92)

127:3–7. Letter addressed to M^{me} X.: “Croisset, Wednesday night, 1 p.m.”

Soyons nous, et rien que nous. “Qu'est-ce que ton devoir? — l'exigence de chaque jour;” cette pensée est de Goethe; faisons notre devoir, qui est de tâcher d'écrire bien, et quelle société de saints serait celle où seulement chacun ferait son devoir? (p. 212)

Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert (1889)

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

131:2. The Irish poet, novelist, short-story writer, and playwright Oscar Fingal O'Flahertie Wills Wilde (1854–1900) became one of the most popular literary figures in London in the early 1890s. Today, he is best remembered, perhaps, as the author of the book Pater was reviewing, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, which first appeared, shortened, in the July 1890 issue of the American periodical *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine*, and, in its entirety, in book form, in 1891.

Wilde studied at Trinity College, Dublin, from 1871 to 1874, and at Magdalen College, Oxford, from 1874 to 1878. Two of his tutors were Walter Pater (1839–1894) and the art critic and philosopher John Ruskin (1819–1900).

After university, Wilde, who—as Pater notes—was a distinguished conversationalist and exceptional for his use of humour and wit, moved to London, into fashionable literary and social circles.

At the height of his fame and success, Wilde's love affair with Lord Alfred Douglas earned him being sentenced to two years hard labour, the maximum penalty, and his subsequent imprisonment from 1895 to 1897.

The major fruits of this predicament of his turned out to be two of his best literary productions: *De Profundis* (published posthumously, in 1905) and *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* (1898), which, his last work, he wrote in France.

Oscar Wilde was a prolific writer.

He wrote several essays, some of which he gathered in his book *Intentions* (1891). However, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890/1891) remained his only complete novel.

In 1888, he published the collection of short stories *The Happy Prince and Other Tales*, which was followed by *A House of Pomegranates* and *Lord Arthur Savile's Crime and Other Stories*, both of 1891.

131:2.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

131:9. As to his poetry, he published *Poems* in 1881; *The Sphinx*, in 1894; *Poems in Prose*, in 1894, too; *The Ballad of the Reading Gaol*, in 1898.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

Among his several plays, deserve special notice: *Lady Windermere's Fan*, from 1892; *A Woman of no Importance*, from 1893; *The Importance of Being Earnest*, from 1895; *Salomé*, from 1896.

131:9. The English poet, literary critic, and essayist Matthew Arnold (1822–1888).

131:10. “The Decay of Lying—An Observation” is one of the essays that Wilde included in his collection of essays titled *Intentions*, which was published in 1891. It first appeared, although under a considerably different form, in the January 1889 issue of *The Nineteenth Century*.

131:15. The collection of essays titled *Intentions*, first published in 1891, contains the following “critical efforts” (as Pater calls them): “The Critic as Artist”, “The Decay of Lying”, “Pen, Pencil and Poison”, “The Truth of Masks”.

131:16. Pater, it is obvious, refers to the novel he is reviewing; *The Portrait of Dorian Gray*.

131:19:22. Pater had in mind such statements concerning realism as the following:

All that we desired to point out was, that the magnificent work of the Elizabethan and Jacobean artists contained within itself the seeds of its own dissolution, and that, if it drew some of its strength from using life as rough material, it drew all its weakness from using life as an artistic method. As the inevitable result of this substitution of an imitative for a creative medium, this surrender of an imaginative form, we have the modern English melodrama. The characters in these plays talk on the stage exactly as they would talk off it; they have neither aspirations nor aspirates; they are taken directly from life and reproduce its vulgarity down to the smallest detail; they present the gait, manner, costume and accent of real people; they would pass unnoticed in a third-class railway carriage. And yet how wearisome the plays are! They

do not succeed in producing even that impression of reality at which they aim, and which is their only reason for existing. As a method, realism is a complete failure.” (Oscar Wilde. “The Decay of Lying—An Observation”. In:—. *Intentions*. London, Methuen & Co., 1909, pp. 22–23.)

131:22–26. Pater still has “The Decay of Lying” in mind:

CYRIL. Well...I should like to ask you a question. What do you mean by saying that life, ‘poor, probable, uninteresting human life,’ will try to reproduce the marvels of art? I can quite understand your objection to art being treated as a mirror. You think it would reduce genius to the position of a cracked looking-glass. But you don’t mean to say that you seriously believe that Life imitates Art, that Life in fact is the mirror; and Art the reality?

VIVIAN. Certainly I do. Paradox though it may seem—and paradoxes are always dangerous things—it is none the less true that Life imitates art far more than Art imitates life. We have all seen in our own day in England how a certain curious and fascinating type of beauty, invented and emphasised by two imaginative painters, has so influenced Life that whenever one goes to a private view or to an artistic salon one sees, here the mystic eyes of Rossetti’s dream, the long ivory throat, the strange square-cut jaw, the loosened shadowy hair that he so ardently loved, there the sweet maidenhood of “The Golden Stair,” the blossom-like mouth and weary loveliness of the “Laus Amoris;” the passion-pale face of Andromeda, the thin hands and lithe beauty of the Vivian in “Merlin’s Dream.” And it has always been so. A great artist invents a type, and Life tries to copy it, to reproduce it in a popular form, like an enterprising publisher. (Oscar Wilde. “The Decay of Lying—An Observation”. In:—. *Intentions*. London, Methuen & Co., 1909, pp. 30–31.)

131:26.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

131:26. Wilde appears to have intended to do in his novel, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, much what Pater himself had done in *Marius, Gaston de Latour*, and his *Imaginary Portraits*: to record the growth, education, and development of an exceptional—a beautiful—soul.

Just like *Marius*, *Dorian Gray* is thus, above all, a *Bildungsroman*.

Wilde's *beautiful soul*—beautiful at least in its programmatic intentions—turns out to be, at the same time, a bountifully *beautiful body*.

The painter Basil Hallward paints a painting of Dorian Gray, who happens to step in Basil's studio at the right time to become fascinated with Lord Henry, the spokesman of the philosophy of life that Pater had famously expounded in his Conclusion to *The Renaissance*.

"What is life?" "How best to live?"—the Greeks of the past had asked themselves with utmost, if importunate, urgency. Pater, whose *anima naturaliter christiana* had a no less natural and marked tinge of paganism, had already made his mission to give the answer, in their place, to the young men of his time: to the sons of the Modern World—who, immersed in the Renaissance in Italy, in Oxford, would not have disposed of time, had it not been for Pater himself, to worry about the absurd question: How to become reborn?

Wilde, nonetheless, one of those same young men who, at least, had been born with talent, in Dublin, thought it worthwhile, it seems, to follow in the footsteps of the much admired, but also much maligned, Don of the Oxonian academy.

Having become the pupil of Lord Henry, Dorian decides seriously to give credit to Horace: thenceforward, his life is to be lived according to the dictum *carpe diem*.

However, he gradually becomes addicted to adrenaline brought out by nefarious, if not devious, thoughts, feelings, deeds.—So much so, that a comprehensive synopsis of the novel would have to accommodate one murder, the attempt to commit another, one accidental homicide, the circumstances of two suicides, and the soiling of various souls.

Many years pass, and, for each evil deed, each foul thought, commission or omission, Dorian's *Doppelgänger*, the portrait of his spirit, expiates with dolent ageing, hideous decaying, the worldly sins perpetrated by his patron: the fleshly frame of Dorian himself—which each day rejuvenates: grows fresher and fairer than the jonquil or the jasmine in the fields of Fairy Land.

In the case of Dorian, then, the art of bolstering beauty in and by the body at all costs becomes, inevitably, the art of atonement at the price of decay and hideousness of the spirit.

Repentance is of no avail. Suicide of the soul is the sole Grail.

Not contrite, irate, Dorian stabs the strokes, upon the canvas, of Basil's brush.

But, alas! the gods had it engraved in all the gardens and graves of loss and gain: soul and body are to be born and perish inseparable twins.

Dorian is found dead—the blade that has spilt Basil's blood stabbed in his own body.

Thus, in turn, the flesh of Dorian atones its faults.—And Gray's perished portrait once more gains the youthful mien, the purity, the pulchritude, that might have been: that really would have been, if the hand holding the chisel burnishing the body had, indeed, become the chisel held by the hand of the spirit.

Pater, of course, was as much aware of all this as he was of his ideational paternity of Wilde's persona.—Wilde himself becoming, perhaps, no more than Dorian's and Wotton's surrogate father, in spite of the fact that Pater himself detects the nativity of the novel in the "aesthetic philosophy" of Oscar's *Intentions*.

Therefore, the reader of this review of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* may be forgiven, if he or she estimate Pater, its author, somewhat cold and distant; if not, at times, playful and patronizing—instead of pater-nalising.

132:2. In Wilde's novel, James Vane (her sister calls him Jim) is the brother of Sibyl Vane, a young actress who commits suicide after she discovers that Dorian does not really love her. In spite of his simplicity of mind and bodily brutality, James

132:9–15.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

loves his sister truly, and, suspecting the shallowness of Dorian's affection for Sibyl, vows to kill him if he ever hurt her.

Eighteen years after Sibyl Vane's suicide, the reader turns the page, and is transported into the episode that Pater probably had most in mind when he referred to the "interlude of Jim Vane." Having finally discovered the whereabouts of Dorian, James is on the brink of killing him. Prompted by fear, Dorian's mind, however, manages to concoct a life-saving stratagem.

"How long ago is it since your sister died?"

"Eighteen years."

"Eighteen years! Set me under the lamp and look at my face!"

The face of the man he had sought to kill had all the bloom of boyhood, all the unstained purity of youth. He seemed little more than a lad of twenty summers, hardly older, if older indeed at all, than his sister had been when they had parted so many years ago. It was obvious that this was not the man who had destroyed her life.

"Forgive me, sir, I was deceived. A chance word I heard in that damned den set me on the wrong track."

132:9–15. Pater is confronting his own understanding of a "true Epicureanism" with what he most probably thought to be Wilde's misunderstanding of the philosophy of life that he, Pater, had delineated, first in his review of William Morris' poems and then in the Conclusion to *The Renaissance*.—Precisely, the sort of misunderstanding that he, Pater, had tried to correct by means of writing *Marius the Epicurean*.

To cut matters short, the reader is invited to go back to what has been said above (see note to 131:26)—for Pater did indeed conceive of "true Epicureanism" as a philosophy of life that may be called "aesthetic" only in the true, philosophic sense of the word. That is to say (to speak the language of Kant and Schiller), in the sense according to which the ultimate goal of such a philosophy of life ("true Epicureanism") becomes to alert the individual to the possibility of *sculpting* his or her own life into the *shape* (*Figur*) of an uninterrupted and ever evol-

ing aesthetic Idea (*ästhetische Idee*); therefore, into the *shape* (*Figur*) of MATTER (sensuality) promoting itself *freely* (*beautifully*), and for its own sake only (for the sake of its *sôtēria*), to a state of undifferentiation from FORM or *Gestalt* (ideality)—and *vice versa*.

Pater's true understanding of "true Epicureanism", which, after all, owes more to the direct consequences of the Kantian epistemology he puts so much stress on in the Conclusion to *the Renaissance* without ever alluding to the debt he owes there to the philosopher of the three *Critiques*, than to his knowledge of the practical philosophy of life propounded by the Cyrenaics and by Epicurus—Pater's true understanding of "true Epicureanism" consists, thus, in a true understanding of true Culture (*cultura hominis, Bildung*).—And thence its enormous, but mostly unrecognized, importance for all men and women of the present time, who have acquired the erroneous habit of conceiving of "culture" above all as a *way of life* (in the footsteps, mainly, of the T. S. Eliot of *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* and of Raymond Williams, the so-called "precursor of Cultural Studies").

To go back, indeed, to the words used above: Pater did conceive of "true Epicureanism" as a philosophy of life leading to a transformation of the hand holding the chisel burnishing the body into the chisel held by the hand of the spirit (and *vice versa*).—This being the reason why we find him using the name "Epicureanism" as a synonym for "life as a fine art" (133:37).

Let the hypothetical reader of this note pay attention directly to Pater.

Marius the Epicurean: "Second Thoughts":

Cyrenaicism or Epicureanism too, new or old, may be noticed, in proportion to the completeness of its development, to approach, as to the nobler form of Cynicism, so also to the more nobly developed phases of the old, or traditional morality. In the gravity of its conception of life, in its pursuit after nothing less than a perfection, in its apprehension of the value of time—the passion and

the seriousness which are like a consecration— *la passion et le sérieux qui consacrent*—it may be conceived, as regards its main drift, to be not so much opposed to the old morality, as an exaggeration of one special motive in it.”

Marius the Epicurean: “Stoicism at Court”:

...he felt already some nascent suspicion of his philosophic programme, in regard, precisely, to the question of good taste. There was the taint of a graceless ‘antinomianism’ perceptible in it, a dissidence, a revolt against accustomed modes, the actual impression of which on other men might rebound upon himself in some loss of that personal pride to which it was part of his theory of life to allow so much. And it was exactly a moral situation such as this that Fronto appeared to be contemplating. He seemed to have before his mind the case of one—Cyrenaic or Epicurean, as the courtier tends to be, by habit and instinct, if not on principle—who yet experiences, actually, a strong tendency to moral assents, and a desire, with as little logical inconsistency as may be, to find a place for duty and righteousness in his house of thought.

And the Stoic professor found the key to this problem in the purely aesthetic beauty of the old morality, as an element in things, fascinating to the imagination, to good taste in its most highly developed form, through association—a system or order, as a matter of fact, in possession, not only of the larger world, but of the rare minority of élite intelligences; from which, therefore, least of all would the sort of Epicurean he had in view endure to become, so to speak, an outlaw.

If, in spite of these statements, by Pater himself, the reader remain unconvinced of the truth of what has been said in this note, let him compare Pater’s own definition of the aims of “Epicureanism” (“A true Epicureanism aims at a complete though harmonious development of man’s entire organism”)

with Matthew Arnold's memorable definition of "culture" (which, nonetheless, is but a reiteration of the main theme of Fredrich Schiller's *Briefe Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*): "culture... is a study of perfection, and of harmonious perfection, general perfection; perfection... consist[ing] in [a] ... harmonious expansion of all the powers which make the beauty and worth of human nature, and ... [being] not consistent with the overdevelopment of any one power at the expense of the rest."

132:25. The American writer, poet, editor, and literary critic Edgar Allan Poe (1809–1849)—to whose short story titled "William Wilson", the "supernatural element" and the *Doppelgänger*-effect of Dorian's picture is, in fact, indebted.

132:29. In Wilde's novel, Hallward, Basil Hallward, is the artist who befriends Dorian Gray, becomes obsessed with his beauty, and ends up killed by him.

Hallward is likewise a friend of Lord Henry Wotton's, the spokesman, in the novel, of that which Pater calls its "kind of dainty Epicurean theory" and "those Epicurean niceties".

132:32–33. Is Pater insinuating that Wilde may have intended the Epicurean Lord Henry Wotton to be "a satiric sketch" of him?—A satiric sketch somewhat like that of Mr. Rose, in William Mallock's (1849–1923) *The New Republic or Culture, Faith and Philosophy in an English Country House* (1877).

132:35–36. Pater is justified in his tendency to conflate, as he does here, Cyrenaicism with Epicureanism ("a true Cyrenaic or Epicurean doctrine of life")—Cyrenaicism being the practical philosophy propounded by Aristippus of Cyrene the Younger (second half of the 4th century B. C.) and his followers, Theodorus, Anniceris, and Hegesias; and Epicureanism being, as is well known, the philosophy propounded by the Greek philosopher Epicurus (341–270 B. C.) and embraced, after him, by the Roman philosopher Lucretius (c. 99–c. 55 B. C.)

In fact, there is a strong connection between the Cyrenaics and the Epicureans, not only in what concerns their shared epistemological sensationalism—which, particularly in the case of the former, gives rise to ethical relativism and assumes

the form of an epistemological relativism much akin to the sensational solipsism that Pater advocates in his Conclusion—, but also in what concerns the, albeit different, ethical philosophies upon which they erect their common hedonism.

The main origin of such a connection is the circumstance that Cyrenaicism is, *qua* theory, a Janus-like, if not even paradoxical, philosophy.

Cyrenaicism starts with the epistemological principle (the, much later, Kantian principle) that, consisting in feelings of a change within ourselves, perceptions (*Wahrnehmungen*) do not supply us with the least information concerning things in themselves (*Dinge an sich*), as well as with the least information concerning the perceptions, thoughts, and feelings of any other individual.

After thus having imprisoned the individual within his “thick wall of personality”, Aristippus arrives, in consequence, at the *prima facie* physiognomy of his ethical philosophy: the only conduct of life that is to be considered correct—and therefore wise—consists in cultivating the art of enjoying to the utmost the present moment; only the present is ours, do not concern yourself, therefore, with past and future circumstances, as well as, then, with your life taken as a whole; only pleasure may be considered the *summum bonum*—any pleasure, be it the result of a reputable or of an unreputable behaviour, of a lawful or of an unlawful action.

However, the mere assertion that only the present moment and the pleasure it may afford count already leads into contradiction—as the Cyrenaics themselves could not but consider—, for, if it necessarily happens that not all pleasures afford the same degree of gratification, it also happens that the actualisation—presentification of no few pleasures necessary lead into (are the cause of) considerable future pain and, therefore, unpleasure.

Here enters the *secunda facie* physiognomy of the Cyrenaic conduct of life (of the Cyrenaic practical philosophy): *carpe diem* (seize the day) must give place to *carpe annum* (seize the year)! In order to live pleurably, one must act wisely: must abstain from pleasures which naturally are a source of

pain or suffering, including, therefore, all pleasures that may spring only from actions that be illegal or even condemned by public opinion.

The Socratic *phronesis*, prudence, once more took its rightful place in *the* human life. With the result that the cultivation of the mind (*paideia, cultura hominis*) again became strongly advocated—and that the Cyrenaic Hegesias went so far as to assent that freedom from pain, not pleasure, must be the main goal of the wise man, since the identification of pure pleasure with the *summum bonum* places one in dependency of circumstances, and since such dependency affords no peace of mind, which, in turn, is a condition *sine qua* no experience at all of true pleasure can be had.

Instead of mere acceptance of, and surrender to, the pleasurable impressions that any present moment may chance to afford, the highest goal of life—the main consideration to take into account in respect of a wise conduct of life—becomes, above all, a state of mind capable of rising the individual above any kind of dependence on present circumstances.

The true hedonist turns out to be the man of true culture!

By now, it should be clear how near to Epicureanism Cyrenaicism indeed is.

To cut a long way short, let us listen to the teachings of Epicurus himself:

When we say, then, that pleasure is the end and aim, we do not mean the pleasures of the prodigal or the pleasures of sensuality, as we are understood to do by some through ignorance, prejudice, or wilful misrepresentation. By pleasure we mean the absence of pain in the body and of trouble in the soul. Is not an unbroken succession of drinking-bouts and of revelry, not sexual love, not the enjoyment of the fish and other delicacies of a luxurious table, which produce a pleasant life; it is sober reasoning, searching out the grounds of every choice and avoidance, and banishing those beliefs through which the greatest tumults take possession of

133:16–35.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

the spirit. Of all this the beginning and the greatest good is prudence... from it spring all the other virtues, for it teaches that we cannot lead a life of pleasure which is not also a life of prudence, honour, and justice; nor lead a life of prudence, honour, and justice, which is not also a life of pleasure. (Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (X, 131–32). Transl. R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1995, vol. II, p. 657.)

133:16–35. As it is evident, these words are to be represented (*vorstellt*) by the reader as spoken by the artist—the painter—Basil Hallward (and as addressed to Harry–Lord Henry Wotton). They appear in chapter I (pp. 14–15 of the 1879 edition).

133:19–20. In the Renaissance, painters in mainland Italy painted mainly frescos—a fresco being a painting obtained by merging paint (dry-powder pigment mixed with water) with lime plaster freshly laid over the surface of a wall, so that, when dry, the plaster and the paint may become indistinguishable from each other, and, therefore, touch-proof.

Due to the fact that the Venetian air is quite humid and replete with salinity, plaster did not set properly there, the paints, as a consequence, adhering poorly to the walls over which they were applied. And thence the need of frequently restoring them.

This gave rise to the use of oil paints on canvas, which began in the 16th century. The so-called “oil paint movement” was led by the painter Giovanni Bellini (c. 1430–1516, and subsequently was much encouraged by the arrival in Venice (in 1475) of the Sicilian painter Antonello da Messina (c. 1430–1749).

133:22. Antinous (l. 22) was a Greek youth from Bithynia (a Roman province in the northwest of Asia Minor, present-day Turkey). He was born c. 111 and died before 130 A. D. He is remembered as the favourite beloved of Hadrian (76–138 A. D.), who was Roman emperor from 117 to 138 A. D.

134:13–14. The German word *Doppelgänger* means literally “the double that goes along”.

134:18–19. The phrase “There goes the devil’s bargain” appears in chapter XVI (p. 281 of the 1879 edition). It is spoken, at the moment Dorian is leaving a bar, by a woman to whom he has tossed a coin, to “encourage” her not to go on talking to him.

134:18–19.

A Novel by Mr. Oscar Wilde (1891)

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

137:14. A glance at the table of contents of *Modern Painting* is enough to let the reader know the treatment of “the modern painting of France” that the book will offer him or her: pp. 2–44: (Pierre Puvis de) CHAVANNES (1824–1898), (Jean François) MILLET (1814–1875), and (Édouard) MANET (1832–1883); pp. 70–83: (Jean-Auguste-Dominique) INGRES (1780–1867) and (Jean-Baptiste-Camille) COROT (1796–1875); pp. 84–96: (Oscar-Claude) MONET (1840–1926), (Alfred) SISLEY (1839–1899), (Camille) PISSARRO (1830–1903), and the Decadence.

137:17–18. “Mr. Moore”—George Augustus Moore (1852–1933), who was born in Ireland—was not only an art critic, but also a novelist, short-story writer, poet, and playwright.—This being the reason why Pater chose to give his review the title “Mr George Moore as an Art Critic”.

Apart from being an Irish landlord and politician, Moore’s father, was an amateur painter. At first George, too, wanted to become a painter, and, when he was 21, left Ireland for Paris, where he studied painting and befriended many of the leading French artists and writers of the day. However, his strongest friendship was with the painter Édouard Manet (1832–1883), who sketched three portraits of him. George Moore later recorded this period of his life in his first autobiography, *Confessions of a Young Man* (1888), as well as in his *Reminiscences of the Impressionist Painters* (1906).

Having concluded that he had no talent for painting, Moore returned to London in 1882, there to begin writing under the influence of such French writers as Honoré de Balzac (1799–1850), Gustave Flaubert (1821–1880), and Émile Zola (1840–1902).—It being, then, no surprise, that his novels introduced into the English fiction of the time a new note of French Naturalism and Realism. *Esther Waters* (1894), his best known novel, became an immediate success. It deals with the

137:14.

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

plight of a servant girl who gives birth to a child out of wedlock, and relates Esther's ensuing hardship and humiliation, over which she triumphs with the help of her love for her child.

Other novels by Moore which merit particular notice are: *A Modern Lover* (1883), *A Drama in Muslin* (1886), *The Lake* (1903), *The Brook Kerith* (1916), *Heloise and Abelard* (1921), and *Ulick and Soracha* (1926).

In 1901, Moore returned to Ireland. There, he worked with the poet W. B. Yeats and with Lady Gregory (Isabella Augusta) in the so-called "Irish Literary Revival", as well as in the founding of Abbey Theatre. As a result, he concentrated his efforts on defining himself as an Irish writer during this period of his life—which he recorded above all in the trilogy *Hail and Farewell!* (*Ave*, 1911; *Salve*, 1912; *Vale*, 1914).

In 1911, after his relations with his compatriots became strained, Moore returned to London, there to continue his work as a writer.

As a short-story writer, Moore is the author of the following collections: *Celibates* (1895), *The Untilled Field* (1903), and *A Story-Teller's Holiday* (1918).

Moore's plays include: *Martin Luther: A Tragedy in Five Acts* (1879), *The Strike at Arlingford: A Play in Three Acts* (1893), *The Bending of the Bough: A Comedy in five Acts* (1900), *The Apostle: A Drama in Three Acts* (1911), *Elizabeth Cooper: A Comedy in Three Acts* (1913), and *The Coming of Gabrielle: A Comedy* (1920).

Moore's production as a poet is slighter, including only *Flowers of Passion* (1878) and *Pagan Poems* (1881).

Although George Moore failed in becoming a recognised painter, he became, in the 1890s, a well-known and influential literature and art reviewer, alongside Arthur Symons, Edmund Gosse and George Saintsbury. He contributed with reviews regularly, particularly to the *Bat* and, later, to the *Speaker*. A selection of his of articles (mainly) on literature was published in *Impressions. And Opinions* (1891)—he having expressed his opinions on literature and writers in *Conversations in Ebury Street* (1924)

Modern Painting (1893), which may be described as an early introduction to French impressionist painting, resulted likewise from what the author himself calls “art journalism”; an expression which he uses in the brief note that opens the book: “The Editor of *The Speaker* allowed me to publish from time to time chapters of a book on art. These chapters have been gathered front the mass of art journalism which had grown about them, and I reprint them in the sequence originally intended.”

137:19. Pater quotes either Thessalonians 4:12 or Corinthians 5:12. In the King James Version, the first versicle reads: “That ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing”; the second reads: “For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?”

At 141:13–14, Pater returns to the idea of those who are “outsiders in the matter of art”, as opposed to “those who in this matter *really know*.” Depending on the reader, of course, the emphasis in “really know” may be likely to raise the question: What does Pater *really mean* here by “art”?

137:23–25. Moore speaks of (Jean-Auguste-Dominique) INGRES (1780–1867) above all in the chapter entitled “Ingres and Corot” (pp. 70–83); of (Jean François) MILLET (1814–1875), above all in the chapter entitled “Chavannes, Millet, and Manet” (pp. 2–44); of (Hilaire Germain Edgar) DEGAS (1834–1917), almost throughout the whole book, but in particular in the chapters titled: “Chavannes, Millet, and Manet” (pp. 2–44), “Monet, Sisley, Pissarro, and the Decadence”, “Art Patrons” (pp. 146–152), and “The New Art Criticism” (pp. 232–248).

137:29–138–1. Moore compares Ingres, as well as Corot, to “old Greek artists” in, for example, the following passage (p. 74): “It is the essentially Greek quality of perfection that brings Corot and Ingres together. They are perfect, as none other since the Greek sculptors has been perfect. Other painters have desired beauty at intervals as passionately as they, none save the Greeks so continuously; and the desire to be merely beautiful seemed, if possible, to absorb the art of Corot even more completely than it did that of Ingres.”

138:4–6. In his essay “Sandro Botticelli,” Pater himself referred to “the faultless nude studies of Ingres”.

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

138:4–6. Pater refers to the *answer* Moore indirectly gives to Whistler’s view “that art” is, “like science, not national, but essentially cosmopolitan”.

First, Moore on Whistler:

Mr. Whistler has shared his life equally between America, France, and England. He is the one solitary example of cosmopolitanism in art, for there is nothing in his pictures to show that they come from the north, the south, the east, or the west. They are compounds of all that is great in Eastern and Western culture. Conscious of this, and fearing that it might be used as an argument against his art, Mr. Whistler threw over the entire history, not only of art, but of the world; and declared boldly that art was, like science, not national, but essentially cosmopolitan; and then, becoming aware of the anomaly of his genius in his generation, Mr. Whistler undertook to explain away the anomaly by ignoring the fifth century B.C. in Athens, the fifteenth century in Italy, and the seventeenth in Holland, and humbly submitting that artists never appeared in numbers like swallows, but singly like aerolites. (p. 3)

Now, Moore’s *answer*:

Now I take it that science differs from art on all these points. Science is not national, it is essentially cosmopolitan. The science of one country is the same as that of another country. It is impossible to tell by looking at it whether the phonograph was invented in England or America. (p. 137)

138:10–14. Pater paraphrases the following statements, by Moore:

To organise something—or, put it differently, to educate some one—is to-day every man's ambition. So long as it is not himself, it matters no jot to him whom he educates. The gipsy under the hedge, the artist painting under a hill, it matters not. A technical school of instruction would enable the gipsy to harness his horse better than he does at present; and the artist would paint much better if he were taught to stipple, and examined by salaried professors in stipple, and given prizes for stippling. The general mind of our century is with education and organisation of every kind, and from this terrible general mind art seems unable to escape. Art, that poor little gipsy whose very condition of existence is freedom, who owns no code of laws, who evades all regulations, who groups himself under no standard, who can live only in disastrous times, when the world's attention is drawn to other things, and allows him life in shelter of the hedges, and dreams in sight of the stars, finds himself forced into a uniform—poor little fellow, how melancholy he looks on his high stool in the South Kensington Museum, and notwithstanding the professors his hand drops from the drawing-board, unable to accomplish the admired stipple. (pp. 131–132)

138:15. Pater once more expresses this idea, “*really* has the secret of”, in 140:17–18: “He seems to be *really* in possession of their ‘secret’ as of Sisley also and Chavannes, of Manet, and of Monet”. In this second case, which occurs immediately after Pater says that “It is perhaps a surprise”, “to find one who is so *hard* in his characterisation of what may be not ungently called “vulgar errors” in matters of art, so reverent and *delicate* when he comes to treat of things *delicate*”—in this second case, the syntax (“their ‘secret’ as of Sisley also and Chavannes”) cannot but evince that its author *really* suspected of some *secret* he *secretly* wished to convey. Almost for sure, then, Pater's repeated use of “secret” in the course of the review (the word reappears at 140:34) has its origin in some train of thought which goes beyond Moore's own use of it—*e.g.*, in these passages:

138:17.

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

“Regarded merely as brushwork, the face of the sage [Thomas Carlyle] could hardly be surpassed; the modelling is that beautiful flat modelling, of which none except Mr. Whistler possesses the *secrets*” (p. 18); “And to speak of transpositions leads us inevitably into consideration of the great *secret* of Corot’s art, his employment of what is known in studios as values” (p. 77). (The italics have been added.)

138:17. *La Source* (*The Spring*) is an oil painting on canvas. It depicts a nude young woman (framed by what appears to be the entrance to a narrow underground corridor) holding a water jar with its opening turned in the direction of the ground. The pose of the nude woman is very much similar to that of Ingres’ depiction of Venus rising from the sea (*Venus Anadyomene*, 1848).

Ingres began work on *La Source* in Florence, around 1820, and completed it only in 1856, in Paris. By that time, Ingres was seventy-six years old, already famous, and president of the *École des Beaux-Arts*.

138:26–28. The German painter, printmaker, and theorist of the German Renaissance Albrecht DÜRER (1471–1528); the German–Swiss painter and printmaker Hans HOLBEIN, the Younger (c. 1497–1543); the Italian painter, sculptor, draughtsman, poet, engineer, architect, and scientist Leonardo DA VINCI (1452–1519).

139:2. Pater refers to Ingres’ painting *La Grande Odalisque* (1814), which, in accordance with its name, depicts a young Turkish concubine lying nude on a sofa with her back turned to the viewer, in whose direction she looks, her head also being turned back.

La Grande Odalisque is one of the first examples in art of “Orientalism”—the West’s fascination with the Muslim world of North Africa and the Near East, which began with Napoleon’s Egyptian campaign (1798–1799); more specifically, with one of its major effects, the dissemination throughout Europe of information and images about the Egypt.

Ingres began and finished the painting while he was staying in Italy—Caroline Murat, Napoleon’s sister and Queen of Naples, having commissioned it.

139:5. Pater refers to the fifth chapter of the book: “Ingres and Corot” (pp. 70–83).

139:6. “Barbizon” refers to the Barbizon school of painters, which was active roughly from 1830 through 1870, and takes its name from the village of Barbizon, France, on the edge of the Forest of Fontainebleau, where its members gathered—most of their works being landscape painting.

The leaders of the Barbizon school were: Théodore ROUSSEAU (1812–1867), Charles-François DAUBIGNY (1817–1878), Jules DUPRÉ (1811–1889), Constant TROYON (1810–1865), Charles JACQUE (1813–1894), and Narcisse Virgilio DÍAZ (1807–1876).

Other painters, however, became associated with the school. It is the case with Jean François MILLET (1814–1875), who lived in Barbizon from 1849 on, and, as Pater states, with Jean-Baptiste-Camille COROT (1796–1875).

Corot first came to Barbizon in the spring of 1829, to paint in the Forest of Fontainebleau, and returned there in the autumn of 1830 and the summer of 1831—to make drawings and oil studies for his two paintings named *View of the Forest of Fontainebleau*, which he intended for the Salons of 1830 and 1831.

While in Barbizon, he met and worked with the members of the school, thus having become associated with it.

139:9. The Dutch Golden Age painter, printmaker and draughtsman Rembrandt Harmenszoon van Rijn (1606–1669), who usually is simply known as Rembrandt.

139:10–20. The passage Pater quotes here is part of the fifth chapter of the book (“Ingres and Corot”), and appears on page 79. It is preceded by the following words: “In Rembrandt, the colour is brown and a white faintly tinted with bitumen; in Claude [Lorrain (c. 1600–1682)], the colour is blue, faintly flushed with yellow in the middle sky, and yet none has denied the right of these painters to be considered colourists.”

139:23–31. This passage also appears on page 79, almost immediately after the one Pater transcribes before quoting it. It is preceded by the following words: “Corot and Rembrandt, as Dutilleux pointed out, arrived at the same goal by absolutely different ends. He saw clearly, although he could not express

140:7–8.

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

himself quite clearly, that, above all painters, Rembrandt and Corot excelled in that mode of pictorial expression known as values, or shall I say chiaroscuro, for in truth he who has said values has hinted chiaroscuro.”

140:7–8. For the use, here, of “secret”, see above, note to 138:15; for Sisley, Chavannes, Manet, and Monet, see above, note to 137:14.

140:9–11. Pater’s second quotation in these lines (“He is ‘the only painter to whom the word *impressionism* may be reasonably applied’”) has the warrant of Moore’s words—since Moore states the following (p. 84): “Impressionism is a word that has lent itself to every kind of misinterpretation, for in its exact sense all true painting is penetrated with impressionism, but, to use the word in its most modern sense—that is to say, to signify the rapid noting of illusive appearance—Monet is the only painter to whom it may be reasonably applied.

However, Pater’s first quotation (“Monet... paints ‘in a series of little dots’”) lacks such a warrant—for Moore nowhere discusses pointillism in connection with Monet; the words “in a series of little dots” being used by him in relation to Seurat, Signac, Anquetin, “a galaxy of lesser light”, and Pissarro:

The first of this new generation was Seurat, Seurat begot Signac, Signac begot Anquetin, and Anquetin has begotten quite a galaxy of lesser lights, of whom I shall not speak in this article—of whom it is not probable that I shall ever speak.

It was in an exhibition held in Rue Lafitte in ‘81 or ‘82 that the new method, which comprised two most radical reforms—an execution achieved entirely with the point of the brush and the division of the tones—was proclaimed. Or should I say reformation, for the execution by a series of dots is implicit in the theory of the division of the tones? How well I remember being attracted towards an end of the room, which was filled with a series of most singular pictures. There must have been at least ten pictures of yachts in full sail. They were all drawn in profile, they were all painted in the very clearest tints,

white skies and white sails hardly relieved or explained with shadow, and executed in a series of minute touches, like mosaic. Ten pictures of yachts all in profile, all in full sail, all unrelieved by any attempt at atmospheric effect, all painted *in a series of little dots!*

Great as was my wonderment, it was tenfold increased on discovering that only five of these pictures were painted by the new man, Seurat, whose name was unknown to me; the other five were painted by my old friend Pissarro (pp. 88–89). (The italics have been added.)

140:12–16. These words are part of the fifth chapter of the book (“Ingres and Corot”), and appear on page 82.

140:18–25. “...these chapters have certainly this merit: that...they arouse *the general reader*, lost perhaps in a general sleep of conventional ideas, at the very least to combat *so incisive a visitor*,—put up *his back* perhaps by a claim for unfamiliar views; challenge *him* to come honestly to convictions for himself, different enough, it may be from Mr. Moore’s.” (The italics have been added.)

Who is who here?

Given the syntax, “so incisive a visitor” cannot but refer to “Mr. Moore”; therefore, “his back” (in the phrase “put up his back”, which seems to provoke the reading: “put back *his*”) cannot but be, likewise, “Mr. Moore’s”—who “claim[s] for unfamiliar views”? However, who is to be “challenge[d] to come honestly to convictions for himself”? Naturally, the reader, who is thought to be “lost perhaps in a general sleep of conventional ideas”—the syntax, therefore, forcing this reading: “...these chapters have certainly this merit: that...they arouse the general reader ...challenge him to come honestly to convictions for himself”. However, is there a way to avoid the suggestion that Pater meant to say: “put up Mr. Moore’s back perhaps by a claim for unfamiliar views; challenge Mr. Moore *to come* honestly to convictions for himself, different enough, it may be from Mr. Moore’s”?

140:29. The English painters Sir Joshua REYNOLDS (1723–1792) and John CONSTABLE (1776–1837).

141:4-6. **141:4-6.** The English painters Sir Joshua REYNOLDS (1723-1792), the Flemish painter Peter RUBENS (1577-1640); the Dutch painter Jacob van RUISDAEL (c. 1628-1682); the American, United Kingdom based, painter James WHISTLER (1834-1903); the American expatriate artist John Singer SARGENT (1856-1925).

Mr. George Moore as an Art Critic (1893)

II. Articles

English at the Universities (1886)

147:5. “The university” refers, of course, to the University of Oxford, with its more than thirty colleges.

147:29. “All undergraduates, no matter which final honour school they intended to read, had to spend at the very minimum the first year working for a predominantly classical examination. For Oxford scientists this represented a particular grievance, and some looked to faculty bifurcation, creating a distinct science degree with its own preliminary requirements shorn of Greek, as a solution.” (M. G. Brock and M. C. Curt-hoys, eds. *The History of the University of Oxford*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997, vol. VI (*Nineteenth-Century Oxford. Part I*), p. 355.)

147:5.

English at the Universities (1886)

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

151:2. The French novelist Gustave Flaubert (1821–1880). (See vol. 1, pp. 89–95 and 117–127; and above, pp. 115–128 and 151–167.)

151:5–7. *Sérénus, histoire d'un martyr—Contes d'autre foi et d'aujourd'hui* is composed of "Sérénus", its title story (pp. 1–61), and ten *Contes d'autre foi et d'aujourd'hui* (*Stories of the Past and of Today*): (i) "La Mère Sainte-Agathe" (pp. 65–81), (ii) "L'Ainée" (pp. 83–100), (iii) "En Nourrice" (pp. 101–116), (iv) "Pauvre Âme" (pp. 117–129); (v) "Les Trois Manières de Garnoteau" (pp. 131–143); (vi) "La Grosse Caisse" (pp. 145–160); (vii) "Les Deux Saints" (pp. 161–172); (viii) "Les Funérailles de Firdousi" (pp. 173–193); (ix) "Les Deux Fleurs" (pp. 195–248); (x) "Boun" (pp. 249–286).

Most of Lemaître's *Stories of the Past and of Today* are divided into titleless sections—an occurrence which is totally ignored by Pater, whose translations frequently encompass passages from two different sections without the reader receiving any notice of the fact. The lack of titles does not apply, however, to the story "Sérénus"—which is divided into four titled sections: I. "Deux Martyrs" ("Two Martyrs"), pp. 3–13; II. "Manuscrit de Sérénus" ("The Manuscript of Sérénus"), pp. 14–49; III. "Les Scrupules de Timothée" ("The Scruples of Thimotheus"), pp. 49–51; "Saint Mark le Romain" ("Saint Mark, the Roman"), pp. 51–61.

151:7–8. *Stories of the Past and of Today* is, of course, Pater's translation of the second part of the original title: *Conte d'autre foi et d'aujourd'hui*. Later on (156:17), Pater uses this shortened—and, at the same time, somewhat different—translation: *Tales of Other Days*. Still some more lines ahead, Pater refers to one story, "Les Deux Fleurs", as "another Story of Other Days" (156:30).

151:8. The "two slight exceptions are: "Les Trois Manières de Garnoteau" ("Garnoteau's Three Manners") and "La

151:2.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

151:8.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Grosse Caisse" ("The Bass Drum", but with play on the double meaning of the French phrase "La Grosse Caisse": "The Big Box"—"The Big Box").

Both of them may, indeed, be considered stories to which Pater could call the reader's attention only by means of qualifying them as "exceptions".

"Les Trois Manières de Garnoteau" is a story about a painter, Garnoteau, who specialises in painting nude nymphs, but who, after having married, is forbidden by his wife (Célestine) to paint the nymphs' thighs and pudenda from a nude female model other than herself.

As a result, Garnoteau begins to paint the torsos of his nymphs from different nude female torsos, and their bottoms and legs from those of his wife—his painted nymphs becoming notorious for the strange effect produced by the assembling of their plump torsos with their too lean legs and bottoms.

After Garnoteau's wife dies, he starts painting again from head to toe of different nude female models—but with a vengeance. Thenceforth, his nymphs become notorious for the strange effect produced by the assembling of their too lean torsos with their plump legs and bottoms.

The story ends with a joke which explains its overall jocular meaning.

According to M. N. Bouillet's *Dictionnaire Universel d'Histoire et de Géographie* (1842), three periods may be distinguished in the painting of the Renaissance painter Raphael Sanzio—the first period being that in the course of which Raphael is told to have but imitated his master Perugino; the second, that in the course of which Raphael is told to have become an original painter; the third, that in the course of which Raphael is told to have surpassed himself.

According to a friend of the narrator of "Les Trois Manières de Garnoteau", the painter Garnoteau, too, might be distinguished as a painter having *trois manières* ("three manners"): his first, pre-marital *manner* would consist in the adequate assembling of torsos, rumps, and legs of all sorts; his second, marital *manner* would consist in the painting of torsos

lacking rumps and legs; his third, post-marital *manner* would consist in the painting of rumps and legs lacking torsos. 151:8.

The following is the last paragraph of the story (p. 141):

“Tu connais les trois manières de Raphaël, d’après le dictionnaire Bouillet. Première manière: il se cherche. Seconde manière: il s’est trouvé. Troisième manière: il se dépasse. On dira de Garnoteau qu’il eut aussi trois manières. Il a peint d’abord des assemblages de torsos, de croupes et de jambes quelconques, puis des torsos sans croupes ni jambes, puis des jambes et des croupes sans torsos; et ces trois manières correspondent aux trois périodes de sa vie: avant Célestine, sous Célestine, et après Célestine.”

(“You are aware of Raphael’s three manners, according to Bouillet’s dictionary. First manner: he searches for *himself*. Second manner: he has found *himself*. Third manner: he surpasses *himself*. One could say that Garnoteau, too, had three manners. At first, he painted assemblings of torsos, rumps, and legs of all sorts; afterwards, he painted torsos with neither rumps nor legs; then, he painted rumps and legs without torsos.—And these three manners correspond to the three periods of his *life*: *before* Célestine, *under* Célestine, and *after* Célestine.”) (The italics have been added.)

On its turn, “La Grosse Caisse” is the story of a widowed father (M. Eusèbe Taponnier) who, after having deprived himself for years of all comforts, to be able to give his motherless daughter the best of everything, has been left alone by her quite some years before the time-setting of the narrative—as a result of her having discovered her propensities to become a big *box*.

Alone, dreading above all the solitude of his after-office hours, M. Eusèbe Taponnier decides to play the drums (the *bass drum*) every night in a cheap nightclub.—And, one night, a new performer on the club’s stage is unexpectedly announced. Alas! it is his lost little queen, who now calls herself

151:8.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Régina, and who, every time she comes to the refrain "Celui que j'aime, (ter), C'est la gross' caisse" ("The one I love—— is the bass drum"), smiles a huge smile, punctuates her sung words with a pause, and points the finger to the bass drum (*big box*) her unbeknownst father is playing.—To his great confusion and dismay!

After a while, reflecting, M. Eusèbe Taponnier comes to the conclusion that the new performer is, in effect, his lost little queen, who now calls herself "queen" in Latin (*regina*). And, as a result, decides to go and wait for her at the performers exit door of the club.

She effusively calls him "dad!"—as if but a short interval had passed since the last time they had been together, —and introduces to him the man who accompanies her as "one of my good friends".

They start meeting each other again, he coming to her house every morning for breakfast *à deux*: father and daughter *tet à tet*.

However, he soon finds out that too many "good friends" with a big key to a big box were required to fill her beloved *grosse caisse*. And, displeased to see so many "good friends" play with her *bass drum*, admonishes her, trying to persuade her that just one or two of them would be more than enough to fill to the brim her beat-the-odds big box.

Afterwards, M. Taponnier regrets having meddled with her daughter's private affairs. And, the day after, once more comes to her house, for breakfast *à deux*, as usual.—Only to be told by one of her "good friends" that she is not available.

He then knocks at her door six days in a row, and six times in a row returns home for breakfast once more alone. At the seventh day, the doorkeeper informs him that his daughter has gone ... on tour.

Soon after, the nightclub's presenter appears on stage and announces that, being indisposed, M^{me} Régina will not, after all, perform.

The piano player presses the keys on the keyboard, to make known that the show is about to begin. Marionette-like, the dancers make their entrance one after the other. And,

having adjusted his glasses on his nose, M. Taponnier begins playing the bass drum—his arms keeping the tempo with machine-like movements.

151:10–11. The French, and afterwards British, painter, etcher, sculptor, and medallist Alphonse Legros (1837–1911), who was born in Dijon, moved to London in 1863, and later became a British citizen. Pater also mentions Legros in (i) *The Renaissance* ("The School of Giorgione"), (ii) *Miscellaneous Studies* ("Art Notes in North Italy"), and (iii) *Essays from "The Guardian"* ("Ferdinand Fabre"):

(i) That the mere matter of a poem, for instance, its subject, namely, its given incidents or situation—that the mere matter of a picture, the actual circumstances of an event, the actual topography of a landscape—should be nothing without the form, the spirit, of the handling, that this form, this mode of handling, should become an end in itself, should penetrate every part of the matter: this is what all art constantly strives after, and achieves in different degrees.

This abstract language becomes clear enough, if we think of actual examples. In an actual landscape we see a long white road, lost suddenly on the hill-verge. That is the matter of one of the etchings of M. Alphonse Legros: only, in this etching, it is informed by an indwelling solemnity of expression, seen upon it or half-seen, within the limits of an exceptional moment, or caught from his own mood perhaps, but which he maintains as the very essence of the thing, throughout his work. (p. 135)

(ii) If the name of [Bernardino] Luini's [c. 1470s–1523] master, [Ambrogio] Borgognone [c. 1480–1532], is no proof of northern extraction, a northern temper is nevertheless a marked element of his genius—something of the patience, especially, of the masters of Dijon or Bruges, nowhere more clearly than in the two groups of male and female heads in the National Gallery, family

151:15.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

groups, painted in the attitude of worship, with a lowly religious sincerity which may remind us of the contemporary work of M. Legros. (p. 96)

(iii) It is to the priestly character, in truth, that Fabre always comes back for tranquillizing effect; and if his peasants have something akin to Wordsworth's, his priests may remind one of those solemn ecclesiastical heads familiar in the paintings and etchings of M. Alphonse Legros. (pp. 133–134)

151:15. See next note.

151:18–19. François Élie Jules Lemaître (1853–1914), the author of the book of tales that Pater was “pointing out to English readers” (vol. I, 151:5), was a French short-story writer, playwright, poet, and literary critic.

Lemaître worked as a schoolmaster before he became professor at the University of Grenoble, in 1883, a post he resigned in 1884, to devote himself to writing. He wrote a vast number of critical essays, which he published in the *Journal des Débats*, and which he collected under the titles *Les Contemporains, Études et Portraits Littéraires* (in 8 volumes, 1885–1899, 1918), and *Impressions du Théâtre* (in 11 volumes, 1888–1898, 1920).

Although he contributed regularly to the *Journal des Débats* and the *Revue des Deux Mondes* as a drama critic, he was a “French journalist” (vol. I, 151:15) only in the sense that Pater, the critic and reviewer, might have been considered to be (also) an “English journalist”.

Lemaître also presented and published lectures, among them one on Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1907), one on Jean Racine (1908), another on François Fénelon (1910), and still another on François-René de Chateaubriand (1912).

Lemaître's own plays were collected under the title *Théâtre de Jules Lemaître* (in 3 volumes, 1906). His best collections of stories include *Sérénus* (1886) and *En marge des vieux livres* (1905–1907), a compilation of tales created around characters from the classic works of literature and history.

As a poet, Lemaître wrote and published two books: *Les Médaillons* (1880) and *Petites Orientales* (1883).

Pater manifestly (and deservedly) thought highly of Lemaître, in particular in regard of the story "Sérénus" (1886), which, curiously, has much in common with *Marius the Epicurean* (1885).

151:20. Of the tales the book contains, the longest (61 pages) is "Sérénus"; the shortest (11 pages) is "Les deux Saints".

152:4–8. The "guileless orphan-girl" is called Lydie de Frégeneuilles; the "hero", "a very intellectual young Parisian", and the narrator of the story, is generally addressed as "Monsieur", and only once as "monsieur Berthier" (p. 80)—although his narration begins with the following statement (page 65): "Cela a commencé, me dit mon ami Maxime Berthier, de la façon la plus banale du monde" ("It all began, my friend Maxime Berthier tells me, with the greatest possible banality.")

152:5. "La Mère Sainte-Agathe": "Mother Saint-Agathe".

152:8–11. "Elle était jeune encore: trente ans, peut-être trente-cinq; mais les années des religieuses, quand elles sont jolies et très saintes, les embaument plutôt qu'elles ne les vieillissent." (p. 71) ("She was still young: thirty years, perhaps thirty-five; but years rather embalm the religious, when they are pretty and live really holy lives, than make them older.")

152:18–27. Pater translates here the following passage:

Le jardin était grand—et propre! d'une propreté de chapelle de couvent. Une allée de tilleuls, aussi exactement alignés que des cierges, conduisait à une terrasse qui donnait sur la Loire et d'où l'on découvrait un aimable paysage tourangeau: entre les rives molles semées de frissonnants bouquets de peupliers, le fleuve bleu étalé comme un lac; des îlots blonds et des touffes d'osier bleuâtre; à l'horizon un pont très long aux arches délicates, d'un gris d'argent, et, par delà, des rangées d'arbres vaguement violets: tout cela très doux, avec des contours fondus et des teintes d'aquarelle, sous un ciel léger, d'un bleu pâle." (pp. 69–70)

152:29–30.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

152:29–30. "C'était exquis, ces conversations avec la sœur, d'autant plus exquis que j'achevais alors un volume de critique mêlée de fantaisie, où je mettais le plus possible de renanisme, d'impressionnisme et de raillerie parisienne, à la fois ou tour à tour. Et souvent aussi c'était après la lecture de quelque livre pervers que je me rendais à ces entrevues blanches." (p. 79). Pater translates this passage some lines further on (153:7–13).

152:33–35. Pater translates here the following passage:

"Un jour, je lus au bas d'un de ces billets ce post-scriptum: La mère Sainte-Agathe dit que je ne mets pas assez de chaleur dans mes lettres. Ah! mon ami, j'en ai pourtant beaucoup au cœur, je vous assure, mais je suis sans doute trop petite fille pour savoir le dire." (pp. 74–75)

153:3–28. Here, Pater translates, and conflates, two separate passages. The first passage (ll. 3–13), appears on page 79; the second passage (ll. 13–28) appears on page 81.

Sans trop m'en rendre compte, je traitais Lydie comme une enfant et, toutes les fois que je disais quelque chose d'un peu sérieux, je m'adressais à la mère Sainte-Agathe.

C'était exquis, ces conversations avec la sœur, d'autant plus exquis que j'achevais alors un volume de critique mêlée de fantaisie, où je mettais le plus possible de renanisme, d'impressionnisme et de raillerie parisienne, à la fois ou tour à tour. Et souvent aussi c'était après la lecture de quelque livre pervers que je me rendais à ces entrevues blanches. (p. 79)

Au moment de me retirer: "Eh bien! à demain," dis-je à la sœur, "et surtout n'oubliez pas le cahier d'honneur!" Et, comme j'embrassais Lydie, je vis qu'elle avait des larmes dans les yeux, "Vous pleurez, Lydie? vous ai-je fait de la peine?" Elle me regarda longuement, sérieusement, et ce regard n'était plus celui d'une petite fille. Êtes-vous

bien sûr," me dit-elle à voix basse, "que c'est encore pour moi que vous venez?..."

Elle me poursuivait tout le soir et toute la nuit, la question de la petite Lydie. Elle m'avait révélé malgré moi le fond de mon cœur. Je sentis, avec grand trouble, que depuis quelque temps je venais en effet pour la mère Sainte-Agathe et que le charme d'innocence de ma fiancée était épuisé... Oui, c'était fini, bien fini. Je n'osai pas aller au couvent le lendemain ni les jours qui suivirent. M'attendit-elle? Je n'y suis plus retourné, jamais. (p. 81)

153:29. "L'Ainée": "The Eldest".

154:5. "Les Deux Saints": "The Two Saints".

154:9–19. Pater translates here the following passage:

La petit village de Champignol-les-Raisins avait un vieux curé, une vieille église et, dans cette église, un vieux saint.

Le saint, c'était sainte Vincent, patron des vigneron. Il était en bois, semblait taillé à coups de serpe, avait un gros ventre, une large face naïvement peinte en vermillon et qui respirait la bonhomie et la gaieté, une trogne de vigneron au temps des vendanges. Il n'était pas joli, joli: mais le curé et ses ouailles étaient habitués à sa figure. Le bon saint jouissait de la plus grande considération dans la paroisse, et il le méritait bien, car il faisait couramment des miracles. (pp. 161–162)

154:29–30. "En Nourrice": "In Child Care" ("Wet-nursed").

154:31–32. "Il est beau," dit-elle. "Il s'appellera Georges, et je veux qu'il soit très heureux." (p. 103)

155:3–156:16. Here, Pater translates, and conflates, two separate passages.

Donc le petit Parisien avait eu la destinée inexplicable, affreuse, de ces petits enfants qui souffrent et crient pendant quelques mois et qui meurent sans y

avoir rien compris. Une nuit il n'avait pas voulu s'endormir. Il avait refusé la panade et le biberon; il avait même refusé le sein de Rosalie, le festin offert trop tard. Ses yeux convulsés roulaient, montraient leur blanc. Ses joues devenaient terreuses; il agonisait. Puis vers le matin, au lieu de cris, il avait poussé de petits gémissements, presque des plaintes de grande personne. Enfin il s'était tu et n'avait plus bougé. Sa mère était bien heureuse de n'avoir pas vu cela.

Il pleuvait à verse quand M. et Mme Loisel arrivèrent au village. La jeune femme, qui pleurait depuis Paris, n'en pouvait plus, chancelante dans sa robe mouillée, les yeux rouges sous le crêpe.

Rosalie, dès le matin, avait envoyé Totor et Fred chez leur grand mère. Elle aussi pleurait, sincèrement, ma foi! et si fort que Mme Loisel alla tout de suite l'embrasser.

Puis la mère regarda, dans le berceau d'osier, le petit cadavre. Georges portait pour la première fois sa belle robe toute salie par Fred. Il était d'une maigreur effrayante; des joues de vieille cire, le nez aminci, les paupières bleuâtres. Sa petite bouche entrouverte, pâle avec un peu d'écume au fond, était avivée de violet sur les bords.

"Pauvre petit! comme il est changé!" disait la mère en sanglotant.

M. Loisel regardait l'enfant mort, attentivement, sans rien dire. Un doute horrible lui venait...

"Allons!" dit Rosalie, "ne regardez plus! Ça vous fait trop de peine." Tout à coup Totor entra, sans prévenir, tenant Fred dans ses deux bras comme un paquet.

Rosalie devint blême. Ce nigaud de Totor expliqua que sa grand mère était malade et qu'elle n'avait pas voulu d'eux.

Et Fred, coiffé d'un des bonnets de Georges, serré dans une de ses brassières, chaussé de ses souliers blancs, Fred crevant de santé, Fred bon garçon et tout frétilant dans les bras de Totor, se mit à sourire au monsieur et à la dame." (pp. 112-114)

Le menuisier vint; puis le curé, avec un enfant de chœur criblé de taches de son et portant une vieille croix désargentée qui branlait sur son manche.

Ils sont navrants, ces enterrements de nourrissons Parisiens qu'on voit traverser parfois les rues désertes des villages, traînant, derrière le cercueil grand comme une boîte à violon, un monsieur et une dame en deuil qui passent en se tamponnant les yeux tandis que les batteurs les regardent curieusement du seuil des granges, et qui vont laisser un morceau de leur cœur dans le coin d'un cimetière perdu.

Quand la première pelletée de terre tomba, Mme Loisel, à qui sa maladie avait fait oublier l'ancien et l'unique baiser donné à Georges, jeta ce cri: "Ah! mon pauvre petit! je ne t'aurai donc pas embrassé vivant!" (p. 115)

156:17. *Tales of Other Days*: see above, note to 151:7–8.

156:17–18. "Boun" is the name of the main character of the story, which begins thus (p. 250): "Il y avait autrefois à Bagdad une petite fille sans parents, née on ne sait où, vivant on ne sait comment, et qui s'appelait Boun on ne sait pourquoi." ("Once upon a time, there was in Bagdad a little girl who had no parents, who had been born it is not known where, who lived it is not known how, and who was called Boun it is not known why.")

"Les Funérailles de Firdosi": "The Funeral of Firdosi".

156:25. The full title of *Rasselas* is: *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*. It consists of an apologue about bliss and ignorance written by the English poet, literary critic, biographer, editor, and lexicographer Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) and published in 1759 as *The Prince of Abissinia: A Tale*.

Hoping to learn how he should live, Rasselas meets with men of varied occupations and interests—scholars, astronomers, shepherds, hermits, and poets,—and explores their manner of life. He finds that complete happiness is elusive and that "while you are making the choice of life, you neglect to live"—which is, perhaps, the most important moral to be drawn from the tale.

156:28–29.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Rasselas, which was supposedly written with the impending expenses of Johnson's mother's funeral in mind, explores and exposes, therefore, the vanity of the human search for complete happiness.

For Pater, "compositions after the manner of *Rasselas*" are, here, above all, compositions with "an Oriental setting".

156:28–29. The "charming story of Boun" is a story about a four-year old child called Boun, her marriage to an old, rich merchant (Silounis), her passionate love for two young men (Touriri and Bigoudi), one after the other, and the magic ring which she is given by the Lace Fairy, when she has already become a sixteen-year old maiden and is about to marry—which ring has the magic power of allowing Boun to become a four-year old child again, and to regain her adulthood, for four times.

Saddened by realising that her love for Bigoudi—who is in love with another girl, Maya,— is not requited, she throws the ring away while she still remains a child for the fourth time. The Lace Fairy, lacking the power both to find the ring and to make Boun become grown-up again, decides to make her soul, too, return to childhood—at a time when Boun's former husband, Silounis, has become quite content with playing the role of her loving father.

The story ends thus (pp. 285–85):

Un matin, le vieux Silounis, s'approchant du berceau de Boun, la trouva endormie du grand sommeil. L'ange de la mort, envoyé par la Fée aux dentelles, était venu prendre son âme pendant la nuit, sans lui faire mal, sans même la réveiller.

(One morning, old Silounis, approaching Boun's cradle, found her sleeping the great sleep. Having been sent by the Lace Fairy, the angel of death had taken possession of her soul during the night, without harming her, without even having awaken her.)

156:30. “Les Deus Fleurs”: “The Two Flowers”.

156:31. “St. Julien l’Hospitalier” refers to the story by Flaubert titled “Légend de Saint Julien l’Hospitalier” (“The Legend of Saint Julian the Hospitalier”), the second of the three stories which compose his book *Trois Contes* (*Three Tales*), which was published in 1877, after having appeared in instalments in two periodicals during the month of April of the same year. The two other stories are: “Un cœur simple” (“A Simple Heart”) and “Hérodiad” (see above, note to 119:16).

In accordance with its title, Flaubert’s “Légend de Saint Julien l’Hospitalier” is a story about the Roman Catholic saint Julian the Hospitaller.

At birth, Julian is predicted to be destined to do great things (to become a *magnificent* man). However, while his father is told that he will marry a great emperor’s daughter, his mother is told that he will become a saint.

As a youth, Julian becomes cruel to animals, and, in consequence, in love with hunting. One day, he brings about the massacre of a herd of deer, and, as a result, a stag causes to fall upon him the curse that he will commit his own parents to death.

Julian decides never again to hunt, and to leave home, in order to escape the curse. He joins a band of vagrants, who grow into a huge army under his control, and makes a name for himself. Then, an emperor whom he has saved from death gives him his daughter in marriage, as well as a castle for their abode.

One night, Julian feels compelled to hunt once more, and leaves the castle for some time, to kill whatever animals he chance upon.

While he is away, his parents, who had long been searching for him, arrive at the castle. When night arrives, his wife directs them to go to sleep in Julian’s bed.—And, when he returns home, he kills them, thinking to have found his own wife in bed with another man.

The stag’s curse thus having been enacted, Julian gives his wife all his possessions and once again leaves home—this time, to live in the wild and become a beggar.

156:30.

M. Lemaître’s “Serenus”, and Other Tales (1887)

156:33–36.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Having arrived near a deserted river-crossing, Julian decides to live a life of service, dedicated to ferrying people across the river. One stormy day, a leper appears, who wishes to cross the river and asks for Julian's help. The storm has made the river become rough, but Julian does not give up. Once across, the leper is not yet content: he asks Julian for food and wine, for Julian's own bed, and, finally, for the warmth of Julian's body.

After Julian has given the lepper, without hesitation, everything he has asked for, the leper reveals himself to be Jesus Christ—who, there and then, takes Julian with him to heaven.

156:33–36. Pater translates from the last paragraph of the story:

Cette histoire, dit Simon Godard, nous montre clairement qu'aux yeux de Dieu même, charité vaut pureté. Le meilleur est d'avoir les deux, qui peut. Mais qui n'a la seconde, tâche au moins d'avoir la première. Amen! (p. 248)

157:2. The comparison implicit between the "satiric effect of the half-sceptical chaplain" and the satirical effect of no few of the characters portrayed by the great English poet Geoffrey Chaucer (c. 1340s–1400) cannot but be justified for anyone who may happen to be familiar, for instance, with the "General Prologue" of *The Canterbury Tales*, as well as with many of such tales themselves.

157:6–159:4. Pater translates the following passage of "Les Deus Fleurs":

Simon Godard, juché sur son antique mule et le ventre ballotté comme une outre pleine, cheminait d'ordinaire aux côtés du chevalier, dont il aimait la candeur, et souvent ils devisaient ensemble pour tromper la longueur du voyage.

"Serons-nous bientôt en Palestine?" lui demanda un jour messire Ory, qui n'était pas grand clerc en géographie.

"Dans un mois d'ici, nous en approcherons si rien de fâcheux ne survient," répondit le chapelain. "Mais nous

serons moitié moins à l'arrivée qu'au départ. On meurt beaucoup dans Tost, par disette, fatigue et fièvres malignes. Je ne sais si vous vous en apercevez, étant toujours perdu dans vos songeries; mais nous laissons derrière nous quantité de nos compagnons, et, comme on n'a pas le temps de les enterrer bien creux, les chiens et les corbeaux leur font une autre sépulture."

"Je ne plains pas ceux-là," dit Ory, "qui nous devancent dans le saint paradis de Dieu. Le corps est une prison et la matière en est vile; ce qu'il devient n'importe mie."

"Il est des moments, messire, où je ne distingue pas clairement la prison du prisonnier. Cela m'afflige que l'on meure tant. Et je ne vois pas non plus nettement à quoi servent toutes ces morts. Nous mettrons un an et plus à prendre deux ou trois villes, et, quand nous serons vainqueurs, il ne restera de nous qu'une poignée d'hommes. Les maladies nous achèveront; les infidèles n'auront même pas la peine de nous mettre dehors, et ce sera à recommencer."

"Voire; mais les murs de Jéricho ne sont tombés qu'à la septième journée, et ce n'est encore la septième croisade."

"Mais est-il bien nécessaire que les chrétiens possèdent le tombeau du seigneur Jésus, qui n'est d'ailleurs qu'un sépulcre vide, où rien n'est resté de lui, et qu'il souffre depuis plus de mille ans être détenu par les infidèles? Et ne croyez vous pas, seigneur chevalier, que ce sol leur appartienne aussi légitimement qu'aux Français le sol de France?"

"Ne parlez pas ainsi, monsieur le chapelain, car telle raillerie ne sied à un homme d'Église ni à un saint comme vous êtes."

"Je ne raille pas, messire; mais la volonté de Dieu ne m'apparaît aussi manifestement qu'à vous. Cela me gêne que Dieu ait donné à ses pires ennemis plus de richesses qu'aux chrétiens, une industrie plus savante, de meilleurs engins de guerre et la victoire sur ses fidèles serviteurs."

"Ignorez-vous donc, maître Godard, que leur richesse

leur vient du démon et qu'elle ne sert qu'à les entretenir dans leurs mœurs abominables? Et si Dieu a permis qu'ils nous vainquissent quelquefois, c'est qu'il éprouve ceux qu'il aime, vu que l'épreuve nous purifie et nous élève jusqu'à lui."

"Vous seriez, messire, un fort bon théologien; et je serais, moi, un très mauvais chevalier. Si, d'aventure, j'étais seigneur au pays de France, je crois que je n'en sortirais guère. Pendant que les seigneurs vont se faire occire au loin, les manants payent mal leurs redevances; les bourgeois, dans les villes, entassent les écus et, comme les seigneurs ont besoin d'argent pour si lointaines expéditions, se font vendre toutes sortes de libertés et privilèges. Je ne m'en plains, étant du peuple; mais je dis que c'est grande duperie à un noble homme de se croiser."

"Je sais, monsieur le chapelain, que vous parlez contre votre pensée et que tout cela n'est que pour me tenter. Mais tels discours ne me touchent pas, moi qui n'ai qu'un petit castel, peu de terres et point de villes. Puis, cela ne me chagrine point que d'autres chrétiens tâchent de rendre meilleure leur basse et dure condition. Quant est de moi, je ne suis pas un drapier ni un marchand d'épices pour ne sortir de mon trou et ne faire état que de l'argent et des jouissances corporelles. C'est d'autre chose plus haute et de plus grand prix que je suis en quête. Je ne suis point, monsieur le chapelain, de même pâte que vos bourgeois et vos vilains. Je ne saurais demeurer longtemps en un même lieu ni borner ma félicité aux choses qu'on peut voir et toucher. J'aime la demoiselle de Blanc-Lys, et je la quitte sans savoir si je reviendrai. Je vais tenter une aventure que vous dites inutile et folle et dont il ne me reviendra nul profit lors même qu'elle réussirait: pourquoi fais-je ainsi? Je ne sais, je ne puis faire autrement et je sens que cela plaît à Dieu et que je suis son ouvrier."

Maître Simon Godard, encore qu'il fût d'esprit retors, ne trouva plus rien à répondre, sinon: "Amen!" (pp. 218–222)

157:31. According to the Hebrew Bible (Joshua 5:13–6:27), the Israelites conquered the Canaanite city of Jericho when they arrived in the Promised Land. The walls of Jericho are told to have collapsed at the sounds of the people shouting and of the ram's horns of Joshua's army. Nonetheless, it appears to have been proved that Jericho's world-famous fortifications permanently collapsed around 1550 B. C., at the end of the Middle Bronze Age and, therefore, well before the time assumed for Joshua's conquest (the 13th century B. C.)

159:5. "Pauvre Âme": "Poor Soul".

159:8–22. Pater translates the first paragraph of "Pauvre Âme":

Il fallait avoir pitié de toutes les douleurs, le cœur et la vie d'un honnête homme n'y suffiraient pas. On commencerait par plaindre les souffrances violentes en tragiques et qui éclatent aux yeux. Mais les autres? celles qui sont modestes? celles qui se voilent de douceur et d'une apparente sérénité? Il est des destinées silencieuses, étouffées, où la douleur est si secrète et si égale dans sa continuité, où elle fait si peu de bruit qu'on ne songe pas à la plaindre. Pourtant rien n'est plus digne de compassion que ces cœurs inquiets et solitaires, avides de se donner et que personne n'a voulu prendre, qui ont prodigué des trésors inaperçus et stériles, et que la mort emporte, extérieurement intacts, mais déchirés en dedans, car ils se sont dévorés eux-mêmes. (pp. 117–118)

160:10–161:13. Pater translates (in his own way and omitting some lines here and there) the following passage of "Pauvre Âme":

Mme de Maucroix avait pris l'habitude de suivre les offices du dimanche dans la chapelle des Dominicains. C'était plus doux, plus chaud, plus intime que dans les églises. Beaucoup de femmes élégantes y venaient faire leur froufrou comme dans un salon.

Un jour de grande fête, un moine de trente ans, très beau, svelte et d'une pâleur superbe, fit un sermon sur 'la

tendresse de Jésus-Christ.' A ce propos il parla beaucoup de l'amour, même profane, et des affections humaines. Il eut des effusions d'un tour romantique et des métaphores effrénées. Il cita Platon, Virgile et Lamartine.

Mme de Maucroix le trouva fort touchant. Elle demanda à sa voisine le nom du nouveau prédicateur : il s'appelait le Père Montarcy.

Le moine prêcha, le dimanche suivant, sur 'le Doute et ses victimes.' Il fut encore plus "moderne." Il cita des contemporains: Jouffroy, Léopardi, Henri Heine, Alfred de Musset. Il décrivit les angoisses d'un esprit qui souffre de ne pas croire; et quelques-uns de ses traits auraient pu convenir aussi bien à la peinture d'un cœur qui souffre de ne pas aimer...

Mme de Maucroix n'y tint plus. Elle alla trouver l'orateur, après le sermon, dans la sacristie, le complimenta timidement avec des larmes dans les yeux, le pria de lui indiquer exactement les ouvrages qu'il avait cités, lui demanda conseil sur ses lectures et s'en alla presque heureuse.

Le père Montarcy était un de ces cœurs généreux et de ces esprits superficiels, comme on ne voit beaucoup dans Tordre de Saint-Dominique. Il avait toutes les belles illusions de Lacordaire, et il y joignait des prétentions scientifiques; il était de ces moines qui ont lu Darwin et qui vont suivre des cours de physiologie à la Sorbonne. Sa parole était enflée et vague, avec de beaux élans. Il marchait dans son rêve, isolé du réel, l'âme et le corps drapés de blanc,— et sachant se draper; très chaste,— mais sentant son pouvoir sur les femmes, en jouissant malgré lui, et se prêtant à leurs adorations.

Mme de Maucroix le revit, le supplia d'être son directeur. Elle lui raconta sa vie, lui confia le vide de son cœur. Que devait-elle faire pour le combler? Et chaque fois qu'elle l'appelait 'mon père,' elle songeait qu'il aurait pu être son fils.

Alors lui, par un coup de politique supérieure,— ému aussi de l'abandon de cette pauvre femme, et pour

répondre à son secret désir, lui dit gravement: "Ma fille, ce serait plutôt à moi de vous appeler ma mère, et à vous de m'appeler votre fils. Je suis jeune et je sens combien je serais faible sans le secours spécial que Dieu accorde à ses prêtres. Il est certes permis de croire que vous avez acquis, par une vie de vertu, des lumières égales à celles que confère l'onction du sacerdoce... Voulez-vous être ma mère et ma directrice?"

Et il se confessa à son tour à Mme de Maucroix. (pp. 121–124)

160:17–20. The Greek philosopher PLATO (c. 428–c.347 B. C.); the ancient Roman poet Publius VERGILIUS Maro (70–19 B. C.); the French writer, poet, and statesman Alphonse de LAMARTINE (1790–1869); the French philosopher Théodore Simon JOUFFROY (1796–1842); the Italian poet and essayist Giacomo LEOPARDI (1798–1837); the German poet and essayist Christian Johann Heinrich HEINE (1797–1856); the French playwright, poet, and novelist Alfred Louis de MUSSET (1810–1857).

160:25. The Catholic Church Order of St. Dominic, or Order of Preaches, was founded in Toulouse, France, by the Spanish priest Saint Dominic. It was approved, by Pope Honorius III, in 1216.

160:26–28. Jean-Baptiste Henri-Dominique LACORDAIRE (1802–1861), the restorer of the Order of St. Dominic in post-revolutionary France; the English naturalist, geologist, and biologist Charles Robert DARWIN (1809–1882).

160:29. The Sorbonne Université (Sorbonne University), located in Paris, France, dates back to 1257, the year Robert Sorbon established the Collège de Sorbonne (Sorbonne College), as part of the mediaeval Université de Paris (University of Paris).

161:29–32. PAULA refers to Saint Paula of Rome (347–404 A. D.), who, having lived her early life as a member of one of the richest senatorial families and as a mother of four daughters and one son, spent her widowhood years, mainly through the influence of St. Jerome, meeting holy men of the Christian

161:29–32.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Church, going in pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and, finally, running, as an abbess, a convent founded by herself in Bethlehem together with a monastery and a hostel for pilgrims. The monastery was run by Jerome, who lived and wrote in one of its cells, and who recorded Paula's formerly luxurious life in his Letter 108.

MONICA refers to Saint Monica (c. 332–387 A. D.), who became honoured and revered in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches as an early North African Christian saint as a result of her outstanding Christian virtues, as well as of her prayer and tearful dedication to the Christianization (and therefore salvation!) of her famous son: Saint Augustine of Hippo (354–430 A. D.—who, in his *Confessions*, repeatedly pays her tribute for her pious acts and life.

MADAME SWETCHINE refers to Anne Sophie Swetchine (1782–1857), who was born Sofia Petrovna Soymonova (sometimes Soïmonov or Soymanof) in Moscow, spent her early years at the court of Empress Catherine the Great, was given a good education by her father (having learnt several languages, including Greek, Latin, and Hebrew), and married General Nicholas Sergejevich Swetchine in 1799.

After the death of her father, she questioned her allegiance to Russian Orthodoxy, having converted to Catholicism latter on, in 1815, as a result, too, of the influence upon her of the French Catholics that she had come to know during her visits to Paris—some of whom belonged to the order of the Jesuits.

Her conversion to Catholicism having forced her to live in exile, she returned to Paris with her husband the following year (1816), there to spend the rest of her life.

From 1826 until her death, in 1857, Sophie Swetchine kept a *salon* at number 71, Rue Saint-Dominique. It became famous for its attendance, which included other Russian exiles and the most notorious figures of the French literary, political and ecclesiastical high society, although in particular those who, like Lacordaire, had special interests and positions in the Church.

Indeed, it was with Jean-Baptiste Lacordaire (1802–1861), who was to re-found the Dominican Order in France,

and with the politician Frédéric-Alfred Pierre, Comte de Falloux (1811–1866), the defender of private Catholic teaching, that she maintained a close lifelong friendship.—It being possible that it is above all as a result of the contacts that she kept with these two men, that she is regarded as having exercised an influence on French Catholicism.

Lacordaire met Madame Swetchine in January 1833, when, as a result of the *Révolution de Juillet* (July Revolution), the French Revolution of 1830, the Catholic religion stopped being the religion of the State, and the clergy became ill-favoured.

As a result, three eminent Catholics, La Menais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert, founded the newspaper *L'Avenir* (*The Future*), to defend the interests of Catholicism and free the Church from its dependency on the State. All three of them were friends of Madame Swetchine, whose truly Christian spirit induced her to exercise the influence she possessed over them, and thus to direct their hearts and minds away from the tendency to ultra liberalism in religion, a tendency that by then had already led many promising young men away from the true Catholic orthodoxy.

It was, however, Lacordaire, who came to develop a friendly filial relationship with Madame Swetchine, to which the extensive correspondence between them bears witness.

162:1–163:4. Pater translates the following passage of "Pauvre Âme":

"Pardonnez-moi ma franchise: mais il est dangereux pour un homme de votre âge d'entendre pendant des heures la confession des jeunes femmes, quand elles sont faites comme celle qui sort d'ici."

Ce fut comme le vent d'un soufflet au visage du jeune religieux. Il se redressa dans son orgueil de prêtre, dans sa fierté d'homme chaste et sûr de lui, dans sa rudesse de moine contempteur de la femme.

La chapelle était déserte. Il s'élança hors du confessionnal, et d'une voix terrible, avec de grands gestes tragiques de ses larges manches: "Madame de Maucroix, je

162:21.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

vous défends, entendez-vous? je vous défends d'entrer dans ma vie de prêtre et de vous mêler de ce qui ne regarde que Dieu et moi!"

Et il sortit de la chapelle à grands pas.

Mme de Maucroix s'affaissa sur les dalles. Le lendemain, brisée de douleur et toute prête à s'humilier, elle revint au couvent. Le frère portier lui dit que le Père Montarcy était absent. Le prieur, qu'elle fit demander, lui annonça d'un ton glacial que le Père était parti pour le Tyrol, où il allait passer quelques mois dans un noviciat nouvellement fondé.

Elle comprit que c'était fini.

Elle possédait en Sologne un vieux petit château: elle s'y réfugia.

Là elle vécut un an parmi la mélancolie des bois de sapins, des bruyères violettes et des étangs immobiles où saignent les couchers de soleil. Elle vécut dans les pratiques d'une dévotion mécanique et minutieuse, dans l'égrènement endormeur des rosaires, les yeux secs, froide et sans pensée. Ou plutôt elle mourut jour par jour, d'une maladie de foie qu'avaient subitement aggravée ses dernières émotions.

Quand elle se vit proche de sa fin, elle pria la sœur qui la gardait d'écrire au Père Montarcy qu'elle allait mourir.

Et elle mourut en effet le lendemain

La réponse du Père arriva trop tard. Elle manquait de simplicité, mais non peut-être de sincérité:

"Mère! mère! mère! j'accours!... Tout est oublié! ah! j'ai bien pleuré devant Dieu, etc..."

Elle était signée: "Votre fieu."

La religieuse qui reçut cette lettre crut pouvoir la déchiffrer, et la bonne fille en fut un peu surprise et scandalisée. (pp- 127-129)

162:21. Tyrol is nowadays a state in western Austria. It comprises the Austrian part of the historical Princely County of Tyrol. The capital of Tyrol is Innsbruck.

162:24. Sologne is a natural region in Centre-Val de Loire, France.

163:5–10. The reader familiarized with Pater's *oeuvre* cannot but pause, to reflect on the pleasure which Pater, no doubt, felt, while he stressed the "peculiar sense of irony" resulting from the self-inflicted death of "a supposed Christian" Roman, "who was not in reality a Christian at all", having been taken for the death of a true "Christian martyr".

Indeed, how could Pater have failed to recognize the similarity between the "peculiar sense of irony" of Lemaitre's story and the no less "peculiar" sense of irony that he himself had created in *Marius the Epicurean*—whose hero likewise is "not in reality a Christian at all", and likewise is supposed to have died the death of a true Christian martyr?

The similarity, of course, has not escaped Pater's critics—as is shown, for instance, by the following words of Louise M. Rosenblatt:

Pater, in his account of Sérenus, had stressed irony as Lemaitre's main trait, and had phrased his "philosophy of life" as imposing, on the one hand, a recognition of the irony of nature and circumstance, and, on the other, an obligation to promote a mood of kindness, "like Sérenus, with a great pity for people, a great indulgence." In his own book, Pater underlines the irony of Marius' end, an irony that reminds us of Sérenus' account of his feelings before death. "Yet Marius was, as we know, no hero, no heroic martyr—had indeed no right to be... Had there been one to listen just then, there would have come, from the very depth of his desolation, an eloquent utterance at last, on the irony of men's fates, on the singular accidents of life and death." (Louise M. Rosenblatt. "The Genesis of Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*." *Comparative Literature*. Summer 1962, vol. XIV, p. 258.)

In a similar vein (although assessing the irony present in *Marius* to be greater than that present in "Sérenus"), John J. Conlon comments:

Pater's review (1887) of Jules Lemaître's *Serenus and Other Tales* brought him back to the familiar territory of sceptical thought, the religious question.... "Serenus," though strikingly similar to *Marius*, is far less subtly ironic.... Pater discovered in Lemaître a spirit quite unlike Amiel's and Feuillet's and more like his own in some ways, but a spirit that erred on the side of negative resolution as Feuillet erred on the positive side and Amiel erred by not considering the "Great Possibility."

Exactly how Pater felt the writers should have resolved the religious question is never explicit. Behind the essays, however, there is a sense in which Pater might be judged as being overly explicit: to him, the question was more important than the answers any of the three arrived at. The fault in Lemaître and Feuillet is that they settled for answers; the fault in Amiel is that he apparently forgot to repeat the question often enough. Nonetheless, it was important to Pater that all three of the writers receive a hearing in England to insure that others could deal with the question he considered ultimately important. (John J. Conlon. *Walter Pater and the French Tradition*. Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, 1982, pp. 11–118.)

Now, is it, indeed, credible, that (to use Rosenblatt's words) the "surprising" similarities, the "stinking parallelisms", between *Marius* and "Sérenus" be just the product of mere chance?

That is to say, although faced with the fact that *Marius* was first published in 1885 and *Sérenus* in 1886, is not the reader somehow *forced* to hypothesize that either Pater must have finished his *Bildungsroman* after having read Lemaître's story, or, inversely, Lemaître must have written his story after having read Pater's.

Put differently: was the pleasure hypothetically felt by Pater while writing his review of *Sérenus* pleasure caused by his discovery of the aforesaid similarities, or, inversely, was it pleasure caused by his sense of an opportunity to pay an unacknowledged debt to his French counterpart?

That is precisely the question Loise Rosenblatt tries to answer in her article "*Marius l'Épicurien*, de Walter Pater, et ses points de départ français". As she states, side by side with the "striking parallelisms" between *Marius* and Lemaître's story, Pater's review of *Sérénus* "takes to its limit the suggestion of the possible influence of one of the narratives on the other".

But how?—in view of the dates of their publishing.

Unless, of course, Pater might have come across Lemaître's story before or while finishing *Marius*. That is to say, unless one may consider "another possibility": the possibility of "the publication of *Sérénus* having had precedence over" that of *Marius*.

Now, having followed the lead opened up by such a possibility, Loise Rosenblatt arrived at an important fact: "in accordance with this hypothesis, we were led to the first publication of *Sérénus* in the July 14, 1883, issue of the *Revue politique et littéraire*, later known as *Revue bleue*"—an issue that "Pater... may have come across in Oxford or in London". (Louise M. Rosenblatt. "*Marius l'Épicurien*, de Walter Pater, et ses points de départ français". *Revue de Littérature Comparée*. 1935, pp. 242–60, *passim*.)

The reader should pay attention, however, to the last words of Pater's review:

M. Lemaître has many and varied interests, a marked individuality of his own amid them all, and great literary accomplishments. His success in the present volume might well encourage him to undertake a work of larger scope,—to add to his other excellent gifts, in the prolonged treatment of some one of those many interests, that great literary gift of patience.

That is to say: M. Lemaître's "success in the present volume might well encourage him ... to add to his other excellent gifts ... that great literary gift of patience"—in the absence of which he ever will succeed in producing a work with the 'larger scope' of my own *Serenus*: my *Bildungsroman Marius the Epicurean*."

163:12.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

163:12. The Mamertine Prison (*Carcere Mamertino*) was a prison (*carcer*) of Ancient Rome, situated on the north-eastern slope of the Capitoline Hill and presumably built in the 7th century B. C. It was originally created as a cistern for a spring in the floor of the second lower level, with the result that prisoners condemned to be locked up in its lowest dungeon had to be lowered through an opening on the ground.

It has been long taken for granted, that St. Peter was imprisoned at the Mamertine Prison, and that the spring in the bottom of the pit came into existence miraculously, to enable him to conduct baptisms. Saint Paul's imprisonment there, on the other hand, is well referenced by his Roman citizenship and decree of execution by Nero.

163:14–20. Pater translates the following passage of "Sérénus":

Il faisait froid; une pluie fine tombait; le ciel, à l'orient, se teignait d'un jaune blafard et comme fangeux. La Ville éternelle, qui commençait à sortir des ténèbres, déroulait autour du Capitole une houle grisâtre de maisons, pareille à une mer bourbeuse après la tempête. De lourds monuments surgissaient çà et là, et leurs arêtes mouillées luisaient faiblement dans le crépuscule. (p. 4)

163:16. "The Eternal City" is, of course, Rome. The epithet "Eternal City" (*Urbs Æterna*), which also appears in Ovid, Virgil, and Livy, seems to have been coined by the Roman poet Albius Tibullus (c. 55–19 B. C.), who, referring to a time before the mythical foundation of Rome by the twins Remus and Romulus, wrote (*Elegies*, II. v., ll. 23–24): "Not yet had Romulus traced the walls of the Eternal City, | wherein was no abiding for his brother Remus" ("Romulus aeternae nondum formaverat urbis | moenia, consorti non habitanda Remo"). (The translation into English is by J. P. Postgate.)

On his turn, the Roman poet Publius Vergilius Maro (70–19 B. C.) employed the epithet "empire without end" (*imperium sine fine*) in the first book of his *Aeneid*, where it is pronounced by Jupiter (I. 279), at the moment he reassures his

daughter Venus concerning the end of the troubles of her son Aeneas: "Then Romulus, proud in the tawny hide of the she-wolf, his nurse, shall take up the line, and found the walls of Mars and call the people Romans after his own name. For these I set no bounds in space or time; but have given empire without end." ("inde lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine laetus | Romulus excipiet gentem, et Mavortia condet | moenia, Romanosque suo de nomine dicet. | his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono; | imperium sine fine dedi.") (The translation into English is by H. R. Fairclough.)

163:25. Titus Flavius Clemens (50–95 A. D.), was a Roman politician. He was cousin of the emperor Domitian (emperor from 81 to 96 A. D.), with whom he served as consul from January to April in A. D. 95. Shortly after leaving the consulship, Clemens was executed, allegedly for atheism, and, over time, came to be regarded as an early Christian martyr. The charge of atheism has been recorded by the Roman historian Lucius Cassius Dio (c. 155– c. 235), who wrote, in his *Roman History* (67.14.):

During this period [A. D. 95] the road leading from Sinuessa to Puteoli was paved with stones. And the same year Domitian slew, along with many others, Flavius Clemens the consul, although he was a cousin and had to wife Flavia Domitilla, who was also a relative of the emperor's. The charge brought against them both was that of atheism, a charge on which many others who drifted into Jewish ways were condemned. Some of these were put to death, and the rest were at least deprived of their property. Domitilla was merely banished to Pandateria. (The translation is by Herbert Baldwin Foster.)

Some scholars identify Clemens with the Roman senator the Talmud refers to as having converted to Judaism and managed to save the Jews from a decree of persecution, before he himself was executed.

163:31–34. "Voici, dit le geôlier, le corps de Marcus An-nîeus Sérénus. On l'a trouvé mort ce matin, et les triumvirs ont

163:32.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

dit que ce n'était pas la peine de décapiter un cadavre. Je pense qu'il s'est empoisonné." (p. 6)

163:32. "The *triumviri capitales* oversaw prisons and executions, along with, probably, some of the functions that today are performed by the police and by Justices of the Peace.

164:2. The Appian Way (*Via Appia*) was one of the earliest Roman roads of the ancient republic. It connected Rome to Brindisi, in southeast Italy.

164:4. For "the priest Timotheus", see below, note to 170:18–23.

164:6–8. "Le prêtre fixa sur ce gracieux visage endormi un regard aigu, obstiné, comme s'il eût voulu pénétrer jusqu'au fond de l'âme mystérieuse qui n'habitait plus ce corps élégant." (pp. 10–11)

164:16–30. Pater translates the following passage of "Sérénus":

"Je suis bien fou d'entreprendre cette confession. Ou elle ne sera point lue, ou elle désolera ceux qui la liront. Mais peut-être qu'en me racontant une dernière fois à moi-même, je me justifierai à mes propres yeux. Des cœurs excellents m'ont aimé, et aucun ne m'a vraiment connu. Or, quoique j'aie longtemps mis mon orgueil à vivre en moi et à n'être pénétré par personne, aujourd'hui mon secret me pèse. Un regret me vient, et presque un remords, d'avoir si bien joué le rôle singulier que les circonstances et ma curiosité ont fini par m'imposer. Je voudrais, pour me persuader que je n'ai pu faire autrement, ressaisir toute la chaîne de mes sentiments et de mes actions depuis mon plus lointain passé jusqu'à ce jour où je vais mourir." (pp. 14–15)

164:34. Domitianus (51–96 A. D.), the emperor of Rome Domitian, was the last member of the Flavian dynasty—which ruled the Roman Empire from 69 to 96 A. D., encompassing the reigns of Vespasian (69–79) and his two sons Titus (79–81) and Domitian himself (81–96).

164: 35–36. Although it is not mentioned in the Bible, nor in the Catechism, the prayer for the divine “the gift of tears” is recurrent in spiritual writers since the beginning of Christianity—probably encouraged by such biblical texts as Jeremiah 9:1 (“Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!”). In his *Meditations*, Augustine left “A Devout Prayer to Christ”, in which he repeatedly asks God for the gift of tears (e.g., “Give me plenteousness of tears flowing from an affectionate heart, such as, by lamenting, may prevail for forgiveness of my sins, a release from the bands with which I have so long been tired, and a godly sorrow, which may produce spiritual and heavenly joy.”)

Indeed, weeping was much encouraged by the Church in the Middle Ages, especially in the case of those whose occupation was above all to pray, as opposed to those whose occupation was primarily to work or fight. Thence, the Christian preoccupation with the cleansing of sin by means of the divine gift of tears.—A preoccupation which is plentifully attested not only by the masses *Pro Petitione Lacrimarum* and *Stabat Mater*, which encouraged weeping as part of the formal liturgy of the Church, but also by such writings as, for instance, *The Ladder of Perfection*, by Walter Hilton, and the *Dialogo della Divina Provvidenza* (*Dialogue of Divine Providence*), by Catherine of Siena (see below, note to 235:15).

In granting Sérénus “the gift of tears”, Pater must have had in mind the following words, which Lemaître gives (p. 20) as part of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

Mon père, que j’aimais tendrement, mourut dans la première année du principat de Vespasien [...] Je me raidis pour porter cette mort en stoïcien: mais devant son bûcher je fondis en larmes.

(My father, whom I loved tenderly, died during the first years of Vespasian’s principality. I hardened myself up, to bear this death stoically: but I burst in tears in front of his funeral pyre.)

165:1–34. **165:1–34.** Pater translates the following passage of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

M. Lemaître’s “Serenus”, and Other Tales (1887)

J’avais douze ans lorsque le grand incendie dévora la moitié de Rome et jeta plus de cent mille malheureux sur le pavé. Pendant deux ou trois ans, malgré les énormes distributions de pain et d’argent ordonnées par le empereur, la misère fut effroyable à Rome. Le spectacle de tant de souffrances imméritées me fit au cœur une blessure incurable. Je conçus l’injustice des choses et l’absurdité des destinées. Je trouvai inique que mon père eût cinq cents esclaves quand tant de pauvres gens mouraient de faim. Je leur donnai tout l’argent dont je pouvais disposer. Mais, avec la raide logique de mon âge, j’estimais qu’ils n’avaient point à me remercier, et je fuyais leurs effusions, dont la grossièreté choquait d’ailleurs mon goût d’enfant aristocrate.

Un jour, mon précepteur me mena à une grande fête que Néron donnait au peuple dans ses jardins. Pour détourner la colère de la foule, qui l’accusait d’avoir allumé l’incendie, il avait fait arrêter quelques centaines de chrétiens. La plupart venaient d’être livrés aux bêtes dans le cirque. D’autres, vêtus de sacs enduits de résine, étaient attachés à de hauts poteaux, de distance en distance, dans les larges allées. A la nuit tombante, on y mit le feu. La populace se pressait avec des vociférations autour des torches vivantes. La flamme qui enveloppait les suppliciés, parfois courbée par le vent, laissait voir leur face horrible et leur bouche grande ouverte dont le cri ne s’entendait pas. Une odeur de chair brûlée emplissait l’air... J’eus une crise nerveuse et l’on m’emporta à demi mort.

La secousse avait été trop forte; et, quoique les plus douloureuses impressions s’effacent vite à cet âge, il m’en resta quelque chose, une langueur à certains moments, une mélancolie, une paresse à vivre, rares chez un enfant. (pp. 16–18)

165:1. On July 18, A. D. 64, a fire started in the Circus Maximus, in Rome. The fire was completely extinguished only six days later, and left almost all Rome in ashes. Nero, the emperor, has traditionally been blamed for the fire—the recorded episode of his playing the lyre while the city went up in flames having become proverbial. Nero himself, of course, blamed the Christians: the despised infidels of his pagan times! Nonetheless, historians have speculated that the emperor wanted to raze the city, so that he could build a new palace for himself.

165:17. Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus (37–68 A. D.), the fifth and last Roman emperor of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Having been adopted by the Roman emperor Claudius at the age of 13, he succeeded him on the throne. Most contemporary historical documents refer to him as tyrannical, self-indulgent, and debauched. After having been declared a public enemy by the Roman Senate, he committed suicide, at the age of 30.

166:2. The name “Stoicism” derives from the “painted porch” (*stoa poikilê*) in the *Agora* at Athens, where the members of the school congregated, and their lectures were held.

Stoicism was one of the new philosophical movements of the Hellenistic period, which is understood to span the period of Mediterranean history between the death of Alexander the Great, in 323 B. C., and the the conquest of Ptolemaic Egypt by the Romans, in 32 B. C.— the Battle of *Actium*, which took place in the previous year (31 B. C.), marking the emergence of the Roman Empire.

Stoicism is usually understood to have gone through changes in the emphasis placed on its major philosophical tenets which allow for its division in three different *schools*: (i) the Early Stoa, from its founder, Zeno of Citium (*c.* 334–*c.* 262 B. C.) to Antipater of Tarsus (*d. c.* 130 B. C.); (ii) the Middle Stoa, from Panaetius (*c.* 185–*c.* 110 B. C.) and Posidonius (*c.* 135–*c.* 51 B. C.) on; (iii) the Late Stoa, from Seneca (4 B. C.–65 A. D.) to Epictetus (*c.* 50–*c.* 135 A. D.) to Marcus Aurelius (121–180 A. D.)

The later Stoics, the Stoics of Roman Imperial times, emphasised the early Stoic doctrines that the sage is utterly immune to misfortune and that virtue is sufficient for happi-

166:2.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

ness. Although such austere ethical views are prone to appear at odds with most men's opinions, they become quite rational not only within the context of the school's physical theory and psychology, but also within the framework of Greek ethical theory, as it was handed down to it from Plato and Aristotle.

The Stoics conceived of the Universe as a combination of two sorts of substance: Matter, as passive, undetermined substance, and Reason, as active, determining substance. The latter, they envisioned as both Universal Reason and Fate. *Qua* active substance, the universe, therefore, was understood by them to be coincident with God, considered not only as mind or reason, but also as the determinant soul of all past, present, and future beings and events.

Individual souls were seen by them as perishable by nature, but, since right Reason (*righteousness*) was conceived as the universal determinant both of matter and spirit, happiness (*eudaimonia*), considered as the goal of human life, could not but consist, for them, in living according to Reason itself.

In the chapter of *Marius* titled "Stoicism at Court", Pa-ter has Marcus Cornelius Fronto (c. 100–c. 170 A. D.) identify all human minds capable of leading a *reasonable* life—all select, Stoic minds—as "a universal commonwealth of mind" (an Earthly Jerusalem in the guise of a New Rome), which, although ultimately fated to suffer annihilation, could not but be the incarnation of the Universal mind, or will, of God: the incarnation, therefore, of the Celestial Jerusalem, in the guise of "that *city on high*"):

...he proceeded to expound the idea of Humanity—of a universal commonwealth of mind, which becomes explicit, and as if incarnate, in a select communion of just men made perfect. ... the world is as it were a commonwealth, a city: and there are observances, customs, usages, actually current in it, things our friends and companions will expect of us, as the condition of our living there with them at all, as really their peers or fellow-citizens. Those observances were, indeed, the creation of a visible or invisible aristocracy in it, whose actual manners,

whose preferences from of old, become now a weighty tradition as to the way in which things should or should not be done, are like a music, to which the intercourse of life proceeds—such a music as no one who had once caught its harmonies would willingly jar. [...] Righteousness would be, in the words of "Cæsar" himself, of the philosophic Aurelius, but a "following of the reasonable will of the oldest, the most venerable, of cities, of polities—of the royal, the law-giving element, therein—forasmuch as we are citizens also in that supreme city on high, of which all other cities beside are but as single habitations."

Pater's intellectual appreciation of such a politico-religious weapon in the service of the advancement of compliance with the Establishment is well known. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to register it here in the form of the following questioning:

But where might Marius search for all this, as more than an intellectual abstraction? Where were those elect souls in whom the claim of Humanity became so amiable, winning, persuasive—whose footsteps through the world were so beautiful in the actual order he saw—whose faces averted from him, would be more than he could bear? Where was that comely order, to which as a great fact of experience he must give its due; to which, as to all other beautiful "phenomena" in life, he must, for his own peace, adjust himself?

This is, indeed, how Pater—Marius—or Pater's Sérenus—does react to Fronto's speech, considered *qua* propaganda of the main philosophical tenets of Marcus Aurelius' *Thoughts*.

How would Lemaître's Sérenus react to it, had he been *born* much later?

Alive as he had become, still a child, to the "injustice of things and the absurdity of men's destinies", would he not have posed himself these very same questions?

166:3.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

166:3. See above, note to 132:35–36.

166:8–36. Pater translates the following passage of "Manuscrit de Sérénus" ("The Manuscript of Sérénus"):

Jamais, je pense, on n'a vu ni on ne verra un si petit nombre d'hommes occuper à leur profit et absorber un si grand nombre d'existences humaines. Quelques-uns de mes amis avaient jusqu'à trois mille esclaves et des richesses dont ils ignoraient les limites. Et la science du plaisir était égale aux ressources dont elle pouvait disposer. Plusieurs générations de privilégiés avaient étudié les moyens d'affiner, de varier et de multiplier les sensations agréables. Assurément les hommes qui viendront après nous ne concevront qu'à peine la vie que certains d'entre nous ont connue et pratiquée. [...] Mais, comme l'avenir imaginera malaisément l'intensité de nos plaisirs physiques, peut-être ne comprendra-t-il pas non plus la profondeur de nos satiétés; et il admirera, en lisant nos chroniques, combien d'hommes se sont donné la mort de notre temps.

Après quinze ans d'orgie tour à tour grossière et délicate, le corps usé, les sens émoussés, le cœur vidé à fond de toute croyance, même de toute illusion, qu'avais-je à faire au monde? Il m'apparaissait comme un spectacle absurde et ne m'intéressait plus. J'avais gardé cette douceur native qui me venait de mon père, mais seulement parce qu'il m'était agréable d'être bon, et encore cela même me devenait indifférent. Au reste, je répugnais à toute action; les emplois publics, devenus vils et précaires, me dégoûtaient d'avance. Je languissais dans un immense et incurable ennui. N'ayant plus aucune raison de vivre, je résolus de mourir.

La mort ne m'effrayait point: c'était pour moi la grande libératrice; mais je la voulais sans souffrance. (pp. 24–26)

166:10–24. Pater translates the following passage of "Manuscrit de Sérénus" ("The Manuscript of Sérénus"):

C'était plus que de l'affection fraternelle: c'était un amour d'une espèce particulière et tel que je n'avais jamais rien éprouvé d'approchant. Séréna était si différente de toutes les femmes que j'avais rencontrées! Il me semblait que cet amour évoquait du fond de mon passé et faisait renaître en moi ce que j'avais eu jadis de meilleur, mes ardeurs de jeune sage aspirant à la suprême pureté. Puis, à mesure que mon intelligence recouvrait sa vigueur, mes habitudes de curiosité me revenaient, et j'apportais peu à peu, dans mon amour passionné pour ma sœur, l'attention d'un observateur séduit par le spectacle d'une âme extraordinaire.

Un jour, Séréna me dit: "Voulez-vous me faire un grand plaisir? Venez avec moi demain matin là où je vous conduirai."

"J'irai où vous voudrez, Séréna." (pp. 28–29)

167:27–168:3. Pater translates the following passage of "Manuscrit de Sérénus" ("The Manuscript of Sérénus"):

J'aperçus dans l'assemblée le consul de l'année, Flavius Clemens: ce qui m'expliqua que la réunion eût lieu dans un des tombeaux de sa famille. Je reconnus la femme de Clemens et sa nièce, et Pomponia Groecina, et Pauline, la veuve de Sénèque, pâle à jamais d'avoir suivi son mari plus qu'à mi-chemin dans la mort. Elles étaient voilées très bas, de manière à cacher leurs cheveux. Je vis enfin, au premier rang. Acte, l'ancienne maîtresse de Néron et l'ancienne amie de mon père, belle encore malgré ses cinquante ans, et, je crois, quelque peu fardée. Le reste de l'assistance me parut se composer de petites gens et d'esclaves. (p. 33)

167:28. For the "consul Clemens", see above, note to 163:25.

167:30–33. Titus Flavius Sabinus II (Consul 47), the father of TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS (Consul 95), was brother

167:30–33.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

to the Emperor Titus Flavius Vespasian. Therefore, TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, his paternal brothers Titus Flavius Sabinus III (Consul 69) and Titus Flavius Sabinus IV (Consul 82), as well as his paternal sisters Flavia, Arrecina Tertulla, and Clementina Tertulla, were first cousins to the offspring of Emperor Vespasian: (i) Domitilla the Younger, (ii) the Emperor Titus, (iii) the Emperor Domitian.—As well as second cousins to their offspring.

TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS married FLAVIA DOMITILLA, the daughter of his first cousin Domitilla the Younger, and, thus, his second cousin.

His brother, Titus Flavius Sabinus IV (Consul 82), married Julia Flavia, the daughter of his first cousin the Emperor Titus Sabinus, and, likewise, his second cousin.

TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS and FLAVIA DOMITILLA had two sons, who, while children, were adopted by the Emperor Domitian as his successors, having been commanded by him to adopt the names Vespasianus and Domitianus.

The reference to CLEMENS' "niece" raises the question: Who may have been TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS' niece?

The *Catholic Encyclopaedia* gives us the answer: "the spurious acts of Nereus and Achilles, and St. Jerome (Ep., CVI-II, 7) represent Flavia Domitilla as the niece, not the wife, of the consul Flavius Clemens, and say that her place of exile was Pontia, an island also situated in the Tyrrhenian Sea. These statements have given rise to the opinion that there were two Domitillas (aunt and niece) who were Christians, and latter generally referred to as Flavia Domitilla the Younger. Lightfoot has shown that this opinion... is derived entirely from Eusebius who was led into this error by mistakes in transcription, or ambiguity of expression, in the sources which he used."

It seems evident that Lemaître embraced "this error", and, therefore, meant to refer to Flavia Domitilla the Younger II, the niece either of Clemens or of Domitilla the Younger I, who is known as St. Flavia Domitilla.

The complete name of "Paulina, the widow of Seneca", was Pompeia Paulina (fl. 1st century). Her husband, the statesman, philosopher, and orator Lucius Annaeus Seneca (c. 4 B.

c.–65 A. D.), was Nero's tutor, and later became his political adviser and minister. When, in 65 A. D., Nero accused Seneca of having taken part in a conspiracy (the Pisonian Conspiracy) and ordered him to commit suicide, Paulina also tried to open her veins, in order to die as well, but, having been immediately informed of it, the Emperor ordered that she be prevented from fulfilling the act.

PAULINA is thought to have been a member of a circle of educated Romans who sought to lead a principled life (the life of a Stoic) under the unprincipled reign of Nero. This is probably the reason why Lemaître included her among the Roman aristocrats that Sérenus should recognize among his sister's Christian friends.

In his translation, Pater omits Lemaître's reference to a fourth early Christian woman. She is called "Pomponia Graecina".—A name which, no doubt, refers to POMPEIA Graecina (d. 83 A. D.), a descendent of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and wife to the Roman general Aulus Plautius.

Lemaître, evidently, saw no incongruity in giving Pompeia Graecina, for literary purposes, as a fourth Christian woman—above all, perhaps, because, in fact, it has been speculated that Pompeia was the saint that the Roman Catholic Church honours under the name Lucina (or Lucy). (See below, note to 218:1 fn.)

167:34–35. The Emperor Nero, of course, had more than one mistress.

He first married Claudia Octavia, the daughter of his uncle, stepfather, and predecessor, the Emperor Claudius. The marriage took place, out of political convenience, in 53 A. D., when Nero was only 16 years old. The next year, he became emperor.

Later on, in 53 A. D., he married his favourite mistress, Poppaea Sabina, with whom is thought to have fallen in love—in spite of the fact that, during one of his extreme outbursts of rage, he kicked her to death.

Acte, Claudia Acte, was a freedwoman who came from Asia Minor.

167:34–35.

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

Nero took her as his mistress a year after the beginning of his reign, having been encouraged to do so by Seneca himself, who, apparently, was concerned that his young student would not be satisfied with his wife, Octavia, and might indulge in risky sexual exploits. This made Acte appear a safe outlet and a good scheme to separate the Emperor from his politically dangerous mother, Agrippina. All possible expedients, however, were employed, in order to keep Nero's politically significant marriage to Octavia unimpaired.

Apparently, such expedients went so far as to convince a protégé of Seneca actually named Serenus to pretend in public that Acte was his own mistress, in order to avert suspicion.

Nero met Acte, as stated above, when he was 17 years old. It is not surprising, then, that their purportedly passionate relationship lasted no more than about three years.—Although he went so far as to express the desire to marry Acte and to have a genealogy fabricated, in order to link her royalty.

Sérénus, however, states not only that Acte was by then "the former mistress of Nero", but also that she was likewise "the former friend of... [his] father". This is because, according to the literary genealogy that Lemaître prepared for him, Sérénus, the supposed Christian martyr, is to be thought of by the reader as being the son of... of Seneca's protégé, actually named Sérénus:

Mon père L. Annæus Sérénus était capitaine des gardes de Néron. [...] Il consentit à passer pour l'amant de l'affranchie Acte, afin que Néron, très jeune alors et surveillé de près par Agrippine, pût, sous ce couvert, voir librement sa maîtresse. Le rôle auquel se prêtait mon père n'avait rien de magnifique. (p. 15)

(My father, L. Annæus Sérénus, was a captain in Nero's guard. [...] He consented on being seen as the lover of Acte, the freedwoman, in order that Nero, still very young at the time and closely watched over by Agrippina, could use such a cover up to meet his mistress without

impediment. The role my father lent himself to was entirely devoid of honour.)

168:9–15.

168:9–15. Pater translates the following passage of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

“Mon cher Marcus,” me dit Séréna en sortant, “vous avez vu ce que sont les chrétiens. Vous les aimerez davantage à mesure que vous les connaîtrez. Vous êtes malheureux, je le sais. Il faut vous faire chrétien. Là est la vérité, et là aussi la consolation.”

“J’y songerai, Séréna.” (pp. 34–35)

168:19–30. Pater translates the following passage of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

Puis, toutes les vertus que les philosophes avaient déjà connues et prêchées m’apparaissaient, chez les disciples de Christus, transformées par un sentiment nouveau: l’amour d’un Dieu homme et d’un Dieu crucifié, amour sensible, ardent, plein de larmes, de confiance, de tendresse, d’espoir. Évidemment ni les forces naturelles personnifiées ni le Dieu abstrait des stoïciens n’ont jamais inspiré rien de pareil. Et cet amour de Dieu, source et commencement des autres vertus chrétiennes, leur communiquait une pureté, une douceur, une onction et comme un parfum que je n’avais pas encore respiré. (pp. 35–36)

168:25–26. For “the abstract deity of the Stoics”, see above, note to 166:2.

169:3–25. Pater translates the following passage of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

L’idée que mes nouveaux frères avaient de ce monde et de cette vie heurtait en moi je ne sais quel sentiment de nature. Je reconnais l’impertinence d’une telle contra-

169:34—

M. Lemaître's "Serenus", and Other Tales (1887)

diction; mais, malgré mon pessimisme persistant, mal combattu par ma curiosité et par mon amour pour Sérénna, il me déplaisait que des hommes méprisassent si fort la seule vie, après tout, dont nous soyons assurés. Puis je les trouvais par trop simples, fermés aux impressions artistiques, bornés, inélégants. Ou bien, un peu de souci de la patrie romaine se réveillant en moi, je m’effrayais du mal que pouvait faire à l’empire, si elle continuait de se répandre, une telle conception de la vie, un tel détachement des devoirs civils et des occupations profanes. D’autres fois, j’étais décidément injuste. L’arrière-pensée religieuse que les chrétiens mêlaient à leurs affections pour les épurer me semblait refroidir ces affections en leur ôtant de leur liberté, de leur grâce et de leur abandon. N’être aimé qu’en tant que racheté par Jésus et qu’en vue de mon salut éternel, cette idée me glaçait. Et alors j’étais choqué que ces saints fussent si sûrs de tant de choses, et de choses si merveilleuses, quand j’avais, moi, tant cherché sans trouver, tant douté dans ma vie, et mis finalement mon orgueil dans mon incroyance. (pp. 36–37)

169:34–170:6. Pater translates the following passage of “Manuscrit de Sérénus” (“The Manuscript of Sérénus”):

En dépit de ces menues faiblesses, les bonnes et belles âmes que j’ai rencontrées là! J’avais beau me dire: Ces saints font un marché; ils comptent sur le paradis; c’est en vue d’un salaire qu’ils pratiquent les plus sublimes vertus. Mais croire à cette récompense éloignée, n’est-ce pas encore un acte de vertu, puisque c’est croire à la justice de Dieu et le concevoir tel qu’il devrait être. (p. 39)

170:18–23. “Sweet Calixtus”, Sérénus comments (p. 43), “had sagely allowed the consul Clemens to participate, externally, in the Roman religious ceremonies” (“Le doux Calixte avait sagement permis au consul Clemens de prendre part, extérieurement, aux cérémonies de la religion romaine”).

It so happens, however, that:

One day, the priest Timotheus, one of the heads of the Roman community, formerly a slave and born in Africa, returned from Syria, where he had gone to visit the Churches. He was an austere man, full of disinterest, and a staunch believer; moreover, deeply ignorant, unskilled in the Greek language, badly understanding Latin.

(Un jour, revint de Syrie, où il était allé visiter les Eglises, un des chefs de la communauté de Rome, le prêtre Timothée, ancien esclave et d'origine africaine. Il était austère, désintéressé, et croyait ardemment: fort ignorant du reste, parlant un mauvais grec, comprenant à peine le latin.) (p. 42)

And, among other things, the arrival in Rome of Timotheus does bring about the "change" Pater speaks of—whose lethal consequences he, however, has not cared to point out sufficiently.

Indeed, Timotheus "would have Serenus receive baptism, or depart entirely from the church". But the real cause of the arrest of "the chief members of the community", and of the ensuing beheading of Clemens, is not this—but this:

Sweet Calixtus had sagely allowed the consul Clemens to participate, externally, in the Roman religious ceremonies; Timotheus remonstrated against such tolerance, arguing that one could not serve two masters; and, as a result, terrified the somewhat feeble spirit of Clemens to such an extent, that the poor man resigned immediately his position as a consul, this having been the cause of his undoing.

(Le doux Calliste avait sagement permis au consul Clemens de prendre part, extérieurement, aux cérémonies de la religion romaine; Timothée s'indigna de cette tolérance, dit qu'on ne pouvait servir deux maîtres, et remplit d'une telle terreur l'esprit un peu faible de Cle-

mens que le pauvre homme résigna subitement ses fonctions de consul, ce qui fut l'origine de sa perte.) (p. 43)

170:30–171:26. Pater translates the end of "Manuscrit de Sérénus" ("The Manuscript of Sérénus"), omitting but the last paragraph:

Le geôlier est un bon homme. J'avais sur moi de quoi écrire; il m'a procuré une lampe. Il a bien voulu me prévenir que le bourreau viendrait vers la pointe du jour. J'ai écrit toute la nuit. Je n'ai plus aucune attache à la vie, et la mort, anéantissement ou passage dans l'inconnu, ne m'effraye pas. Je me suis remis, à peu de chose près, dans l'état d'esprit où j'étais l'an dernier, quand j'ai voulu mourir dans mon bain. Mais, au dernier moment, j'ai peur de la mort qui souille et qui défigure; j'ai peur de la hache qui peut manquer son coup... On a poussé très loin, de mon temps, la science des poisons: la perle creuse de mon anneau contient une goutte d'un liquide incolore qui me tuera en quelques minutes, presque sans douleur.

J'ai vu quels honneurs rendaient les chrétiens à l'osuaire où sont les restes des victimes de Néron. Ils vont m'honorer aussi comme un de leurs saints. Mais puis-je à présent les détromper? Et d'ailleurs, à quoi bon? Je souhaite qu'ils devinent mon suicide, je souhaite qu'ils lisent cette confession; mais je ne ferai rien pour cela. Car si Séréna savait comment je meurs et dans quelle incroyance, ce serait pour elle une trop grande douleur... Au reste, j'espère bien que Timothée, qui ne m'aimait point, ne laissera rendre à mes os qu'un culte modéré... Et si des cœurs simples me vénèrent plus que de raison, qu'importe encore? C'est leur foi qui leur sera comptée, non les mérites du saint qu'ils invoqueront. Puis, après tout, ce n'est point un méchant dont ils honoreront la mémoire. J'ai cherché sincèrement la vérité. Je me suis efforcé, dans mon adolescence, d'atteindre à la sainteté

telle que je la concevais. Et si j'ai été paresseux, voluptueux et faible, si j'ai peu fait pour les autres hommes, j'ai toujours eu pour eux beaucoup d'indulgence et de pitié. (pp. 47–49)

172:5–6. “Que son crime ou sa justification demeure avec lui! Son écrit le jugera. Dieu qui sondez les reins et les cœurs, je recommande mon frère à votre miséricorde.” (p. 51)

172:10. Beaugency is located in the centre of the Val de Loire, in France. Presumably, Lemaitre has chosen this specific (non-fictional) region as a convincing prop for the staging of his legend of “Saint Mark, the Roman” (“Saint Marc le Romain”).

172:13–14. The Benedictines—another convincing prop—are a monastic religious order of the Catholic Church: the Order of Saint Benedict, their founder in the 6th century. They are also called the Black Monks, in reference to the colour of their religious habits.

172:35. Pater translates the first line of the third paragraph of “L’Ainée” (“The Eldest”): “Elle a de ces ironies, la bonne Nature.” (p. 83)

173:6–7. See above, note to 170:30–171:26.

172:5–6.

M. Lemaitre’s “Serenus”, and Other Tales (1887)

Toussaint Galabru (1889)

177:1–12. The French novelist Ferdinand Fabre (1830–1898), who recorded his memories of his childhood and of his early youth in *Ma Vocation* (1889), tells us that he was destined to the priesthood, and was sent for that purpose to the seminary of St. Pons de Thomières—where, however, he had, on the 25th of June, 1848, the unusual experience of having God warn him, in a vision, that it was not His will that he become a priest:

Ma mère chérie,—La lutte où j’ai manqué périr prend fin dès ce moment. Dieu ne veut pas que je sois prêtre et je ne le serai point. Une lumière m’a éclairé cette nuit: j’ai vu le Fils à la droite du Père, et la volonté d’en haut m’a été clairement manifestée....

(My dear mother,—From this moment on, the struggle that just missed my undoing comes to an end. It is not God’s will that I become a priest, and in no way will I become one. A light has enlightened me to-night: I saw the Son on the right of the Father, and the will from on high has been clearly manifested to me....)

As a result, he felt destined to look about him for a profession—which he did, having meddled for a while with medicine (at Montpellier) and legal clerkship (in Paris).

In 1853, he published a volume of verses, *Feuilles de lierre* (*Ivy Leaves*), before he temporarily lost his health and took residence in Bédarieux (in the department of Hérault), where he had been born.

It was only about ten years later, that he returned to Paris, to publish his first novel, *Les Courbezon* (1862)—which, having been distinguished by the French Academy, immediately became a success among French readers, writers, and critics, thus bringing him unexpected fame as a novelist.

177:1–12.

Toussaint Galabru (1889)

From then on, Fabre must have felt that he finally had found his God-ordained vocation, for he decided to spend the rest of his life writing novels.

By the time of his death, in 1898, he had published about twenty of them—including *Norine* (1889), which Pater reviewed in the 12th June, 1889, issue of *The Guardian*.

Fabre's novels may be divided into two categories: (i) those that deal with his reminiscences of early life in the Cévennes about Bédarieux, and (ii) those in which he deals with the nefarious influence of the Jesuits in provincial life and religion.

Among those that belong to the first category, deserve particular mention, side by side with the one Pater himself mentions, *Les Courbezou: scènes de la vie cléricale* (1862), the following: *Julien Savignac: scènes de la vie cléricale* (1863), *Barnabé* (1874), *Mon Oncle Célestin: mœurs cléricales* (1881), *Mon-sieur Jean* (1886), and *Xavière* (1890).

Among those that belong to the second category, and likewise deserve particular mention, are the four volumes of *La petite mère* (1877)—*La paroisse du jugement-dernier*, *Le calvaire de la baronne Fuster*, *Le combat de la fabrique Bergonnier*, *L'hospice des enfants assistés*,—and the two purely clerical novels that Pater likewise mentions: *L'Abbé Tigranne* (1873) and *Lucifer* (1884).—The last but one (*L'Abbé Tigranne*) being a very powerful picture of unscrupulous priestly ambition and, by common consent, the best of all Fabre's novels; the last (*Lucifer*) consisting in a gallery of serious clerical portraits—as Pater seems to note (“in a series of stories”)

Instead of comparing Ferdinand Fabre to “Erckmann-Chatrion”, the French authors Émile Erckmann (1822–1899) and Alexandre Chatrion (1826–1890), nearly all of whose works were jointly written and paint the landscape and the people of Alsace (of “the Rhineland”, as Pater put it in his *Guardian* review of Fabre's *Norine*), Pater might, perhaps, have compared him to the English novelist Thomas Hardy (1840–1928).—For Fabre does, indeed, occupy in French literature a position somewhat analogous to that which Hardy occupies among English writers of fiction.

Thomas Hardy, it is well known, “has made his own, and conveys to us,” the south and southwest of England, which he chose as the setting for his major novels and upon which he imposed the fictional literary landscape that he himself created and gave the name “Wessex” (the so-called “Thomas Hardy’s Wessex”).

Ferdinand Fabre, in his turn, “has made his own, and conveys to us,” as Pater notes, the mountain villages of Hérault, one of the four departments in south-central France which fall into the region of the Massif Central called “Les Cévennes” (Ardèche, Gard, and Lozère being the other three departments).—With the result that almost all his novels in fact deal with the population of, and life in, that region of France; particularly with the celibate virtues, the ecclesiastical passions, and the struggle between body and spirit of its local priests.

That it is so, should be no cause for wonder—the young Fabre having been destined to the priesthood, under the influence of his mother, and an uncle of his having been a priest.

177:28. The French novelist Émile Zola (1840–1902).

178:9. *rusé*: “cunning”.

178:20. *chantres*: “songsters”.

178:25–34. Pater is right in exclaiming: “No! the hero is not Toussaint Galabru”.

Toussaint Galabru is composed of two “episodes”.

The first episode is titled “Sourmartre” (a small village to the south of Bédarieux), is divided in fifteen sections, begins on page 1, and ends on page 191.

The second episode is titled “Saint-Estève” (corresponding to the nineteenth-century village of Saint-Etienne-de-Mursan), is likewise divided in fifteen sections, begins on page 193, and ends on page 371.

The time-setting of the first episode is the year 1842; the second episode begins: “A quelque dix ans de là, vers la fin d’avril” (“Ten years from then, towards the end of April”), in 1852, and moves on, at the beginning of the second section, to 1868—the action of the second section itself and of the remaining thirteen sections taking place, then, sixteen years after the action of the first section (of the second episode).

The first episode is mostly an account of the adventures of an hunting party, formed by the young narrator, his school friend Baptistin Nizerrolles-Closcard, and the latter's father, Monsieur Nizerrolles-Coscard, the local church's suisse. The innocent narrator joins the other two without permission of his parents, and becomes witness to some disreputable incidents while Monsieur Nizerrolles-Coscard tries to discharge himself of his obligation: to catch a hare the *curé* had his eye on and longed to see on his table.

Once in a while, "cet abominable sorcier de Toussaint Galabru" (p. 41), or "cet Toussaint Galabru, qui fait un métier d'Enfer" (p. 87), is spoken of. Nonetheless, it is only towards the end of the first episode (on p. 110), that he makes his appearance: to viciously take advantage of his proverbial cleverness, and take hold of the hunters' prize, as well as of a sharecropper's wife.

In the second episode, the young narrator has become a writer, and is addressed as "Vous, monsieur, qui écrivez les livres à Paris" ("You, Sir, who write books at Paris"). (p. 310.)

The first section, sett in 1852, brings the by then "Parisian" narrator once more in touch with his old school friend, Baptistin Nizerrolles, who, in the meantime, has become both a pious priest in Bédarieux and, much like Chaucer's Monk, a persistent hunter of hare and quail—in spite of being forbidden by his vocation from putting his gun to use!

Labbé Nizerrolles having met his old friend at Bédarieux, and having invited him to his house on Christmas eve, the remaining sections (II–XV), sett in 1868, are mainly occupied by an account of events which are to be thought of as having occurred between 1852 and the narrator's present, as well as by much discussion concerning Galabru's refusal to convert, in spite of his being quite ill, and a love episode between Vincinet, Galabru's son, and Lalie, Baptistin's god-child.

The book ends with a public procession approaching the house of the dying Toussaint Galabru, to administer him the last rites, and returning on its way—after the Abbé Nizerrolles has pronounced *De profundis!*—singing Psalm 130:3: *Si iniquitates observaveris, Domine, Domine, quis sustinebit?* ("If thou,

Lord, will be extreme to mark what is done amiss—O Lord, who may abide it?)

178:31.

In spite of the book's title, Pater, then, is quite justified in asserting that its true "hero" is "droll Baptistin Nizerolles"—as well as in referring to this "creature of nature" as a *Curé* who, "to the last," "knows more of the quails, the varied bird-life of the Cevennes, than of the life of souls."

It is left to the reader, of course, to ascertain what else, if anything, Pater really meant by these words. Above all, in view of his description of Fabre's style—at once "graphic" and "discreet"—as the style of a writer "who has a fine sense of his words."

Notice: "there is nothing in Fabre to shock the most scrupulous conscience, the daintiest taste." (177:29–30)

Why should there be?

178:31. *maire*: "mayor".

178:34. *impromptu*: "off-hand", "unpremeditated".

179:5. *esprit de corps*: "a shared spirit of comradeship, enthusiasm, and devotion to a cause among the members of a group".

Toussaint Galabru (1889)

A Century of Revolution (1889)

183:3. Pater, no doubt, had in mind “revivals” such as, for instance, the revival of Scepticism in the Renaissance— as part of the larger *rebirth* (renaissance) of Hellenic (classical and pagan) art and culture and side by side with the revival of Platonism and Aristotelianism— and his own *revival* of Cyrenaicism: of *culture* (*Bildung*).—To those who really have understood him and the Greek–Roman concept *paideia–cultura hominis*.

183:8. Pater quotes the last words of the following passage:

Human society reposes upon ideas. Aristotle pointed out, two thousand years ago, that it is not in man’s choice whether he will philosophise or not; philosophise he must. He thinks; he believes; and therefore he acts. Without some faith—even if it be but in ‘the inalienable nature of purchased beef’—he could not act at all. What then is the idea, the faith, the dogma, underlying the Revolution? (p. 4)

183:16. The phrase “must needs live” does not appear in *A Century of Revolution*. Pater, therefore, must have enclosed it between inverted commas to qualify its literal meaning.

183:19. “Mr Lilly”—William Samuel Lilly (1840–1919),—the author of *A Century of Revolution*, was a barrister and a writer on religious, political, and social subjects.

Lilly was educated at Peterhouse College, Cambridge, taking the degree of Bachelor of Law in 1862, and the degree of Master of Law in 1870. In 1869, he was admitted to the Inn of Court of the Inner Temple, but, having become secretary to the government of Madras in the same year, he went to India. However, his health failed him, and he was obliged to return to England and to find a new career.

183:3.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

183:19.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

In 1873, he was called to the Bar of the Inner Temple, but, being “a barrister in nothing much beyond the title” (to quote his obituary in the 1st of September, 1919, issue of *The Times*), he soon accepted a new position.

The following year (1874), he converted to Roman Catholicism, an event which made him known to Henry Fitzalan-Howard, 15th Duke of Norfolk, whose influence immediately gained him to be appointed secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain—a post which he held for nearly twenty years.

From then on, he became “Essayist and Catholic Champion” (to refer to him using the title of the above-mentioned obituary), in which capacity he not only contributed to some of the major publications of his time, such as *The Nineteenth Century*, *The Contemporary Review*, *The Fortnightly Review*, *Popular Science Monthly*, and *The Dublin Review*, and wrote articles for the *Dictionary of National Biography*, but also produced a considerable number of quite interesting (and mostly intelligent) books.

“Among his earliest books”, states the same obituary, “was the once famous *Ancient Religion and Modern Thought*, published in 1884, of which he used anew a considerable part of the material in subsequent books. *Chapters in European History* (1886), *The Claims of Christianity* (1894), *Christianity and Modern Civilization* (1903), and *Studies in Religion and Literature* (1904) are among other essays in the same field.”—To which are to be added—besides, of course, *A Century of Revolution* (1889)—the following: *On Right and Wrong* (1890); *The Great Enigma* (“an inquiry... into the tenableness of the religion which for more than a thousand years has supplied the foremost nations of the world with an answer to The Great Enigma of human existence”), of 1892; *Four English Humourists of the Nineteenth Century* (1895); *Essays and Speeches* (1897); *First Principles in Politics* (1899); *Renaissance Types* (1901); *Idola Fori* 1910; *The New France* (1913).

Now, to quote one last time his obituary in *The Times*, Lilly’s work is marked not only by his impulse “to trace the working-out of principle through the ages”, but also by his “steady effort to reconcile the old and the new”.

Without doubt, such an *impulse* has likewise left its stamp, in a forceful manner, on Pater's own work. What about Lilly's "steady effort to reconcile the old and the new"?

The answer to this question will depend, most certainly, on *which* Pater one may happen to have in mind.

The twenty-six year old Pater of "Coleridge's Writings" strongly reacts against Coleridge's philosophic "Schellingism" (Absolute Idealism), the literary theory he reads therein, and his conservative theology precisely because he sees in the author of *Biographia Literaria*, *On the Constitution of Church and State*, and *Aids to Reflection* a mind determined on reconciling the old and the new—on keeping the old wine in the new bottles:

Nature, which by one law of development evolves ideas, moralities, modes of inward life, and represses them in turn, has in this way provided that the earlier growth should propel its fibres into the later, and so transmit the whole of its forces in an unbroken continuity of life. Then comes the spectacle of the reserve of the elder generation exquisitely refined by the antagonism of the new. [...] Communicating in this way to the passing stage of culture the charm of what is chastened, high-strung, athletic, they yet detach the highest minds from the past by pressing home its difficulties and finally proving it impossible. Such... is also the peculiar charm of Coleridge.

Of course, Pater thought of himself as one to be reckoned among "the highest minds".

Now, what about the Pater, the fifty-year old Pater, who wrote the present article? How does he react to Lilly's tendency to compromise?

This is, perhaps, the question one should keep foremost in mind while reading the words that made this note, and the remaining ones, necessary.

Nonetheless, let us listen to the Pater, the forty-nine-year old Pater, who had reviewed *Robert Elsmere* about one year before publishing the present article (1889):

183:19.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

We have little patience with those liberal clergy who dwell on nothing else than the difficulties of faith and the propriety of concession to the opposite force. Yes! Robert Elsmere was certainly right in ceasing to be a clergyman. But it strikes us as a blot on his philosophical pretensions that he should have been both so late in perceiving the difficulty, and then so sudden and trenchant in dealing with so great and complex a question. Had he possessed a perfectly philosophic or scientific temper he would have hesitated. ...one by one, Elsmere's objections may be met by considerations of the same genus, and not less equal weight, relatively to a world so obscure, in its origin and issues, as that in which we live.

Robert Elsmere was a type of a large class of minds which cannot be sure that the sacred story is true. It is philosophical, doubtless, and a duty to the intellect to recognize our doubts, to locate them, perhaps to give them practical effect. It may be also a moral duty to do this. But then there is also a large class of minds which cannot be sure it is false—minds of very various degrees of conscientiousness and intellectual power, up to the highest. They will think those who are quite sure it is false unphilosophical through lack of doubt. For their part, they make allowance in their scheme of life for a great possibility, and with some of them that bare concession of possibility (the subject of it being what it is) becomes the most important fact in the world. The recognition of it straightway opens wide the door to hope and love; and such persons are, as we fancy they always will be, the nucleus of a Church.

Of course, the Pater of 1888 thought of himself as one to be reckoned among the "large class" of "philosophical minds"—"of very various degrees of conscientiousness and intellectual power, up to the highest"—"which cannot be sure" that "the sacred story" "is false".

Was he by then wiser?

Was he just older?

Or was he both—as well as much more cunning and, as such, secretive?

183:21. Pater quotes from the following words: “The subsequent history of France is essentially the history of its endeavour ‘to mix itself with life.’” (p. 1)

183:23. *A Century of Revolution* is composed of seven chapters: I. “The Revolutionary Dogma” (pp. 1–16); II. “The Revolution and Liberty” (pp. 17–51); III. “The Revolution and Religion” (pp. 52–105); IV. “The Revolution and Science” (pp. 106–130); V. “The Revolution and Art” (pp. 131–164); VI. “The Revolution and Democracy” (pp. 165–196); VII. “The Revolution and England” (pp. 197–207).

Pater, then, refers to the second chapter.

184:3–4. Probably, in speaking of the “later phases of Liberalism which figure as derivative from” the French Revolution, Pater was motivated by these and similar statements by Lilly:

One of the newest and ugliest features of our political life is the growth of a school professing principles far removed from any which have hitherto been accepted in England. It calls itself Liberal, but it is possessed by another spirit than that which has ever animated the great historic party known by the name. In my judgment, we owe to the Liberal party, directly or indirectly, every wise reform, every beneficial law, whereby our ancient institutions have been preserved and strengthened, during the last two centuries. [...] But the Liberal party has until now accounted Rousseau the most dangerous foe to liberty. It has regarded his speculations with disgust, and their practical application by the Jacobins with abhorrence. The new school of Liberalism draws its inspiration from Rousseau, nay, openly professes his sophisms, and does not shrink from apologising for the most monstrous crimes of his disciples. It breathes the spirit of the Revolutionary dogma. Heine tells us, in one of his letters, that an English man loves liberty like his lawful wife. But the *doctrinaires*, of whom I speak, seek to persuade him to

184:30.

give her a bill of divorcement, and to take in her place a Goddess of Reason *à la française*. (pp. 202–203)

A Century of Revolution (1889)

184:30. Pater refers to the fifth chapter: “The Revolution and Art” (pp. 131–164).

184:33. The French novelist, short story writer, playwright, literary theorist, and critic Émile Zola (1840–1902), whose novel *Nana* was first published in 1880—*Nana*, its female protagonist, being a portrayal of the human animal species to which the title of John Ford’s well known play (*’Tis Pity she’s a Whore*) might perhaps apply better than any other comment on it.

184:33–34. Pater may be right, in asserting that William Lilly finds “naturalism” “at its height in M. Zola’s *Nana*”. Nonetheless, it may turn out not be possible to find in *A Century of Revolution* a justification for such a statement of more import than its author’s mention of “the significance of the Naturalism of which *Nana*, whether in the original form of a novel or in M. Busnach’s theatrical adaptation, may be taken as a type.” (p. 134)

184:36–37. It is not easy, perhaps, to ascertain what Pater really had in mind when he wrote that *Nana* “is very far from being characteristic of the whole scope of M. Zola’s work”. Pater seems to have referred to Zola in writing only in the present article, on Lilly’s book, and on his article on Ferdinand Fabre’s *Toussaint Galabru*—where he states that Fabre’s novel *Les Courbezons* “displays the passions of the peasant, with a power of realism... worthy of M. Zola at his best.” (177:26–28)

Now, in view of this Paterian distinction between “Zola at his best” and, presumably, “Zola at his worst”, it may not be preposterous to assume that Pater meant “far from being characteristic” to be construed not in qualitative terms, in respect of “naturalism” *qua* literary matter and/or mode, but in quantitative–intensive terms: “not characteristic of the whole scope of M. Zola’s” artistry.

Pater must have written this article of his, on Lilly’s book, sometime before its publication (December 1889). Thus, it may have happened that, by then, he had had access to the review of *Nana* that Henry James published in the 26th

of February, 1880, issue of *The Parisian* (p. 9), and intended to express an assessment of the novel similar to that which James formulated at the outset: 185:1–2.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

It is a difficult book to read; we have to push our way through it very much as we did through *L'Assommoir*, with the difference that in *L'Assommoir* our perseverance, our patience were constantly rewarded, and that in *Nana* these qualities have to content themselves with the usual recompense of virtue, the simple sense of duty accomplished. I do not mean, indeed, by this allusion to duty that there is any moral obligation to read *Nana*; I simply mean that such an exertion may have been felt to be due to M. Zola by those who have been interested in his general attempt. His general attempt is highly interesting, and *Nana* is the latest illustration of it. It is far from being the most successful one; the obstacles to the reader's enjoyment are numerous and constant. [...] The obstacles to interest in *Nana* constitute a formidable body, and the most comprehensive way to express them, is to say that the book is inconceivably and inordinately dull.

185:1–2. Pater refers to the following vindication “by Mr. Lilly”:

... certain it is, as a matter of historical fact, that in Christianity, and in Christianity alone, was found a force able to destroy the domination of the State over the immaterial part of our nature. It enfranchised religion from secular chains, and laid the only true foundation for that liberty of conscience before human law, which is the most precious of all liberties, and the tutor of the rest. ‘Le premier arbre de la liberte,’ said Victor Hugo... ‘c’ est cette croix sur laquelle Jesus Christ s’est offert en sacrifice pour la liberte, l’egalite, et la fraternité du genre humain.’ And for the first three centuries the truth preached by the noble army of martyrs... was the self-

same which the King of Martyrs had preached from His cross; that the children of men, brothers in Divine sonship, equal in their spiritual nature, were, of indefeasible right, independent of all earthly power in the domain of conscience; each of them, even to the humblest, the most degraded, autonomous in that sacred sphere, and accountable to God alone.

This is the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. All the great religions are, indeed, at one, in proclaiming the doctrine of a limit to human sovereignty, and a region in which it does not enter. The special glory of Christianity is to have made this doctrine triumph over the greatest political power the world had ever known, and to have engrained it into the minds of the most progressive races. [...] The advance of the general mind is so slow.... It has taken the world, as represented by its foremost races, fifteen hundred years to enter fully into that idea of spiritual freedom upon which Christianity itself rests. [...] The only true school of spiritual freedom is the absolute idealism of the Divine Founder of Christianity. The only sure foundation of liberty of conscience is the doctrine of the autonomy of conscience, as the voice of Him whom it is better to obey than man. Yes. Religious liberty, the most sacred attribute of human personality, is of the essence of the principle for which Christ died. It is the bread—*panis vivus et vitalis*—which He cast upon the waters of Time: and we have found it, after many days. [...] The cause of religious liberty in the Middle Ages... meant little more to the most clear-sighted of its champions than the independence of the spirituality from “kings, tyrants, dukes, princes, and all the jailers of human souls.” Yet... these words of Gregory VII.... involve the conception of freedom as ethical and spiritual, as resting upon the infinite worth of the individual and his direct relation to God, which prevailed in the Middle Ages, and which was the source of the great growth of individuality so strikingly characteristic of them. (pp. 27—31)

Now, it is certainly difficult to detect the slightest hint of irony in Pater's encomium of this encomium by Lilly of "Individualism", considered "as a discovery of Christianity or Catholicism".

If Pater really meant what he wrote concerning "what Christianity, in that most venerable of its forms, has been to each and all of us" (185:6–7), how could he, being intelligent as he was, having truly been born a truth-seeking soul—how could he not betray the awareness that such a vindication by Mr. Lilly amounts to no more than what he himself says to have been the "equipment for the work" of the "legislators of 1789": "A few gaudy phrases, a few specious formulas, a few abstract ideas, an illimitable self-confidence, and an ebullient enthusiasm"? (p. 10)

Here is again Mr. Lilly, "so nobly vindicat[ing]" the divine traits of the "Individualism" of the spirit, "as a discovery of Christianity or Catholicism":

...the self-same [truth] which the King of Martyrs had preached from His cross; that the children of men, brothers in Divine sonship, equal in their spiritual nature, were, of indefeasible right, independent of all earthly power in the domain of conscience; each of them, even to the humblest, the most degraded, autonomous in that sacred sphere, and accountable to God alone.

Here is now Mr. Lilly, portraying the diabolical traits of the individualism of Nature:

How... does the Revolutionary dogma look in the light of these facts, so luminously exhibited by Mr. Darwin as the 'scientific' account of the human mammal? First consider the doctrine of the natural, inalienable, and imprescriptible rights of the individual, which is the chief corner-stone of the whole Revolutionary edifice. How is it possible to predicate such rights of an animal whose attributes are constantly varying—whose original is not Jean-Jacques's perfect man in a state of nature,

185:3.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

but, not to go further back, a troglodyte with half a brain, with the appetites and habits of a wild beast, with no conception of justice, and with only half articulate cries for language? (pp. 118–119)

Was it not to expect, to say the least, that Pater should have encouraged his readers to ask themselves the following two questions?

How does the Christian–Catholic dogma of the “Divine sonship” of all human individuals, “equal in their spiritual nature”, look in the light of these facts, so luminously exhibited by Mr. Darwin as the ‘scientific’ account of the human mammal?

How is it possible to predicate such a “Divine sonship” of an animal whose attributes are constantly varying—whose original is... a troglodyte with half a brain, with the appetites and habits of a wild beast, with no conception of justice, and with only half articulate cries for language?

185:3. ἦθος: *ēthos*.

185:17. Mr. Lilly himself offers his readers a detailed explanation of “the signification which the word Darwinism bears in common parlance throughout Europe.” (p. 108) It not being possible to accompany him here in his long-range conceptual travels over Germany, France, and England, in pursuit of such a “significance”, let us be content with traversing the following short-cut across his vast Darwinian field:

...the origin of the human race as a distinct species... the law of natural selection in the struggle for existence, and the law of sexual selection. The struggle for existence! That is the primary fact upon which Darwinism is built. The world, to the eye of science, is a scene of incessant struggle of individual against individual, of species against species. The more healthy, the more vigorous, the more fortunate survive and multiply. The weakest succumb, disappear, and perish. It is in the vegetable world as in the animal. [...] It is, and ever has been so among men, from the rudest societies in which cannibals. openly prey upon one another, up to the most civilised, where

the process by which man devours man, though thickly veiled, is none the less, real. (pp. 112–113)

185:17.

And with what joy, the paladin of the “Divine sonship” of all human souls “is ready to accept what is popularly known as ‘Darwinism’”!

Of the absolute reason, which the Revolution professes to worship, usually under the strangest travesties, Darwinism knows nothing. Its only notion of reason, as of justice and of right, is relative. Right to be means Might to be. For the true state of nature is a state of war: *bellum omnium contra omnes*. Again, take the thrice-sacred formula, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. What place is there for these conceptions if ‘the scientific evolution’ alone remains as the one truth which the Revolution gospel will allow us to recognise? Liberty? the sovereignty of the individual? It disappears with the fiction of a perfectly homogeneous humanity. The message of ‘scientific evolution’ to the masses is to know their masters, for that will be best for them; to recognise the provision of nature, which has made the few, strong, wise, and able; the many, weak, foolish, and incompetent. Equality? [...] Why, man is nothing but the product of vast inequalities... Inequalities of right rest upon inequalities of fact.... Darwinism gives the lie direct to the individualism which is of the very essence of Jacobinism. To nature, the individual is valueless. The natural goodness of the *bête humaine*? It is aboriginally unethical; ferocious passions are its very groundwork; and all that countless ages of progress have effected has been, more or less imperfectly to tame them in favoured varieties of it. (pp. 119–20)

How good it must feel, to follow God in recognizing oneself one with all other men, “equal in their spiritual nature”, and to follow Mr. Darwin in recognizing oneself one of “their masters”, one mong “the few, strong, wise, and able”!

185:18. **185:18.** Jonh Henry Newman (1801–1890), who, after great doubt and vacillation—perhaps as great as Mr. Lilly’s,—converted from Anglicanism to Catholicism in 1845, later (1879) becoming Cardinal.

A Century of Revolution (1889)

(No such luck, for Mr. Lilly!)

185:25–26. p. 38.

185:27–28. p. 145.

185:29–30. p. 29.

III.

Introductions

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

191:1. Ottery St. Mary, known simply as Ottery, is a town in the East of Devon district, England, on the River Otter, about 10 miles (16 km) east of Exeter and 82 miles (132 km) east of Cornwall.

191:3–5. Since 1814, when he was 42 years old and retreated from London, Coleridge had been living in the West Country: in Bristol and then in Wiltshire. He returned to London by the end of March 1816, intending to present his new play, *Zapolya*, to the theatre world. However, his health failed him by then, and he took to his bed, in the care of a physician named Joseph Adams. Adams, being quite anxious about the great poet's health, wrote a colleague of his, Dr. James Gillman, asking whether he might be able to help him provide Coleridge with the conditions and surroundings best fitted for his recovery. What Coleridge most needed, Adams said, was seclusion, a garden, and someone who would firmly forbid him from taking laudanum.

Perhaps impressed by that unexpected opportunity to get to know the great English poet intimately, Dr. James Gillman promptly responded that he was willing to have Coleridge live in his house, at Highgate—a suburban area of north London, at the north-eastern corner of Hampstead Heath.

So, on 13 April 1816, arrangements having been made, Coleridge showed up at Moreton House, on Highgate Hill, where the Gillmans were then living, and stayed there until his death, which occurred eighteen years later, on the 25th of July, 1834.

Four years later (in 1838), Dr. Gillman published, in two volumes, his own account of Coleridge's life (*Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*).

191:6–7. Coleridge's first book of poems was titled *Poems on Various Subjects*. It was printed in Bristol, in 1796, and published both in Bristol and London. The title page reads: Poems | on | Various Subjects | By | S. T. Coleridge | Late of Jesus

191:1.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

191:9–11.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

College, Cambridge | [Epigraph from Statius' *Silvae*] | London | Printed for G. G. and J. Robinsons, and | J. Cottle, Bookseller, Bristol. | 1796.

191:9–11. “[O]ne year” refers to the year of the book’s first publication, 1816. The title page of the third edition reads: Christabel, | &c [“Kubla Khan, a Vision”, and “The Pains of Sleep”] | By | S. T. Coleridge, Esq. | Third Edition | London | Printed for John Murray, Albemarle-Street | By William Bulmer and Co. Cleveland-Row, | St. James | 1816.

191:11–14. The title page of the book reads: Sibylline Leaves | A | Collection of Poems. | By | S. T. Coleridge, Esq. | London: | Rest Erner, 23, Paternoster Row. | 1817. The words by Coleridge that Pater quotes, explaining the origin and meaning of the title, appear at the very beginning of the “Preface” (p. i).

191:15–21. Pater, who was writing sometime in or before 1880, gives his readers three different dates: 1828, 1834, and 1877, the date of “the latest reprint”.

1828 is the date of the publication of *Poetical Works*, “arranged by [Coleridge] himself” in three volumes; not of *Poetical and Dramatic Works*, a title which first appeared in 1844. The title page of the 1828 edition reads: THE | POETICAL WORKS | OF | S. T. COLERIDGE, | INCLUDING THE DRAMAS OF | WALLENSTEIN, REPOSE, AND ZAPOLYA | IN THREE VOLUMES | [*volume number*] | LONDON: | WILLIAM PICKERING | MDCCCXXVIII.

1834 is the date of the publication of *Poetical Works* “arranged by another hand” likewise in three volumes, this other “hand” being probably H. N. Coleridge. The title page reads: THE POETICAL WORKS OF | S. T. COLERIDGE | [*volume number*] | LONDON: | WILLIAM PICKERING | 1834.

The title page of the 1844 edition of *Poetical and Dramatic Works* reads: THE POETICAL | AND DRAMATIC WORKS OF | S. T. COLERIDGE | [*volume number*] | LONDON: | WILLIAM PICKERING | 1844.

The title page of “The latest reprint, with notes and an excellent memoir, and some poems not included in any earlier collection, ... founded on th[e] final edition of 1834”, reads: THE POETICAL AND DRAMATIC | WORKS OF SAMU-

EL TAY- | LOR COLERIDGE | FOUNDED ON THE AUTHOR'S
LATEST EDITION OF | 1834 WITH MANY ADDITIONAL PIECES
NOW | FIRST INCLUDED AND WITH A COLL- | TION OF VARI-
OUS READINGS | [volume number] | LONDON: | BASIL MON-
TAGU PICKERING | 1877.

191:24–27.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

This edition is in 4 volumes. The “excellent memoir”, which is unsigned, covers pages ix to cxviii of the first volume.

191:24–27. Somewhat like many of his critics, who have tended to speak of “German Idealism” (when they do speak of it) without differentiating between the two quite different versions of idealism which were represented, respectively, by Kant, and, starting from and *against* him, by Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, Pater himself conflates those two versions, of which the one, Kant’s, is to be correctly identified as “Subjective Idealism”, and the other, Fichte’s, Schelling’s, and Hegel’s, as “Absolute Idealism” (subjective–objective idealism)—Pater himself conflates those two quite different versions of idealism under the designation “the then recent metaphysics of Germany”, and, as a result, ends by including Kant’s Subjective Idealism in “what has been variously called the *a priori*, or absolute, or spiritual, or Platonic view of things”.

Notice: “that spiritual philosophy, as represented by the more transcendental parts of Kant, and by Schelling” (191:29–30).

Notice: to speak of “the more transcendental parts of Kant[’s transcendentalism]” cannot but be equivalent to speaking of, for instance, “the more salty parts of salt”.

Now, “Plato” and “Platonism” are designations naturally associated in thought with the designation “metaphysical realism”, but the designation *apriorism*—which properly belongs to the philosophical field of epistemology, not to that of ontology—is most certainly not. Pater, therefore, cannot but be treading perilous ground in identifying *apriorism* with Platonism, as well as in identifying, without due qualification, modern German Absolute Idealism (“Shellinguism”, as he roughly puts it) with the “absolute... or Platonic view of things”.—In spite of it being true, that the ontology of Schelling and Hegel, in particular, are akin to (perhaps even an “extension” of) the ontology shared by Platonic and Neoplatonic “views of things”.

191:29.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

On the other hand, if it is true that one is entitled to place the epistemology of Kant in connection with the “older, classical and native” epistemology of Platonism & Co., it is no less true that, then, such a connection must inevitably be thought of not as a *positive* connection (as Pater does, unawares), but as a *negative* one—in the sense, for instance, in which it may be said that heliocentrism (Copernican-Keplerian astronomy) is *negatively* connected with geocentrism (Aristotelian–Ptolemaic astronomy). For, while Ideas, for instance, are for Schelling and Hegel, as for Giordano Bruno and Plato, ontological entities, they are for Kant no more than, so to speak, necessary *rou-tines* of the human *software* that is called “reason” (*Vernunft*)—be they understood as constitutive Ideas (*konstitutive Ideen*) or as regulative Ideas (*regulative Ideen*).

The *apriorism* of Kant, then, is indeed a brand of *apriorism* quite different from that of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel.—A fact Pater completely ignores.

191:29. The German philosophers Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775–1854).

192:10–11. The English philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806–1837), who, being an empiricist, could not indeed but be “the furthest removed from Coleridge’s own masters”: above all, from Schelling, whose thought Pater identifies with that of Schelling’s own *master*, Kant.

192:11–12. In the nineteenth century, the epithet “High-Church” became associated with the so-called “Oxford Movement”, which, during the 1830s, disseminated the idea that the Anglican church was by history and identity a truly “catholic” church, and therefore sought a renewal of Roman Catholic orthodoxy and practice within the Church of England, in opposition to the many Protestant tendencies of that church.

The fact that, in referring to “some of the earlier writers of the *high-church* school”, Pater italicizes the epithet “high-church” suggests, however, that he had in mind the less specific sense which it acquired, since the inception of the Anglican Church, in the reign (1509–1547) of Henry VIII, as a *label* for the *school* of Anglicanism—mostly composed of upper-class,

right-wing believers—that, in opposition to the low-church *school*, or *party*, was in favour of the continuance within the Church of England, as nearly as possible in its orthodox form, of the doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Roman Catholic Church, including its principle of papal supremacy.

It is important to stress that Pater specifically meant “writers of the *high-church school*” who were “directly and indirectly” influenced by Coleridge’s writings in spite of being “furthest removed from Coleridge’s own masters” (furthest from Kant and Schelling), and that, therefore, he must have had in mind either writers who, like Mill, were in favour of Empiricism, writers who were in favour of the 17th century Rationalist philosophers, or, finally, writers who were in favour of one of the two main philosophical and theological branches of the mediaeval Christian (Catholic) tradition: the Augustinian (Platonic) and the Thomistic (Aristotelian).

Besides, if we take into consideration above all the period between 1816 and 1859 (the period between the appearance of Coleridge’s *The Statesman’s Manual* and the publication of Darwin’s *The Origin of Species*), Pater’s temporal qualifier (“early”) suggests that the writers he had in mind had been active somewhat between the 1820s and 1830s, since, the Oxford Movement having had its inception in the beginning of the 1830s, they would otherwise not fit in the description “earlier writers of the *high-church school*”.

On the other hand, it is possible that Pater included among the “earlier writers of the *high-church school*”, considered specifically as pre-Tractarian High Churchmen, some of the men who latter became directly associated with the Oxford Movement: John Henry Newman (1801–1890), who in fact was positively influenced by Coleridge, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882), John Keble (1792–1866), Charles Marriott (1811–1858), and Richard Hurrell Froude (1803–1036).

In this case, Pater would probably be referring to those men, or some of those men, in opposition to later sympathisers with the Oxford version “of the *high-church school*”: men such as, for instance, John Mason Neale (1818–1866), John Freder-

192:21. ick Denison Maurice (1805–1872), Stewart Duckworth Headlam (1847–1924), and Charles Gore (1853–1932).

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

192:21. Pater refers to “Human Life: On the Denial of Immortality. A Fragment”—which is part of *Sibylline Leaves* (1817) and, since it indeed illustrates effectively Coleridge’s “study of the earlier English philosophical poetry”, deserves to be transcribed here:

If dead, we cease to be; if total gloom
Swallow up life’s brief flash for aye, we fare
As summer-gusts, of sudden birth and doom,
Whose sound and motion not alone declare,
But are their whole of being! If the breath
Be Life itself, and not its task and tent,
If even a soul like Milton’s can know death;
O Man! thou vessel purposeless, unmeant,
Yet drone-hive strange of phantom purposes!
Surplus of Nature’s dread activity,
Which, as she gazed on some nigh-finished vase,
Retreating slow, with meditative pause,
She formed with restless hands unconsciously.
Blank accident! nothing’s anomaly!
If rootless thus, thus substanceless thy state,
Go, weigh thy dreams, and be thy hopes, thy fears,
The counter-weights!—Thy laughter and thy tears
Mean but themselves, each fittest to create
And to repay the other! Why rejoices
Thy heart with hollow joy for hollow good?
Why cowl thy face beneath the mourner’s hood?
Why waste thy sighs, and thy lamenting voices,
Image of Image, Ghost of Ghostly Elf,
That such a thing as thou feel’st warm or cold?
Yet what and whence thy gain, if thou withhold
These costless shadows of thy shadowy self?
Be sad! be glad! be neither! seek, or shun!
Thou hast no reason why! Thou canst have none;
Thy being’s being is contradiction.

The poem appears on pages 269–270 of volume 2 of the edition of *The Poetical and Dramatic Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* that Pater refers to as “the latest reprint” (1877).

Since this must have been the edition Pater used while writing his Introduction, all his quotations of Coleridge’s poetical and dramatic works will be henceforth referenced as: PDW 1877, followed by the volume number and the page(s) number(s).

It will be so mostly because the selection of Coleridge’s works for which Pater was writing his Introduction is quite meagre. Besides the First Part of *Christabel*, it comprehends only the following poems: “Time, Real and Imaginary”; “Love”; “Sonnet” (‘As when far off the warbled strains are heard’); “The Eolian Harp”; “Frost at Midnight”; “Dejection. An Ode”; “Sonnet. Composed on a Journey Homewards”; *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (Thomas Humphrey Ward, ed. *The English Poets: Selections With Critical Introductions by Various Writers and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold*. London, Macmillan, 1880, vol. IV (*Wordsworth to Rossetti*), pp. 115–154.)

192:23. The English Romantic poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822), who, as Pater states, referred to Coleridge, in the fifth part (“Grace”) of his poem *Peter Bell the Third*, as “A subtle-souled psychologist” (l. 379):

Among the guests who often stayed
 Till the Devil’s petits-soupers,
 A man there came, fair as a maid,
 And Peter noted what he said,
 Standing behind his master’s chair.

He was a mighty poet—and
 A subtle-souled psychologist;
 All things he seemed to understand,
 Of old or new—of sea or land—
 But his own mind—which was a mist.
 (ll. 373–382)

192:29. Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880) Shelley composed *Peter Bell the Third* in October 1819, having in mind to satirise Wordsworth's tale of a wayward potter, in *Peter Bell* (1819), who renounces his immoral life after a sequence of natural occurrences have revealed to him the error of his old ways. On completion, Shelley sent the poem to his friend James Henry Leigh Hunt, on 2 November 1819, with the intention that he put it through immediate, but anonymous, publication.

However, *Peter Bell the Third* came to be first published only in the 1839 edition of *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, Edward Monx, pp. 238–246), edited by Mary Shelley, who, in her note to the poem (p. 253), stated: "He [Shelley] was unacquainted personally with Wordsworth, or with Coleridge (to whom he alludes in the fifth part of the poem), and therefore, I repeat, his poem is purely ideal; it contains something of criticism on the compositions of those great poets, but nothing injurious to the men themselves."

192:29. Samuel Taylor Coleridge. "To Wordsworth: Composed on the Night After his Recitation of a Poem on the Growth of an Individual Mind", l. 80 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 227):

That way no more! and ill beseems it me,
Who came a welcomer in herald's guise,
Singing of Glory, and Futurity,
To wander back on such unhealthful road,
Plucking the poisons of self-harm! And ill
Such intertwine beseems triumphal wreaths
Strew'd before thy advancing! (ll. 76–82)

192:35. The main representatives of the so-called "Lake School" were three English poets who all lived in the Lake District of England (this being the origin of the name): William Wordsworth (1770–1850), Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834), and Robert Southey (1774–1843).

192:37–193:1. As it not infrequently happens in reading Pater, one is here lead into the mistake of construing mere paraphrasis as quotation: Coleridge's words, which do not con-

tain “written”, appear in the following passage of his Preface to *Poems on Various Subjects*: “To censure it [egotism] in a Monody or Sonnet is almost as absurd as to dislike a circle for being round. Why then write Sonnets or Monodies? Because they give me *pleasure when perhaps nothing else could. After the more violent emotions of Sorrow, the mind demands solace and can find it in employment alone*.” (S. T. Coleridge. “Preface”. In:—. *Poems on Various Subjects*. London, G. G. and J. Robinsons and J. Cottle, 1796, p. vi.) (The italics have been added.)

193:7–14. Pater quotes lines 20 to 27 of “On Observing a Blossom: On the First of February, 1796.” (PDW 1877, vol. 1, p. 157)

193:21. “Kubla Khan”: see next note.

193:26–28. “Kubla Khan, a Vision”, was first published in 1816 (S. T. Coleridge. *Christabel, &c.* London, John Murray, 1816, pp. 51–58). Since “&c.” refers to “Kubla Khan, a Vision”, and “The Pains of Sleep”, Coleridge in fact “placed” “Kubla Khan” originally “side by side with” “The Pains of Sleep”.

193:29. Pater quotes from line 22 of “Dejection: An Ode”, which was first published in the *Morning Post*, October 4, 1802, and included in *Sibylline Leaves* from 1817 on.

193: 30–34. *The Prelude* was first published in 1850 (William Wordsworth. *The Prelude, or Growth of a Poet’s Mind; An Autobiographical Poem*. London, Edward Moxon, 1850.

The Advertisement ends thus: “The Friend, to whom the present Poem is addressed, was the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who was resident in Malta, for the restoration of his health, when the greater part of it was composed. Mr. Coleridge read a considerable portion of the Poem while he was abroad; and his feelings, on hearing it recited by the Author (after his return to his own country) are recorded in his Verses, addressed to Mr. Wordsworth” (pp. vii–viii). The “Verses” are, in Pater’s formulation, “the lines addressed to Wordsworth after his recitation of *The Prelude*.” (See above, note to 192:29.)

The passage of such “Verses” or “lines” to which Pater refers, the passage in which Coleridge “regrets so eloquently”

194:1. “the limited quantity of his poetical performance”, appears to be the following (ll. 61–75; *PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 226):

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

Ah! as I listen'd with a heart forlorn,
The pulses of my being beat anew:
And even as life returns upon the drown'd,
Life's joy rekindling roused a throng of pains—
Keen pangs of Love, awakening as a babe
Turbulent, with an outcry in the heart;
And fears self-will'd, that shunn'd the eye of hope;
And hope that scarce would know itself from fear;
Sense of past youth, and manhood come in vain,
And genius given, and knowledge won in vain;
And all which I had cull'd in wood-walks wild,
And all which patient toil had rear'd, and all,
Commune with thee had open'd out-but flowen
Strew'd on my corse, and home upon my bier,
In the same coffin, far the self-same grave!

194:1. Nether Stowey is a village in the Sedgemoor district of Somerset, South West England. As Pater informs the reader, Coleridge lived there from 1797 to 1798.

194:2. *annus mirabilis*: literally, “miraculous year” (in terms of literary production).

194:21. “Lake School”: see above, note to 192:35.

194:28–30. William Shakespeare. *Henry V*. Act IV, Scene vi, ll. 15–17.

195:5–7. Samuel Taylor Coleridge. “To Wordsworth: Composed on the Night After his Recitation of a Poem on the Growth of an Individual Mind”, ll. 89–91 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 227).

195:14–17. Samuel Taylor Coleridge. “To Wordsworth: Composed on the Night After his Recitation of a Poem on the Growth of an Individual Mind”, ll. 16–19 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 224).

195:19–20. Pater, it is evident, did not care much for accuracy in quoting. Not: “composed on the night after Wordsworth’s recitation of a poem on the growth of an individ-

ual mind”; but: “composed on the night after” Wordsworth’s “Recitation of a Poem on the Growth of an Individual Mind”.

195:23–24. Samuel Taylor Coleridge. “To Wordsworth: Composed on the Night After his Recitation of a Poem on the Growth of an Individual Mind”, ll. 46–47 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 226).

195:27. “Lake poetry”: see above, note to 192:35.

“Lines to Joseph Cottle”: “Lines Addressed to Joseph Cottle”, which first appeared under this title in 1797 (*Poems of S. Taylor Coleridge, Second Edition, to which are Now Added Poems by Charles Lamb and Charles Lloyd*. Bristol, J. Cottle, 1797, pp. 246–248 (“Supplement”). Originally (1796), the poem had appeared under the title “Epistle IV. To the Author of Poems Published Anonymously in Bristol, in September, 1795” (*Poems on Various Subjects*. London, G. G. and J. Robinsons and J. Cottle, 1796, pp. 125–128.)

The only difference between the two editions of the poem is that, in the first (1796), the poem begins “Unboastful Bard!”, while in the second (1797) it begins “Dear friend!”

The Supplement in which the poem appears in the second edition (1797) is preceded by an Advertisement, where Coleridge writes: “I have excepted the following Poems from those, which I had determined to omit [...] The first in order of these verse, which I have thus endeavoured to *reprieve* from immediate oblivion, was originally addressed ‘To the Author of Poems published anonymously, at Bristol.’ A second edition of these poems have lately appeared with the Author’s name prefixed: and I could not refuse myself the gratification of seeing the name of that man among my poems, without whose kindness, they would probably have remained unpublished; and to whom I know myself greatly and variously obliged, as a Poet, a Man, and a Christian.” (pp. 243–244)

Joseph Cottle (1770–1853) was an English publisher and author. He was born in Bristol, where he established himself as a bookseller, printer, and publisher in 1791. He published the works of Coleridge on generous terms, and supported and advanced the works of many local poets, including, Thomas Chatterton, Robert Southey, and William Wordsworth. The first edition of Coleridge’s *Poems* (*Poems on Various Subjects*,

195:28.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

London, 1796) was printed for G. G. and J. Robinsons (London) as well as for Cotthe (Bristol), and the first edition (1798) of Coleridge and Wordsworth's volume *Lyrical Ballads* was printed for Biggs as well as for Cottle himself.

Cottle was likewise a poet and a prose writer. His works include: *Poems* (1795); *Malvern Hills* (1798), with a prefatory poem by Robert Southey; *Alfred* (1800); *The Fall of Cambria* (1808), *Early Recollections, Chiefly Relating to the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge, During his Long Residence in Bristol* (1837); *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey* (1847). What he had to say in *Early Recollections* concerning Coleridge was, at the time, severely criticised and generally condemned.

195:28. "Ode to Dejection": see above, note to 193:29.

195: 32. "Lake School": see above, note to 192:35.

196:3–4. "Dejection: An Ode", l. 44 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 218). Pater mistakenly splits this line in two.

196:6–7. "Dejection: An Ode", ll. 28–29 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 217). Pater mistakenly splits this line in two.

196:8. The English Romantic poet George Gordon Byron, 6th Baron Byron (1788–1824).

Pater refers to the following conversation between Byron and his friend Percy Bysshe Shelley, which was recorded by the English biographer and novelist E. J. Trelawny, in his *Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron* (London, Edward Moxon, 1858, pp. 30–31):

I was then and afterwards pleased and surprised at Byron's passiveness and docility in listening to Shelley—but all who heard him felt the charm of his simple, earnest manner; while Byron knew him to be exempt from the egotism, pedantry, coxcombry, and, more than all, the rivalry of authorship, and that he was the truest and most discriminating of his admirers.

Byron looking at the western sky, exclaimed,

"Where is the green your friend the Laker talks such fustian about," meaning Coleridge—

Gazing on the western sky,
And its peculiar tint of yellow green. [...]

196:19–23.

“Who ever,” asked Byron, saw a green sky?”

Shelley was silent, knowing that if he replied, Byron would give vent to his spleen. So I said, “The sky in England is oftener green than blue.”

“Black, you mean,” rejoined Byron; and this discussion brought us to his door.

196:19–23. “Lines Written in the Album at Elbingerode, in the Hartz Forest”, ll. 17–21 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 202).

196:16–17. The English Romantic poet Percy Bysshe SHELLEY (1792–1822); the English Romantic painter, printmaker and watercolourist Joseph Mallord William TURNER (1775–1851).

196:26–29. *Christabel*, I, ll. 16–19 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 65).

197:1–2. *Christabel*, I, ll. 33–34 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 66). Pater misquotes line 33: “And nought was green upon the oak”; not “Nought was green upon the oak”.

197:4–8. *Christabel*, I, ll. 48–52 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 66).

197:11–18. “Dejection: An Ode”, ll. 9–14 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 216). Pater misquotes line 9: “For lo! the New-moon winter-bright!”; not “Lo! the new-moon winter-bright!”

197:18. Pater had in mind Coleridge’s use of the term “ministry” in such verbal contexts as “the secret ministry of frost” or “cold” (“Frost at Midnight”, l. 72 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 12).

197:19. The two poems by Coleridge which Pater quotes immediately after this line were written “in April, 1798”. See next two notes.

197:20–23. “The Nightingale: A Conversational Poem, Written in April, 1798”, ll. 8–12 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 21).

197:26–28. “Fears in Solitude. Written in April, 1798, During the Alarm of an Invasion”, ll. 1–3 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 12).

The poem “Fears in Solitude” “was composed”, to quote the *Wikipedia*, “while France threatened to invade Great Britain. Although Coleridge was opposed to the British government, the poem sides with the British people in a patriotic de-

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

fence of their homeland. The poem also emphasizes a desire to protect one's family and to live a simple life in harmony with nature. The critical response to the poem was mixed, with some critics claiming that the work was 'alarmist' and anti-British."

197:29–198:3. "Fears in Solitude. Written in April, 1798, During the Alarm of an Invasion", ll. 7–11 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 13). Pater misquotes line 7: "...but the dell"; not "But the dell".

198:4–5. "Fears in Solitude. Written in April, 1798, During the Alarm of an Invasion", ll. 200–201 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 19). Pater misquotes line 200: "Pass like the gust, that roared and died away"; not "The gust that roared and died away".

198:6–7. "Fears in Solitude. Written in April, 1798, During the Alarm of an Invasion", ll. 201–202 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 19).

198:10. "Lake School": see above, note to 192:35.

198:11–12. See above, note to 197:26–28.

198:12. "[T]hat silent dell": the poem "Fears in Solitude" is spatially set in "A green and silent spot amid the hills, | A small and silent dell!" (ll. 1–2). See vol. 1, 197:24–25.

198:30–199:15. "France: An Ode", I (ll. 1–21). (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 4).

199:24–25. "France: An Ode", V, ll. 97–98. (*PDW* 1877, vol. 2, p. 8).

199:27. "Lake School": see above, note to 192:35.

200:1–2. "To a Young Ass, its Mother Being Tethered Near it", ll. 17–18 (*PDW* 1877, vol. 1, p. 70).

200:22–24. THOMAS PERCY (1729–1811), Bishop of Dromore, County Down, Ireland, was the editor of the first great ballad collection, *Reliques of Ancient Poetry* (1765), which most encouraged the 18th century ballad revival, as a significant contribution for the Romantic movement's appreciation for mediaeval popular literature.

JAMES MACPHERSON (1736–1796), a Scottish writer, poet, literary collector, and politician, was the author of *The Poems of Ossian* (1760s), which he published under the claim that he had collected the poems of Ossian (a legendary bard in Irish mythology) on the basis of ancient sources transmitted to him by word-of-mouth.

The Scottish historical novelist, poet, playwright, and historian SIR WALTER SCOTT (1771–1832), whose love of popular literature led him to edit and publish, in 1802, the two-volume ballad collection *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, containing 48 traditional ballads, of which 26 were then published for the first time.

200:25–26. “Monody on the Death of Chatterton”, ll. 155–156 (PDW 1877, vol. 1, p. 62). “Chatterton” refers to the English poet Thomas Chatterton (1752–1770), whose precocious genius led him to commit suicide at the age of 17, but lived on, to influence not only Coleridge, but also other Romantic poets. Namely, Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats.

200:34–201:1. SAMUEL PURCHAS (c. 1577–1626), an English Anglican cleric who, under the claim of being reports to foreign countries, published: *Purchas, his Pilgrimage; or, Relations of the World and the Religions Observed in all Ages* (1614); *Purchas, his Pilgrim. Microcosmus, or the Historie of Man. Relating the Wonders of his Generation, Vanities in his Degeneration, Necessity of his Regeneration* (1619); *Hakluytus Posthumus; or Purchas, his Pilgrimes, Contayning a History of the World in Sea Voyages and Lande Travells, by Englishmen and Others* (1625, 4 vols.).

THOMAS BURNET (c. 1635?–1715), an English theologian and writer on cosmogony who, among other works, published: *Telluris Theoria Sacra*, 2 vols., 1681, 1689 (*Theory of the Earth*, 2 vols., 1684, 1690), and *Archaeologiæ Philosophicæ sive Doctrina Antiqua de Rerum Originibus*, 2 Books, 1692 (*Archaeologiæ philosophicæ: or the ancient doctrine concerning the originals of things*, vol. I (Book I) and vol. II (Book II), 1736).

201:2–3. The epigraph of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* is a *passim* overview of a page-long passage in Book I, chapter VII—“De Hebræis, eorumque Cabalâ” (“Of the Jews and their Kabbala”),—of Thomas Burnet’s (see previous note) *Archaeologiæ Philosophicæ sive Doctrina Antiqua de Rerum Originibus* (*Archaeologiæ philosophicæ: or the ancient doctrine concerning the originals of things*). The complete epigraph, of which Pater reproduces only the beginning, reads:

Facile credo, plures esse Naturas invisibiles quam visibiles in rerum universitate. Sed horum omnium familiam quis nobis enarrabit? et gradus et cognationes et discrimina et singulorum munera? Quid agunt? quae loca habitant? Harum rerum notitiam semper ambivit ingenium humanum, nunquam attingit. Juvat, interea, non diffiteor, quandoque in animo, tanquam in tabulâ, majoris et melioris mundi imaginem contemplari: ne mens assuefacta hodiernae vitae minutiis se contrahat nimis, et tota subsidat in pusillas cogitationes. Sed veritati interea invigilandum est, modusque servandus, ut certa ab incertis, diem a nocte, distinguamus. (Thomas Burnet. *Archaeologiae Philosophicae sive Doctrina Antiqua de Rerum Originibus* (Book I, Chap. VII). Londini, *Capitis Episcopi in Cœmeterio Paulino*, 1692, p. 68 *passim*.)

Facile credo, plures esse Naturas invisibiles quam visibiles in rerum universitate: I readily believe that there are more invisible entities in the universe than visible ones.

Sed horum omnium familiam quis nobis enarrabit? However, who will tell us how they all are grouped in one family?

et gradus et cognationes et discrimina et singulorum munera? and their ranks, relationships, and differentiating features, as well as the functions of each of them?

Quid agunt? quae loca habitant? What do they do? What places do they inhabit?

Harum rerum notitiam semper ambivit ingenium humanum, nunquam attingit: The mind of man has searched incessantly after knowledge of these things, without ever attaining it.

Juvat, interea, non diffiteor, quandoque in animo, tanquam in tabulâ, majoris et melioris mundi imaginem contemplari: In spite of this, I do not deny that it may be of assistance, to bring the mind to contemplate in itself, as if in a tablet, the image of a greater and better world;

ne mens assuefacta hodiernae vitae minutiis se contrahat nimis, et tota subsidat in pusillas cogitationes: so that, habituated to the narrow banalities of daily life as it is, the mind contract not

upon itself, and diminish its own scope by entertaining petty thoughts.

Sed veritati interea invigilandum est, modusque servandus, ut certa ab incertis, diem a nocte, distinguamus: Nevertheless, it is by being alert to truth, by constantly following method, that we come to distinguish what is certain from what is uncertain, day from night.

201:7. Pater refers to the story in Greek mythology called “Dionysus and the Tyrrhenian Pirates”, which is best known as told in the seventh hymn of the *Homeric Hymns*. In his *The Greek Myths*, Robert Graves summarizes the story thus:

When all Boeotia had acknowledged Dionysus’s divinity, he made a tour of the Aegean Islands, spreading joy and terror wherever he went. Arriving at Icaria, he found that his ship was unseaworthy, and hired another from certain Tyrrhenian sailors who claimed to be bound for Naxos. But they proved to be pirates and, unaware of his godhead, steered for Asia, intending to sell him there as a slave. Dionysus made a vine grow from the deck and enfold the mast, while ivy twined about the rigging; he also turned the oars into serpents, and became a lion himself, filling the vessel with phantom beasts and the sound of flutes, so that the terrified pirates leaped overboard and became dolphins. (Robert Graves. *The Greek Myths* (27. h.). London, Penguin, 1988, vol. 1., p. 106.)

201:14. The Scottish historical novelist, poet, playwright and historian Sir Walter SCOTT (1771–1832); the English playwright and poet William SHAKESPEARE (1564–1616).

201:28–34. The English poet, painter, and printmaker William Blake (1757–1827).

Pater must have read the anecdote concerning Blake’s experience of ghosts in Blake’s biography by Alexander Gilchrist (Alexander Gilchrist. *The Life of William Blake*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1863, 2 vols).

On page 128 of volume 1, Gilchrist writes:

Smith tells us that Blake “was inspired with the splendid grandeur of this figure,” *The Ancient of Days*, “by the vision which he had declared hovered over his head at the top of his staircase,” in No. 13. Hercules Buildings, and that “he has been frequently heard to say that it made a more powerful impression upon his mind than all he had ever been visied by.” On that same staircase it was Blake, for the only time in his life, *saw a ghost*. When talking on the subject of ghosts, he was wont to say they did not appear much to imaginative men, but only to common minds, who did not see the finer spirits. A ghost was a thing seen by the gross bodily eye, a vision, by the mental. “Did you ever see a ghost?” asked a friend. “Never but once,” was the reply. And it befell thus. Standing one evening at his at his garden-door in Lambeth, and chancing to look up, he saw a horrible grim figure, “scaly, speckled, very awful, stalking downstairs towards him.” More frightened than ever before or after, he took to his heels, and ran out of the house.

“Smith” refers to the English painter, engraver, and antiquarian (1766–1833) John Thomas Smith, who knew Blake personally and, in fact, states, in the chapter of his *Nollekens and his Time* titled “Blake”:

He was inspired with the splendid grandeur of this figure, by the vision which he declared hovered over his head at the top of his staircase; and he has been frequently heard to say, that it made a more powerful impression upon his mind than all he had ever been visited by. (John Thomas Smith. *Nollekens and his Time: Comprehending the Life of that Celebrated Sculptor; and Memoirs of Several Contemporary Artists from the Time of Roubiliac, Hogarth, and Reynolds to that of Fuseli, Flaxman, and Blake*. London, Henry Colburn, 1828, vol. 1, p.478.)

The “figure” Gilchrist speaks of, *The Ancient of Days*, is a design originally published as the frontispiece to the 1794 work

Europe: a Prophecy. Blake named it after one of God's titles in the Book of Daniel (Daniel 7:9—"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire"), and it shows Urizen (the old man Blake made stand for conventional reason and law) crouching, inside a circular design, with a cloud-like background. His outstretched hand holds a compass over the darker void below.

201:31–32. William Blake's *Illustrations of the Book of Job* comprehend a series of twenty two engraved prints (1826) illustrating the biblical Book of Job, as well as two earlier (1806 and 1821) sets of watercolours on the same subject.

Pater refers to no. 14 of the beautiful twenty-one earlier watercolour illustrations, which is titled *When the Morning Stars Sang Together*. It depicts God re-enacting the creation of the world, while Job and his wife kneel below. The scene follows the moment in which Job challenges God to appear and explain why he, Job, should suffer the succession of evils that proverbially so much put his patience to the test.

Hurt and irate, full of pride—much-too-human pride,—
God answers him by asking: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. | Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? | Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof; | *When the morning stars sang together*, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?" (Job 38:4–7)

202:4–7. The Swedish theologian, scientist, philosopher and mystic Emanuel SWEDENBORG (1688–1772).

William SHAKESPEARE'S (1564–1616) tragedy *Hamlet* (1599–1601).

Cristopher MARLOWE'S (1564–1593) tragedy *Doctor Faustus* (c. 1588–1592).

Johann Wolfgang von GOETHE'S (1749–1832) *Faust. Eine Tragödie* (*Faust. A Tragedy*), 1808 (Part I) and 1832 (Part II).

202:7–17. Pater quotes (misquotes, for he originally has "spot" take the place of "blot") lines 5 and 6 of stanza 4 of

202:7–17.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

section iv of part II of Alfred Lord Tennyson's (1809–1892) *Maude: A Monodrama* (1855)—in which these words (“the spot upon the brain | That *will* show itself without”) are indeed uttered in the presence of the ghost of the narrator's deceased “true love”:

And I wake, my dream is fled;
In the shuddering dawn, behold,
Without knowledge, without pity,
By the curtains of my bed
That abiding phantom cold.

“Get thee hence, nor come again,
Mix not memory with doubt,
Pass, thou deathlike type of pain,
Pass and cease to move about!
‘Tis the blot upon the brain
That *will* show itself without.”

Pater may have learned about “the vision by which Swedenborg was called, as he thought, to his work” in one of the biographies of Swedenborg that were available to him. One of those biographies is titled “General Biographical Notices”, and appears in volume 1 of *Documents Concerning the Life and Character of Emanuel Swedenborg*. It recounts the episode Pater refers to thus:

Swedenborg was of a very gentle disposition; but he was straight-forward, and would not betray the truth from respect to men, or for any other reason. Mr. Robsahm [Carl Robsahm (1735–1794)], the author of his biography [*Memoirs of Swedenborg*] asked him... how he began to have his revelations: “I was in London,” answered Swedenborg, “and dined late at my usual inn, where I had a private room that I might be at liberty to reflect at pleasure upon spiritual subjects. I felt very hungry, and ate with eagerness. Towards the close of the meal I noticed a sort of dimness spreading before

my eyes, and saw the floor covered with snakes, toads, caterpillars, and other hideous reptiles; and I became more and more astonished, as the darkness increased. However, it soon disappeared (and with it the swarm of repulsive reptiles). Then I saw clearly a man surrounded with vivid and shining light, sitting in a corner of the room. I was alone; and judge of my alarm, when I heard him pronounce distinctly (but with a voice capable of inspiring terror): *Eat not so much*. After these words my eyes again became darkened, but gradually the darkness passed away, and I then found myself alone in the room. Still somewhat frightened at all I had seen, I hastened back to my lodgings, without telling any one what had happened. There I gave myself up to reflection, but could not comprehend how this could have been the effect of chance, or of any physical cause. The following night the same man (refulgent with light) presented himself again before me, and said: *I am God the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer; I have chosen thee to explain to men the interior sense of the Sacred Scripture; I will dictate to thee what thou shalt write*. [This time I was not at all alarmed, and the light by which he was surrounded, although it was exceedingly vivid and dazzling, did not make even the least painful impression upon my eyes. He was clothed in imperial purple, and the vision lasted a full quarter of an hour]. The same night the eyes of my interior man were opened, and perfectly fitted to see into heaven, the world of spirits, and hell; and I found everywhere many persons of my acquaintance, some of whom had died a long time, and others only a short time, before. From that day I renounced all worldly occupations, in order to devote myself exclusively to spiritual things, as I had been commanded.” (R. L. Tafel, ed. and transl. *Documents Concerning the Life and Character of Emanuel Swedenborg*. London, Swedenborg Society, 1875, vol. 1, pp. 68–69).

Now, in this relatively long passage (202:7–17), Pater is trying to convey to the reader what he thinks to have been “a

change of temper” that “passed over the whole modern mind”: “a change of temper in regard to the supernatural”. Unfortunately, he plays fast and loose with words here, so that it becomes difficult to see how the examples he gives fit in his conception of such a “change”.

For instance, what does he really mean by “the whole modern mind”, since all the names he gives are names of men that lived in the “modern world”—at least, when this designation is understood, as it should be in the present context, as synonymous with “Modernity”? What does he really mean by “the older romantic presentation of” “the supernatural”—as opposed to the presentation of the supernatural by “the modern mind? Is it Swedenborg’s? Is it Shakespeare’s? is it Marlowe’s? Is it Goethe’s?

One point, however, appears to be certain: on the one hand, Pater identifies “the older... presentment” “of the supernatural”, or the older “sense of the supernatural”, with the indifference towards the opposition between immanence and transcendence that he detects in Blake: “His ‘spirits,’ at once more delicate, and so much more real than any ghost... were an integral element in his every-day life”; on the other hand, Pater identifies the modern “presentment” “of the supernatural”, or the modern “sense of the supernatural”, with the view, expressed by Tennyson, that “spirits” seen (experienced *qua* immanent entities) are, as much as “ghosts”, a projection (an externalization) of a mere “blot upon the brain”.

We therefore are faced with: on the one hand (*e.g.*, the left hand), the older “sense of the supernatural”; on the other hand (*e.g.*, the right hand), the modern “sense of the supernatural”; and somewhere in the middle “a change of temper in regard to the supernatural”.

On the side of the “modern sense”, Pater places the question asked to Blake by “Some one”, and on the opposite side he places the answer given by Blake himself: “And the difference of mood expressed in that question and its answer, is indicative of a change of temper in regard to the supernatural”.

Besides, “the true measure” of such a “change” “is the influence of the writings of Swedenborg”.—Upon whom or

what? Just upon Blake? Or upon the whole “older romantic presentment” “of the supernatural”?— Which, strangely enough, would then have to be conceived of as “romantic” and Swedenborgian, as well as pre-modern.

Be it as it may, it seems, however, certain that Pater likewise places Swedenborg, and “the vision by which Swedenborg was called, as he thought, to his work”, on the side of the “older romantic presentment” “of the supernatural”—in spite of taking them as “the true measure” of the “change” he is trying to convey to the reader. For, after all, wasn’t Blake’s sense of the supernatural *large enough*, to be taken by Pater as a “true measure”?

Now, if, as we have just seen, Pater places “the ghost which called” Swedenborg “to his work” on the “older” side, he inevitably places “the ghost which *called* Hamlet” on the opposite side: the “modern” side—in spite of the fact that the second (Shakespeare’s *ghost*) predates the first (Swedenborg’s *ghost*), and, thus, *is* “older”.

What about *Faustus* (Marlowe’s) and *Faust* (Goethe’s)?

The difference between them lies on “the spells of” each of them, says Pater—apparently sure that the reader cognizant with both *Fausts* would immediately realize what such “spells” are supposed to mean, as well as that he, Pater, could not but place the “spells of” “Marlowe’s *Faust*” on the Swedenborgian side, and the “spells of” “Goethe’s”, therefore, on the Shakespearean side.

Now, Pater chooses “the ghost which *called* Hamlet” as an example of what he wants to say concerning the modern side: the side where spirits and ghosts seen (experienced *qua* immanent entities) are to be interpreted by the seer(s) as mere *blots upon the brain that will show themselves without*. He, therefore, is referring the reader either to *Hamlet*, I, v, or to *Hamlet*, I, v and *Hamlet*, III, iv.

And how does Hamlet *read* the ghost of his father in both instances? As a *blot upon the brain that will show itself without*?

In order to get an answer, let us content ourselves with considering *Hamlet*, I, v, ll. 113–134—for that will be more than sufficient.

202:7–17.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

HAMLET. Angels and ministers of grace defend us!
Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,
Be thy intents wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape
That I will speak to thee: I'll call thee Hamlet,
King, father, royal Dane: O, answer me!
Let me not burst in ignorance; but tell
Why thy canonized bones, hearsed in death,
Have burst their cerements; why the sepulchre,
Wherein we saw thee quietly inurn'd,
Hath oped his ponderous and marble jaws,
To cast thee up again. What may this mean,
That thou, dead corse, again in complete steel
Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon,
Making night hideous; and we fools of nature
So horribly to shake our disposition
With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls?
Say, why is this? wherefore? what should we do?

Well, would not Pater, then, have been more successful if had spoken not of “the ghost which *called* Hamlet”, but, for instance, of “the ghost that, in *Hamlet*, appears to the soldiers keeping watch”? (*Hamlet*, I, i).

The soldiers are Bernardo, Horatio, and Marcellus.
How do they QUALIFY that which they see?

Horatio calls it the “image” of “Our last king” (ll. 80–81), an “illusion” (l. 127), one of the “spirits [that] oft walk in death” (l. 138), an “extravagant and erring spirit” (l. 154), and “This spirit” (l. 171).

Bernardo calls it “this portentous figure” (l. 109).

Marcellus calls it “this thing” (l. 21), “dreaded sight” (l. 25), “this apparition” (l. 28).

How do they DESCRIBE that which they see?

Horatio states that it is “like a guilty thing | Upon a fearful summons” (ll. 148–149), that it “usurps” the “time of night, | Together with [the] fair and warlike form” of Hamlet the Elder (ll. 47–49), that it bears “the very armour... [Ham-

let the Elder] had on | When he the ambitious Norway com-
bated” (ll. 60–61).

Bernardo states that it is a “figure” “like the king that’s
dead” (l. 41), that it “Comes armed through... [their] watch...
so like” Hamlet the Elder, “the king | That was and is the ques-
tion of these wars” (ll. 110–111).

Marcellus states that “it is, as the air, invulnerable” (l. 147).

How do they INTERPRET that which they see?

Horatio affirms that it is the product of Bernardo’s and
Marcellus’ “fantasy” (l. 23), knows not what it may be, that ap-
pears “Together with th[e] fair and warlike form” of Hamlet the
Elder (ll. 47–49), thinks that it “bodes some strange eruption
to... [their] state” of Denmark (l. 69).

Bernardo is inclined to think that it is “something more
than fantasy” (l. 54).

How do they REACT to the phenomenon?

Horatio becomes “harrow[ed] ... with fear and wonder”
(l. 44), states that he “might not... believe” in it “Without the
sensible and true avouch | Of... [his] own eyes” (ll. 57–58).

What is more consistent with the view that ghosts seen
are but *a blot upon the brain*, “a condition of one’s own mind”?
Hamlet’s view of the spectre of his dead father or the soldiers’
view of the “thing”, “sight”, or “fantasy” they would not believe
in were it not for “the sensible and true avouch | Of... [their]
own eyes”?

Now, for the two *Fausts*’ “spells”.

*Sint mihi dei Acherontis propitii! Valeat numen triplex
Jehovae! Ignei, aërii, aquatici, spiritus, salvete! Orientis
princeps Beelzebub, inferni ardentis monarcha, et Demogor-
gon, propitiamus vos, ut appareat et surgat Mephistopheles!
Quid tu moraris? Per Jehovam, Gehennam, et consecratam
aquam quam nunc spargo, signumque crucis quod nunc
facio, et per vota nostra, ipse nunc surgat nobis dicatus Me-
phistopheles! (1.3.16-22)*

*May the gods of Acheron be generous to me! Away with
the threefold power of Jehovah! Hail spirits of fire, air, and*

202:7–17.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

water! The prince of the East, Beelzebub, monarch of burning hell, and Demogorgon, we beseech you that Mephistopheles may rise and appear. Why do you delay? By Jehovah, Gehenna, and the holy water I now sprinkle, and by the sign of the cross I now make, and by our vows, may Mephistopheles himself arise at our command. (The translation is by David Scott Kastan.)

This is Marlowe's Faustus's conjuration, or "spell"—by means of which he does expect to succeed in calling forth the ghostly presence of Mephistopheles.

This "spell" is clearly a parody of the religious rites of the Catholic Church, and, like all parody, entails both that which is posited (parody in itself) and that which is given (that which is parodied). That is to say, Marlowe's Faustus' conjuration remains the product of a mind that is not yet beyond, for instance, Swedenborg's and Blake's belief in the possibility of transcendence becoming immanence; the product of a mind, therefore, which remains entangled in the mediaeval, or "older", "sense" and "presentment" of "the supernatural", and which, as a result, may be considered "modern" only in virtue of its antinomianism.

So far, then, Pater's understanding and use of the two *Fausts'* "spells" stand.

*Erst zu begegne dem Tiere,
Brauch ich den Spruch der Vierte:*

*Salamander soll glühen,
Undene sich winden,
Sylphe verschwinden,
Kobold sich mühe!*

*Countering the beast, I might well
First use the fourfold spell:*

Salamander shall broil,

Undene shall grieve,
Sylphe shall leave,
Kobold shall toil.

(The translation is by Walter Kaufmann.)

202:7–17.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

One does indeed find this sort of “spell” in Goethe’s *Faust*.—But is it really a more “modern” “presentment” “of the supernatural” than the “spell” that is uttered by Marlowe’s Faust?

Where does the difference lie, then?

The difference does not lie, contrarily to what Pater seems to say, in Goethe’s Faust conceiving of Mephistopheles and an array of other spirits as a *blots upon the brain that will show themselves without*, the experience of those spirits being for him “a condition of one’s own mind”; the difference lies in the fact that for Goethe’s Faust, in opposition to Marlowe’s, the transcendent world is not ontologically transcendent (as it happens with all forms of theism), but epistemologically transcendent.—Or, to put it in another way, the difference lies in that for Goethe’s Faust, in opposition to Marlowe’s, “the so-called real things themselves are but *spectra*”, as a result of the human mind’s incapacity to transcend its own epistemological limitations. That is to say, as the human mind’s incapacity to go beyond itself and merge itself with the universal spirit, *die Erdgeist* (the spirit of the Earth), which is common to all forms of pantheism.

In passing from Marlowe to Goethe, what is determinant, then, is that the “spells” of the latter are, and “the spells” of the former are not, a direct result of “those pantheistic theories which locate an intelligent soul in material things, and have largely exercised men’s minds in some modern systems of philosophy” (vol. 1, 102:15–18). That is to say, what is determinant is that for Marlowe Hell is the ontologically transcendent realm of Mephistopheles, while for Goethe the Earth, Nature, the Universe, is the ontologically immanent realm both of Mephistopheles himself and of “the Spirit of Earth (*die Erdgeist*).

202:7–17. This, indeed, is what causes the difference between the “spells” of those two playwrights to be as marked as the “difference ... between the rough masks of an early mosaic and a portrait by Reynolds or Gainsborough.” (vol. 1, 102:18–21)

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1880)

Nevertheless, how is it truly—the curious reader may ask,—the “spell” of Goethe’s Faust?

The *spell* of Goethe’s Faust!

(Er schlägt unwillig das Buch um und erblickt das Zeichen des Erdgeistes.)

Wie anders wirkt dies Zeichen auf mich ein!
Du, Geist de Erde, bist mir näher;
Schon fühl ich meine Kräfte höher,
Schon glüh ich wie von neuem Wein.
Ich fühle Mut, mich in die Welt zu wagen,
Der Erde Weh, der Erde Glück zu tragen,
Mit Stürmen mich herumzuschlagen
Und in des Schiffbruchs Knirschen nicht zu zagen.
... ..

(Er faßt das Buch und spricht das Zeichen des Geistes geheimnisvoll aus. Es zuckt eine rötliche Flamme, der Geist erscheint in der Flamme.)

(In disgust, he turns some pages and beholds the symbol of the earth spirit.)

How different is the power of this sign!
You, spirit of the earth, seem close to mine:
I look and feel my powers growing,
As if I’d drunk new wine[,] I’m glowing,
I feel a sudden courage, and should dare
To plunge into the world, to bear
All earthly grief, all earthly joy—compare
With gales my strength, face shipwreck without care.
... ..

(He seizes the book and mysteriously pronounces the symbol of the spirit. A reddish flame flashes, and the SPIRIT appears in the flame.) 202:33–34.

(Faust, I, ll. 460–467. The translation is by Walter Kaufmann.)

“The SPIRIT appears in the flame”—and Faustus becomes amazed at his unexpected monstrosity—SIZE—,for indeed the philosophy which animates *Faust* is, LITERALLY, a “philosophy... which sees in the external world no mere concurrence of mechanical agencies, but an animated *body*, informed and made expressive, like *the body of man*, by an indwelling intelligence”! (vol. 1, 196:12–15) (The italics have been added.)

202:33–34. The reader of Pater should be aware of the following: that the reader of Coleridge that Pater himself refers to here—“a reader who really give himself” to the text he or she may happen to read—is exactly the kind of reader his own writings, Pater’s writings, demand, whenever the aim in mind be to get to know what their author really intended to convey to “a careful reader” (vol. 1, 203:2). Indeed, the present Introduction, “Samuel Taylor Coleridge”, is—perhaps against all expectations—one of Pater’s texts which heavily confronts its readers with such a demand.

202:38. The English Romantic poets William WORDSWORTH (1770–1850) and John KEATS (1795–1821).

203:8–10. *Christabel* was first published in 1816, in *Christabel, &c* [“Kubla Khan, a Vision”, and “The Pains of Sleep”]. Coleridge preceded the poem by a “Preface”, which begins thus:

The first part of the following poem was written in the year 1797, at Stowey, in the county of Somerset. The second part, after my return from Germany, in the year 1800, at Keswick, Cumberland. Since the latter date my poetic powers have been, till very lately, in a state of suspended animation. But as, in my very first conception of the tale, I had the whole present to my mind with the wholeness no less than with the liveliness of a vision, I trust that I shall

be able to embody in verse the three parts yet to come in the course of the present year. It is probable that if the poem had been finished at either of the former periods, or if even the first and second part had been published in the year 1800, the impression of its originality would have been much greater than I dare at present expect. But for this I have only my own indolence to blame.

Pater' "notion of a very exquisitely limited design, with that pleasing sense of unity, which is secured in *The Ancient Mariner*", was perhaps connected with Coleridge's statement that, in his "very first conception of the tale", he "had the whole present to... [his] mind with the wholeness no less than with the liveliness of a vision".

Nonetheless, Pater probably had in mind too the famous passage in *Biographia Literaria* (II, xiv) in which Coleridge explains the origin of both the *The Ancient Mariner* and *Christabel*:

During the first year that Mr. Wordsworth and I were neighbours, our conversations turned frequently on the two cardinal points of poetry, the power of exciting the sympathy of the reader by a faithful adherence to the truth of nature, and the power of giving the interest of novelty by the modifying colours of imagination. [...] The thought suggested itself—(to which of us I do not recollect)—that a series of poems might be composed of two sorts. In the one, the incidents and agents were to be, in part at least, supernatural; and the excellence aimed at was to consist in the interesting of the affections by the dramatic truth of such emotions, as would naturally accompany such situations, supposing them real. And real in this sense they have been to every human being who, from whatever source of delusion, has at any time believed himself under supernatural agency. [...]

In this idea originated the plan of the *Lyrical Ballads*; in which it was agreed, that my endeavours should be directed to persons and characters supernatural, or at least romantic; yet so as to transfer from our inward nature

a human interest and a semblance of truth sufficient to procure for these shadows of imagination that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment, which constitutes poetic faith. [...]

With this view I wrote *THE ANCIENT MARINER*, and was preparing among other poems, *THE DARK LADIE*, and the *CHRISTABEL*, in which I should have more nearly realized my ideal, than I had done in my first attempt.

203:16–17. *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, VI, ll. 478–479 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 53).

203:25–27. *Christabel*, II, ll. 557–559 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 86).

203:29–30. *Christabel*, II, ll. 375–376 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 79).

204:1–2. *Christabel*, II, ll. 385–386 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, p. 80).

204:8–26. *Christabel*, II, ll. 408–426 (PDW 1877, vol. 2, pp. 80–81).

204:33. As it is indicated by the lines from *Christabel* that Pater has just quoted (204:8–26), “Lioline” refers to Sir Leoline, the widowed father of Christabel, in Coleridge’s homonymous poem, and “Roland” refers to Sir Roland de Vaux of Tryermaine, the supposed father of Geraldine and an old, but estranged, friend of Sir Leoline—who remains convinced that Geraldine, “a bright green snake” (II, l. 551) coiled around his daughter’s dove “wings and neck” (II, l. 552), is “th’ insulted daughter of his friend” (II, l. 647).

205:4–5. Pater quotes from “A General Thanksgiving”, in *The Book of Common Prayer* (see: Miles Myres, ed. *The Book of Common Prayer*. London, Thomas Baker, 1887, p. 91).

205:6–11. Apparently, the words which here appear enclosed by quotation marks are Pater’s own words—the quotation marks being used by him to show that they might have been uttered by Coleridge “in his later period of definite religious assent”, instead of “What he really did say” (vol. 1, 205:11).

205:13–206:3. “A Tombless Epitaph”, ll. 14–37. (PDW 1877, vol. 2, pp. 205–206).

Introduction To *The Purgatory* of Dante Alighieri (1892)

209:1–2. “His reputation will always be strengthened, because he is hardly read”. Voltaire. “Dante”. In:—. *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Paris, Cosse et Gaultier–Laguionie, 1838, p. 339. Pater gives the following footnote (p. xiii): “*Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Art. Dante.”

“Voltaire”: the French writer and philosopher (François-Marie Arouet) Voltaire (1694–1778).

209:8–13. The German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832).

The “church of Saint Francis” refers to the thirteenth-century Basilica of St. Francis (1181–1226), situated in the Saint’s hometown, Assisi, in the province of Perugia, Italy.

The Basilica contains two churches of different styles and building stages, one on top of the other: the Lower Church and the Upper Church.

The nave walls of the Lower Church bear the remains of frescoes depicting scenes from the Passion of Christ (right) and stories from the life of St. Francis (left), by the so-called Master of St. Francis (c. 1253), as well as (left) a fresco of the Coronation of the Virgin by Puccio Capanna (14th century).

In the vault crossing, above the Gothic altar, are other frescoes attributed to Giotto’s assistants, including the Maestro delle Vele (Master of the Assisi vaults).

The walls and the barrel vault of the right transept bear frescoes by the school of Giotto (1267–1337), as well as a Madonna Enthroned with Angels and St. Francis by the Florentine painter Cenni di Pietro (Giovanni) Cimabué (c.1240–1302).

The Lower Church itself contains eight chapels (six on the right side, two on the left side).

The Chapel of St. Catherine of Alexandria (also called the Chapel of the Crucifix) is decorated with a cycle of frescoes by the Bolognese painter Andrea de’ Bartoli (fl. c.1349–69).

209:1–2.

Introduction To *The Purgatory* of Dante Alighieri (1892)

The Chapel of the Magdalene preserves frescoes (from about 1314) depicting stories of Mary Magdalene and the Saints, attributed to the school of Giotto (1267–1337), and perhaps including some painting by Giotto himself.

The chapel of St. Nicholas, too, is decorated with frescoes from the school of Giotto (1300 to 1310), possibly executed with assistance from Giotto himself, and representing stories of the life of that saint.

The first chapel on the left, the Chapel of Saint Martin, displays episodes from the life of the saint by Simone Martini (1312–1320).

The transept of the Upper Church is likewise decorated with frescoes by the Florentine painter Cenni di Petro (Giovanni) Cimabué (c.1240–1302), depicting scenes from the Crucifixion, the Apocalypse and the life of St. Peter.

The upper part of the nave walls exhibits a cycle of frescoes with Stories of the New and Old Testaments, thought to be partly the work of painters of the Roman school and partly by followers of Cimabué.

The lower part of the nave walls is decorated with a fresco cycle designed by Giotto (1267–1337), who supervised its completion by other painters. The cycle contains scenes from the life of St. Francis, from his youth through death, and also depicts posthumous miracles attributed to him.

Now, Pater's words concerning Goethe's refusal "to inspect the frescoes of Giotto in the church of Saint Francis" are somewhat misleading, above all as a result of directly linking that refusal with the supposition that those frescoes are "work... done... under Dante's immediate influence".—Dante, whom Goethe appears to refer to in the *Italian Journey* (*Italienische Reise*) only twice and in quite different contexts.

In a footnote, Pater identifies the section of the *Italian Journey* he had in mind: "*Ital. Reise*. Letter from Perugia, 25 Oct. 1786." Most editions of the *Italienische Reise*, however, give Goethe's words about his visit to Assisi as belonging to another (the next) letter, which is headed: Foligno, den 26. Oktober abends" (Foligno, the evening of the 26th of October

[1785]). The part of this letter which concerns the episode Pater speaks of is the following:

209:8–13.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

Aus Palladio und Volkmann wußte ich, daß ein köstlicher Tempel der Minerva, zu Zeiten Augusts gebaut, noch vollkommen erhalten dastehe. Ich... stieg unter einem starken Wind nach Assisi hinauf.... Die ungeheueren Substruktionen der babylonisch übereinander getürmten Kirchen, wo der heilige Franziskus ruht, ließ ich links mit Abneigung, denn ich dachte mir, daß darin die Köpfe so wie mein Hauptmannskopf gestempelt würden. Dann fragte ich einen hübschen Jungen nach der Maria della Minerva; er begleitete mich die Stadt hinauf, die an einen Berg gebaut ist. Endlich gelangten wir in die eigentliche alte Stadt, und siehe, das löblichste Werk stand vor meinen Augen, das erste vollständige Denkmal der alten Zeit, das ich erblickte. (Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. *Italienische Reise*. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1913, p. 122.)

From reading Palladio and Volkmann, I knew there was a Temple of Minerva here, built during the reign of Augustus and still perfectly preserved. ... I... climbed the road to Assisi on foot with a high wind blowing against me. I turned away in distaste from the enormous substructure of the two churches on my left, which are built one on top of the other like a Babylonian tower, and are the resting place of St Francis. I was afraid that the people who gathered there would be of the same stamp as my captain. I asked a handsome boy the way to the Maria della Minerva, and he accompanied me up into the town, which is built on the side of a hill. At last we arrived in the Old Town and—lo and behold!—there it stood, the first complete classical monument I have seen.” (The translation is by W. H. Auden and Elizabeth Mayer.)

The “average specimen of old Roman architecture” Pater speaks of is, then, the “Temple of Minerva” in the “Old town”

209:8–13.

Introduction To
The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri (1892)

of Assisi—which, indeed, Goethe “inspected carefully”, at the cost of being accosted by some armed Italian countrymen, who mistook him for a smuggler!

And, if anything, what Goethe’s account “explains, much to the surprise of the reader of to-day,” is most certainly not related to his dislike of St. Francis, Giotto’s frescos, or the totally irrelevant supposition that such frescos be “work ... done ... under Dante’s immediate influence”.

Indeed, Goethe is quite clear concerning his motivations:

Die ungeheueren Substruktionen der babylonisch übereinander getürmten Kirchen, wo der heilige Franziskus ruht, ließ ich links *mit Abneigung*...

(I turned away *in distaste* from the enormous sub-structure of the two churches on my left, which are built one on top of the other like a Babylonian tower, and are the resting place of St Francis.)

...denn ich dachte mir, daß darin die Köpfe so wie mein Hauptmannskopf gestempelt würden.

(I was afraid that the people who gathered there would be of the same stamp as my captain.)

More accurately: “since I thought to myself that the heads of those inside would be of the same stamp as the head of my captain”—“my captain” being “ein wahrer Repräsentant vieler seiner Landsleute” (“ a perfect type of the average Italian”) who, having noticed that Goethe was “a Protestant”, pestered the German genius with questions such as:

Dürft ihr denn... mit einem hübschen Mädchen auf einem guten Fuß leben, ohne mit ihr grade verheiratet zu sein? erlauben euch das eure Priester?

(Are you really aloud... to have an affair with a pretty girl without being married to her? Do your priests permit you that?)

Goethe's reasons for having been "careful not to inspect the frescoes of Giotto in the church of Saint Francis, work, done, it has been thought, under Dante's immediate influence", have nothing to do either with Date or Giotto: they amount to no more than his distaste for the building's style(s) and his fear that, would he have done otherwise, he might once more come across "heads" of an Italian stamp he would do anything in the world to avoid meeting again.

Of course, Goethe was primarily motivated by his love of Pagan architecture—as opposed, perhaps, to his distaste for some specimens of Christian architecture,—such kind of love not being prone to lead one to read and admire Dante (at least *the* Dante which the Catholic world has mad its own, no less than the writings of the Pagan Plato and the Pagan Aristotle).

And perhaps, after all, Pater had in mind the feeling that is expressed by the two passages in *Italienische Reise* in which Goethe does mention Dante—both of which appear in Goethe's account of his second Roman visit:

Speaking of the the partisan evaluations of the Italian poets that the Italian men of letters were prone to do, Goethe writes:

Viel schlimmer aber war es, wenn Dante zur Sprache kam. Ein junger Mann von Stande und Geist und wirklichem Anteil an jenem außerordentlichen Manne nahm meinen Beifall und Billigung nicht zum besten auf, indem er ganz unbewunden versicherte, jeder Ausländer müsse Verzieht tun auf das Verständnis eines so außerordentlichen Geistes, dem ja selbst die Italiener nicht in allem folgen könnten. Nach einigen Hin- und Widerreden verdroß es mich denn doch zuletzt, und ich sagte, ich müsse bekennen, daß ich geneigt sei, seinen Äußerungen Beifall zu geben; denn ich habe nie begreifen können, wie man sich mit diesen Gedichten beschäfti-

209:8–13.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

gen möge. Mir komme die Hölle ganz abscheulich vor, das Fegefeuer zweideutig und das Paradies langweilig, womit er sehr zufrieden war, indem er daraus ein Argument für seine Behauptung zog: dies eben beweise, daß ich nicht die Tiefe und Höhe dieser Gedichte zum Verständnis bringen könne.

It was even worse when Dante came up in the discussion. A young man of rank and intelligence, who genuinely admired that great poet, did not take kindly to my praise of him, declaring that no foreigner had the right to claim that he understood such a unique mind when even Italians could not always grasp what he meant. After some talking back and forth, I got rather cross and said that I must confess that I agreed with him, since I had never been able to understand how people could take the trouble to read these poems. I thought the *Inferno* absolutely horrible, the *Purgatorio* ambiguous, and the *Paradiso* a bore. The young man was delighted, for my words seemed a proof of his assertions. (The translation is by W. H. Auden and Elizabeth Mayer.)

Speaking now of the outdoor meetings of the *shepherds* who had founded the literary society *Arcadia*, Goethe adds the following—somehow likewise ironic— observation:

Zwar hatten die werten Schäfer, im Freien auf grünem Rasen sich lagernd, der Natur hierdurch näher zu kommen gedacht, in welchem Falle wohl Liebe und Leidenschaft ein menschlich Herz zu überschleichen pflegt; nun aber bestand die Gesellschaft aus geistlichen Herren und sonstigen würdigen Personen, die sich mit dem Amor jener römischen Triumvirn nicht einlassen durften, den sie deshalb ausdrücklich beseitigten. Hier also blieb nichts übrig, da dem Dichter die Liebe ganz unentbehrlich ist, als sich zu jener überirdischen und gewissermaßen platonischen Sehnsucht hinzuwenden, nicht weniger ins Allegorische sich einzulassen,

wodurch denn ihre Gedichte einen ganz ehrsamem, eigentümlichen Charakter erhalten, da sie ohnehin ihren großen Vorgängern Dante und Petrarck hierin auf dem Fuße folgen konnten.

One more observation. When human beings lie on the green sward in the open air and seek to come close to Nature, love and passion have sometimes been known to insinuate themselves into their hearts. But these worthy shepherds were ecclesiastics and other men of dignity who were not allowed to be on intimate terms with the Amor of the Roman Triumvirs. That god, therefore, was expressly dethroned. But love is indispensable to poetry, so all they could do was to tum to super-terrestrial, more or less platonic longings and, following in the footsteps of their great forerunners, Dante and Petrarch, indulge themselves in allegorical delights, and it is this which gives their poems their peculiarly decorous character. (The translation is by W. H. Auden and Elizabeth Mayer.)

210:4–6. The “historic sense” Pater speaks of here makes the “sympathetic, eclectic, cosmopolitan” critic capable of contemplating the works of art of previous epochs fully aware both of their discontinuity and continuity with the works of art of his own time.

In his essay “Winckelmann”, Pater wrote:

The history of art has suffered as much as any history by trenchant and absolute divisions. Pagan and Christian art are sometimes harshly opposed, and the Renaissance is represented as a fashion which set in at a definite period. That is the superficial view: the deeper view is that which preserves the identity of European culture. The two are really continuous; and there is a sense in which it may be said that the Renaissance was an uninterrupted effort of the middle age, that it was ever taking place. When the actual relics of the antique were restored to the world, in the view of the Christian ascetic it was as if an

210:15–19.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

ancient plague-pit had been opened. All the world took the contagion of the life of nature and of the senses. And now it was seen that the medieval spirit too had done something for the new fortunes of the antique. By hastening the decline of art, by withdrawing interest from it and yet keeping unbroken the thread of its traditions, it had suffered the human mind to repose itself, that when day came it might awake, with eyes refreshed, to those ancient, ideal forms.

In the same essay, one also comes across these other words:

... individual genius works ever under conditions of time and place: its products are coloured by the varying aspects of nature, and type of human form, and outward manners of life. There is thus an element of change in art; criticism must never for a moment forget that 'the artist is the child of his time.' But besides these conditions of time and place, and independent of them, there is also an element of permanence, a standard of taste, which genius confesses. This standard is maintained in a purely intellectual tradition. It acts upon the artist, not as one of the influences of his own age, but through those artistic products of the previous generation which first excited, while they directed into a particular channel, his sense of beauty. The supreme artistic products of succeeding generations thus form a series of elevated points, taking each from each the reflexion of a strange light, the source of which is not in the atmosphere around and above them, but in a stage of society remote from ours. The standard of taste, then, was fixed in Greece, at a definite historical period. A tradition for all succeeding generations, it originates in a spontaneous growth out of the influences of Greek society.

210:15–19. At least some readers of Pater will be fully aware that the truth of this assertion ("The religious ideal

of that age, the theoretic construction which catholicism puts on the facts of nature and history, is for him, in spite of an invading rationalism already at work about him, itself also still an authentic fact”) is debatable. Indeed, an attentive reading of Dante’s *Commedia*—literally (in Latin), and on authorial authority, *Comedia Dantis Alagherii* (*The Comedy of Dante Alighieri*)—will perhaps be sufficient to discourage belief in it.

Consider, in connection with this, what the English poet Percy Bysshe Shelley had to say, in his *Defence of Poetry*, about Dante:

The distorted notions of invisible things which Dante and his rival Milton have idealized, are merely the mask and the mantle in which these great poets walk through eternity enveloped and disguised. It is a difficult question to determine how far they were conscious of the distinction which must have subsisted in their minds between their own creeds and that of the people. Dante at least appears to wish to mark the full extent of it by placing Rhiphaeus, whom Virgil calls *justissimus unus*, in Paradise, and observing a most heretical caprice in his distribution of rewards and punishments.

In the *Aeneid*, Virgil refers to Ripheus as being both *ius-tissimus unus* (II, l. 426) and *servantissimus aequi* (II, l. 427)—two epithets whose meanings were for Dante, most certainly, quite different from those which modern translators attribute to them: e.g., “most just of all the Trojans”, “most zealous for the right”.—For, otherwise, Dante himself would not have thought it just to place the Pagan Ripheus in the Christian Sixth Heaven! (in the *sphere* of Jupiter), among the most observant of the right:—of righteousness:—in the company of King David, Trajan, Hezekiah, Constantine, and William II of Sicily!

It is in Canto XX of the *Paradiso* (ll. 67–72), that the reader is given notice of Ripheus (speaks the “voice” of “the Eagle”):

“Chi crederebbe giù nel mondo errante
 che Rifèo Troiano in questo tondo
 fosse la quinta de le luci sante?
 Ora conosce assai di quel che ‘l mondo
 veder non può de la divina grazia,
 ben che sua vista non discerna il fondo.”

(“Who would believe, down in the erring world, that Ripheus the Trojan was the fifth of the holy lights in the circle? Now he knows much of the divine grace that the world cannot see, even though his sight discerns not the bottom.”) (The translation is by Charles S. Singleton.)

“Although his eye discern not the bottom”!

210:35–211:1. Cantos III–IV of the *Purgatorio* place Dante and Virgil on the First Slope of the Mountain of Purgatory, where they meet the Late Repentant who were Excommunicated, whose punishment is Detention for thirty times the time of their rebellion against the Church.

Cantos XV–XVII of the *Purgatorio* place Dante and Virgil on the Third Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where they meet the Wrathful, whose punishment is remaining under Dark Smoke.

Cantos XXV–XXVI of the *Purgatorio* place Dante and Virgil on the Seventh Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where they meet the Lustful, whose punishment is remaining under Fire.

In his translation of the *Purgatorio*, Allen Mandelbaum gives the following summaries of Cantos II, III, XVII, and XXV (the Cantos Pater here refers to):

Canto II: *Ante-Purgatory. Dawn on the shore of the island mountain. The sudden light upon the sea. The helmsman angel and the boat full of arriving souls. The encounter with Casella, Dante’s friend. Casella’s singing. Cato’s rebuke. The simile of the doves.*

Canto III: *Ante-Purgatory. From the shore to the base of the mountain. Dante’s fear when his shadow—and no*

other—appears. Reassurance by Virgil and explanation of the nature of shades. Consideration of the way to ascend the Mountain of Purgatory. The meeting with the souls of the Late-Repentant who were also Excommunicates. Manfred.

Canto XVII: From the Third to the Fourth Terrace. Examples of wrath: Procne, Haman, Amata. The angel of gentleness. The Seventh Beatitude, Ascent to the Fourth Terrace. Virgil on love and on Purgatory's seven terraces punishing the seven sins: pride, envy, and wrath—resulting from perverted love; sloth—from defective love; avarice, gluttony, and lust—from excessive love of earthly goods.

Canto XXV: From the Sixth to the Seventh Terrace: the Lustful. Hour and mode of ascent to the Seventh Terrace. Dante's queries about the leanness of bodiless shades. Statius' explanation of generation, souls after death, and aerial bodies. The punishment of the Lustful, purification through fire. The Lustful shouting examples of chastity: the Virgin Mary and Diana.

There follows Shadwell's translation of the lines Pater mentions (*Purgatorio*, XVII, ll. 91–139, pp. 251, 253, 255, 257):

“Creator,” he [Virgil] began “my son [Dante],
 “Nor creature, well thou knowest, was none
 “But was to love inclined,
 “In nature or in mind.
 “Love natural is from error free:
 “The other fails, or in degree,
 “As less or more his flame,
 “Or if perverse his aim.
 “Yet while aright he keep his course,
 “And in due measure spend his force,
 “Evil delight can never
 “Be born of his endeavour.
 “But if he go aside to ill,
 “Or with unregulated will
 “Of good pursue the track,

“Too forward or too slack,
 “Against Creator works his creature:
 “Now canst thou see that in your nature
 “Tis love that sows the seed
 “Of good or evil deed.
 “Now, being that the eyes of love
 “Ne’er from their subject’s weal may move,
 “All things secure and free
 “Must from self-hatred be.
 “Again, as nought can stand asside,
 “Nor from its primal cause divide,
 “That too is cut away,
 “Nor can to hate be prey.
 “If my division holdeth good,
 “Remains therefrom that we conclude,
 “Love misdirected will
 “Pursue its neighbour’s ill.
 “Tis from a single source it springs
 “But fruit of three-fold fashion brings,
 “As in your clay ‘tis bred
 “And there is nourished,
 “There is who hopes for highest place,
 “If but his neighbour he abase,
 “And greatness only so
 “Desireth to bring low,
 “There is who power and fame and prize
 “Feareth to lose if others rise:
 “So longs he, grieving sore,
 “For some reverse in store.
 “And there is one that wronged hath been,
 “And would with vengeance sate his spleen;
 “Fain is he to requite
 “With ill another’s spite.
 “This triple love below is punished:
 “Now of the other be thou monished,
 “That unto good will haste
 “With eagerness misplaced.
 “All long to rest their mind on good,

“But indistinctly understood:
 “So the desire of each
 “Striveth thereto to reach.
 “Ye who were drawn with love too cold
 “That good to compass and behold,
 “If duly ye repented,
 “Are on this ledge tormented.
 “Yet is there , good that cannot bless
 “Nor issue to true happiness,
 “That essence fair, the root
 “Of goodness and its fruit.
 “The love that to such good gives heed,
 “And fallows with unmeasured speed,
 “Above us thou shalt see
 “Lament in circles three.
 “But by what rule of reason guided
 “It is in triple sort divided,
 “I will forbear to speak:
 “Thyself the cause shalt seek.”

This is probably one of those passages of the *Commedia* which the “young man of rank and intelligence” that Goethe speaks of in the *Italian Journey* (see above, note to 209:8–13) would bear in mind while protesting that “even Italians could not always grasp what... [Dante] meant”. (Besides, Shadwell’s translation is not of much help to the reader—so that the reader himself is encouraged to have recourse to Charles S. Singleton’s prose rendering.)

Dante and Virgil have reached the Fourth Ascent of the Mountain of Purgatory, leading to the Fourth Terrace. To while away the night (the second night of their journey), Virgil outlines to Dante the design of Purgatory.—So that the lines Pater mentions give us Virgil speaking of “love” in connection with the seven Terraces of Purgatory, each of them offering the appropriate penance for one of the Seven Sins.

Virgil begins by telling Dante that there must always be *love* both on the side of the *creator* and of the *creature* (the *cre-*

ated), love being either natural (spontaneous) or derived from the soul (*d'animo*). The first kind of love is always without error (never is unrighteous love), while the second may *err* (may fail to be *righteous* love) in one of three ways: by means of being directed to a *bad* object (*per malo obietto*); by means of an excess of vigour on its part (*per troppo... de vigore*); by means of a defect of vigour on its part (*per poco di vigore*).

It is when *it* (*qua creatura*) speeds with too much zeal for the good object (*quando... con più cura | ...che non dee corre nel bene*), or when *it* runs with too little zeal (*con men [cura] che non dee corre nel bene*), that love *qua* the creature (*fattura*) labours against love *qua* the creator (*fattore*).

Now (says Virgil, the Pagan poet), the sins of Pride, Envy, and Wrath result from Perverted Love (love directed to a *bad* object); the sin of Sloth results from Defective Love (love which lacks zeal and therefore vigour and speed); the sins of Avarice, Gluttony, and Lust result from Excessive Love (love with too much zeal and therefore vigour and speed).

The first three sins (of Pride, Envy, and Wrath) are expiated in Terraces one to three of the Mountain of Purgatory (*Questo triforme amor qua giù di sotto | si piange*: “This three-fold love down here below | weeps itself”); the sin of Sloth is expiated in Terrace four (*Se lento amore a lui veder vi tira | o a lui acquistar, questa cornice, | dopo giusto pentir, ve ne martira*: “If slow love draws you, to have you see it, | or to make it your own, this terrace, | after due penitence, causes you to suffer for it”); the last three sins (of Avarice, Gluttony, and Lust) are expiated right below the Earthly Paradise! (*Altro ben è che non fa l'uomo felice... | | L'amor ch'ad esso troppo s'abbandona, | di sovri' a noi si piange per tre cerchi*: “Another good there is, which does not make man felicitous... | | The love which abandons itself to that in excess, | above us does it weep itself for three circles”).

Was Pater really aware of the *greatness* of the Italian poet Dante, when he advised his readers to “consider” “the moral power of Canto XVII. 91–139”? If so, would he have stated that Dante’s “care for the elaboration of detail” “had something in common with the art of that day, with what must be called its *naïveté*”? (vol. 1, 211:21–23)

“Manfred” (“in the matter of Manfred especially”) refers to Manfredi di Sicilia (1232–1266), the last king of Sicily from the Hohenstaufen dynasty, who reigned from 1258 until his death. He was excommunicated by three successive popes, and the target of a Crusade (1255–1266), which was called first by Pope Alexander IV and then by Urban IV. Nothing came of Alexander’s call, but Urban enlisted the aid of Charles of Anjou in overthrowing Manfred. Manfred was killed during his defeat by Charles at the Battle of *Benevento*, Charles having afterwards assumed the kingship of Sicily.

Manfred was an illegitimate son of Frederick II (1194–1250), who was himself the son of emperor Henry VI of the Hohenstaufen dynasty and Queen Constance of Sicily, of the Hauteville dynasty. Frederick was king of Sicily from 1198, king of Germany from 1212, king of Italy and Holy Roman Emperor from 1220, and king of Jerusalem from 1225.

In the course of his struggle for power and supremacy in Italy and elsewhere, Frederick II gained the opposition of the Papal See, he too having been excommunicated three times. His willingness to penetrate into the secrets of the universe brought on him the reputation of an atheist, his scandalous sensual indulgence having, likewise, made him unfit, in the eyes of the Popes and the Church, to enter Heaven. Furthermore, his endeavour to restore the *imperium mundi*, with Rome once more the capital of the world and he himself as the true emperor of the Romans, led him to publish a manifesto protesting against the popes’ claim of the world-empire for themselves, an act which, in its turn, gained him not only being excommunicated for the last time (by pope Gregory IX), but also the reputation of a self-confessed heretic.

All this goes to show that, in deciding where in God’s World to place Manfred and his progenitor (whether in Hell or in Purgatory), Dante saw himself confronted with much in common, good as well as evil, between father and son.

The truth is that, whether or not due to his political proclivities (not to say “political *vendetta*”), Dante decided to place Frederick II (the father) in the sixth circle of Hell, which he allots to the Heretics, and to place Manfred (the son) much

closer to Paradiso: in the first Slope of the Mountain of Purgatory, which he allots to the Late Repentant Excommunicates.

As to Queen Constance of Sicily, Frederick's mother and Manfred's grand-mother, the reader is to find her, together with Piccarda Donati, on the Moon! the first sphere of Heaven, which Dante allots to those who, in life, have been Inconstant in their Vows.

In Canto X of *Inferno* (ll. 118–120), the spirit of a Heretic tells Dante and Virgil: “Qui con più di mille giaccio: | qua dentro è 'l secondo Federico | e 'l Cardinale; e de li altri mi taccio.” (“Here, with more than a thousand, do I lie: | inside here, is the second Frederick | and the Cardinal; concerning the others, I keep silence.”)

As to the episode, in *Purgatorio*, concerning Manfred, here is Shadwell's translation of it (Canto III, ll. 103–145, pp. 41, 43, 45):

Then one of them began: “Whoe'er
 “Thou art, look round, and make thee ware,
 “If thou in yonder place
 “Hast ever seen my face.”
 I turned, and looked with eyesight keen:
 Comely, and blond, and fair of mien
 He showed, save where a scar
 Did all one temple mar.
 Humbly I pleaded that I had
 Beheld him never: “Look,” he said,
 And pointed where a blow
 Above his breast did show.
 Then smiling spake: “I Manfred am;
 “Of Empress Constance' line I came,
 “Her grandson; and I pray,
 “When back thou take thy way,
 “Go to my daughter fair, whose sons
 “Are Sicily's pride and Arragon's,
 “To her the truth unfold,
 “Though other tale be told.

“After my form was riven through
 “With these two mortal thrusts, I drew
 “Weeping to Him from whom
 “Doth willing pardon come.
 “Foul were my sins: but boundless grace
 “Hath arms of such a large embrace,
 “That they will straight admit
 “Whatever turns to It.
 “And if Cosenza’s shepherd could
 “In God that page have understood,
 “Before by Clement sent
 “In chase of me he went,
 “My body’s bones would still be found
 “Sheltered beneath the ponderous mound,
 “Near Benevento laid,
 “Upon the bridge’s head.
 “Now falls the rain, now drives the blast
 “About them, forth the Kingdom cast,
 “To Verde’s margin brought
 “With candles all put out.
 “It may not be their curse should kill,
 “Or hinder Love’s eternal will
 “So long as hope is seen
 “To wear a shred of green.
 “True, who in contumacy dies,
 “And dares the Holy Church despise,
 “E’en though before his end
 “In penitence he bend,
 “Still must it be he stand without
 “This bank, that circles round about,
 “Nor hope above to climb,
 “Until for all the time
 “That his presumption there did last,
 “Full thirty times be gone and past,
 “Save only that decree
 “By good prayers shortened be.
 “See then henceforth thou aid my healing,
 “To my good Constance all revealing

211:10.

“My sentence here which they
“Yonder may do away.”

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

Manfred being an excommunicate, his dead body was left on the battlefield, instead of being given a proper burial. According to Dante’s version, the Archbishop of Cosenza, at the behest of Pope Clement IV, would have had Manfred’s bones disinterred and cast outside the kingdom, onto the banks of the river Verde (III, ll. 124-32). The excommunicates, Manfred tells Dante, must wait in Ante-Purgatory thirty times the length of their period of excommunication, unless the sentence be shortened by prayers of the living (III, ll. 136-41).

Now, the reader who follow Pater’s advice will have, no doubt, much to “consider” in regard of “the moral delicacy” “in the matter of Manfred especially”—Epecially if he or she consider it “side by side with the moral power of Canto XVII. 91–139”!

211:10. The Florentine painter and architect Giotto di Bondone (c. 1267–1337).

211: 24–28. Shadwell’s translation, p. 357. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

Dante compares the Gluttonous to such birds—the Gluttonous having been allotted the Sith Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where they are punished by being subject to Starvation.

211:30–212:4. Shadwell’s translation, p. 361. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

These lines tell of the Gluttonous that Dante sees beneath “the laden and verdant branches” of a tree that appears to him when Virgil and Statius have distanced themselves from him.

212:9–11. Shadwell’s translation, p. 63. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

These words are spoken by Virgil, when a group of penitents walk towards him and Dante, and, noticing that the sun's rays cannot pass through Dante's body, two of them run to them amazed. Virgil tells them (in Singleton's translation): "You may go back and report to those who sent you that this man's body is true flesh. If they stopped for seeing his shadow, as I suppose, they have sufficient answer. Let them do him honor, and it may be dear to them." (XXIV, ll. 31–36)

212:14. Pater quotes *Purgatorio*, XI, l. 81 ("[that art] which in Paris is called 'illumination'"). Dante is in the First Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where the Proudful expiate their sin. One of the spirits there recognizes Dante, and, noticing this, Dante asks him: "are you not Oderesi, the honour of Gubbio and the honor of that art which in Paris is called 'illumination'?" (XI, ll. 79–81) (The translation is by Singleton.)

212:18–23. The English poet, literary critic, biographer, editor, and lexicographer Samuel Johnson (1709–1784).

The principle that "abstraction, generalisation", as opposed to the nineteenth-century (Romantic) taste for the concrete and particular, is "of the essence of art and poetry"—this Neoclassical principle is formulated thus by Imlac, in chapter X of Johnson's *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia* (1759):

The business of a poet... is to examine, not the individual, but the species: to remark general properties and large appearances: he does not number the streaks of the tulip, or describe the different shades in the verdure of the forest. He is to exhibit in his portraits of nature such prominent and striking features as recall the original to every mind, and must neglect the minuter discriminations, which one may have remarked and another have neglected, for those characteristics which are alike obvious to vigilance and carelessness.

213:3–4. *Vita Nuova* (in Italian) or *Vita Nova* (in Latin), meaning "New Life", is the editorial title of the first of the two collections of verse that Dante wrote in the course of his

213:3–4. life. He himself refers to it as *questo libello* (meaning probably both “little book” and “little libel”):

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

In quella parte del libro de la mia memoria, dinanzi a la quale poco si potrebbe leggere, si trova una rubrica la quale dice: *Incipit vita nova*. Sotto la quale rubrica io trovo scritte le parole le quali è mio intendimento d'asemplare in questo libello; e se non tutte, almeno la loro sentenza.

(“In *that* part of the book of my memory, before which little can be read, there is to be found a rubric that says: *Incipit Vita Nova* [Here begins a New Life].—Under which rubric I find written the words I intend to give a sample of in this *libello*; and, if not of all of them, at least of their import.”)

Dante's *libello*, an exemplary sample of the so-called *Dolce Stil Novo*, the Tuscan Sweet New Style! contains 42 chapters with commentaries on 25 sonnets, one *ballata*, and four *canzoni*. It ends with the following words:

Appresso questo sonetto, apparve a me una mirabile visione, ne la quale io vidi cose che mi fecero proporre di non dire più di questa benedetta, infino a tanto che io potesse più degnamente trattare di lei. ...io spero di dicer di lei quello che mai non fue detto d'alcuna.

(After having written this sonnet, a marvellous vision presented itself to me, by means of which I saw things which led me to propose to myself to say nothing more concerning this blessed one [Beatrice], until I become capable of dealing with her in a more dignified way. ... I expect to say of her that which never was said of any other.)

In this way, the *little life* of Dante the sincere and humbled lover of the proud Beatrice comes to an end. The great

poet is born. Truly, *Incipit Vita Nova!* His new, *great life* begins. His words shall speak what never was spoken before.

213:7–16. Shadwell's translation, pp. 119, 121. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

At the beginning of Canto IX, Dante, accompanied by Virgil, Sordello, Nino Visconti, and Currado Malaspina, has reached the final phase of the ascent of the Second Slope of the Mountain of Purgatory. It is the first night of his journey. The five of them seat on the grass, inside the Valley of the Late-Repentant who lived Preoccupied with the World. In accord with the symmetric design of the whole book—which determines that Dante will experience a dream in the course of each of the three nights of his journey,—the Poet-Pilgrim falls asleep. And, when, outside Purgatory, in the “eastern balcony” of the northern hemisphere, Aurora appears, he dreams that an Eagle takes him up to “the fire's orbit” (as if he were Ganymede), and that, there, the Eagle and him burn. This imagined conflagration, he says afterwards, compels him to break his sleep. The words Pater quotes are to be thought of as spoken by Dante-the-pilgrim, who begins his account of these (foregone) events. (For Sordello, see notes to 26:9, 218:1 f.n., and 218:4.)

213:32–33. Pater quotes *Purgatorio*, I, ll. 4–5 (“...that second realm, | where the human spirit is purged”). Dante, the poet-narrator, states (in Singleton's translation): “To cruise over better waters the little bark of my genius now hoists her sails, leaving behind her a sea so cruel; and I will sing of that second realm where the human spirit is purged and becomes fit to ascend to Heaven.” (I, ll. 1–6)

214:1. One hears here echoes of *Marius the Epicurean*, whose sixteenth chapter is titled “Second Thoughts”.

214:3. [*M*]ar sì crudele (I, l. 3) is Dante's Italian, in the Proem to the *Purgatorio*, for “a sea so cruel” (see above, note to 213:32–33).

214:10–13. Shadwell's translation, p. 43. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

214:15–19.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

These three lines (in Shadwell’s translation) do in fact correspond to the last two lines (134–135) of Canto III (“[none is so lost] that the eternal love cannot return, | so long as hope sees promise in the green”). Therefore, they, too, convey “the moral delicacy of Canto III, in the matter of Manfred especially” (vol. 1, 210:38–211:1). (See above, note to 210:35–211:1.)

214:15–19. Shadwell’s translation, p. 43. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

These four lines (in Shadwell’s translation) do in fact correspond to lines 122–123 of Canto III (“but the infinite goodness has such long arms, | that she clasps all who come to her”). Therefore, they likewise convey “the moral delicacy of Canto III, in the matter of Manfred especially” (vol. 1, 210:38–211:1). (See above, note to 210:35–211:1.)

214:26–215:2. Shadwell’s translation, p. 151. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

In Canto XI, Dante and Virgil are on the First Terrace of the mountain of Purgatory, where the Proudful expiate their sin. Lines 1–24 are occupied by the prayer that the Proudful intone as they pass by the two poets: a prayer on behalf of themselves and of the living. The following lines, including those that Pater here quotes, convey Dante’s comment on the pageant of the Proudful and on their prayer:

If there they always ask good for us, what for them can here be said or done, by those who have their will rooted in good? Truly we ought to help them wash away the stains they have borne hence, so that pure and light they may go forth to the starry wheels.

“[T]hose who have their will rooted in good”! “[T]he stains they have borne hence, so that pure and light they may go forth to the starry wheels”!

215:4-5. “In My Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.” (John 14:2)

215:5. The ancient Roman poet of the Augustan period Publius Vergilius Maro (70–19 B. C.).

Pater, of course, refers to Virgil as the guide of Dante, from Ante-Hell to the Earthly Paradise (the uppermost part of Purgatory). According to him, Pater, why should not the Pagan poet Virgil too have “a place”, or a mansion, in “My Father’s” Catholic! “house... [of] many mansions”? Was he not one of the great masters of “classic or Pagan poesy”? And why should not “classic or Pagan poesy” hold “its own beside the poetry of inspiration”, like Dante’s, once “the Empire” holds its own “side by side with the Church”?

Was Pater speaking in earnest? Was he not aware that Virgil appears in the *Commedia* mainly as the helmsman of Dante’s “little bark of my genius”? That is to say, as the Master who had taught the Florentine poet how to say of the blessed Beatrice—in the Italian of the *Commedia*—, instead of in Latin, “that which never was said of any other”?—So that Virgil himself, side by side with the Aristotle of *De Caelo*, may well be thought of as the originator of the “marvellous vision” that Dante speaks of in the *Vita Nuova* (see above, note to 213:3–4).

Why should Dante otherwise exclaim thus, in the Invocation to the Muses (*Purgatorio*, I, ll. 7–12)?

Ma qui la morta poesi resurga,
 o sante Muse, poi che vostro sonno;
 e qui Caliopè alquanto surga,
 seguitando il mio canto com quel suono
 di cui le Piche misere sentiro
 lo copo tal, che disperar perdono.

(In Singleton’s translation: “But here let dead poetry rise again, O holy Muses, since I am yours; and here let Calliope rise up somewhat, accompanying my song with that strain whose stroke the wretched Pies felt so that they despaired of pardon.”)

215:11. Was not Calliope the muse of heroic poetry? Was not Virgil the Master of Latin heroic poetry? Who does accompany Dante's song along Purgatory (a mountain built out of words) but Virgil himself?

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

To echo Matthew Arnold, Dante well knew that "la morta poesi" was eminently poetry of the *senses* (of the five senses as well as of the senses of words), while the *modern* poetry of his time was poetry of the heart and the imagination. Pater, nonetheless, judges the one to be just "Pagan poesy"; the other, "poetry of inspiration".

215:11. See note immediately above.

215:12–14. Shadwell's translation, p. 3. (See note to 215:5.)

215:16–17. 1 John 3:2. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." Probably, Pater had in mind some definite source for the formulation he uses ("though we know not what we shall be") of the phrase "it doth not yet appear what we shall be".

215:17. Casella, who Dante speaks of as being a singer, is known above all through Dante himself. According to the time-scheme of Dante's *magnum opus*, Dante-the-Pilgrim and Virgil reach the shore of the Mountain of Purgatory (after a 24-hour journey from the centre of the Earth to the South Pole) early in the morning of Easter Sunday, April 10, 1300. As a result, it is generally supposed that Casella must have died prior to that date.

Casella, who was probably a friend of Dante's, has been identified by most of the earliest commentators of the *Commedia* as a native from Florence, and is mentioned in some mediæval documents as a musician.

In the *Purgatorio*, the spirit of Casella is the first that Dante recognizes as having been known to him in life. At the request of Dante himself, Casella mentally sings, quite appropriately, the *canzone* "Amor che ne la mente mi ragiona" ("Love that with me, in my mind, reasons"), which appears in Dante's

Convivio (III, ll. 1–90)—so that it has been thought that he, Casella, set some of Dante’s poems to music.

215:18 f.n.

It is, of course, on the basis of this, that Pater assumes that Dante truly believed that Casella would “still exercise... his wonted musical skill” in the after-life: that it was Dante’s “persuasion that earthly and personal gifts will not lose their charm and purpose in another life”.

In his essay “The Poetry of Michelangelo”, Pater, however, had already stated his exegetic belief in Dante’s undoubted belief in the resurrection of the body:

In this effort to tranquillise and sweeten life by idealising its vehement sentiments, there were two great traditional types, either of which an Italian of the sixteenth century might have followed. There was Dante, whose little book of the *Vita Nuova* had early become a pattern of imaginative love, maintained somewhat feebly by the later followers of Petrarch; and, since Plato had become something more than a name in Italy by the publication of the Latin translation of his works by Marsilio Ficino, there was the Platonic tradition also. Dante’s belief in the resurrection of the body, through which, even in heaven, Beatrice loses for him no tinge of flesh-colour, or fold of raiment even; and the Platonic dream of the passage of the soul through one form of life after another, with its passionate haste to escape from the burden of bodily form altogether; are, for all effects of art or poetry, principles diametrically opposite.

215:18 f.n. Shadwell’s translation, p. 147. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

At Canto X, from which Pater quotes, Dante and Virgil ascend to the First Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where the sin of Pride is expiated. There arrived, Dante spends most of the time scrutinizing the examples of *true* humility (“l’imagini di tante umilitadi”) that he sees sculptured on the wall rising towards the next terrace.

215:18 f.n.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

These are traditional images concerning: firstly (as in all the other cantos) the life of Mary; secondly, the Old Testament; thirdly, the so-called “Pagan World”.

In this particular occasion, Dante is presented with the following scenes: the Annunciation to the Virgin Mary, which she humbly accepted; King David dancing before the Ark (II Sam. 6:14-16), with Michal, Saul’s daughter, watching from a window above and despising him; a poor widow begging Emperor Trajan (emperor from 98 to 117 A. D.) to avenge her son’s death.

These images, however, turn out to be quite deceptive, causing Dante’s senses (sight and smell) to battle against each other, one *saying* “Yes” while the other says “No”.

Suddenly, Virgil calls Dante’s attention to the multitude of sinners that he sees approaching them in the distance. These advance slowly under the weight of huge *stones*—so that they and their punishment turn out to be no less deceiving than the images themselves.

Aware that most readers of his masterwork would indeed let themselves be deceived, Dante, here as usual, warns them.

In the first place, by having Virgil tell Dante-the-pilgrim:

“Ma guarda fiso là, e disviticchia
“col viso quel che vien sotto a quei sassi:
“già scoger puoi come ciascun si picchia.”

In Mandelbaum’s translation:

“But look intently there, and let your eyes
“unravel what’s beneath those stones: you can
“already see what penalty strikes each.”

In the second place, by having Dante-the-narrator tell them (the readers):

Non vo’ però, lettore, che tu ti smaghi
di buon proponimento per urdire
come Dio vuol che ‘l debito si paghi.
Non attender la forma del martire:

pensa la succession; pensa ch'al peggio
oltre la grande sentenza non può ire.

215:18 f.n.

Again in Mandelbaum's translation:

But I would
not have you, reader, be deflected from
your good resolve by hearing from me now
how God would have us pay the debt we owe.
Don't dwell upon the form of the punishment:
consider what comes after that; at worst
it cannot last beyond the final judgment.

That is to say: *Do not pay attention to the form of the weighty punishment; think of the size of what will perforce have to follow it!* Which is the same as to say: *Think of the debt you will have to pay—of the difference between your real size and the size of your Pride become true.*

This is why Dante utters the following words, from which Pater selects the two lines he gives in the footnote:

O superbi cristian, miseri lassi,
che, de la vista de la mente infermi,
fidanza avete ne' retrosi passi,
non v'accorgere voi che noi siam vermi
nati a formar l'angelica farfalla,
che vola a la giustizia senza schermi?

Once more in Mandelbaum's translation:

O Christians, arrogant, exhausted, wretched,
whose intellects are sick and cannot see,
who place your confidence in backward steps,
do you not know that we are worms and born
to form the angelic butterfly that soars,
without defenses, to confront His judgment?

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

215:20–22.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

Now, Pater well knew of what sort of “worms” and “stones” Dante speaks here, by means of “exercis[ing]” the “wonted musical skill” he, Pater, transfers to “Casella”.—For, otherwise, he would not have gone to the trouble of transcribing in a footnote the apparently unrelated words he there transcribes; for, otherwise, he would not have mentioned the “persuasion” he attributes to Dante: “his persuasion that earthly and personal gifts will not lose their charm and purpose in another life”.

“Gifts”, one should note, are here synonymous with “worms”—even if they be Dante’s “musical” “gifts”.

It does appear, then, that, while writing his Introduction, Pater, too, was, after all, “exercis[ing]” his own “musical skill”—although, as ever, in a quite (or quiet) low key.

Should the reader “che de la vista de la mente [non è] inferno” say: *in an inaudible key?*

215:20–22. “[H]umanism, ...the mental attitude of the Renaissance and of the modern world.” In the essay “Pico della Mirandola”, Pater defined “the essence of humanism” thus:

...he[Pico] is a true humanist. For the essence of humanism is that belief of which he seems never to have doubted, that nothing which has ever interested living men and women can wholly lose its vitality—no language they have spoken, nor oracle beside which they have hushed their voices, no dream which has once been entertained by actual human minds, nothing about which they have ever been passionate, or expended time and zeal.

215:29–30. The English playwright and poet William Shakespeare (1564–1616); the ancient Greek playwright Sophocles (c. 497–405 B. C.)

216:10. Pater refers to the translations of *La Divina Commedia* by the American poet Henry Wadsworth LONGFELLOW (1807–1882) and the English linguist Charles Bagot CAYLEY (1823–1833). The first appeared in 1867 (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company); the second appeared in 1851 (London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Company).

Concerning the first of these two translations (Longfellow's) and the one by the Reverend Henry Francis CARY (c. 1772–1844), Shadwell writes, in his Preface (p. vi):

... prose translation, even at its best, leaves half the problem unattempted; the music, the cadences, of the poem are lost. Blank verse, such as Cary and Longfellow have given, is little better. No attempt is made to satisfy the ear with any effect corresponding to that produced by Dante's recurring rimes; and in those parts of the poem where the matter is less elevated, and where the diction is simple, the absence of rime makes the translation tedious.

216:11. “[T]he ‘mysticity’ which is so characteristic of the original”.

The adjective “mystic”, meaning “mysterious”, derives, as Pater, of course, knew, from Greek *mystikos* (“secret”), which, in its turn, is cognate to *mystes*: “one who has been initiated”. By means of the noun “mysticity”, Pater, then, meant: *prima facie*, “the mysteriousness of faith”; *secunda facie*: *secret knowledge of Dante's* “exercise *there* [of] his wonted *musical skill*” (vol. 1, 215:17–18)—*on the part of he who be initiated*.

216:12–13. The English painter, poet, translator, and art critic Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828–1882), whose translation of the *Vita Nuova* appeared in 1861, as part of (pp. 29–109) his *The Early Italian Poets* (London, Smith, Elder and Co.)

216:20. Pater appears to be quoting table talk attributed to the American poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807–1882): “Nothing is more dangerous to an author than sudden success. The patience of genius is one of its most precious attributes.” (Samuel Longfellow, ed. *The Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1891, vol. 3, p. 407.)

216:22–23. Shadwell's translation, p. 31. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

216:26–27.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

At the end of Canto II, when the spirits who stand on the shore of the Mountain of Purgatory gather round Dante and Casella, to listen to the song of the latter (see above, note to 215:17), the custodian of the island Mountain of Purgatory, Cato of Utica (the Roman Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis) cries out: “Wherefore this sloth, or this delay? | ‘Haste to the mount, to put away | ‘The scale that comes between, | ‘And lets not God be seen.” (Shadwell’s translation, p. 29). Then, says Dante, all the spirits haste to the hill-side, like a flock of pigeons “by sudden terror chased.”

At the beginning of the following canto (Canto III), Dante comments on his own reaction to Cato’s rebuke, saying that, on hearing it, he had drawn to his faithful companion (Virgil), who, however, had likewise rushed towards Cato, only to slow his step afterwards, smitten with self-reproach, and, as a result, to cause Dante’s own mind to expand. And it is at this point, that the words that Pater quotes in Shadwell’s translation, which ignores their original syntax, are uttered by Dante himself (Dante-the-narrator):

Quando li piedi suoi lasciar la fretta,
che l’onestade ad ogn’ atto dismaga,
la mente mia, chi prima era ristretta,
lo ‘ntento rallargò, sì come vaga,
e diedi ‘l viso mio incontr’ al poggio
che ‘nverso ‘l ciel più alto si dislaga.

In Singleton’s translation: “When his feet left off haste, [] which takes seemliness from every act, [] my mind, which at first had been restrained, [] widened its scope as in eager search, [] and I turned my face to the hill [] that rises highest heavenward from the sea.”

216:26–27. Pater, of course, is being modest here—above all in view of what Shadwell says of him (p. xii):

The translator owes his thanks to many friends...
above all, to Mr. Walter Pater, whose contribution to
.this volume is only the last of many acts of kindness and

encouragement without which the work would never have been completed.

216:34–

216:34–217:1. This passage deserves special care in reading it, for, although Pater seems to be predicating the qualities he names only of Dante's text and of Shadwell's translation of it, he is also predicating them of his own writings in general: "...that general *sense of composure* and breadth of effect which gives... *the air of a "classic."*

217:2. The English *metaphysical* poet, satirist and politician Andrew Marvell (1621–1678).

Pater refers to Marvell's "An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwell's Return From Ireland" (see next note), which probably was written in June 1650 and was first printed in Edward Thompson's edition of the poet's works (Andrew Marvell. *Works*. Ed. Edward Thompson, London, Printed for the Editor, 1776, vol. 3, pp. 495–499).

Marvell wrote his ode to give written form to his perception of Oliver Cromwell's (1599–1658) dissolution of the English monarchy, *a propos* Cromwell's return to England after a military expedition to Ireland which resulted in the defeat by his army of the Irish Catholic and English Royalist Alliance. The poem, which is deliberately ambiguous concerning the posture of the narrator towards Cromwell's reconfiguration of the political and religious side of the Britain of his time, does, indeed, put on "the air of a 'classic'", "the note of a dignified plain-song", as a result, in great part, as Pater notes, of its metre: of being written in stanzas of four lines composed of a rhymed couplet in iambic tetrameter, followed by a rhymed couplet in iambic trimeter—a couplet consisting of two successive lines rhyming A–B and having the same metre; a iambic tetrameter consisting of four iambic *metra*, each composed of one stressed syllable followed by an unstressed one; a iambic trimeter consisting, in its turn, of three iambic *metra* (each composed of one stressed syllable followed by an unstressed one).

217:4–6. *Terza rima*: invented by Dante, expressly for the *Commedia*, this rhyming verse consists of tercets (three line stanzas) with an interlocking three-line rhyme scheme—the

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

last word of the second line in one tercet providing the rhyme for the first and third lines in the tercet that follows (*aba bcb cdc*). Independently of the number of lines it may consist of, the whole poem, or poem-section, may, therefore, end with either a single line (the first of an incomplete stanza) or with two lines repeating the rhyme of the middle line of the previous tercet: must end either *bcb c* or *bcb cc*.

Shadwell's "reasons for adopting" the metre of Marvell's "Ode", instead of Dante's *terza rima*, were the following (pp. vi–vii):

... to reproduce for the English reader the form as well as the matter of the *Commedia*, Dante's own metre, the *terza rima*, has been adopted by Mr. Cayley, by Dr. Plumpton, and, less exactly, by Mr. Ichabod Wright. But the *terza rima* in English, though it succeeds in reproducing the rime, fails in two ways. In the first place, it is not an English metre: it has never been used by any English poet for original composition; its structure is unfamiliar; and the ear does not expect, and is not gratified by meeting with, the recurrent rimes. Secondly, the difficulty, always great, of finding three rimes suitable to the meaning, becomes much greater in translation; and it must frequently happen that the words which best reproduce the meaning have to be discarded in favour of weaker ones which fulfil the condition of the triple ending. The same causes necessitate the use of various forms of "padding," of violent inversions and complications of grammatical structure; and of archaic and uncouth expressions employed without any justification in the original.

If English *terza rima*, which makes the closest attempt to reproduce both the matter and the form of the *Commedia*, is therefore unsuccessful, is any other form of rimed verse possible? In the translation here published, the metre chosen is that used by Andrew Marvell in his well-known Horatian Ode to Cromwell. This Ode is composed in stanzas, each stanza consisting of

one pair of iambic eight-syllabled lines, and one pair of six-syllabled lines....

217:17–23.

217: 17–23. Pater had already used this analogy in his essay “Style”:

The right vocabulary! Translators have not invariably seen how all-important that is in the work of translation, driving for the most part at idiom or construction; whereas, if the original be first-rate, one’s first care should be with its elementary particles, Plato, for instance, being often reproducible by an exact following, with no variation in structure, of word after word, as the pencil follows a drawing under tracing-paper, so only each word or syllable be not of false colour, to change my illustration a little.

Well! that is because any writer worth translating at all has winnowed and searched through his vocabulary, is conscious of the words he would select in systematic reading of a dictionary, and still more of the words he would reject were the dictionary other than Johnson’s; and doing this with his peculiar sense of the world ever in view, in search of an instrument for the adequate expression of that, he begets a vocabulary faithful to the colouring of his own spirit, and in the strictest sense original.

217: 27:28. In order that the curious reader may quickly assess Pater’s assessment of Shadwell’s translation, there follow the first lines Pater himself selected in the first place (Canto V. 52–57), followed by Shadwell’s and Mandelbaum’s translations:

“Noi fummo tutti già per forza morti,
“e peccatori infino a l’ultima ora;
“quivi lume del ciel ne fece accorti,
“sì che, pentendo e perdonando, fora
“di vita uscimmo a Dio pacificati,
“che del disio di sé veder n’accora.”

217:27–28.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

Shadwell's translation (p. 65):

"All we by violence came to die,
"Sinners to life's extremity:
 "But there, when on our sight
 "Was opened Heaven's light,
"Repenting, pardoning, at last
"At pence with God from life we passed,
 "At peace with him whose grace
 "Moves us to seek his face."

Mandelbaum's translation:

"We all were done to death by violence,
"and we all sinned until our final hour;
"then light from Heaven granted understanding,
 "so that, repenting and forgiving, we
"came forth from life at peace with God, and He
"instilled in us the longing to see Him."

At Canto V, Dante and Virgil have reached the Second Slope of the Mountain of Purgatory, where the Late-Repentant who Died by Violence and Without the Last Rites expiate their tardiness in repenting.

When these see Dante and Virgil climb the slope, they approach them, and notice that Dante's body is alive. As a result, they change the prayer they were singing verse by verse, the *Miserere*, into a long "Oh!" Serving as messengers, two of them come nearer Dante and Virgil, to inquire what they are. In answer, Virgil tells the two of them that Dante's body "is flesh". They, then, go rapidly back, to join the group of spirits they had left higher up the hill. Having done so, they all stream down together, pressing on Dante and Virgil.

The reader then learns of three meetings, between Dante and Virgil, on the one hand, and, one the other: in the first place, Jacopo del Cassero; in the second place, Buouconte da Montefeltro; in the third place, La Pia, a lady from Siena.

The words that have been quoted above form part of the speech delivered by Jacopo del Cassero (1260–1298), a magistrate and *condottiero* five years older than Dante himself, who tells the two wayfarers of his sudden death at the ends of killers sent by Azzo VIII d’Este, lord of Ferrara, Modena, and Reggio from 1293 until his death, in 1308.

218:1 f.n. Shadwell’s translation, p. 125. The line numbers Pater gives refer to the Italian text facing the translation (not to the translation itself, whose lines are not numbered).

See above, note to 213:7–16, concerning the events that lead Dante-the-narrator to utter the words that Pater gives in the footnote (“Lettor, tu vedi ben com’ io innalzo | la mia materia, e però con più arte | non ti maravigliar s’io la rincalzo”).—Which ambiguously predicate the quality “greater art” (“più arte”) both of Dante-the narrator and of the reader.

First of all, one should notice that, in writing these words: “some readers may think that he rises and falls”, Pater appears to distance himself from the “readers” he speaks of; this being confirmed by what he says some lines below: “His translator... rising and falling with him, if so it be”. (vol. 1, 218:7–9)

Indeed, by means of the words that Pater quotes (“Thou seest, my Reader, how I raise | My theme, nor should it thee amaze | If greater art sustain | The matter of my strain”), Dante-the-narrator is not referring, as it becomes evident, to the rising and falling of his style, to the rising and falling of the greatness of his poetry, but, full of irony—as ever—, to his having just elevated his *materia* (matter or subject) and his intention of keeping it high by means of sustaining it with still “più arte” (“more art” or “greater art”).—*Arte* being, here as anywhere else in the *Commedia*, the “musical skill” Pater himself speaks of, above. (In connection with Casella, see above, note to 215:18. f.n.).

Now, how does Dante, in Canto IX, elevate, or raise, or uplift, his *materia*?

Accompanied by Virgil, Sordello, Nino Visconti, and Currado Malaspina, Dante-the-pilgrim seats on the grass, inside the Valley of the Late-Repentant who lived Preoccupied with the World, and, after he falls asleep, dreams that an Eagle

218:1 f.n.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

“con penne d’oro”! (“with feathers of gold”) takes him up—elevates, raises, or uplifts him— to “the fire’s orbit” (as if he were Ganymede), and that, there, the Eagle and him burn.

This imagined conflagration scorches him so, he says, that he awakes terrified, only to become disoriented, when he notices that, besides being alone, he no longer stands in the place where he sat before.

As always (until the Earthly Paradise), Virgil is there, to reassure him: to let him know, this time, that, in Purgatory, reality and dream are not much different from each other: that, while he was being uplifted by an Eagle, Ganymede-like! to Heaven, in a dream, he was in reality being uplifted to the terrace above by... “una donna” that said “I son Lucia”.

In Singleton’s translation:

You are now arrived at Purgatory... when your soul was sleeping within you, upon the flowers that adorn the place down there, came a lady who said, ‘I am Lucy; let me take this man who is sleeping, so will I speed him on his way. Sordello remained, and the other noble souls. She took you, and when the day was bright she went on upwards and I in her steps. Here she laid you down; but first her beautiful eyes showed me that open entrance; then she and slumber went away. (IX, ll. 49–63)

So, here, Dante elevates his *materia* not only by having himself lifted by an Eagle higher into Heaven, in a dream, but also by having himself *erected into* the entrance of Purgatory, in reality, by Lucia, the lady of the beautiful eyes that show Virgil the beautiful, salvific entrance.

Lucia, a disembodied spirit, a womanly spirit, carrying Dante-the-pilgrim in flesh and with bone, on her lap, up the steep slope leading to the entrance of Purgatory! What a reality become a true dream! “O Christians, arrogant, exhausted, wretched, | whose intellects are sick and cannot see” (X, ll. 121–122).

Now, who may this lady have been while alive?—She, who, in *Inferno* (II, ll. 94 ff.), is said (by Beatrice) to have been

sent to Beatrice by the Virgin Mary, to encourage her to help he whose love for her had diverted him away from “the vulgar throng”?!

Well, she is believed to have been Saint Lucia of Syracuse (283–304 A. D.), a Christian martyr who died during the Diocletian Persecution. But not before, so some of the many stories associated with her states—but not before having had her eyes removed, in order to have them miraculously restored to her in her grave, and, as a result, to be elevated to the condition of patron of those with eye illnesses, as well as, in Dante’s great comedy, elevated to the high rank of graceful fore-sight of the illuminating grace.

This is how Dante really elevates his *materia* circle by circle (in Hell), terrace by terrace (in Purgatory), sphere by sphere (in Heaven): always upwards (even when he sinks himself down the circles of the Inferno)... each time cured one more boning inch of the blindness he so much blames Christians for (“O Christians, arrogant, exhausted, wretched, | whose intellects are sick and cannot see”): each time, therefore, with a spirit more *erect*, more capable of observing and understanding (with the help of the Pagan poet Virgil) the beatific and salvific geography of the after-life, as well as the true ranks and revels of the beautiful souls of the Saints in *it*—in the celestial Paradise!

Once again, then, it appears that Pater wrote his footnote with his tongue in his cheek.—For the quite ironic words that he quotes may indeed be said to bear a connection with the idea of Dante-the-pilgrim ascending higher and higher (towards the Seventh Heaven on his way to the Empyrean), impelled and sustained by the art of Dante-the author, as well as a connection with the idea of the translator “following him” feeling himself raised by him, likewise, higher and higher, but not, most certainly, a connection with the idea of Dante-the-author rising and falling, with the translator “following him” likewise rising and falling on his lap.

As it is well known, the poet Alexander Pope contradicted the Horatian dictum *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus* (“even the good Homer nods”). At the end of Part I

218:4. of his *Essay on Criticism*, he said: “Nor is it Homer nods, but we that dream.”

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

Following in his footsteps, one might say, concerning the Paterian possibility that Dante “rise and fall”: “Nor is it Dante falls, but the addressee that fails him.”

218:4. Sordello da Goito, the 13th-century Lombard troubadour, who is the subject of Robert Browning’s (1812–1889) *Sordello* (1849).

“Sordello’s generous welcome of Virgil” and “the grand outburst against Italy, drawn from ... [Dante-the pilgrim] at the sight of” it, take place in Canto VI, by the Second Slope of the Mountain of Purgatory, where Dante and Virgil still remain among the Late-Repentant who Died by Violence and Without the Last Rites.

After having conversed with several other spirits and after Virgil has enlightened Dante, at his bidding, concerning the efficacy of prayers for the dead, they encounter the spirit of Sordello “completely | apart, and seated”—Sordello, who, like Virgil, was from Mantua, with the result that each of them embraces the other:

“O Mantuano, io sono Sordello
de la tua terra!”: e l’um l’altro abbracciava.
(VI, ll. 74–75)

Seeing this scene of his own creation before the eyes of his own imagination, Dante-the-author then transfers his rage towards the Italy of his time to Dante-the-narrator, and uses this opportunity to illustrate how people from the same city (like Virgil and Sordello) used to stay connected, while at the time he was writing they acted like strangers to each other.

Dante’s “grand outburst against Italy” is, indeed, a scorching invective against the people of Italy (VI, ll. 76–126), after which he turns his anger in particular to the Florentines, who, he believed, had become especially bad neighbours (VI, ll. 126–151).

218: 5–6. Dante “permits himself much harshness of imagery and vocabulary”.

Pater, whose admirable intelligence and sensitivity manifestly succumbed both to his inborn scrupulousness and the hypocrisy and bigotry of his surroundings, thus having become a man looking at himself, his fellowmen, and the world from a perspective diametrically opposed to that of a Dante—Pater, pale and pious Pater, had in mind, here, no doubt, passages such as the following, taken from Dante’s “grand outburst against Italy” (see note immediately above):

Ahi serva Italia, di dolore ostello,
 nave senza nocchiere in gran tempesta,
 non donna di provincie, ma bordello!
 (VI, ll. 76–78)

“Ah, Italia, land of slaves, of sorrow hostel, ship lost in a stormy sea, in lack of a steersman, no lady of provinces honoured, owner, but of a whorehouse!”

In Shadwell’s quite successful translation (p. 83):

Enslaved Italia, haunt of woes,
 Pilotless ship while tempest blows,
 Of provinces no queen
 But brothel-house unclean!

218: 10–11. “[T]he speculative or philosophic passages (Canto IV. 1–12, for example, and XVIII. 19–75)”.

Canto IV begins with a “speculative or philosophic” speech, by Dante-the-narrator, concerning the traditional division of the soul (*anima*) in three potencies or souls (*animae*): the vegetative, the sensitive, and the rational or intellectual. This speech is originated, as Dante says, by his absorption in listening, in the previous Canto, to Manfred (see above, note to 210:35–211:1), an absorption which causes him, *qua* pilgrim, not to notice that the Sun had climbed “for full fifty degrees”.

Dante considers the subdivision of the soul in several souls, each having a different power or virtue, “that error which

218:18–21.

Introduction To *The Purgatory of Dante Alighieri* (1892)

holds that one soul above another is kindled within us” (The translation is by Singleton).

At the beginning of Canto XVIII, Dante and Virgil have reached the Fourth Terrace of the Mountain of Purgatory, where the Slothful expiate their sin.

In the previous canto (Canto XVII), to while away the night, Virgil outlines to Dante the design of Purgatory (see above, note to 210:35–211:1). Now, in Canto XVIII, Dante is once more moved by his insatiable curiosity, and, being encouraged by Virgil to speak his mind, desires to know of the Pagan sage what love is: “ti prego, dolce padre caro, | che mi dimostri amore” (“I pray you, sweet dear father, | That you expound love to me”).

The “speculative or philosophic” speech which, in this case, Pater had in mind belongs, then, to Virgil, and concerns love, considered as a principle determining “every good operation [of the soul] and its opposite” (“ogne buono operare e ‘l suo contrario”).

Perhaps it is true to say that, when Dante is truly understood, his way of thinking, “so difficult, yet so fascinating to the modern student” (vol. 1, 218:12–13), is seen to be not so far from us, in terms of the history of the Western Mind, as Pater seems to have thought: is seen to be a “mode of thought” indeed “earlier” “than our own”, but, at the same time, quite familiar to us.

218:18–21. Like the *Paradiso*, and almost like the *Inferno*, the *Purgatory* consists of thirty-three cantos. Of these, Shadwell’s translation, as Pater knew it, leaves out the six last cantos (Cantos XVIII–XXXIII). His justification for this fact is the following:

An apology ought perhaps to be offered, apart from the impatience of the translator to finish his task, for closing the present experiment at the end of the twenty-seventh canto of the *Purgatorio*. The concluding six cantos of the second Cantica constitute, from several points of view, a distinct section of the poem. They have nothing to do with the general allegory, the moral

experience of the human soul, the process by which it can rise from earth to heaven. They do not even belong to the imaginary course of the purified soul after death. The earthly Paradise is a scene which is concerned solely with Dante's personal story. Virgil disappears without a farewell. Statius is there, but only in name: he takes no part in the action. No other souls are met with in their passage heavenward. 'The reconciliation of Dante with Beatrice, and the great pageant, revealing what was in store for the Church and the Empire, interrupt the course of the allegory; they form a personal episode, full of beauties of its own, but as distinct in thought and tone from the Purgatory proper, as that is from either of the two other divisions of the poem.' (pp. xi–xii)

What a long apology for "the impatience of the translator to finish his task"!

Not everyone, however, will endorse the violence Shadwell here does to the unity of the *Purgatory*, which is indiscernible from the unity of the *Commedia* as a whole. Even in spatial terms, the Earthly Paradise is to be thought of as the topmost part of the Mountain of Purgatory.

Be it as it may, Shadwell seems to have taken Pater's regret seriously, for he did complete his translation of the *Purgatory*, and publish the remaining part under the subtitle "Part II" (London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, and New York, The Macmillan Company, 1899)—although, by then, Pater no longer could see, read, and preface it, having meanwhile died... departed to Heaven!

IV.

Essay

On Wordsworth (1874)

223:1–4. For the distinction between Fancy and Imagination, see Wordsworth's 1815 Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*. 223:1–4.

223:6. No doubt, Pater meant by "German philosophers" above all Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775–1854)—although the importance that the faculty of imagination (*Einbildungskraft*) acquired for the epistemology of the three major German representatives of Absolute Idealism (Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel), and afterwards for the literary theory of the German and English Romantic poets, derived originally from Kant's distinction, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (see, e.g., B 150–152), between the reproductive imagination (*reproduktive Einbildungskraft*) and the productive imagination (*produktive Einbildungskraft*): a distinction which reappears, through Schelling, and therefore with ontological nuances which are completely absent from Kant's Objective Idealism, in Coleridge's famous distinction, in the *Biographia Literaria*, between the primary and the secondary imagination.

A note in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (A 120) makes evident why Kant's treatment of the imagination was new and appealing to poets concerned with the creative power of perception underlying poetry:

No psychologist has yet thought that the imagination is a necessary ingredient of perception itself. This is so partly because this faculty has been limited to reproduction, and partly because it has been believed that the senses do not merely afford us impressions but also put them together, and produce images of objects, for which without doubt something more than the receptivity of impressions is required, namely a function of the synthesis of them. (Immanuel Kant. *Critique of Pure*

223:12–15.

Reason. Transl. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2020, p. 239).

On Wordsworth (1874)

223:12-15. See above, note to 223:1-4. In the several editions of *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* that the poet himself had published (e.g., the 1815, 1832, 1836, and 1846 editions), the poems are grouped thematically, under headings such as “Poems of the Fancy” and “Poems of the Imagination”.

223:22–24. For Wordsworth’s criticism of the eighteenth-century *fetish* for the use of poetic diction, see the 1815 Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*.

223:27. In 1791, Wordsworth travelled to France, where, besides having gotten Marie Anne Vallon, a French young girl, pregnant with a daughter, Caroline, he became a strong supporter of the new revolutionary politics—his enthusiasm concerning the new spirit of *liberté, égalité, fraternité* apparently having stood the terror launched by the arrest (in August, 1792) and the decapitation (in January, 1793) of Louis XVI, which resulted in the end of the French monarchy.

Wordsworth having meanwhile returned to England, his “political ideas” began to move slowly in the opposite directions, as a result of the so-called Reign of Terror, which ensued after the creation of the First Republic (in September, 1792). The “reaction” Pater speaks of, after which Wordsworth became more and more conservative, to the point of occasionally expressing himself as “a declaimer on moral and social topics”, took place, as Pater points out, by 1795, motivated by the “excesses” that then occurred, causing the wave of violence and bloodshed of the previous years to rise to its limit.

On August 22, 1795, the National Convention, composed largely of Girondins who had survived the Reign of Terror, approved a new constitution, which created France’s first bicameral legislature. Executive power would lie in the hands of a five-member Directory (*Directoire*) appointed by parliament. Outraged, the Royalists joined forces by the thousands, and advanced on the Tuileries, to protest against the new regime. It was then, that the future director, Paul Barras, decided to do something unprecedented, something that revolutionary

leaders had never done before: to call in the army against the Parisian demonstrators. The man he chose to lead the armed forces of the new regime was the then quite young, but already quite successful, General Napoleon Bonaparte—who, in response to the order, quickly gathered his troops, marched towards the Tuileries, had his cannons turned onto the crowd, and ordered them to be fired at point-blank range. Several hundred demonstrators were killed almost instantaneously, but a few hours later, after the fighting came to an end, Napoleon, who was soon to be promoted to the rank of Major General, was happy for having succeeded in putting down the royalist insurrection.

224:13. Perhaps following Matthew Arnold, Pater makes much, in his writings, of the so-called “imaginative reason”.

For instance, in the essay “The School of Giorgione”, he states that “the ideal examples of poetry and painting” are “those in which the constituent elements of the composition are so welded together, that the material or subject no longer strikes the intellect only; nor the form, the eye or the ear only; but form and matter, in their union or identity, present one single effect to the ‘imaginative reason,’ that complex faculty for which every thought and feeling is twin-born with its sensible analogue or symbol.”—

And in his Introduction “Samuel Taylor Coleridge” (vol. 1, 194:25–36), he shows what he intends to mean here, although he there does not mention “the ‘imaginative reason’”:

Of what is understood by both [Wordsworth and Coleridge] as the imaginative quality in the use of mere poetic figures, we may take some words of Shakespeare as an example:—

My cousin Suffolk,
My soul shall thine keep company to heaven;
Tarry, sweet soul, for mine, then fly abreast.

The complete infusion here, of the figure into the thought, so vividly realised that though the birds are not

224:27–29.

On Wordsworth (1874)

actually mentioned yet the sense of their flight, conveyed to us by the single word “abreast,” comes to be more than half of the thought itself;—this, as the expression of exalted feeling, is an instance of what Coleridge meant by Imagination.

Although Pater nowhere does reveal it—as was usual with him,—he was quite aware that the concept of “imaginative reason” derives from Kant’s *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (see specially I, § 49), in particular from Kant’s explanation of what he calls “aesthetic ideas” (*ästhetische Ideen*), whose infusion of intellectual form (the Idea) and matter (the imaginative production of a sensible *physiognomy* for the empty form of the Idea) requires the *free* (aesthetic) cooperation between reason (*Vernunft*) and imagination (*Einbildungskraft*), from which cooperation results that reason thinks *for* the imagination, while the imagination itself imagines *for* reason.

Thence, indeed, the designation “imaginative reason”, which, however, obscures the fact that such “complex faculty” might as well be called “reasoning imagination”.

224:27–29. The classical expression of the “old fancy” Pater here speaks of his the following passage of Plato’s *Phaedrus* (245 a):

There is a third form of possession or madness, of which the Muses are the source. This seizes a tender, virgin soul and stimulates it to rapt passionate expression, especially in lyric poetry.... But if any man come to the gates of poetry without the madness of the Muses, persuaded that skill alone will make him a good poet, then shall he and his works of sanity with him be brought to nought by the poetry of madness, and behold, their place is nowhere to be found. (The translation is by R. Hackforth.)

225:32–36. The French essayist, novelist, and philosopher, Étienne Pivert de SENANCOUR (1770–1846), who became famous primarily for his epistolary novel *Obermann* (1804); the

French poet, dramatist, novelist, journalist, and art and literary critic Pierre Jules Théophile GAUTIER (1811–1872); the Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer Jean-Jacques ROUSSEAU (1712–1778); the French writer, politician, diplomat and historian François-René de CHATEAUBRIAND (1768–1848); the French poet, novelist, essayist, and playwright of the Romantic movement VICTOR HUGO (1802–1885).

226:3. The English painter Sir Joshua REYNOLDS (1723–1792); the English portrait and landscape painter, draughtsman, and printmaker Thomas GAINSBOROUGH (1727–1788).

226:10. William Wordsworth was born on 7 April, 1770, in Cockermouth, Cumberland, in the region in north-western England which is known as the Lake District, and died on 23 April, 1850, at Rydal Mount, having been buried at St. Oswald's Church, Grasmere. When he died, he was, then, just sixteen days short of his eightieth birthday.

226:12–15. In the case of the Italians, Pater refers to the painters of the so-called “Proto Renaissance” (1300–1425) and “Early Renaissance” (1425–1495): artists like GIOTTO (c. 1267–1337) and ORCAGNA (c. 1308–1368), and, in the second period, those who worked from the time of MASSACIO (1401–1428) to the time of Sandro BOTTICELLI (c. 1445–1510) and Giovanni BELLINI (c. 1430–1516).

In the case of the Flemish, Pater refers to the so-called “Flemish Primitives”, who were active during the period of the Northern Renaissance (the 15th and the 16th centuries): artists who worked from the time of Robert CAMPIN (c. 1375–1444) and Jan VAN EYCK (before 1390–1441) to the time of Gerard DAVID (c. 1460–1523).

226:19. The poem “Resolution and Independence” was written from May 3 to July 4, 1802, and was first published in 1807 (William Wordsworth. *Poems in Two Volumes*. London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807, vol. 1, pp. 89–97).

226:21. The English Romantic poet John Keats (1795–1821). His poem *The Eve of Saint Agnes* was first published in 1820, in the volume *Lamia, Isabella, The Eve of Saint Agnes, and Other Poems* (London, Taylor and Hessey, 1820, pp. 81–104). The poem, which is set in the Middle Ages, owes its

226:24–25.

On Wordsworth (1874)

title to its having been inspired by the popular belief that a girl could dream of her future husband if she performed certain rites on the eve of St. Agnes (the 20th of January)—Saint Agnes referring to the patron saint of virgins, a martyr of the fourth century.

226:24–25. “As a light | And pliant harebell, swinging in the breeze | Of some grey rock . . .” (William Wordsworth. *The Prelude* (1850), X, ll. 277–278. In:—. *The Complete Poetical Works. With an Introduction by John Morley*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1889, p. 310). Henceforth, this edition of Wordsworth’s Poetical Works, which Pater reviewed in 1889 (see vol. 1, pp. 99–105), will be henceforth referenced as: *CPW*, 1889.

226:26–27. *The Prelude*, XII, ll. 319–320 (*CPW*, 1889, p. 324).

226:28–29. “And in the meadows and the lower ground | Was all the sweetness of a common dawn”. *The Prelude*, XIV, ll. 329–330 (*CPW*, 1889, p. 261).

226:30. “And that green corn all day is rustling in thine ears!” “The Pet-Lamb. A Pastoral” (1800), l. 28 (*CPW*, 1889, p. 140).

226:33–227:1. “[S]o that he conceives of noble sound as even moulding the human countenance to nobler types”. Pater appears to have had in mind lines 29–30 (*CPW*, 1889, p. 115) of the poem “Three Years she Grew in Sun and Rain” (1800):

Three years she grew in sun and shower,
Then Nature said . . . (ll. 1–2)
[. . .]
“The stars of midnight shall be dear
To her; and she shall lean her ear
In many a secret place
Where rivulets dance their wayward round,
And beauty born of murmuring sound
Shall pass into her face.” (ll. 25–30)

226:33–227:2. “[S]o that he conceives of noble sound... as something actually ‘profaned by visible form or image’”. Pater misquotes *The Prelude*, II, ll. 305–306 (CPW, 1889, p. 247):

... I would walk alone,
Under the quiet stars, and at that time
Have felt whate’er there is of power in sound
To breathe an elevated mood, by form
Or image unprofaned.... (ll. 302–306)

227:12–14. Pater quotes: (i) the Introductory Note to part III (“At Rome”) of the poem *Memorials of a Tour in Italy* (1842): “but when particular spots of objects are sought out, disappointment I believe is invariably felt” (CPW, 1889, p. 753)—presumably to add the qualifier “particular” to line 208 of *Prelude*, XII; (ii) line 219 of that same passage of the *Prelude* (CPW, 1889, p. 322):

There are in our existence *spots of time*,
That with distinct pre-eminence retain
A renovating virtue, whence—depressed
By false opinion and contentious thought,
Or aught of heavier or more deadly weight,
In trivial occupations, and the round
Of ordinary intercourse—our minds
Are nourished and invisibly repaired;
A virtue, by which pleasure is enhanced,
That penetrates, enables us to mount,
When high, more high, and lifts us up when fallen.
This efficacious spirit chiefly lurks
Among those passages of life that give
Profoundest knowledge to what point, and how,
The mind is lord and master.... (ll. 208–222)

227: 24–25. The “lichened Druid stone”. Pater may have had in mind one (or both) of the two (only, apparently) references to druidic stones that Wordsworth’s poetry contains: (i) line 171 of “An Evening Walk” (1793), “The Druid stones a

228:2–3. brightened ring unfold” (*CPW*, 1889, p. 6), or (ii) line 133 of part III (“Despondency”) of *The Excursion* (*CPW*, 1889, p. 442):

On Wordsworth (1874)

And hence, this upright Shaft of unhewn stone,
From Fancy, willing to set off her stores
By sounding Titles, hath acquired the name
Of Pompey’s Pillar; that I gravely style
My Theban Obelisk; and, there, behold
A Druid Cromlech!—thus I entertain
The antiquarian humour, and am pleased
To skim along the surfaces of things,
Beguiling harmlessly the listless hours. (ll. 128–136)

228:2–3. The English Romantic poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822), who, in the fourth part (“Sin”) of his poem *Peter Bell the Third* (see above, note to 192:23), referred to Wordsworth’s apprehension of physical and psychological phenomena thus (ll. 309–312):

An apprehension clear, intense,
Of his mind’s work, had made alive
The things it wrought on; I believe
Wakening a sort of thought in sense.

Most certainly, Pater had in mind, while quoting this line by Shelley, the faculty he calls “imaginative reason” (see above, note to 224:13).

228:20–23. The “leech-gatherer” refers to the naratee of the poem “Resolution and Independence” (*CPW*, 1889, pp. 174–176); the “woman stepping westward” refers to the woman spoken of in the poem “Stepping Westward” (*CPW*, 1889, p. 192); “the aged thorn” refers to the thorn in the poem “The Thorn” (*CPW*, 1889, pp. 76–79); the “lichened rock on the heath” presumably refers to the unspecified rock Wordsworth speaks of when comparing to it the thorn in “The Thorn” (ll. 10–13):

It stands erect, and like a stone
With lichens is it overgrown.

229:3.

Like a rock or stone, it is o'ergrown,
With lichens to the very top" (CPW, 1889, pp. 7677).

229:3. The expression "Grave livers" appears in stanza XIV (CPW, 1889, p. 176) of Wordsworth's poem "Resolution and Independence" (1807):

His words came feebly, from a feeble chest,
Yet each in solemn order followed each,
With something of a lofty utterance drest;
Choice word, and measured phrase; above the reach
Of ordinary men; a stately speech;
Such as *grave Livers* do in Scotland use,
Religious men, who give to God and Man their dues.

229:12–17. As it is obvious, Pater is silently referring to passages of the "Preface" to the 1800 edition (vol. 1) of *Lyrical Ballads* such as this:

The principal object... proposed in these Poems, was to choose incidents and situations from common life, and to relate or describe them throughout, as far as was possible, in a selection of language really used by men.... Humble and rustic life was generally chosen, because in that condition the essential passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity, are less under restraint, and speak a plainer and more emphatic language; because in that condition of life our elementary feelings co-exist in a state of greater simplicity, and, consequently, may be more accurately contemplated, and more forcibly communicated; because the manners of rural life germinate from those elementary feelings, and, from the necessary character of rural occupations, are more easily comprehended, and are more durable; and, lastly, because in that condition the passions of

On Wordsworth (1874)

229:20.

On Wordsworth (1874)

men are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature. The language, too, of these men is adopted (purified indeed from what appear to be its real defects, from all lasting and rational causes of dislike or disgust), because such men hourly communicate with the best objects from which the best part of language is originally derived; and because, from their rank in society and the sameness and narrow circle of their intercourse, being less under the influence of social vanity, they convey their feelings and notions in simple and unelaborated expressions. Accordingly, such a language, arising out of repeated experience and regular feelings, is a more permanent, and a far more philosophical language, than that which is frequently substituted for it by Poets, who think that they are conferring honour upon themselves and their art in proportion as they separate themselves from the sympathies of men, and indulge in arbitrary and capricious habits of expression, in order to furnish food for fickle tastes and fickle appetites of their own creation.” (CPW, 1889, pp. 850–851)

229:20. The “picture within” is, here, what in the essay “Style” Pater calls “the vision within” or “sense of fact”:

...just in proportion as the writer’s aim, consciously or unconsciously, comes to be the transcribing, not of the world, not of mere fact, but of his sense of it, he becomes an artist, his work fine art; and good art ... in proportion to the truth of his presentment of that sense; as in those humbler or plainer functions of literature also, truth—truth to bare fact, there—is the essence of such artistic quality as they may have. Truth! there can be no merit, no craft at all, without that. And further, all beauty is in the long run only fineness of truth, or what we call expression, the finer accommodation of speech to that vision within.

229:23–24. In the first edition of *Appreciations* (1889), page 50, Pater placed between quotation marks the words “related in a selection of language really used by men”—because they appear at the beginning of the fifth paragraph of the “Preface” to *Lyrical Ballads* (1800): “The principal object, then, which I proposed to myself in these Poems was to chuse incidents and situations from common life, and to *relate* or describe them, throughout, as far as was possible, *in a selection of language really used by men*” (CPW, 1889, p. 850). (The italics have been added.)

230:7–10. “Michael” is the narratee of “Michael, a Pastoral Poem”, which first appeared in the 1802 edition (vol. 2) of *Lyrical Ballads* (CPW, 1889, pp. 131–137); “Ruth” is the narratee of “Ruth”, which also first appeared in the 1802 edition (vol. 2) of *Lyrical Ballads* (CPW, 1889, pp. 121–124).

230:11–16. The French novelist, memoirist, and journalist Amantine Lucile Aurore Dupin (1804–1876), who is best known as GEORGE SAND and wrote several “novels which depict country life”, most notably *La Mare au Diable* (*The Devil’s Pool*), from 1846, *Françoi le Champi* (*The Country Waif*), from 1847, and *La Petite Fadette*, from 1849; the Pomerian priest and author Johannes Wilhelm MEINHOLD (1797–1851); the French poet, novelist, essayist, and playwright of the Romantic movement VICTOR HUGO (1802–1885).

230:16–17. The “girl who rung her father’s knell”: “The Westmoreland Girl”, II, ll. 65–68 (CPW, 1889, p. 787).

230:17. The “unborn infant feeling about its mother’s heart”: “The Thorn”, XIII, ll. 133–143 (CPW, 1889, p. 78).

230:19–20. The “tales of passionate regret that hang by a ruined farm-building”. See, for instance, Book I (“The Wanderer”) of *The Excursion* (1814) (CPW, 1889, pp. 415–428), which developed out of a poem titled *The Ruined Cottage*, and “The Earl of Breadalbane’s Ruined Mansion and Family Burial-Place near Killin” (CPW, 1889, pp. 696–697), the twelfth section of *Yarrow Revisited, and Other Poems* (1835).

230:23–26. “[N]ot ‘passionate sorrow’ only for the overthrow of the soul’s beauty...” The phrase “passionate sorrow” does not seem to appear in Wordsworth’s poems: it is

230:26–27.

On Wordsworth (1874)

possible that Pater had in mind Wordsworth's note on line 73 ("Are not, in sooth, their Requiems sacred ties") of the poem "Stanzas Suggested in a Steam-Boat off Saint Bees' Heads", in which he speaks of "impassioned grief": "I am aware that I am here treading upon tender ground; but to the intelligent reader I feel that no apology is due. The prayers of survivors, during *passionate grief* for the recent loss of relatives and friends, as the object of those prayers could no longer be the suffering body of the dying, would naturally be ejaculated for the souls of the departed; the barriers between the two worlds dissolving before the power of love and faith." CPW, 1889, p. 843)

230:26–27. "[T]he sailor 'who, in his heart, was half a shepherd on the stormy seas': "The Brothers", l. 146 (CPW, 1889, p. 125).

230:27–28. The "wild woman teaching her child to pray for her betrayer": "Her Eyes are Wild", VIII, ll. 71–80 (CPW, 1889, pp. 81–82).

230:28–29. The "making of the shepherd's staff": "Michael", l. 183 (CPW, 1889, p. 133).

230:29–30. The "young boy laying the first stone of the sheepfold": "Michael", ll. 322–328, 382–387 (CPW, 1889, pp. 135, 136).

231:1–6. The inconsistency of which Pater accuses Wordsworth is, perhaps, characteristic of even the greatest minds of the Victorian Era—Walter Pater himself not being excluded from them in both aspects (that of great greatness and that of inconsistency). Understandably, such an inconsistency becomes more flagrant if one makes the common error of assuming that the history of a man's mind and heart exhibits "the solidity" (or unity, or identity) "with which language invests" it, by means of permitting to refer to it with a single, invariable name, such as "Pater". In fact, a man should not be accused of being inconsistent as a result of comparing, for instance, the religious beliefs he may have entertained as a young man with the religious beliefs he may entertain, or may have entertained, after having attained his mature or even old age. All inconsistency is by nature a quality capable of being ascertained synchronically; not diachronically.

As to the specific case of Wordsworth's religious beliefs (taken both as thesis and as antithesis, as "those traditional beliefs... which were otherwise the object of his devout acceptance"), one might say, taking above all *The Prelude* as testimony, that he clearly went through quite different phases of religious sentiment (if not belief), the most predominant and lasting (because recurring) having, perhaps, been what one might call his idiosyncratic form of Christian pantheism—which, in the end, may or may not have developed, as he grew older and went through the loss both of his brother, John (who drowned in 1805), and (in 1812) of two of his children (Thomas and Catherine), into the theism which the thirtieth of his *Ecclesiastical Sonnet* (from the early 1840s), titled "Forms of Prayer at Sea", appears to express (CPW, 1889, p. 636)—perhaps as the result of an imaginative experiencing of Captain John Wordsworth's predicament at sea:

To kneeling Worshippers no earthly floor
 Gives holier invitation than the deck
 Of a storm-shattered Vessel saved from Wreck
 (When all that Man could do availed no more)
 By Him who raised the Tempest and restrains:
 Happy the crew who this have felt, and pour
 Forth for His mercy, as the Church ordains,
 Solemn thanksgiving. Nor will they implore
 In vain who, for a rightful cause, give breath
 To words the Church prescribes aiding the lip
 For the heart's sake, ere ship with hostile ship
 Encounters, armed for work of pain and death.
 Suppliants! the God to whom your cause ye trust
 Will listen, and ye know that He is just.

Perhaps it will be safer, if not more *daring*, to take seriously, as a life-long adequate manifesto of Wordsworth's religious position, the following words, which he wrote no much sooner than he composed the sonnet which has just been quoted:

231:1–6.

On Wordsworth (1874)

My dear Sir,

It cannot but be highly gratifying to me to learn that my writings are prized so highly by a poet and critic of your powers. The essay upon them which you have so kindly sent me seems well qualified to promote your views in writing it. I was particularly pleased with your distinction between religion and poetry and versified religion. For my own part, I have been averse to frequent mention of the mysteries of Christian faith, not from a want of a due sense of their momentous nature, but the contrary. I felt it far too deeply to venture on handling the subject as familiarly as many scruple not to do. I am far from blaming them, but let them not blame me.... Besides general reasons for diffidence in treating subjects of Holy Writ, I have some especial ones. I might err in points of faith, and I should not deem my mistakes less to be deprecated because they were expressed in metre. Even Milton, in my humble judgment, has erred, and grievously....

I am not at all desirous that any one should write an elaborate critique on my poems. There is no call for it. If they be from above, they will do their own work in course of time, if not, they will perish as they ought. But scarcely a week passes in which I do not receive grateful acknowledgments of the good they have done.... As these benefits are not without a traceable bearing upon the good of the immortal soul, the sooner, perhaps, they are pointed out and illustrated in a work like yours the better.”

(Letter to the poet and hymn writer Henry Alford (1810–1071), dated February, 21, 1840. In: Ernest de Selincourt, ed. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. The Later Years*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, vol. 2, pp. 1006–1007).

One should take special note of the words: “I might err in points of faith”; “If they be from above”; “the good of the immortal soul”.

Now, supposing that Wordsworth life-long religious sentiment were capable of being captured, and, thus, *solidified*, by means of the designation “Christian Pantheism”, would not this make his religious positioning *synchronically* inconsistent?

No doubt, yes, if one identify “Christianity” with “theism”, which, of course, is not conceptually capable of harmonising with any form of pantheism.

These, however, are nothing more than generic and specific divisions imposed on life—on the continuously different beating of the heart—by the understanding (by life itself). Life, as an experience in itself, is, in the end, of a quite different sort of phenomena.

One should, therefore, speak of Wordsworth’s religious positioning—and of Pater’s— as “heterodoxy”; not as “inconsistency”.

And do not, all forms of deep religious sentiment, instead of *fixed* religious labels in the mind, become, sooner or later, heterodoxy?

What about, for instance, Pater’s own solution for the religious predicament of his Marius the Epicurean? *Anima naturaliter christiana*? An Epicurean?

And, furthermore, did the *Aufklärungsmänner* stop thinking of themselves as Christian men as a result of their deism—of having endorsed the identification of the Judeo-Christian god with the likewise transcendent, but unknown, architect of the world-machine?

In a similar manner, Wordsworth must have thought of himself, without any cause for the slightest sense of contradiction or inconsistency, both as a *religious* poet and as a Christian man—for, as it was seen above, he absolutely endorsed (with a sense of relief, or justification, it seems) Henry Alford’s “distinction between religion and poetry and versified religion.”

In volume one of his *The School of the Heart and Other Poems* (1835), Alford himself has referred to Wordsworth as

...that reverend Priest of Poesy,
Whose presence shines upon these twilight
times, [who]

Hath, in THE CHURCHYARD IN THE MOUNTAINS, done
One Sacrifice whose scent shall fill the world”.

231:18–22. It is not easy to ascertain what passages of Book VII (“Residence in London”) of *The Prelude*, if any in particular, Pater may have had in mind as an expression of “thoughts which have visited from time to time far bolder and more wandering spirits.”

The “‘little rock-like pile’ of a Westmoreland church” passage starts with the line “Maiden of Buttermere! She lives in peace” (1850, VII, l. 320) and ends with the line “Mother and child!—These feelings, in themselves” (1850, VII, l. 329)—the words Pater quotes (“the little rock-like pile”) being part of line 1327. (CPW, 1889, p. 285)

After dealing with the real episode of Mary—the beautiful, innocent mountain girl who was sullied by the married man who tricked her into marrying him and made her the mother of a beautiful boy, but who nonetheless was to be transfigured by the poet’s memory and imagination in a timeless *Madonna* “Without contamination”—, Wordsworth’s mind “passes” into the recollection of, and commentary on, several episodes which in themselves are candidates to the title of “bold trains of speculative thought”, but which, according to Pater’s “Conclusion”-like phraseology, seem to have been considered by Pater himself not as isolated narrative units, but as verbal receptacles of “points” or *summits* of a “variegated, dramatic life”—as verbal receptacles of “bold... thought[s]” from each of which Wordsworth “pass[es] most swiftly” to the following one, in order to continually come “into strange contact with thoughts which have visited... far bolder and more wandering spirits”, and thus to “be present always at the focus where the greatest number of vital forces unite in their purest energy”.

Nonetheless, one might wilfully select from among such episodes, as presumably being more prone to have ignited Pater’s “hard, gemlike flame”, either the episode (1850, VII, ll. 382–399) of Wordsworth’s first encounter with “woman as she is” “utter[ing] blasphemy” (CPW, 1889, pp. 285–286), or the

episode (1850, VII, ll. 333–381) of Wordsworth’s encounter, in a theatre, with a too life-like parody of his imagined *Madonna*, “Mary of Buttermere”, and her “new-born infant” sleeping “underneath the rock-like pile” “fearless as a lamb” (CPW, 1889, p. 285). This parody, do not overlook it, reader, is a child “By Nature’s gifts so favoured” (thence, his *attraction*):

231:18–22.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Those simple days
Are now my theme; and, foremost of the scenes,
Which yet survive in memory, appears
One, at whose centre sate a lovely Boy,
A sportive infant, who, for six months’ space,
Not more, had been of age to deal about
Articulate prattle—Child as beautiful
As ever clung around a mother’s neck,
Or father fondly gazed upon with pride.
There, too, conspicuous for stature tall
And large dark eyes, beside her infant stood
The mother; but, upon her cheeks diffused,
False tints too well accorded with the glare
From play-house lustres thrown without reserve
On every object near. The Boy had been
The pride and pleasure of all lookers-on
In whatsoever place, but seemed in this
A sort of alien scattered from the clouds.
Of lusty vigour, more than infantine
He was in limb, in cheek a summer rose
Just three parts blown—a cottage-child—if e’er,
By cottage-door on breezy mountain side,
Or in some sheltering vale, was seen a babe
By Nature’s gifts so favoured. Upon a board
Decked with refreshments had this child been placed,
His little stage in the vast theatre,
And there he sate surrounded with a throng
Of chance spectators, chiefly dissolute men
And shameless women, treated and caressed;
Ate, drank, and with the fruit and glasses played,
While oaths and laughter and indecent speech

231:30–31.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Were rife about him as the songs of birds
Contending after showers. The mother now
Is fading out of memory, but I see
The lovely Boy as I beheld him then
Among the wretched and the falsely gay,
Like one of those who walked with hair unsinged
Amid the fiery furnace. Charms and spells
Muttered on black and spiteful instigation
Have stopped, as some believe, the kindest growths.
Ah, with how different spirit might a prayer
Have been preferred, that this fair creature, checked
By special privilege of Nature's love,
Should in his childhood be detained for ever!
But with its universal freight the tide
Hath rolled along, and this bright innocent,
Mary! may now have lived till he could look
With envy on thy nameless babe that sleeps,
Beside the mountain chapel, undisturbed.

231:30–31. Of course, “that mysterious notion of an earlier state of existence started, for “the Platonists”, in Plato’s (c. 428– c. 348 B. C.) thought concerning life before and after death (the so-called Platonic “Cyclical Argument”), of which the *Phaedo* and the mythical tenth Book of the *Republic* have become the classical exponents.

In respect to the early Christian scholar Origen of Alexandria (c. 185–c. 253 A. D.), it is to be noticed, first of all, that the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul is in him, as it was to be expected, the result of his knowledge of Plato, as well as of such Neoplatonic writers as Plotinus (c. 204–270 A. D.), although its main justification is to be found, no doubt, in Origen’s need to harmonize his theological principles and to prove his no less sectarian adversaries wrong.

Origen believed that God originally created a great number of disembodied souls, and that these, having afterwards sinned, were embodied, in accordance with the degree of their fall, in demons, people, and angels.

He likewise believed that God eternally created, in his mind, not one, but many worlds, which, in the course of their becoming reality one after the other, would become the stages, so to speak, on which each of the souls would be permitted to enact either its own redemption, and thus become free of evil, or, inversely, its fall into stages of ever greater evil.

As a result, Origen states, in his *De principiis* (III, i, 21):

... we are of opinion that, seeing the soul, as we have frequently said, is immortal and eternal, it is possible that, in the many and endless periods of duration in the immeasurable and different worlds, it may descend from the highest good to the lowest evil, or be restored from the lowest evil to the highest good. (*The Writings of Origen*. Transl. Frederick Crombie, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1869, vol. 1, p. 219).

The “old heresy of Origen” results from the fact that the doctrine which was most common among the Fathers of the Church (e.g., Lactantius, Jerome, and Ambrose), and which therefore was regarded as the orthodox one, was that of creationism—according to which God creates each human individual as a new soul, and inserts the soul itself in the individual’s body, as it starts to be formed in his or her mother’s womb, with the result that soul and body are created together, and that therefore the soul itself, albeit being immortal, does not pre-exist the body, as an eternal entity.

At the time Origen lived and wrote, the Church had not yet established any relevant dogma concerning the origin and the destiny after life of the soul, it thus being paradoxical, to say the least, to consider him an heretical on the basis of his having embraced the Platonic doctrine of the eternity of the soul and, as a result, of the soul’s pre-existence.—For all heresy is by nature non-authoritative opposition (*Gegensetzung*), by an individual or group of individuals, to an authoritatively posited (*gesetzt*) dogma, whose formal transgression is thereby no less authoritatively posited (and punished).

231:37–38.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Indeed, the “old heresy of Origen”, the so-called “Origenism”, saw its inception only by the end of the fourth century—namely, in 398 A. D., when a monk called Tyrannius Rufinus (c. 345–411 A. D.) published his translation of the first two books of Origen’s *De principiis* (*On First Principles*) and claimed, in the preface he appended to it, to have followed the example of Jerome (c. 347–420 A. D.) in amending the theologically transgressive—allegedly transgressive—passages he had come across in Origen’s book.

Only fragments of Origen’s Greek text remain, but they seem to present proof enough that, after all, Jerome’s Latin translation is marked by its accentuation of Origen’s alleged deviations from orthodoxy no less than Rufinus’ is marked by its alleviation of them.

231: 37–38. By the “famous ‘Ode on the Recollections of Childhood,’” Pater, of course, meant “Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood”, which was composed between 1803 and 1806, and was first published (with the title “Ode”) in 1807 (William Wordsworth. *Poems in Two Volumes*. London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807, vol. 2, pp. 145–158).

About eighteen years after having published the present essay, “On Wordsworth” (1874), Pater still associated Wordsworth’s “notion of an earlier state of existence” with “the old heresy of Origen”, then become “the unsanctioned dreams of Origen”. By the end of the chapter of *Plato and Platonism* (1821–1822) titled “The Doctrine of Number”, giving a forceful twist to Wordsworth’s statement that “The soul that rises with us” “cometh from afar: | Not in entire forgetfulness, | And not in utter nakedness”, he, Pater, wrote:

For in truth we come into the world, each one of us, ‘not in nakedness,’ but by the natural course of organic development clothed far more completely than even Pythagoras supposed in a vesture of the past, nay, fatally shrouded, it might seem, in those laws or tricks of heredity which we mistake for our volitions; in the language which is more than one half of our thoughts; in the

moral and mental habits, the customs, the literature, the very houses, which we did not make for ourselves; in the vesture of a past, which is (so science would assure us) not ours, but of the race, the species: that Zeit-geist, or abstract secular process, in which, as we could have had no direct consciousness of it, so we can pretend to no future personal interest. It is humanity itself now—abstract humanity—that figures as the transmigrating soul, accumulating into its ‘colossal manhood’ the experience of ages; making use of, and casting aside in its march, the souls of countless individuals, as Pythagoras supposed the individual soul to cast aside again and again its outworn body.

So it may be. There was nothing of all that, however, in the mind of the great English poet at the beginning of this century whose famous Ode on *The Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Childhood*, in which he made *metempsychosis* his own, must still express for some minds something more than merely poetic truth. For Pythagoreanism too, like all the graver utterances of primitive Greek philosophy, is an instinct of the human mind itself, and therefore also a constant tradition in its history, which *will* recur; fortifying this or that soul here or there in a part at least of that old sanguine assurance about itself, which possessed Socrates so immovably, his masters, his disciples. Those who do not already know Wordsworth’s Ode ought soon to read it for themselves. Listen instead to the lines which perhaps suggested Wordsworth’s:—*The Retreat*, by Henry Vaughan, one of the so-called Platonist poets of about two centuries ago, who was able to blend those Pythagorean doctrines with the Christian belief, amid which indeed, from the un-sanctioned dreams of Origen onwards, those doctrines have shown themselves not otherwise than at home.

“Happy, those days, he declares,

232:1.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Before I understood this place
Appointed for my second race,
Or taught my soul to fancy aught
But a white celestial thought;
When yet I had not walked above
A mile or two from my first love,
But felt through all this fleshly dress
Bright shoots of everlastingness.
O! how I long to travel back
And tread again that ancient track!
That I might once more reach that plain
Where first I left my glorious train.—
But, Ah! my soul with too much stay
Is drunk; and staggers in the way.
Some men a forward motion love,
But I backward steps would move;
And when this dust falls to the urn
In that state I came, return.

(As was usual with him, Pater does not notify the reader that he has omitted a large portion of Vaughn's poem.)

232:1. The poem "Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye During a Tour. July 13, 1798", was first published in the same year it was composed, in the first edition of *Lyrical Ballads (Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems)*. London, J. & A. Arch, 1798, pp. 201–210).

232:5. *The Prelude*, 1850. Book XII, l. 182 (CPW, 1889, p. 322).

232:7–14. It is not possible, of course, to ascertain if, while writing these lines, Pater had in mind any specific "brain-sick mystic of ancient" or "modern times"—specially because anyone who be familiar with his peculiar trains of thought will immediately suspect that, by "mystic", Pater meant, here, not an Eckhart or a Swedenborg, for instance, but a Schelling and a Schellingian theorist like Coleridge—if not even an Immanuel Kant, their most immediate Master. And, in fact, is not what Pater here says an adequate description of Coleridge's un-

derstanding of the work, above all, of what he called not “the productive imagination”, as Kant had done, but “the secondary imagination”?

232:20–23.

On Wordsworth (1874)

The imagination... I consider either as primary, or secondary. The primary imagination I hold to be the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM. The secondary I consider as an echo of the former, co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in the kind of its agency, and differing only in degree, and in the mode of its operation. It *dissolves, diffuses, dissipates*, in order to *re-create*; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still, at all events, it struggles to idealize and to unify. It is essentially vital, even as all objects (as objects) are essentially fixed and dead.” (Samuel Taylor Coleridge. *Biographia Literaria*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, vol. 1., pp. 297–298). (The italics have been added.)

232:20–23. No doubt, the “old dream of the *anima mundi*”, or *Weltseele* (world soul) or *Weltgeist* (world spirit), was associate in Pater’s mind: in the first place, with PYTHAGORAS (c. 570–c. 495 B. C., for whom “Truths of number”, “the essential laws of measure in time and space”, were “something, independently of ourselves, in the real world without us, like a personal intelligible soul” (*Plato and Platonism*, pp. 52–53); in the second place, with PARMENIDES (530–460 B. C.), “that most ancient assertor of God’s identity with the world” (*Gaston de Latour*, p. 141); in the third place, with the PLATO (c. 428– c. 348 B. C.) of the dialogue *Timaeus*, where (30b–30c) one can read that “we may say that the world came into being—a living creature truly endowed with soul and intelligence by the providence of God” (the translation is by Benjamin Jowett); in the fourth place, with SPINOZA (1632–1677), the defender of “the theorem that God” is “in all things whatever” (*Gaston de Latour*, p. 150); in the fifth place, with GIORDANO

232:24.

On Wordsworth (1874)

BRUNO (1548–1600), the assertor of the “antient ‘pantheism’”, of “the vision of all things in God” (*Gaston de Latour*, pp. 141, 142); in the sixth place, with SCHELLING (1775–1854) and HEGEL (1770–1831)—the latter (Hegel) and Bruno being those whom the “old dream of the *anima mundi*” most made “indifferent to the distinctions of good and evil.”

232:24. Pater refers to the Faust of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s (1749–1832) *Faust. Eine Tragödie* (*Faust. A Tragedy*), 1808 (Part I) and 1832 (Part II).

Goethe’s Faust must, indeed, have been primarily in Pater’s mind, when he referred to those who “desired to lose themselves” in “the *anima mundi*”—for Faust’s greatest endeavour truly is to become one with Goethe’s “Geist der Erde” (spirit of the Earth), whose sign is nothing more than a hidden reiteration of the hidden “sign of the macrocosm” (all the tragic laughter resulting from the inadequacy between that which Goethe *makes* Faust see in it and that which the reader may imagined it to be):

(*Er schlägt das Buch auf und erblickt das Zeichen des Makrokosmus.*)

Ha! Welche Wonne fließt in diesem Blick
Auf einmal mir durch alla meine Sinnen!
Ich fühle junges, heiliges Lebensglück
Neuglühend mir durch Nerv und Adern rinnen.
War es ein Gott, der diese Zeichen schrieb,
Die mir das innere Toben stillen,
Das arme Herz mit Freude füllen
Und mit geheimnisvollem Trieb
Die Kräfte der Natur rings um mich her enthüllen?

Bin ich ein Gott? Mir wird so licht!
Ich schau in diesem reinen Zügen
Die wirkende Natur vor meiner Seele liegen.
... ..
Wie alles sich zum Ganzen webt,

Eins in dem andern wirkt und lebt!
Wie Himmelskräfte auf und nieder steigen[!]

232:24.

... ..
Wo faß ich dich, unendliche Natur?
Euch Brüste, wo? Ihr Quellen alles Lebens,
An denen Himmel und Erde hängt,
Dahin die welke Brust sich drängt—
Ihr quellt, ihr tränkt, und schmacht ich so vergebens?

On Wordsworth (1874)

(Er schlägt unwillig das Buch um und erblickt das Zeichen des Erdgeistes.)

Wie anders wirkt dies Zeichen auf mich ein!
Du, Geist de Erde, bist mir näher;
Schon fühl ich meine Kräfte höher,
Schon glüh ich wie von neuem Wein.
Ich fühle Mut, mich in die Welt zu wagen,
Der Erde Weh, der Erde Glück zu tragen,
Mit Stürmen mich herumzuschlagen
Und in des Schiffbruchs Knirschen nicht zu zagen.
... ..

(Er faßt das Buch und spricht das Zeichen des Geistes geheimnisvoll aus. Es zuckt eine rötliche Flamme, der Geist erscheint in der Flamme.)

(He opens the book and sees the symbol of the macrocosm.)

What jubilation bursts out of this sight
Into my senses—now I feel it flowing,
Youthful, a sacred fountain of delight,
Through every nerve, my veins are glowing.
Was it a god that made these symbols be
That soothe my feverish unrest,
Filling with joy my anxious breast,
And with mysterious potency
Make nature's hidden powers around me, manifest?

232:24.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Am I a god? Light grows this page—
 In these pure lines my eyes can see
 Creative nature spread in front of me.

 All weaves itself into the whole,
 Each living in the other's soul.
 How heaven's powers climb up and descend [!]

 Where, boundless nature, can I hold you fast?
 And where you breasts? Wells that sustain
 All life—the heaven and earth are nursed.
 The wilted breast craves you in thirst—
 You well, you still—and I languish in vain?

(In disgust, he turns some pages and beholds the symbol of the earth spirit.)

How different is the power of this sign!
 You, spirit of the earth, seem close to mine:
 I look and feel my powers growing,
 As if I'd drunk new wine[,] I'm glowing,
 I feel a sudden courage, and should dare
 To plunge into the world, to bear
 All earthly grief, all earthly joy—compare
 With gales my strength, face shipwreck without care.

(He seizes the book and mysteriously pronounces the symbol of the spirit. A reddish flame flashes, and the SPIRIT appears in the flame.)

(Faust, I, ll. 430–467 passim. The translation is by Walter Kaufmann.)

“The SPIRIT appears in the flame”—and Faustus becomes amazed at his unexpected monstrosity—SIZE—, for indeed the philosophy which animates *Faust* is, LITERALLY, a “philosophy... which sees in the external world no mere concur-

rence of mechanical agencies, but an *animated body*, informed and made expressive, like *the body of man*, by an indwelling intelligence"! (vol. 1, 196:12–15) (The italics have been added.)

232:27. "[T]he Westmoreland churchyard". See vol. 1, 231:19.

233:1–2. Pater refers to Books XII and XIII of *The Prelude*, both of which bear the title "Imagination and Taste. How Impaired and Restored" (CPW, 1889, pp. 320–329).

233:19–31. Once more, Pater describes the operation and effects of "that complex faculty for which every thought and feeling is twin-born with its sensible analogue or symbol", the faculty which, following Arnold, he called "the imaginative reason" (see above, note to 224:13).

When Pater states that "It belonged to the higher, the imaginative mood, and was the pledge of its reality, to bring the appropriate language with it", he is (consciously) echoing Kant's definition of "genius", in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (I, § 49):

...so besteht das Genie eigentlich in dem glücklichen Verhältnisse, welches keine Wissenschaft lehren und kein Fleiß erlernen kann, zu einem gegebenen Begriffe Ideen aufzufinden, und andererseits zu diesen den Ausdruck zu treffen, durch den die dadurch bewirkte subjektive Gemütsstimmung, als Begleitung eines Begriffs, anderen mitgeteilt werden kann. Das letztere Talent ist eigentlich dasjenige, was man Geist nennt; denn das Unnennbare in dem Gemütszustande bei einer gewissen Vorstellung auszudrücken und allgemein mittelbar zu machen, der Ausdruck mag nun in Sprache, oder Malerei, oder Plastik bestehen: das erfordert ein Vermögen, das schnell vorübergehende Spiel der Einbildungskraft aufzufassen und in einen Begriff (der ebendarum original ist, und zugleich eine neue Regel eröffnet, die aus keinen vorhergehenden Prinzipien oder Beispielen hat gefolgert werden können) zu vereinigen, der sich ohne Zwang der Regeln mitteilen läßt.

234:5–6.

On Wordsworth (1874)

Thus genius really consists in the happy relation, which no science can teach and no diligence learn, of finding ideas for a given concept on the one hand and on the other hitting upon the expression for these, through which the subjective disposition of the mind that is thereby produced, as an accompaniment of a concept, can be communicated to others. The later talent is really that which is called spirit, for to express what is unnameable in the mental state in the case of a certain representation and to make it universally communicable, whether the expression consist in language, or painting, or in plastic art—that requires a faculty for apprehending the rapidly passing play of the imagination and unifying it into a concept (which for that very reason is original and at the same time discloses a new rule, which could not have been deduced from any antecedent principles or examples), which can be communicated without the constraint of rules.” (The translation is by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews.)

234:5–6. “Daffodils” refers to the (titleless) poem starting “I wandered lonely as a cloud”, which was composed in 1804 and first published in 1807 (William Wordsworth. *Poems in Two Volumes*. London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807, vol. 2, pp. 49–50); the poem “The Two April Mornings” was composed in 1799 and first published in 1800 (William Wordsworth. *Lyrical Ballads, with Other Poems*. London, T. N. Longman and O. Rees, 1800, vol. 2, pp. 123–126).

234:15–17. Pater refers to line 50 of Wordsworth’s poem “To the Moon” (“To look on tempests, and be never shaken”), which is a quotation of line 6 of Shakespeare’s Sonnet 116 (“That looks on tempests and is never shaken”).

Love is not love
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove.
O no! it is an ever-fixed mark

That looks on tempests and is never shaken;
Wordsworth wrote:

May sage and simple, catching with one eye
The moral intimations of the sky,
Learn from thy course [the Moon's], where'er their own
 be taken,
"To look on tempests, and be never shaken;"
To keep with faithful step the appointed way...

234:17–18. See above, note to 231: 37–38.

In the first edition of *Appreciations* (1889), on page 58, Pater replaced "has its antitype" by "had its anticipator". It is, however, difficult to believe that Pater was not aware of what he meant to express, when he originally wrote "antitype". Most probably, then, what Pater really had in mind was the *secunda-facie* reading that Henry Vaughan's (1621–1695) poem, "The Retreat" (first published in *Silex Scitillans, Part I*, 1650), appears to offer, which, depending on the reader, may permit to consider it an "antitype", instead of an "anticipator", of Wordsworth's *Ode*.

Notice, in this respect, that, in the first edition of *Appreciations* (1889), Pater replaced the footnote concerning Vaughan's poem, "Henry Vaughan's *Retreat*" (which is significant in itself), by the footnote: "Henry Vaughan, in *The Retreat*!"

234:21–22. "[T]he language used by the simplest people under strong excitement". With all evidence, Pater is, here, consciously echoing the "Preface" to *Lyrical Ballads*. See above, note to 229:12–17.

235:10–11. Félix Grandet is a character in Honoré de Balzac's (1799–1850) *La Comédie Humaine* (1830–1848), more specifically in the novel *Eugénie Grandet* (1833). Pater refers to Grandet as a pursuer of "mean or of intensely selfish ends" because he personifies avarice as a manifestation of a deep-rooted selfishness and self-contentment, which in itself is the source of an invincible will to power (to use Nietzsche's tag, *Wille zur Macht*) over those who surround him—such as Nanon, his servant, and his own daughter, Félix Grandet,—as

235:15.

On Wordsworth (1874)

well as of a monomaniac contempt for humanity, comparable in magnitude only to his love of, and delight in, the contemplation of his hoarded gold.

Javert is a character in Victor Hugo's (1802–1885) *Les Misérables* (1862). In his turn, he is a pursuer of “intensely selfish ends” as a result of his worship of duty for its own sake and of his concomitant devotion to the observance of the law and the enforcement at all costs of his authority as a policeman. His mission, as understood by him, is the cold, merciless one of bringing to justice all those who, like Fantine and Jean Valjean, may become the target of his selfish intransigence concerning the rights of Right over the life and destinies of wrong-doers.

Having, however, become aware that public law, no less than life itself, conforms more to a continuum of shades of grey than to a clear-cut opposition between black and white, he fails in his dutiful commitment to duty, when he permits Jean Valjean to escape the cold claws of the law. Unable to abide by the reasons of the heart as well as by the rules of right and wrong, he, then, commits suicide, by plunging himself into the cold waters of the river Seine.

235:15. Catherine of Siena (1347–1380), who was canonized in 1461, by Pope Pius II, and declared a patron saint of Rome in 1866, by Pope Pius IX, was a mystic who became a preeminent figure in the Catholic Church mainly as a result of the role she played as a mediator during the Great Schism of the West, which had a strong effect in Pope Gregory XI's decision to leave Avignon for Rome, in 1376.

Caterina di Siena, who is said to have learned how to write in 1377, when she was thirty years old, bequeathed the world not only an immensity of letters to persons of high rank, which gained her a preeminent place among the early Tuscan writers, as well as a handful of prayers, but also a dialogue with God which is known both as *Libro della Divina Doctrina* and as *Dialogo della Divina Provvidenza* (*Dialogue of Divine Providence*).—Finished in 1377 (the year in which, again, she is supposed to have learnt how to write), as a result of having been dictated to her by God Himself, while she was terribly debili-

tated by her rigorous fasting but marvellously strengthened by her wholesome ecstasy.

Being a mystic, all Caterina wished for was, understandably, to achieve an incorporeal union with God, it thus being no surprise, that her *Dialogue* is not supposed to be a dialogue between her and herself, but between her, as a soul that *rises up* to God, and God Himself.

Now, Pater, who had no qualms at all in blaming Wordsworth for not having noticed the inconsistency between his “strange speculations” and “those traditional beliefs, which were otherwise the object of his devout acceptance”—now, Pater, who, furthermore, had likewise no qualms in making scorn of the “mysterious notion of an earlier state of existence, the fancy of the Platonists, the old heresy of Origen”, as well as of the “old dream of the *anima mundi*” (232:20), proves now, not surprisingly, to be a true patron of *consistency*: now, when, besides absolving the Saint of Siena from the madness which he found so damning in “a brainsick mystic of ancient and modern times” (232:13–14), he commends her for having “made the means to her ends so attractive” and books her a luxury suit, “an undying place”, “in *the House Beautiful*”—in which, before, he had allowed to reside only “those who have treated life in the spirit of art”!

And yet, reader, really to read Pater on Caterina di Siena is to become aware that he is not being inconsistent, there.

235:17. “[T]he House Beautiful”. See above, note to 61:35–36.

235:20–37. Pater, no doubt, was aware of his debt to Matthew Arnold (1822–1888), when he wrote that “the conception of means and ends”, which “covers the whole of life”, “reduc[es] all things to machinery”: “machinery”, meaning *mechanical attachment to means as if they were ends in themselves, regardless of their ends and effects*—“machinery” being, perhaps, the word which most abounds in Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy*, with an abundance which is notorious even in the following, isolated passages (Matthew Arnold. *The Complete Prose Works*, Ed. R. H. Super, Ann Arbor, The Univer-

235:20–37. 1992, pp. 117, 96):
sity Press of Michigan Press, vol. 5 (*Culture and Anarchy*),

On Wordsworth (1874)

When I began to speak of culture, I insisted on our bondage to machinery, on our proneness to value machinery as an end in itself, without looking beyond it to the end for which alone, in truth, it is valuable. Freedom, I said, was one of those things which we thus worshipped in itself, without enough regarding the ends for which freedom is to be desired. In our common notions and talk about freedom, we eminently show our idolatry of machinery. Our prevalent notion is... that it is a most happy and important thing for a man merely to be able to do as he likes. On what he is to do when he is thus free to do as he likes, we do not lay so much stress.

Faith in machinery is, I said, our besetting danger; often in machinery most absurdly disproportioned to the end which this machinery, if it is to do any good at all, is to serve; but always in machinery, as if it had a value in and for itself. What is freedom but machinery? what is population but machinery? what is coal but machinery? what are railroads but machinery? what is wealth but machinery? what are religious organisations but machinery?

Pater, however, does not appear to use the term, “machinery”, in the Arnoldian sense (that which was specified above), either as a result of having misconceived Arnold’s use of the word or of putting it to use with a calculated twist of his own.

Let us, first of all, try to clarify the meaning of the statements Pater makes in this passage.

Pater introduces here the notion of “type” as being interchangeable with the notion of “figure”, “picture”, and—less conspicuously—“ideal”.

Now, it is clear that what Pater means to express by means of those more or less indistinct notions is what he elsewhere (in the chapter of *Marius* titled *Animula vagula*) calls “practical ideal”, as well as that, in face of this, we ourselves are

at liberty to designate the concept Pater had in mind, more accurately, “regulative principle” (*regulatives Prinzip*).—A regulative principle being, says Kant (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A 509), “a principle of the greatest possible continuation and extension of experience, in accordance with which no empirical boundary would hold as an absolute boundary... a principle of reason which, as a rule, postulates what should be effected by us in the regress” “in the series of conditions for given appearances”. (The translation is by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood.)

The first idea we are faced with here is, then, that all of us (instead of “most of us”) construe “the whole of life” according to a specific “practical ideal” or “regulative principle”.

Pater presents us with two major practical ideals: the one which he understands as determining “the higher ethics” (or “higher morality”) and the one which we ourselves are at liberty to understand as determining *the lower* or *basic ethics*, since its regulative effect is “men’s lives as we actually find them to be the basis of the higher ethics”

The first of these two practical regulative principles (*praktisch-regulative Prinzipien*), Pater identifies as the *practical* principle (the principle of *doing*), whereas he identifies the other as the *ontic* principle (the principle of *being*). The first, he directly associates with the external relation between “means and ends”, so that he conceives of it as the principle regulating, and conducting to, heterotelism; the second, he indirectly associates with the internal relation of means with themselves, so that he conceives of it as the principle regulating, and conducting to, autotelism.

According to Pater, each of these principles excludes the other.

As he states, the *practical* principle, that which is regulative of the *lower* or *basic ethics*, “covers... not the intangible perfection of those whose ideal is rather in being than in doing; not those manners which are in the deepest as in the simplest sense morals, and without which one cannot so much as offer a cup of water to a poor man without offence; not the part of ‘antique Rachel,’ sitting in the company of Beatrice”.

What it does cover, because it “reduc[es] all things to machinery”, is “the meanness of men’s daily lives, and much of the dexterity and vigour with which they pursue what may seem to them the good of themselves or of others”.

Now, Arnold undoubtedly conceived of “machinery” as the use and evaluation of a mean (*Mittel*) considered “as an end in itself, without looking beyond it to the end for which alone, in truth, it is valuable”.—Whereas Pater conceived of “machinery” as the use and evaluation of a mean (*Mittel*) considered as mean, “looking beyond it to the end for which alone, in truth, it is valuable”, instead of as an end-in-itself.

“Machinery”, then, is for Arnold the use of means for the sake of their endotelic, instead of exotelic, qualities (as if they were ends-in-themselves), whereas for Pater it is the reverse: the use of means for the sake of their exotelic, instead of endotelic, qualities (as means, indeed, instead of as ends-in-themselves)!

After all, it is as a direct result of this, that Pater is of the opinion that “the higher morality might well endeavour rather to draw men’s attention from the conception of means and ends in life altogether.”

We, then, have the opposition between “the conception of means and ends” as the regulative principle of “the whole of life” *qua* “meanness” and “dexterity and vigour” in the pursuit of an apparent “good” (“what may seem to them the good of themselves and others”), and the conception of means as ends-in-themselves as the regulative principle of “the whole of life” *qua* “the intangible perfection of those whose ideal is rather in *being* than in *doing*”.

That is to say, we, then, have the opposition between *being* and *doing*.

Pater has tried to explain somewhere else what this opposition really means for him. Before we look at those other passages of his writings, we must make clear for ourselves what follows.

In the first place, that Pater had in mind here, as ever, a “good” proper to all men. That is to say, a universally valid *good*, because determined by the man-independent *lógos* MAN, con-

sidered both as the group of essential predicates *sinus quibus non* MAN and as the ought-to-be of those same predicates, as well as of all non essential, accidental, predicates of which a man (a member of the class MAN) be, *qua* subject, capable of actualizing in himself.

In the second place, that it is as a result of this, that he, Pater, permitted himself to oppose to such a universal *good* the particular (and apparent) goodness of “what may seem” to most men “the good of themselves or of others”.

In the third place, that Pater thought of such a universal *good* as *cultura hominis* (he calls it just “culture” or “education”), whose universal *telos* (or final cause, according to Aristotle) he considered to be *perfectio hominis* (he calls it just “perfection”).

As Kant as shown (*Critique of the Power of Judgment*, Introduction, VIII), man can conceive of two kinds of finality (*Zweckmäßigkeit*): subjective finality (*subjektive Zweckmäßigkeit*) and objective finality (*objektive Zweckmäßigkeit*).

The representation (*Vorstellung*) of the first kind of finality occurs when the object is considered in respect of its form as present in apprehension (*apprehensio*), and therefore is prior to any concept of the object itself (to any knowledge of the *lógos* of the object).

The representation (*Vorstellung*) of the second kind of finality occurs when, inversely, the object is considered in terms of the relation between its particular form and the universal form of its *lógos*, and therefore demands the antecedent presence of a concept of the object itself.

This second type of finality is the one which matters here, because the concept of “perfection” is operative only in relation to it.

Objective finality (*objektive Zweckmäßigkeit*), Kant likewise shows (*Critique of the Power of Judgment*, I, § 15), is either external (*äußere Zweckmäßigkeit*) or internal (*innere Zweckmäßigkeit*), this being the origin of the opposition between *hexotelicity* and *endotelicity*.

External finality (e.g., *cutting*, in relation to all knives) is the utility (*Nützlichkeit*) of the object, whereas internal finality is its perfection (*Vollkommenheit*).

Perfection, however, can be either qualitative perfection (*qualitative Vollkommenheit*) or quantitative perfection (*quantitative Vollkommenheit*).

The first (qualitative perfection) pertains to the degree in which the object, *qua* particular or individual, conforms to the *lógos* of its class (*e.g.*, the degree in which John, being eyeless, earless, stupid, and unimaginative, conform to the *lógos* MAN); the second (quantitative perfection) pertains to the degree in which the object, *qua* particular or individual, instantiates *in actu* the internal completeness (*Vollkommenheit*) or perfection which be universally valid (*in potency*) to all the members of its class.

Take, for instance, the man John and the man Jason.

John and Jason would both belong to the class MAN, as opposed, for instance, to the class ASS.—This being the reason why none of them would become more perfect as a result, for instance, of miraculously having grown beautiful, lush, long ears!

Therefore, both John and Jason would have to instantiate the essential predicates belonging to the class MAN. *E.g.*, each of them would have to be more or less *rational*, more or less intelligent, more or less self-conscious, more or less ethically good. And, in this sense, both of them would be equally perfect, in terms of qualitative perfection.

Moreover, both John and Jason would likewise instantiate at least a few of the accidental predicates which are proper to the class MAN. *E.g.*, John would be an excellent football player, but a disastrous poet, while Jason would be an excellent poet and painter, but a disastrous football player.

As a result, they would be, *qua* football players and poets, equally perfect in terms of qualitative perfection, but quite differently perfect in terms, now, of quantitative perfection.

Considered as quantitative perfection, internal finality, then, consists in the degree in which a member of the class MAN, for instance, instantiates, in relation to its utmost possible extent, not only each of the essential predicates which naturally belong to all men, but also some of the accidental predicates which the class MAN is capable of instantiating—Socrates, for example, having perhaps instantiated in its utmost extent the

essential predicate MORAL GOODNESS, and Dante, Da Vinci, Dickens, etc., having perhaps instantiated, likewise in its utmost extent, the accidental predicates POET, PAINTER, NOVELIST.

It is now possible to see why, although somewhat incorrectly, Pater opposes *being* to *doing*. *Being* is the natural seat of internal finality, *qua* qualitative as well as quantitative perfection, although Pater manifestly took into account, as he should, the latter. While *doing*—in truth, *making*—is the natural seat of external finality and, therefore, of utility.

Arnold, who cared for quantitative perfection—*cultura hominis*—as much as Pater, *demande*d that there be no machinery-*a*: no taking means into account without entering into consideration with the degree of their utility or external finality. Pater, on the other hand, *demande*d that there be no machinery-*b*: no taking into account utility or external finality, *tout court*, instead of internal finality, *qua* (the latter) quantitative perfection!

Which one of them was *right*? As usual, both of them. How so?

Both of them were *right* because *the right way to do*, to act, is the following.

On the one hand, to attend to the internal finality of the means (*sub specie* quantitative perfection) as if they were ends-in-themselves, not regardless, indeed, of their qualitative character, their being means (and therefore not regardless of their qualitative perfection), but mentally placing in suspension for a while (between representational brackets) this qualitative character of theirs, and, with it, their utility or external finality.

On the other hand, to attend to the external finality of the means (their utility) as if they were nothing but means, not regardless, indeed, of their internal finality (their qualitative and quantitative perfection), but mentally placing the latter in suspension for a while (between representational brackets).

Now, man's dignity, beauty, grace, and nobility—in a word, man *qua* Culture or education (*paideia*, *cultura hominis*, *Bildung*), *qua aristo*—depends on his not having utility (objective, external finality) at all!—This being the reason why Pater could not be more right, when he wrote (in the chapter of *Mar-*

235:20–37.

On Wordsworth (1874)

ius titled *Anima naturaliter christiana*, concerning Marius, the following words:

For still, in a shadowy world, his deeper wisdom had ever been, with a sense of economy, with a jealous estimate of gain and loss, to use life, not as the means to some problematic end, but, as far as might be, from dying hour to dying hour, an end in itself—a kind of music, all-sufficing to the duly trained ear, even as it died out on the air.

Or, again, when, in the chapter titled *Animula vagula*, he wrote:

Not pleasure, but a general completeness of life, was the practical ideal to which this anti-metaphysical metaphysic really pointed. And towards such a full or complete life, a life of various yet select sensation, the most direct and effective auxiliary must be, in a word, Insight. Liberty of soul, freedom from all partial and misrepresentative doctrine which does but relieve one element in our experience at the cost of another, freedom from all embarrassment alike of regret for the past and of calculation on the future: this would be but preliminary to the real business of education—insight, insight through culture, into all that the present moment holds in trust for us, as we stand so briefly in its presence. From that maxim of Life as the end of life, followed, as a practical consequence, the desirableness of refining all the instruments of inward and outward intuition, of developing all their capacities, of testing and exercising one's self in them, till one's whole nature became one complex medium of reception, towards the vision—the "beatific vision," if we really cared to make it such—of our actual experience in the world. Not the conveyance of an abstract body of truths or principles, would be the aim of the right education of one's self, or of another, but the conveyance of an art—an art in some degree peculiar to each individual character; with the modifications, that

is, due to its special constitution, and the peculiar circumstances of its growth, inasmuch as no one of us is “like another, all in all.”

Nonetheless, let us not be naïve.

The reader should pay attention to the series of *silent* meanings and senses that Pater’s discourse (almost always) hides behind its marauding punctuation marks:—on the top or on the bottom,— ahead or aback. That is to say, the reader should be aware, in this particular context, of what went through Pater’s mind, when, for instance, perhaps wiping out his smile, he put his pen to the *sentence*: “great ends and little ones alike” (vol. 1, 235:1). To read Pater, reader, is to put eye on “this dim world somewhat vague” (vol. 1, 235:2).—And to be capable of shutting one’s eye to *it* does, indeed, require “a *disciplina arcani*” (vol. 1, 225:6–7).—For, “In poetry, in art, if you enter into their true spirit at all, you touch this principle in part”: “To treat life in the spirit of art, is to make life a thing in which [*it*] means and ends are identified.” (vol. 1, 236:15–19).

Now, since a Man has no utility (objective, external finality) at all, take as an example of what was said above, concerning *the right way to do*, to act, the means (*Mittel*) KNIFE.

For, indeed, in the course of fabricating a knife, one is at liberty to *forget* for a while its utility, its external finality, and concentrate one’s attention in its internal finality (*sub specie* quantitative perfection), trying to do one’s best to make of it a true work of art, a true cutting *aristo!*—Or noble specimen of the class KNIFE.

For, indeed, one will never succeed in this if, on the other hand, one will not *forget* for a while the knife’s internal finality (*sub specie* quantitative perfection) and concentrate one’s attention in its utility (external finality), which will directly determine its internal finality (*sub specie*, now, qualitative perfection).—Since the qualitative perfection of a knife whose utility (external finality) be TO CARVE, for instance, ever will coincide with that of a knife whose utility (external finality) be, e.g., TO BONE.

Yes! Pater was right once more: “an art in some degree peculiar to each individual character; with the modifications,

235:20–37.

On Wordsworth (1874)

that is, due to its special constitution, and the peculiar circumstances of its growth, inasmuch as no one of us is 'like another, all in all.'

Replace "each individual character" for "each specific character" (as opposed to "generic character"), and these words will totally apply to what has just been said.

Now, no member of the class MAN will ever be capable of being estimated exclusively in terms of his entity, or onticity (his *being* what he be in this or that degree of perfection), with total disregard for his agentivity (his *doing*).—This being the reason why one cannot avoid considering Pater, this time, in the wrong, both in what concerns his preference for *being* over *doing* and is resultant incapacity to make justice to Aristotle, the "old Greek moralist who has fixed for succeeding generations the outline of the theory of right living".—

Although, reader, what Pater really meant to be read by his readers was, almost for sure, that he well knew he could not avoid *being*, but that this did not entail his *doing*. That is to say, that he would rather *be* than *do* it. (If the word "homosexual" does not come to your mind, you definitely are not in the right track.)

Second, or hidden, meanings aside, Pater should have taken into account not the opposition between *being* and *doing*, but the direct way in which the *being* of a human individual (his degree of quantitative perfection) determines, and is determined by, his *doing*.—Considered, therefore (a human individual's *doing*), *qua* agentivity determined not by its external finality or utility, but, inversely, by its own internal finality.— Considered, after all, *qua* the *perfected* agentivity or *doing* which Pater himself had in mind when he wrote of "those manners which are in the deepest as in the simplest sense morals, and without which one cannot so much as offer a cup of water to a poor man without offence".—Those *manners*, after all, which, in life as well as in Pater's *perfected* discourse, share too much of *sunshine*, to be looked at straight in the eye, and therefore must remain, straight to the eye of most onlookers, "intangible perfection" (vol. 1, 235:30–31).

In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (I, vii, 3), Aristotle draws our attention to the fact that some ends are likewise means, and that, therefore, not all ends are final ends. He writes (here, as in subsequent quotations, in the translation by H. Rackham): "... there appear to be several ends at which our actions aim; but as we choose some of them—for instance wealth, or flutes, and instruments generally—as means to something else, it is clear that not all of them are final ends; whereas the Supreme Good seems to be something final."

Aristotle next (I, VII, 5) identifies "the Supreme Good", the most final of all ends, with *happiness-eudaimonía*, the state of being possessed by the deity (*daímōn*) of the good (*eú*). "Now", he says, "happiness above all else appears to be absolutely final in this sense, since we always choose it for its own sake and never as a means to something else".

The *happiness* (or *wellness*) "we always choose... for its own sake" is, however, not *happiness* in an absolute sense, since it is determined by the specific *lógos* MAN, and, consequently, coincides with the actualization of the utmost possible degree of human quantitative perfection. And it is this, which leads Aristotle to state (I, VII, 9) that, since "To say... that the Supreme Good is happiness will probably appear a truism", "we still require a more explicit account of what constitutes happiness." Such an account, "we may arrive at" it "by ascertaining what... man's function" is (I, VII, 10).

After having considered some generic possibilities, Aristotle concludes (I, VII, 13): "There remains... what may be called the practical life of the rational part of man... the active exercise of the rational faculty." He, then, goes on to point out (I, VII, 14–16) the premises from which it follows "that the Good of man is the active exercise of his soul's faculties in conformity with excellence or virtue". That is to say, in conformity with *areté*, and therefore as an *aristocratic* exercise: an exercise conforming to the *happiness* of the "soul's faculties", to their utmost possible quantitative perfection.

The above mentioned premisses are the following:

1. that the function of an individual and of a good individual of the same class (for instance, a harper and a good

235:20–37.

On Wordsworth (1874)

harper) is generally (qualitatively) the same, the latter's superiority in excellence (quantitative superiority) being added to the function itself (e.g., the playing of an harp);

2. that the function of a man is a form of life consisting in the exercise of the soul's faculties and activities in association with rational principle;

3. that, therefore, the the function of a good man is to perform such activities well and rightly;

4. that a function is well performed when it is performed in accordance with its own proper excellence.

The "Supreme Good" of man, his "intangible perfection" (in Pater's own words), is, thus, in no way separable from the concept of "end" or "finality" (contrarily to Pater's supposition): it (the "Supreme Good") is the consummation of man's internal finality, the extension of man's quantitative perfection to its utmost—which, since man's function is to exercise (to actualize) that which he *is* potentially, his faculties, cannot consist only in *being*; has to consist, too, in *doing*, in the exercise of such faculties in accordance with their (potentially) utmost qualitative completion and quantitative perfection.—The means to the attainment of the latter (qualitative completion and quantitative perfection), to the attainment of *perfectio hominis*, being culture or education (in the etymological sense of the word, *ex- + ducere*).

What a human being *does* is, then, *what* he *is*, *qua* end-in-itself, just as *what* he *is* is *what* he *does*, no less *qua* end-in-itself—what he *does* being quite different from what he *makes*, *qua* means, now, to a certain end. Let us pay attention to Aristotle himself (VI, ii, 5), the "old Greek moralist who has fixed for succeeding generations the outline of the theory of right living":

Thought by itself... moves nothing, but only thought directed to an end, and dealing with action. ...the act of *making* is not an end in itself, it is only a means, and belongs to something else. Whereas a thing *done* [e.g., an act of justice] is an end in itself: since doing well... is the End, and it is at this that desire aims." (The italics have been added.)

Pater's attempts to clarify his dislike of *doing* and his love of *being* do, indeed, partake of the confusion that manifestly lies at the basis of his misunderstanding of Aristotle's "theory of right living".

In the chapter of *Marius the Epicurean* titled "New Cyrenaicism", for instance, the narrator speaks of "the hours... in which" Marius "had been helped by work of others to the pleasurable apprehension of art, of nature, or of life"—and then states: "Not what I do, but what I am, under the power of this vision'—he would say to himself—is what were indeed pleasing to the gods!"

The narrator, then, expresses not only (i) the idea that Marius' "vision"—his perception (instead of "apprehension") "of art, of nature, or of life"—is not already Marius' own *doing*, but also (ii) the idea that, if it so happened that it became possible for Marius to *do* an act of injustice, for example, "under the power" of such a "pleasurable" "vision", "the gods" would nevertheless be pleased with what he were while doing it!

The reader is confronted with a similar passage in the chapter of *Marius* titled *Anima naturaliter christiana*:

Revelation, vision, the discovery of a vision, the seeing of a perfect humanity, in a perfect world—through all his alternations of mind... he had always set that above the having, or even the doing, of anything. For, such vision, if received with due attitude on his part, was, in reality, the being something, and as such was surely a pleasant offering or sacrifice to whatever gods there might be, observant of him. And how goodly had the vision been!

The "vision" is "the 'beatific vision'... of our actual experience in the world" (to quote now the chapter titled *Animula vagila*), which is the same as to say that it is the consciousness either of the actuality or of the potentiality of such an experience.

The narrator, however, now expresses the possibility of "such vision" being passively "received" (apprehended) by Marius "with due attitude on his part"—as if it were something

235:34–35.

On Wordsworth (1874)

given to him,—instead of expressing the fact that, *qua* consciousness, it would have to be his own *doing*, the exercising of his own human faculties in accordance with their specific degree of quantitative perfection at the moment.

And, as if that were not enough, the narrator likewise expresses the paradoxical idea that Marius' entity, his consciousness of "such vision" "of a perfect humanity, in a perfect world", and the sentiment produced in him by it, "was surely a pleasant offering or sacrifice to whatever gods there might be, observant of him".—In spite of its having been "received" by him, Marius, passively, without ever having become his own *doing*; the only feature capable of making it a "vision" "indeed pleasing to the gods!"

In short, Pater's erroneous preference for *being* over *doing* was in great part a direct consequence of his having mistaken the passivity which is proper to apprehension (*Auffassung*) for the activity (or agentivity) in which perception (*Unternehmung*) naturally consists—and of his resultant incapacity to perceive that Aristotle was right, when he asserted that "doing well", exercising the "soul's faculties in conformity with excellence or virtue", "is the End", the *happiness*, of all the members of the class MAN.—Whether they be or not capable of "doing well". Whether, no less, they be or not capable of enhancing, by means of Culture, their inborn aptitude for "doing well".

Pater, then, appears not to have detected in himself the presence of the epistemological illusion that he so lucidly detected in Wordsworth, when he pointed out that, "in... moments of intense susceptibility", the poet "seemed to himself but the passive recipient of external influences", an illusion as a result of which "he was attracted by the thought of a spirit of life in outward things, a single all-pervading mind in them, of which man, and even the poet's imaginative energy, are but moments,—that old dream of the *anima mundi*" (vol. 1, 232:15–20).

235:34–35. "[A]ntique Rachel" is how C. B. Cayley translated the end of Dante's' line 102 of Canto II of *Inferno* ("l'antica Rachele"). (See: Dante Alighieri. *Divine Comedy. The Vision of Hell*. Transl. C. B. Cayley, London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851, p. 12.)

Rachel, the second wife of Jacob, does not appear in *Inferno*, but is mentioned there (Canto II) by Beatrice, who has descended from *Paradiso* to go in search of Virgil and ask him to direct Dante, her great former lover! to the way of salvation. She, Beatrice, tells Virgil (in C. B. Cayley's translation):

“A gentle Lady [Mary] is in heaven, of whom
 “This obstacle is mourned, where thou art sent;
 “She breaks on high the force of bitter doom.
 “This Lady with her quest to Lucia went,
 “And said, ‘Thy loyal one [Dante] has need of thee,
 “And I commend him unto thy content.’
 “Lucia, of all unkindness enemy,
 “Arose, and found me sitting in my place,
 “In antique Rachel her society.” (II, ll. 94–102)

By the time Dante reaches the Empyrean, the topmost sphere of heaven (according to the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic, geocentric, astronomy, which Dante made his own), he is enlightened by St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), who, in Canto XXXII, explains to him the hierarchy of the beatific souls sitting, along the petals of the White Rose of Heaven, at the feet of God! The portion of his speech that concerns Rachel and Beatrice, goes like this (likewise in C. B. Cayley's translation):

“The wound, that was by Mary balmed and drest,
 “That woman [Eve], sitting loveliest at her feet,
 “Is she, that laid it open and imprest.
 “And nearest, in the third row, is the seat
 “Of Rachel, and with her to make a pair
 “Is Beatris, even as thine eyes they meet.”
 (XXXII, ll. 4–9)

So, while Eve sits in the second row, immediately below Mary (the “second Eve”, the one who closed the wound which the first Eve had opened), Rachel, and, at her right, Beatrice, sit in the seats of the third rank.

235:34–35. Now, why should Pater have invoked Rachel in this context of “On Wordsworth”?

On Wordsworth (1874)

Because Rachel (the second wife of Jacob) represents the contemplative life (the life of ends-in-themselves), in opposition to her sister Leah (the first wife of Jacob), who represents the active life (the life of means to ends); because, as Pater states, one important lesson, “if men must have lessons”, is that which Wordsworth “conveys more clearly than all”: the lesson of “the supreme importance of contemplation in the conduct of life” (vol. 1, 234:28–31).

Dante experiences a dream during each of the three nights that his and Virgil’s ascent to the Earthly Paradise (the top of the Mountain of Purgatory) lasts. His last dream, which concerns the two sisters, Rachel and Leah, takes place in *Canto XXVII* (of *Purgatorio*). It goes like this (now, in Shadwell’s translation):

And in the hour when first, I deem,
Shone on the mount the orient beam
Of Venus, in whose rays
Love’s flame seems aye to blaze,
Came to my dreams a lady young
And fair, that moved a plain along,
Gathering flowers gay,
And singing on her way.
“Let him,” she said, “that asketh, know
“My name is Leah, and I go,
“Plying my fingers fair,
“A garland to prepare.
“To deck myself it needeth me,
“Ere in the glass I look: but she,
“My sister Rachel stays,
“Content all day to gaze.
“In her fair eyes she takes her fill,
“I with my hands must deck me still:
“Before the glass to shine
“Her lot, to labour mine.”

(XXVII, ll. 94–107)

236:5–11. The “one who had meditated more profoundly than others on the true relation of means to ends in life, and on the distinction between what is desirable in itself and what is desirable only as machinery,” was the English philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), whose defence of Utilitarianism (the view that “actions are right in the proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness”), in the footsteps of Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and of his father, the Scottish philosopher and economist James Mill (1773–1836), made him a true representative of the main tendencies of the spirit of Pater’s days (see above, note to 101:11–12).

It cannot but appear paradoxical, that Pater, who, a few lines above, expressed the wish that “the higher morality... endeavour rather to draw men’s attention from the conception of means and ends in life altogether”—it cannot but appear paradoxical, that Pater now express his respect and admiration for the ethical theory (Utilitarianism) of the man (Mill) who made himself know as the paladin of the “principle of utility”, the foundation stone of the “utilitarian doctrine”.

On the other end, if one bear in mind that tags such as “end-in-itself” and “for its own sake” (used in relation to means) must have had so strong an appeal to Pater, that he easily might come to represent (*vorstellen*) the words without going to the trouble of asking himself what sort of ends-in-themselves he might be confronted with, such a respect and admiration are prone to lose their paradoxical character.

Like Aristotle, Mill thought of happiness as the great final end of all mankind. Unlike Aristotle, however, he did not employ the word “happiness” to express the meaning Aristotle had in mind when he evinced that *eudaimonia* (*happiness*) consists in the active exercise of man’s faculties in conformity with excellence or virtue: in the actualization of the utmost possible degree of human quantitative perfection (see above, note to 235:20–37).

In the same way, if it is a fact that Mill’s “utilitarian standard enjoins and requires the cultivation of the love of virtue up to the greatest strength possible, as being above

all things important to the general happiness”, it is no less a fact—and a very telling one,—that Mill himself is far from using the word “virtue”, contrarily to Aristotle, in any sense capable of making it synonymous with human “perfection” and “excellence”, which are what Aristotle’s *aretē* naturally meant to all the Greeks of his time (whether they were or not promoters of the ideal of *kalokagathía*).

Some short excerpts form Mill’s essay “Utilitarianism”, in one of which (excerpts) power and ambition pursued for their own sakes (as ends-in-themselves) are made part of happiness, will be enough to evince both what has just been said and how appealing to Pater’s mind Mill’s phraseology would indeed have been. (All quotations are from: John Stuart Mill. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*. London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1954.)

The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure. (II, p. 6)

Questions about ends are... questions what things are desirable. The utilitarian doctrine is, that happiness is desirable, and the only thing desirable, as an end; all other things being only desirable as means to that end. (IV, p. 32)

The only proof capable of being given that an object is visible, is that people actually see it. The only proof that a sound is audible, is that people hear it: and so of the other sources of our experience. In like manner, I apprehend, the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it. If the end which the utilitarian doctrine proposes to itself were not, in theory and in practice, acknowledged to be an end, nothing could ever convince any person that it was so. (IV, p. 32)

The ingredients of happiness are very various, and each of them is desirable in itself, and not merely when consid-

ered as swelling an aggregate. The principle of utility does not mean that any given pleasure, as music, for instance, or any given exemption from pain, as for example health, are to be looked upon as means to a collective something termed happiness, and to be desired on that account. They are desired and desirable in and for themselves; besides being means, they are a part of the end. Virtue, according to the utilitarian doctrine, is not naturally and originally part of the end, but it is capable of becoming so; and in those who love it disinterestedly it has become so, and is desired and cherished, not as a means to happiness, but as a part of their happiness. (IV, pp. 33–34)

What, for example, shall we say of the love of money? There is nothing originally more desirable about money than about any heap of glittering pebbles. Its worth is solely that of the things which it will buy; the desires for other things than itself, which it is a means of gratifying. Yet the love of money is not only one of the strongest moving forces of human life, but money is, in many cases, desired in and for itself; the desire to possess it is often stronger than the desire to use it.... It may be then said truly, that money is desired not for the sake of an end, but as part of the end. From being a means to happiness, it has come to be itself a principal ingredient of the individual's conception of happiness. The same may be said of the majority of the great objects of human life—power, for example, or fame... the strongest natural attraction, both of power and of fame, is the immense aid they give to the attainment of our other wishes; and it is the strong association thus generated between them and all our objects of desire, which gives to the direct desire of them the intensity it often assumes, so as in some characters to surpass in strength all other desires. In these cases the means have become a part of the end, and a more important part of it than any of the things which they are means to. What was once desired as an instrument for the attainment of happiness, has come to be desired for its own sake. In being desired for its own sake it is, however, desired as part of happiness. The person is made, or

thinks he would be made, happy by its mere possession; and is made unhappy by failure to obtain it. The desire of it is not a different thing from the desire of happiness, any more than the love of music, or the desire of health. They are included in happiness. They are some of the elements of which the desire of happiness is made up. Happiness is not an abstract idea, but a concrete whole; and these are some of its parts. And the utilitarian standard sanctions and approves their being so. Life would be a poor thing, very ill provided with sources of happiness, if there were not this provision of nature, by which things originally indifferent, but conducive to, or otherwise associated with, the satisfaction of our primitive desires, become in themselves sources of pleasure more valuable than the primitive pleasures.... Virtue, according to the utilitarian conception, is a good of this description. There was no original desire of it, or motive to it, save its conduciveness to pleasure, and especially to protection from pain. But through the association thus formed, it may be felt a good in itself, and desired as such with as great intensity as any other good.... (IV, pp. 33–34)

It results from the preceding considerations, that there is in reality nothing desired except happiness. Whatever is desired otherwise than as a means to some end beyond itself, and ultimately to happiness, is desired as itself a part of happiness, and is not desired for itself until it has become so. Those who desire virtue for its own sake, desire it either because the consciousness of it is a pleasure, or because the consciousness of being without it is a pain, or for both reasons united.... (IV, p. 35)

“[T]he means have become a part of the end, and a more important part of it than any of the things which they are means to. What was once desired as an instrument for the attainment of happiness, has come to be desired for its own sake.”

Do not, these assertions, bring to mind immediately the following passage of Pater’s essay “Prosper Mérimé”?—

In the mental world... a great outlook had lately been cut off. After Kant's criticism of the mind, its pretensions to pass beyond the limits of individual experience seemed as dead as those of old French royalty. ... imprisoned now in the narrow cell of its own subjective experience, the action of a powerful nature will be intense, but exclusive and peculiar. It will come to art, or science, to the experience of life itself, not as to portions of human nature's daily food, but as to something that must be, by the circumstances of the case, exceptional; almost as men turn in despair to gambling or narcotics, and in a little while the narcotic, the game of chance or skill, is valued for its own sake. The vocation of the artist, of the student of life or books, will be realised with something—say! of fanaticism, as an end in itself, unrelated, unassociated.

Concerning Mill's alleged statement that, "when the battle which he and his friends were waging had been won, the world would need more than ever those qualities which Wordsworth was keeping alive and nourishing"—and therefore concerning likewise the footnote,—see above, note to 101:13–15.

236:15–17. "In poetry, in art, ...you touch this principle in part; these, by their very sterility, are a type of beholding for the mere joy of beholding". What Pater means to say is not, of course, that poetry and all the other forms of art are barren (sterile), but that they *do* nothing at all, and that therefore they should not be understood as means (*Mittel*) to any end (*Zweck*) whatsoever—just like a childless woman should not be understood as a means in relation to the children she may or may not come to bear.

Somehow, Pater uses the word "sterility" here to convey a sense similar to that which he lends to the noun "sexlessness" and the adjective "sexless" in his essay "Diaphaneité": "The beauty of the Greek statues was a sexless beauty; the statues of the gods had the least traces of sex. Here [in the Diaphaneité-character] there is a moral sexlessness, a kind of impotence,

236:27–33.

On Wordsworth (1874)

an ineffectual wholeness of nature, yet with a divine beauty and significance of its own.”

“Ineffectualness” and “ineffectual” (in-effect-ual) are, in effect, quite synonymous here with “sterility”–“sexlessness” and “sexless”—as it becomes obvious when one construes “effect” (as opposed to “cause”) as “end” (as opposed to “means”).

Furthermore, it may have happened that the word “sterility” brought to Pater’s mind its etymological (semantic) associations, the Greek adjective *steira* having expressed not only the meaning “barren”, but also the meanings “childless”, “virgin”.

Let us not forget the motives of Pater’s objection to his being described as a hedonist: “The newspapers had for long attributed to Pater as many aesthetic extravagances as were reported of Oscar Wilde, and they called him a “Hedonist”—a term to which he objected ‘because it made a wrong—and unpleasant—impression on those who did not understand Greek.” (Thomas Wright. *The Life of Walter Pater*. London, Everett & Co., 1907, vol. 2, p. 127.)

236:27–33. Pater quotes from the “Preface” to *Lyrical Ballads*. Namely, from the paragraph beginning: “It will now be proper to answer an obvious question, namely, Why, professing these opinions, have I written in verse?” (CPW, 1889, p. 857)—and from the paragraph beginning: “It is not, then, in the dramatic parts of composition that we look for this distinction of language” (CPW, 1889, p. 857).

237:4–5. Pater misquotes (“of man suffering amid awful forms and powers”) line 165 (“Man suffering amid awful Powers and Forms”) of Book VIII (“Retrospect”) of *The Prelude* (CPW, 1889, p. 293).

V.

Imaginary Portrait

Imaginary Portraits 2. An English Poet (1931)

243:1. Pays de Caux: a region in Normandy (in the north of France), confronting the south-coast of England, on the opposite side of the English Channel.

243:2. The rulers of Normandy and England, after the Battle of Hastings (1066): William I, the Conqueror (1066–1087); William II, Rufus (1087–1100); Henry I, Beauclerc (1100–1135); Stephen (1135–1154); Empress Matilda (1141). With the death of Stephen, the Norman Line ended, giving rise to the Plantagenet–Angevin Line, whose first ruler was Henry II, Curtmantle (1154–1189).

243:6. “[W]hite cliffs”: the Pays de Caux is a chalk plateau.

243:12. [H]ouse-leeks: *Sempervivum tectorum*, a hardy, evergreen, low growing perennial of the *Crassulaceae*, which sometimes is referred to as “Liveforever” or, more rarely, “Hen-and chickens”. A well-known plant, its leaves are edible in salads, and its juice can be used as a refreshing drink.

243:20. *Chez-soi*: “at home”.

243:27. *Curé*: “priest”.

244:18. Carrara is a city in Tuscany, in central Italy, the region being famous for the white marble quarried there. Seen at some distance, its hills do look like clouds spread over the ground, so that Pater’s analogy, “Carrara mountains of clouds”, is quite appropriate.

244:36. Corn-cockle: *Agrostemma githago*, a well-known annual-flowering herbaceous plant in the pink and carnation family; Yellow daisy: *Bellis perennis*, a well-known European species.

244:37. Rouen, an old city situated in Normandy, a historic and cultural region of northern France, lies about 60 kilometers (37 miles) south of the Pays de Caux.

245:16. Cumberland, a historic county which is directly associated with the Lake-School poets (Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey), is located in the northwestern extreme

243:1.

An English Poet (1931)

245:38.

An English Poet (1931)

of England. It is bounded: on the north, by the Scottish counties of Dumfriesshire and Roxburghshire; on the north-east, by Northumberland; on the east, by County Durham; on the south-east, by Westmoreland; on the south, by Lancashire.

245:38. *Wanderjahr*, a German word which is directly associated (in the plural, *Wanderjahre*) with Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's (1749–1832) *Bildungsroman Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* (*Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman Years*), means, literally, "wandering year".

246:19. Hallstadt: a town, surrounded by mountains, in the state of Bavaria, southern Germany.

247:6. Honey-suckle (or Honeysuckle, *Lonicera*), well known for its fragrance and the sweet taste of its nectar, which lends it its name, is an arching shrubs or twining vine of the *Caprifoliaceae* family. Among its approximately 180 species, is the common honeysuckle or woodbine (*Lonicera periclymenum*), the white honeysuckle or Chinese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), and the the species Pater refers to: Red Honey-suckle (*Lonicera sempervirens*).

247:21. Augsburg: a city in the state of Bavaria, southern Germany, 50 kilometres (31 miles) west of Munich, the capital of Bavaria.

In Germany, ironwork became preeminent only during and after the 15th century. During the Renaissance, ironwork in Germany was produced almost everywhere and for many purposes, such as window grilles, gates, fountain railings, door knockers, hinges, handles, and locks. Smith's work in Germany, during that period, is to be found specially in the southern parts of Germany: in cities such as Augsburg, Nürnberg, Frankfurt, Salzburg, Munich, and Innsbruck.

250:36. "[I]l suffit que la pensée vous en soit venue pour que ma vie en demeure consolée et charmée": "its enough that the thought has come to your mind for my life to remain consoled and charmed". These words appear in Octave Feuillet's (1821–1890) *Journal d'une Femme* (Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1887 [1878], p. 195).

The book tells the story of two friends, Charlotte, the author of the title's *journal*, and Cécile. They happen to fall in love

with same man, M. d'Eblis, who chooses to marry Cécile de Stèle, when he realises that his friend M. de Louvercy is secretly in love with Charlotte. M. de Louvercy has recently returned from the war, which caused him to become disfigured to the point of barely being recognisable by those who knew him before.

The words Pater quotes are to be imagined as spoken by M. de Louvercy to Charlotte, who, having been deprived of her happiness by the marriage of her friend Cécile to the man she loved (M. d'Eblis), decides to make him (M. de Louvercy) happy by marrying him. "La pensée" that the quotation refers to is, then, Charlotte's "thought" of sacrificing her life in favour of M. de Louvercy's *happiness*.

250:38–251:2. Judging from Pater's scant references to American authors and from what he states, he possibly had in mind here the American novelist Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804–1864), whose novel *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851) he called "Hawthorne's beautiful romance" in his review "Coleridge's Writings" (1866). (See above, note to 18:7–9.)

Tuscany (*Toscana*) is a region in central Italy, whose regional capital is Florence (*Firenze*). It borders the region of Liguria, to the northwest; to the north, the region of Emilia-Romagna; to the east, the regions of Marche and Umbria to the southeast, the region of Lazio; to the west, the Ligurian and Tyrrhenian Seas.

The Apennines are the mountains that run almost the whole length of Italy, from Liguria (in the North) to the tip of Calabria (in the South). They occupy mostly the centre of Italy, so that they divide Tuscany roughly in three zones: in the centre, the mountainous zone which Pater calls "Apennine Italy"; to the east, Inland Tuscany; to the west, Maritime Tuscany.

251:2–5. Possibly, Pater refers to the English art critic John Ruskin (1819–1900), a substantial part of whose writings is devoted to the geology, mineralogy, and architecture of the Swiss, French, and Italian Alps. Extended treatment of the Alps appears, for example, in Ruskin's fourth volume (1856) of *Modern Painters* and in his autobiography (1885–1889), *Praeterita: Outlines of Scenes and Thoughts Perhaps Worthy of Mem-*

251:5–7.

An English Poet (1931)

ory in my Past Life, whose second volume (1887) is devoted to the Alpine region.

251:5–7. Possibly, Pater refers to the Scottish essayist, historian, and novelist Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), the author of *Early Kings of Norway* (London, Chapman and Hall, 1875) and *On Heroes, and Hero-Worship and The Heroic in History* (London, Chapman and Hall, 1841).

In Norse mythology, Valhalla (“hall of the slain”) is a majestic, enormous hall located in Asgard, which is ruled over by the god Odin. Half of the heroes who die in combat are conducted there by the Valkyries, to be with Odin, while the other half is chosen by the goddess Freyja (the Venus of the Norse Mythology), to inhabit the field Fólkvangr.

251:7–10. One can but wonder if the poet Pater had in mind here be William Wordsworth (1770–1850), whose two *Memorials—Memorials of a Tour in the Continent* (1820) and *Memorials of a Tour in Italy* (1837)—would take “one deep into the Campaign of Rome or along the tender French coast”.

Although it is improbable, it may be that the assertion: “the expression of being ‘in the spirit’ seemed clearly explained”—that this assertion be connected with the following remark by Wordsworth, accompanying the sonnet “Between Namur and Liege” (from *Memorials of a Tour in the Continent*): “Details *in the spirit* of these sonnets are given both in Mrs. Wordsworth’s Journals and my Sister’s, and the re-perusal of them has strengthened a wish long entertained that somebody would put together, as in one work, the notices contained in them, omitting particulars that were written down merely to aid our memory, and bringing the whole into as small a compass as is consistent with the general interests belonging to the scenes, circumstances, and objects touched on by each writer.” (William Wordsworth. *Poetical Works*. London, E. Moxon, Son & Co., 1870, vol. 3, p. 135.)

251:14–15. “St. Mark” refers to St. Mark’s Basilica, in Venice. The Treasury of the Basilica consists nowadays of about three hundred pieces in gold, silver, glass and other precious materials from various sources, including enamelled gold-work looted during the Fourth Crusade (1202–1204) and brought

to Venice from Constantinople. Roughly during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, the treasure kept in the Basilica was what remained of the much larger treasure that had been amassed during the Venetian Republic (697–1797), which was plundered when the Republic itself came to an end, as a result of the French occupation of Venice under Napoleon and Habsburg Austria. By the end of the second decade of the nineteenth century, the treasure was further impoverished, by the need to sell precious stones and pearls in order to obtain money for the restoration of the Basilica.

[I]ncense of Palestine appears to refer (at least *prima facie*) to Palestine, a mixture of different types of granulated incense, obtained from the incisions of different tree trunks, such as olibanum (from Eritrea, Ethiopia and Sudan), myrrh (from Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia), styrax (from Indonesia, Thailand and Malaysia), and sandalwood (from the west of Africa). The granules are immersed in processed pigments of various colours and mixed with the scents of flowers and shrubs, such as lavender and juniper.

251:18–27. Pater speaks here of “style or manner (λέξις), as opposed to the matter (λόγοι), in the imaginative literature” (to quote the chapter of *Plato and Platonism* titled “Plato’s Aesthetics”). That is to say, Pater once more speaks of the indifference in true “imaginative literature” between form and matter, whose fusion is achieved by the faculty he calls “imaginative reason” (see above, note to 224:13)—such a fusion being what he tried to explain when he stated, concerning Wordsworth:

In him, when the really poetical motive worked at all, it united, with absolute justice, the word and the idea; each, in the imaginative flame, becoming inseparably one with the other, by that fusion of matter and form, which is the characteristic of the highest poetical expression. His words are themselves thought and feeling; not eloquent, or musical words merely, but that sort of creative language which carries the reality of what it depicts, directly, to the consciousness. (vol. 1, 233:23–31)

251:18–27.

An English Poet (1931)

In the present passage, however, where he speaks of “manner” in the sense of “how things... [are] said” and as “those elements of... literary production which... are so delicately and individually apprehended”, that they are capable of being detected and understood only by means of “a literary sense”—in the present passage, however, Pater appears to have had in mind that, as he says in “Style”, “‘The style’”, or manner, “‘is the man’”: is the peculiar use of words each individual has to have recourse to, whenever his goal is sincerely to express what otherwise he would not be able to make (*secretly*) public: his or her private, and no less peculiar, “vision within”.

Let us pay attention to Pater’s own words, concerning “Style”:

... according to the well-known saying, ‘The style is the man,’ complex or simple, in his individuality, his plenary sense of what he really has to say” by means of “the medium through which alone he can expose that inward sense of things, the purity of this medium, its laws or tricks of refraction: nothing is to be left there which might give conveyance to any matter save that.

Anticipating his readers reaction to these assertions, Pater adds:

A relegation, you may say perhaps—a relegation of style to the subjectivity, the mere caprice, of the individual, which must soon transform it into mannerism. Not so! since there is, under the conditions supposed, for those elements of the man, for every lineament of the vision within, the one word, the one acceptable word, recognisable...

No, not by every reader, not to say “not by most readers”.—Only “by the sensitive, by others ‘who have intelligence’ in the matter, as absolutely as ever anything can be in the evanescent and delicate region of human language.”—It being so because, indeed, “The style, the manner, would be the man, not

in his unreasoned and really uncharacteristic caprices, involuntary or affected, but in absolutely sincere apprehension of what is most real to him.”

The predicament of the writer who sets as his goal to express, to make *public*, “what is most real to him” (his “vision within”) by means of his individual style is then the following: faced with the impossibility of using words (signifiers) to convey their lexicalised meanings (signifieds), he is forced to choose not only his *own* words, but also the particular meanings they are to convey to himself and to others; using his *own* words, he depicts and describes his individual, and private, “vision within”; by proceeding thus, he runs the risk, most of the times, that his readers take for granted that the “vision within” which the words they read (and their imagination) elicit from them *is* the (quite different) “vision within” which he (the writer) meant to depict and to describe to them!

Take this *invitation*, reader, as an example:

That intellectual life within life which had involved for him, so far, a certain bitter self-reliance and a somewhat sad sort of walking by faith, enlarged now rapidly to something ripe and full, like the sudden enrichment of the youthful body itself in its propitious year. It is in this, so poetical a situation, as he tarries awhile for the coming of his friend at a place where he sees the sea for the first time, that the reader is to contemplate him. (vol. 1, 253:38–254:6)

Pater, then, truly wrote for “the sensitive”, for “others ‘who have intelligence’ in the matter, as absolutely as ever anything can be in the evanescent and delicate region of human language.” That is to say, Pater wrote mostly the type of literature he himself qualifies in the chapter “Plato’s *Æsthetics*”: “literature... of which among other things it may be said that it solicits a certain effort from the reader or spectator, who is promised a great expressiveness on the part of the writer, the artist, if he for his part will bring with him a great attentiveness. And how satisfying, how reassuring, how flattering to himself

251:23–24.

An English Poet (1931)

after all, such work really is—the work which deals with one as a scholar, formed, mature and manly.”

To quote once more “An English Poet”: Pater wrote, above all, for readers capable of hearing and seeing—through “a subtler operation from the style, the ether-like manner of the thing”—“all that ... [is] not actually there for ear and eye” (vol. 1, 252:14–15, 11–12); such readers being those qualified to detect and admire his (Pater’s) “delicate verbal cunning” (vol. 1, 252:27).

Indeed, “the power of choice utterance was felt coming” (vol. 1, 253:3–4).

251:23–24. The English writer Sir Thomas BROWNE (1605–1682), the object of Pater’s essay (in *Appreciations*) that bears his name for a title; the English (Jacobean) dramatist John WEBSTER (c. 1580–c. 1632); the English dramatist, translator, and poet George CHAPMAN (c. 1559–1634).

251:32–35. This assertion does not appear to be typical of Pater, who, in *Plato and Platonism*, disparaged what might be called *the feminine element in literature*:

Manliness in art, what can it be, as distinct from that which in opposition to it must be called the feminine quality there,—what but a full consciousness of what one does, of art itself in the work of art, tenacity of intuition and of consequent purpose, the spirit of construction as opposed to what is literally incoherent or ready to fall to pieces, and, in opposition to what is hysteric or works at random, the maintenance of a standard. Of such art ἦθος rather than πάθος will be the predominant mood. To use Plato’s own expression there will be here no παραλείπόμενα, no ‘negligences,’ no feminine forgetfulness of one’s self, nothing in the work of art un-conformed to the leading intention of the artist, who will but increase his power by reserve. An artist of that kind will be apt, of course, to express more than he seems actually to say. He economises. He will not spoil good things by exaggeration. The rough, promiscuous wealth of nature he reduces to grace and order: reduces, it may

be, lax verse to staid and temperate prose. With him, the rhythm, the music, the notes, will be felt to follow, or rather literally accompany as ministers, the sense,—
ἀκολουθεῖν τὸν λόγον.

252:1.

An English Poet (1931)

252:1. The “great English poet” is here William Wordsworth, whose “Preface” to *Lyrical Ballads* Pater once more had in mind.

252:15–16. “So written language came to be form and colour”. These words reveal that Pater truly did understand the *secret* of the old formula: *ut pictura poesis*—in agreement with which the literary artist is to choose, and to put to use, words not according to their lexicalised meanings, but as if they truly were verbal brush strokes of colour: according to the images and associations, the lineaments in the canvas of the mind, which, together, they be most prone to elicit—just like the colour green, for instance, naturally elicits images of grass, trees, and fields, but not images of the sun, the moon, the stars.

252:20. *Hamlet*, Act II, Scene ii, l. 192.

252:22. *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene v, l. 188.

254:36–37. Wild marigold: a common name for several plants, in particular for *Calendula arvensis*, which is native to central and southern Europe, and *Tagetes minuta*, which is native to southern South America, but became naturalised in Europe and other parts of the world as a result of the Spanish colonisation of the Americas.

Yellow horned poppy: *Glaucium flavum*, a summer flowering plant of the family *Papaveraceae*. Also named “yellow hornpoppy” and “sea poppy”, it grows on shingle beaches, cliffs, and sand dunes around the coast of England and Wales, never being found inland.

List of Works Cited

List of Works Cited

- A Bookman's Catalogue: the Norman Colbeck Collection of Nineteenth-century and Edwardian Poetry and Belles Letters in the Special Collections of the University of British Columbia.* Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 1987, 2 vols.
- Alighieri, Dante. *Divine Comedy. The Vision of Hell.* Transl. C. B. Cayley, London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851.
- Alighieri, Dante. *Purgatorio, Part II.* Transl. Charles Lancelot Shadwell, London, Macmillan and Co., and New York, The Macmillan Company, 1899.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy.* Transl. Charles Bagot Cayley, London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Company, 1851.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy.* Transl. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1867.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Inferno.* Transl. Allen Mandelbaum, Toronto, Bantam Books, 1982.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Inferno.* Transl. Charles S. Singleton, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Paradiso.* Transl. Allen Mandelbaum, Toronto, Bantam Books, 1986.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Paradiso.* Transl. Charles S. Singleton, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Purgatorio.* Transl. Allen Mandelbaum, Toronto, Bantam Books, 1984.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Purgatorio.* Transl. Charles S. Singleton, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1973.

- Alighieri, Dante. *Vita Nuova*. Transl. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1861.
- Ariosto, Ludovico. *Opere Minori di Ludovico Ariosto*. Ed. Filippo Luigi Polidori, Firenze, Felice le Monier, 1857, 2 vols.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Transl. H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Transl. S. H. Butcher, London, Macmillan and Co. 1895.
- Arnold, Matthew. *The Complete Prose Works*, Ed. R. H. Super, Ann Arbor, The University Press of Michigan Press, vol. 5 (*Culture and Anarchy*), 1992.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *L'Art Romantique*. Paris, Louis Conard, 1925.
- Beeching, H. C., Mackail, J. W., and Nichols, J. B. B. *Love in Idleness. A Book of Poems*. London, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883.
- Bernard, H. H., transl. *Cambridge Freethoughts and Letters on Bibliolatry, Translated from the German of G. E. Lessing*. London, Trübner and Co., 1862.
- Blake, William. *Songs of Innocence and Experience, and Other Poems*. Ed. Richard Herne Shepherd, London, Basil Montagu Pickering, 1866.
- Böhme, Jakob. *On the Divine Intuition*. In:—*Six Theosophic Points and Other Writings*. Transl. John Rolleston Earl, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1920, pp. 175–220.
- Böhme, Jakob. *The Threefold Life of Man*. Transl. John Sparrow, London, John M. Watkins, 1909.
- Bray, Anna Eliza. *Life of Thomas Stothard, R. A, with Personal Reminiscences*. London, Bradbury & Evans for John Murray, 1851.
- Brock, M. G. and Curthoys, M. C., eds. *The History of the University of Oxford*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997, vol. VI (*Nineteenth-Century Oxford. Part I*).

- Carlyle, Thomas. *Early Kings of Norway*. London, Chapman and Hall, 1875.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, and Hero-Worship and The Heroic in History*. London, Chapman and Hall, 1841.
- Chesneau, Ernest. *La Peinture Anglaise*. Paris, A. Quentin, 1882.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character*. London, Taylor and Hessey, 1825.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Aids to Reflexion*. Ed. H. N. Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1839.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia Literaria*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1847, 2 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Christabel & C.* 3. ed., London, John Murray, 1816.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: Letters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1840.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare and Some of the Old Poets and Dramatists, with Other Literary Remains*. Ed. H. N. Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1849, 2 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each*. London, Edward Monxon, 1830.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each*. London, Hurst, Chance and Co., 1852.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Poems of S. Taylor Coleridge, to which are Now Added Poems by Charles Lamb and Charles Lloyd*. 2. ed., Bristol, J. Cottle, 1797.

- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Poems on Various Subjects*. London, G. G. and J. Robinsons, Bristol, J. Cottle, 1796.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Poetical and Dramatic Works*. London, William Pickering, 1844, 3 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Poetical Works, Including the Dramas Wallenstein, Repose, and Zapolya* London, William Pickering, 1828, 3 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Poetical Works*. London, William Pickering, 1834, 3 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Sibylline Leaves: A Collection of Poems*. London, Rest Ernner, 1817.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Complete Works*. Ed. W. G. T. Shedd, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853, 7 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Friend; A Series of Essays*. London, Gale and Curtis, 1812.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Literary Remains*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, London, William Pickering, 1836, 4 vols.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Statesman's Manual; or, the Bible the Best Guide to Political Skill and Foresight: A Lay Sermon, Addressed to the Higher Classes of Society, with an Appendix, Containing Comments and Essays Connected with the Study of the Inspired Writings*. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1853.
- Colquhoun, John Campbell. *Scattered Leaves of Biography*. London, William Machintosh, 1864.
- Conlon, John J. *Walter Pater and the French Tradition*. Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, 1982.
- De Quincey, Thomas. *Literary Reminiscences*. Boston, Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1854, 2 vols.
- Courtney, W. L. *The Life of John Stuart Mill*. London, Walter Scott, 1889.

- Dennistoun, James. *Memoirs of the Duke of Urbino*. London, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1851.
- Dio, Lucius Cassius. *Annals of Rome*. Transl. Herbert Baldwin Foster, Troy, New York, Pafraets Books, 1906, vol. V.
- Donoghue, Denis. *Walter Pater: Lover of Strange Souls*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
- Fauriel, Claude Charles. *Histoire de la Poésie Provençale*. Paris, Benjamin Duprat, 1847, 2 vols.
- Fauriel, Claude Charles. *History of Provençal Poetry*. Transl. G. J. Adler, New York, Derby & Jackson, 1860, 2 vols.
- Feuillet, Octave. *Journal d'une Femme*. Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1887.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Lettres a George Sand, Précédées d'une Étude par Guy de Maupassant*. Paris, G. Charpentier, 1884.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Lettres a sa Niece Caroline*. Paris, Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1906.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Madame Bovary, Moeurs de Province*. Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1857.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris, Louis Conard, 1910, 18 vols.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Par les chemins et par le grèves (Voyage en Bretagne), Accompagné de mélanges et fragments inédits*. Paris, G. Charpentier et C^{ie}, 1886.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Three Tales*. Trad. Arthur McDowall, Norfolk, Connecticut, New Directions, 1924.
- Gilchrist, Alexander. *The Life of William Blake*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1863, 2 vols.
- Gillman, James. *The Life of Coleridge*. London, William Pickering, 1838, 2 vols.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust*. Transl. Walter Kaufmann, New York, Anchor Books, 1961.
- Graves, Robert. *The Greek Myths*. London, Penguin, 1988, 2 vols.

- Hegel, G. W. Friedrich. *Philosophy of Right*. Transl. S. W. Dyde, London, George Bell, 1896.
- Herodotus. *Histories*. Transl. A. D. Godley, London, William Heinemann, 1920, 4 vols.
- Infessura, Stefano. *Diario della Città di Roma*. Ed. Oreste Tomasini. 2. ed., Roma, Forzani E. C. Tipografi del Senato, 1890.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Transl. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Transl. and ed. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Keats, John. *Lamia, Isabella, The Eve of Saint Agnes, and Other Poems*. London, Taylor and Hessey, 1820.
- Knight, William Angus, et al., eds. *Selections from Wordsworth. With Preface and Notes*. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co, 1888.
- Knight, William Angus, ed. *Wordsworthiana: A Selection of Papers Read to the Wordsworth Society*. London, Macmillan & Co., 1889.
- Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Transl. C. D. Young, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1915, vol. VIII.
- Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Transl. R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1995, vol. 2.
- Lee, Vernon (Violet Paget). *Baldwin: Being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations*. London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1886.
- Lee, Vernon (Violet Paget). *Belcaro, Being Essays on Sundry Aesthetical Questions*. London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1881.
- Lee, Vernon (Violet Paget). *Euphorion: Being Studies of the An-*

- tique and the Mediaeval in the Renaissance*. London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1884, 2 vols.
- Lee, Vernon (Violet Paget). *Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy*. London, W. Satchell and Co., 1880.
- Lee, Vernon (Violet Paget). *The Countess of Albany*. London, W. H. Allen & Co., 1884.
- Longfellow, Samuel, ed. *The Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1891.
- Lowell, James Russell. "Democracy". In:—. *The Writings of James Russell Lowell*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1890, vol. 6 (*Literary and Political Addresses*).
- Lucy Hartley. *Democratising Beauty in Nineteenth-century Britain. Art and the Politics of Public Life*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Marvell, Andrew. *Works*. Ed. Edward Thompson, London, Printed for the Editor, 1776, 3 vols.
- Matarazzo, Francesco. *Cronaca della città di Perugia, dal 1492 al 1503*. Ed. Ariondante Fabreti. In: *Archivio Storico Italiano*. I. Serie, vol. 16 (1850), pt. 1, pp. 69, 71–750.
- Matarazzo, Francesco. *Chronicles of the city of Perugia, 1492–1503*. Transl. Edward Strachan Morgan, London, J. M. Dent & Co., 1905.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography*. 3. ed., London, Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1874.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*. London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1954.
- Modigliani, Anna. "Pontani, Gaspare". In: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*. vol. 84, 2015.
- Moratorius, Ludovicus Antonius, ed. *Diarium romanum urbis, ab anno MCCCCLXXXI ad MCCCXCII*. In: *Rerum Italicarum Scriptore*. 1734, vol. III, pt. 2, 1069–1429.

- Morley, John. *Recollections*. London, Macmillan & Co., 1917, 3 vols.
- Myres, Miles, ed. *The Book of Common Prayer*. London, Thomas Baker, 1887.
- Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg). *Logologischen Fragmente* (1798) In:—. *Novalis Schriften: die Werke Friedrich von Hardenbergs*. Ed. Paul Luckhohn and Richard Samuel, 3. ed., Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1997–, vol. II (*Das philosophische Werke I*).
- Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg). *Novalis Schriften*. Ed. Ludwig Tieck and Friedrich Schelling, Berlin, G. Keimer, 1837.
- Origen. *The Writings*. Transl. Frederick Crombie, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1869, 2 vols.
- Pandolfini, Agnolo. *Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*. Firenze, Tartini e Franchi, 1734.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Transl. W. H. S. Jones, London, William Heinemann, 1933, 6 vols.
- Plato. "Letter VII". Transl. L. A. Post. In:—. *The Collected Dialogues*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 1574–1598.
- Plato. *Phaedrus*. Transl. R. Hackforth. In:—. *The Collected Dialogues*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 475–525.
- Plato. *Republic*. Transl. Paul Shorey. In:—. *The Collected Dialogues*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 575–844.
- Plato. *Symposium*. Transl. Michael Joyce. In:—. *The Collected Dialogues*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 526–574.
- Plato. *Timaeus*. Transl. Benjamin Jowett. In:—. *The Collected Dialogues*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns,

- Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 1151–1211.
- Postgate, J. P. *et al.*, trans. *Catullus, Tibullus, Pervigilium Veneris*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Raffalovich, Marc-André. *In Fancy Dress*. London, Walter Scott, 1886.
- Robbia, Luca Della. “Recitazione *del caso di Pietro Paolo Boscoli e di Agostino Capponi, scritta da Luca della Robbia, l’anno MDXIII*”. In: *Archivio Storico Italiano*. Firenze, vol. I, 1842, pp. 283–309.
- Rosenblatt, Louise M. “*Marius l’Épicurien*, de Walter Pater, et ses points de départ français”. *Revue de Littérature Comparée*. 1935, pp. 242–60.
- Rosenblatt, Louise M. “The Genesis of Pater’s *Marius the Epicurean*.” *Comparative Literature*. Summer 1962, vol. XIV, pp. 242–260.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Émile*. Transl. Barbara Foxley, London, Dent, 1969.
- Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn Muhammad. *The Essential Rumi*. Transl. Coleman Barks *et al.*, New York, Harper, 1995.
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles-Augustin. “Qu’est-ce qu’un classique?” In:—. *Causeries du Lundi*. Paris, Garnier Frères, 1852, vol. 3, p. 49.
- Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von. *System of Transcendental Idealism*. Trad. Peter Heath, Charlottesville, Virginia, University of Virginia Press, 1993.
- Seeley, Sir John Robert. *Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1865.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, *The Poetical Works*. Ed. Mary Shelley, London, Edward Monx, 1839.
- Smith, John Thomas. *Nollekens and his Time: Comprehending the Life of that Celebrated Sculptor; and Memoirs of Several*

- Contemporary Artists from the Time of Roubiliac, Hogarth, and Reynolds to that of Fuseli, Flaxman, and Blake.* London, Henry Colburn, 1828, 2 vols.
- Southey, Robert. *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey.* Ed. John Wood Warter, London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1856, 4 vols.
- Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle). *Histoire de la peinture en Italie.* Paris, Didot, 1817, 2 vols.
- Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle). *Chroniques italiennes.* Paris, Michel Lévy Frères, 1855.
- Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle). *Oeuvres complètes.* Paris, Michel Lévy, 17 vols., 1853–1855.
- Symonds, John Addington. *Studies of the Greek Poets.* London, Smith, Elder & Co., 2 vols., 1873 and 1876.
- Tafel, R. L., ed. and transl. *Documents Concerning the Life and Character of Emanuel Swedenborg.* London, Swedenborg Society, 1875, 2 vols.
- Taine, Hippolyte. *Philosophie de l'art en Italie.* Paris, Germer-Ballière, 1866.
- Theocritus. *Idylls.* In: *Greek Bucolic Poets.* Transl. J. M. Edmonds, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2001, pp. 5–361.
- Trelawny, E. J. *Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron.* London, Edward Moxon, 1858.
- Vernon, Peter J. "Pater's Letters to Andre Raffalovich". *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920.* Vol. 26, no. 3, 1983, pp. 192–197.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid.* Transl. J. W. Mackail, London, Macmillan and Co., 1885.
- Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid.* Transl. H. R. Fairclough, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2006.

- Virgil. *The Eclogues and Georgics*. Transl. J. W. Mackail, London, Rivingtons, 1889.
- Voltaire. *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Paris, Cosse et Gaultier-Laguionie, 1838.
- Ward, Thomas Humphrey, ed. *The English Poets: Selections With Critical Introductions by Various Writers and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold*. London, Macmillan, 1880, vol. IV (*Wordsworth to Rossetti*).
- Wilde, Oscar. "The Decay of Lying—An Observation". In:—. *Intentions*. London, Methuen & Co., 1909, pp. 22–23.
- Woodhull, Michael, transl. *The Nineteen Tragedies and Fragments of Euripides*. London, John Walker et. al., 1809, 3 vols.
- Wordsworth, William and Coleridge, S. T. *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems*. London, J. & A. Arch, 1798.
- Wordsworth, William and Coleridge, S. T. *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems*. London, T. N. Longman and O. Rees, 1800, 2 vols.
- Wordsworth, William and Dorothy. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. The Later Years*. Ed. Ernest de Selincourt, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1939, 3 vols.
- Wordsworth, William. *Poems in Two Volumes*. London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807, 2 vols.
- Wordsworth, William. *Poems*. Ed. Matthew Arnold, London, Macmillan & Co., 1879.
- Wordsworth, William. *Poetical Works*. London, E. Moxon, Son & Co., 1870, 6 vols.
- Wordsworth, William. *The Complete Poetical Works. With an Introduction by John Morley*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1889.
- Wordsworth, William. *The Prelude, or Growth of a Poet's Mind; An Autobiographical Poem*. London, Edward Moxon, 1850.

- Wordsworth, William. *The Recluse*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1888.
- Wright, Samuel. *A Bibliography of the Writings of Walter H. Pater*. Folkestone, Kent, England, Garland, 1975.
- Wright Thomas. *The Life of Walter Pater*. London, Everett & Co., 1907, 2 vols.

Onomastic Index

Onomastic Index

- Abélard, Pierre: 42:6.
Historia calamitatum: 42:6.
Letters of Abelard and Heloise: 42:6.
- Acte, Claudia: 167:27–168:3; 167:34–35.
- Adams, Joseph: 191:3–5.
- Agrippina: 167:34–35.
- Alberti, Leon Battista: 67:15–17.
I Libri Della Famiglia: 67:15–17.
- Alcman: 73:12.
- Alexander IV, Pope: 210:35–211:1.
- Alexander VI, Pope: 65:27–28; 65:28–30; 66:33–67:6.
- Alexander, the Great: 166:2.
- Alford, Henry: 231:1–6.
The School of the Heart and Other Poems: 231:1–6.
- Alighieri, Dante: 26: 33; 42:3; 109:23; 109:24; 209:8–13; 210:15–19; 211: 24–28; 213:3–4; 213:32–33; 215:17; 216:11; 216:22–23; 216:34–217:1; 217:4–6; 218:1 f.n.; 218: 5–6; 218: 10–11; 235:20–37; 235:34–35.
Convivio: 215:17.
La Divina Commedia: 109:23; 109:24; 210:15–19; 215:5; 215:17; 216:10; 217:4–6; 218:1 f.n.; 218:18–21.
“Beatrice”: 215:17; 218:1 f.n.; 218:18–21; 235:34–35.
“Bernard (Saint)”: 235:34–35.
“Buouconte da Montefeltro”: 217: 27:28.
“Cassella”: 215:17; 215:18 f.n.; 216:22–23; 218:1 f.n.
“Cato of Utica”: 216:22–23.
“Currado Malaspina”: 213:7–16; 218:1 f.n.
“Dante”: 109:24; 210:35–211:1; 211:30–212:4; 212:9–11; 212:14; 214:26–215:2; 215:5; 215:17; 215:18 f.n.; 216:22–23; 217: 27:28; 218:1 f.n.; 218:4; 218:18–21; 235:34–35.
“David” (King): 210:15–19; 215:18 f.n.
“Eve”: 235:34–35.
“Ganymede”: 213:7–16; 218:1 f.n.; 218: 10–11.
Inferno: 109:24; 209:8–13; 210:35–211:1; 218:1 f.n.; 218:1 f.n.; 218:18–21; 235:34–35.
“*Inferno*”: 215:5.
“Jacopo del Cassero”: 217: 27:28.
“La Pia”: 109:24; 217: 27:28.
“Leah”: 235:34–35.
“Lucia”: 218:1 f.n. .
“Manfred”: 210:35–211:1; 214:10–13; 214:15–19; 218: 10–11.
“Mary (Virgin)”: 215:18 f.n.; 218:1 f.n.; 235:34–35.
“Michal”: 215:18 f.n.
“Nino Visconti”: 213:7–16; 218:1 f.n.
Paradiso: 109:24; 209:8–13; 210:15–19; 218:18–21.
“*Paradiso*”: 213:32–33; 235:34–35.
Purgatorio: 109:24; 209:8–13; 210:35–211:1; 212:14; 213:32–33; 214:3; 215:5; 215:17; 218:18–21; 235:34–35.
“*Purgatorio*”: 210:35–211:1;

- 211: 24–28; 212:14; 213:7–16;
214:26–215:2; 215:5; 215:17;
216:22–23; 217: 27:28;
218:1 f.n.; 218:4; 218: 10–11;
218:18–21; 235:34–35.
“Rachel”: 235:34–35.
“Sordello”: 213:7–16; 218:1
f.n.; 218:4.
“Statius”: 211:30–212:4.
“Virgil”: 109:24; 210:35–
211:1; 211:30–212:4; 212:9–
11; 214:26–215:2; 215:5;
215:17; 215:18 f.n.; 217: 27:28;
218:1 f.n.; 218:4; 218: 10–11;
218:18–21; 235:34–35.
Vita Nuova: 213:3–4; 215:5;
215:17.
“Beatrice”: 213:3–4; 215:5.
Allamanon, Bertrand d’: 43:22–23.
Amber Witch, The: 50:35.
Ambrose, St.: 231:30–31.
Amiel, Henri-Frédéric: 163:5–10.
Angelo, Michael: 25:27–29.
Anniceris: 132:35–36.
Anquetin, Louis: 140:9–11.
Anthony the Great, St.: 124:25–26.
Antinوس: 133:22.
Antipater of Tarsus: 166:2.
Apuleius, Lucius: 50:15.
Metamorphoses: 50:15.
Argonautica cycle: 50:30–31.
Ariosto, Ludovico: 65:28–30.
Opere Minori: 65:28–30.
Rime: 65:28–30.
Aristippus of Cyrene, the Younger:
132:35–36.
Aristotle: 8: 27–28; 21:16; 68:30;
209:1–2; 215:5; 235:20–37;
236:5–11.
De Caelo: 215:5.
Nicomachean Ethics: 8: 27–28;
16:14–15; 235:20–37.
Poetics: 74:18–19.
Arnold, Matthew: 56:12–13;
131:9; 132:9–15; 192:21;
224:13; 233:19–31; 235:20–37.
Culture and Anarchy: 235:20–37.
“Pagan and Medieval Religious
Sentiment”: 49:38–50:1; 215:5.
Poems of Wordsworth: 101:1–5.
Arrian of Nicomedia: 43:7.
Arts and Crafts Essays: 73:1–2.
Athanasius of Alexandria: 124:25–
26.
Auden, W. H.: 209:8–13.
Augustine, St: 30:4; 109:22.
Confessions: 109:22; 161:29–32.
Meditations: 164: 35–36.
Augustus, Octavian: 209:1–2.
Aurelius, Marcus: 25:23–24;
166:2.
Thoughts: 166:2.
Austin, John: 31:15.
Azzo VIII d’Este: 217: 27:28.
Bacon, Francis: 31:27–28.
Ball, Sir Alexander John: 11:34–35.
Balzac, Honoré de: 137:17–18;
235:10–11.
Eugénie Grandet: 235:10–11.
Barca, Hamilcar (father): 119:16.
Barca, Hamilcar (son): 119:16.
Barca, Hasdrubal: 119:16.
Barca, Mago(n): 119:16.
Barca, Salammbô: 119:16.
Barras, Paul: 223:27.
Barry RA, James: 82:31.
The Progress of Human Culture:
82:31.
Bartoli, Andrea de’: 209:8–13.
Baudelaire, Charles: 56:12–13;
109:10; 109:22.
L’Art Romantique: 109:22.
Baur, Ferdinand: 34:7.
Beardsley, Aubrey: 109:10.
Beeching, Henry Charles: 73:1–2.
A Paradise of English Poetry:
73:1–2.
*Faith: Eleven Sermons with a
Preface*: 73:1–2.

- “Lines by a Person of Quality”: 73:19.
- Love in Idleness*: 73:1–2.
- “After Parting”: 74:33–34.
- “Envoy”: 73:1–2.
- “For a Drawing”: 77:2–7.
- In Limine*: 75:34.
- “In Scheria”: 74:33–34; 74:37–75:1; 75:1–4.
- “Ireland.1821”: 75:13.
- “Ireland. 1822”: 75:13.
- “Jealousy”: 74:33–34.
- “Lines by a Person of Quality”: 73:19.
- Loca senta situ*: 75:18; 75:22.
- Luna Fatifera*: 75:16.
- “Magdalen Gardens and Magdalen Bridge”: 75:11–12.
- “Nocturne—Chopin, op 37, 1”: 77:2–7.
- “Nocturne—Chopin, op 40, 2”: 77:2–7.
- “On a Drawing by Burne Jones”: 77:2–7.
- “On a Drawing of Lionardo...”: 77:2–7.
- “On a Madonna and Child by Bellini”: 77:2–7.
- “On the Birth of Venus by Botticelli”: 77:2–7.
- “Santa Cruz”: 75:7–8.
- “Song”: 77:2–7.
- “The Handmaid of the Lord”: 76:12–13.
- “The History of Philip the Deacon”: 76:12–13.
- “The Last Tennis-Party”: 76:19.
- “The Lost Self”: 76:5.
- “The Nature of Things”: 73:20–21.
- “To Erato”: 73:1–2.
- Loves’ Looking Glass: A Volume of Poems*: 73:1–2.
- Bell, Dr. Joseph: 11:34–35.
- Bellini, Giovanni: 102:33–34; 133:19–20; 226:12–15.
- Benedict, St.: 172:13–14.
- Bentham, Jeremy: 28:6; 31:15; 101:11–12; 236:5–11.
- Béranger, Pierre-Jean de: 125:6–15; 125:8–10.
- Berkeley, George: 31:27–28.
- Blake, Robert: 75:7–8.
- Blake, William: 59:5–6; 201:28–34.
- America: A Prophecy*: 60:3–5.
- Book of Urizen*: 60:3–5.
- Europe a Prophecy*: 201:28–34.
- The Ancient of Days*: 201:28–34.
- Illustrations of the Book of Job*: 201:31–32.
- When the Morning Stars Sang Together*: 201:31–32.
- Songs of Innocence and of Experience*: 60:2; 60:6.
- Boethius: 49:38–50:1.
- Böhme, Jakob: 21:10–11.
- The Threefold Life of Man*: 21:10–11.
- On the Divine Intuition*: 21:10–11.
- Bonaparte, Napoleon: 223:27.
- Bonington, Richard Parkes: 82:19–22.
- Book of Common Prayer (The)*: 205:4–5.
- Borgia, Cesare: 65:28–30.
- Borgia, Rodrigo: 65:27–28; 65:28–30; 65:28–30.
- Borgognone, Ambrogio: 151:10–11.
- Boron, Robert de: 44:16.
- The Great History of the Grail*: 44:16.
- Boscoli, Pietro Paolo: 67:17–19; 67:19–23.
- Botticelli, Sandro: 88:15–16; 102:33–34; 226:12–15.
- Bouillet, M. N.: 151:8.
- Dictionnaire Universel d’Histoire et de Géographie*: 151:8.

- Bowyer, Rev. James: 11:34–35.
Bradley, Andrew Cecil: 73:1–2.
Brock, M. G.: 147:29.
The History of the University of Oxford: 147:29.
Browne, Sir Thomas: 251:23–24.
Browning, Robert: 87:1–3; 104:13; 112:6.
“Rudel to the Lady of Tripoli”: 43:22–23.
Sordello: 26:9; 218:4.
Bruegel, the Elder: 124:25–26.
Bruno, Giordano: 19:12–13; 19:34–35; 19:36; 21:16; 191:24–27; 232:20–23.
Buonconte da Montefeltro: 109:24.
Burnet, Thomas: 200:34–201:1.
Telluris Theoria Sacra: 200:34–201:1.
Archaeologia Philosophicæ: 200:34–201:1; 201:2–3.
Burns, Robert: 101:24–27.
Byron, George Gordon: 101:13–15; 196:8.
Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage: 37:16–17.
- Callimachus: 73:12.
Campin, Robert: 102:33–34; 226:12–15.
Capanna, Puccio: 209:8–13.
Carlyle, Thomas: 18:18–19; 23:15; 138:15; 215:5–7.
Early Kings of Norway: 215:5–7.
On Heroes, and Hero-Worship: 215:5–7.
Cary, Henry Francis: 216:10.
Castiglione, Baldassare: 67:14–15.
The Book of the Courtier: 67:14–15.
Catherine of Alexandria, St.: 209:8–13.
Catherine of Siena, St.: 235:15.
Dialogue of Divine Providence: 164: 35–36; 235:15.
- Catherine, the Great: 161:29–32.
Catholic Encyclopaedia (The): 167:30–33.
Cayley, Charles Bagot: 216:10; 217:4–6; 235:34–35.
Cellini, Benvenuto: 65:10; 65:28–30.
Vita di Benvenuto di Maestro Giovanni Cellini: 65:10; 65:28–30.
Cervantes, Miguel de: 181–2.
Don Quijote de la Mancha: 181–2.
Chapman, George: 251:23–24.
Charles Jacque: 139:6.
Charles of Anjou: 210:35–211:1.
Charles VIII (of France): 69:6–9.
Chateaubriand, François-René de: 14:22–23; 102:12–14; 125:6–15; 125:8–10; 151:18–19; 225:32–36.
René: 37:16–17.
Chatrian, Alexandre: 177:1–12.
Chatterton, Thomas: 195:27; 200:25–26.
Chaucer, Geoffrey: 49:38–50:1.
The Canterbury Tales: 49:38–50:1; 51:24–26; 52:1–8; 157:2.
Troilus and Criseyde: 49:38–50:1.
Chavannes, Pierre Puvis de: 137:14; 38:4–6; 140:7–8.
Chesneau, Ernest: 81:22; 82:34–37.
La Peinture Anglaise: 81:6.
Peintres et Statuaires Romantiques: 81:22.
Chevalier, Ernest Armand: 93:27–29; 94:35–36; 96:9–13; 96:26–31.
Christ: *see* Jesus.
Cibo, Giovanni Battista: 68:6.
Cicero, Marcus Tullius: 68:30.
Cimabué, Cenni di Petro: 209:8–13.
Claudius (Roman Emperor): 167:34–35.
Clemens, Titus Flavius: 163:25; 167:27–168:3; 167:28; 167:30–33; 170:18–23.
Clement IV, Pope: 210:35–211:1.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor: 8:30–9:4; 12:6; 75:16; 101:24–27; 104:7; 183:19; 223:6; 224:13; 232:7–14.
A Course of Lectures: 24:15–16; 24:19–23; 26:30–31; 26:31–32; 26:33–35; 26:35–37.
 “A Tombless Epitaph”: 205:13–206:3.
Aids to Reflection: 15:8–10; 21:37–38; 28:11–13; 28:21–29:5; 33:6–7; 33:9; 33:10; 183:19.
Biographia Literaria: 12:13–32; 12:33–34; 13:13–14; 22:f.n.; 23:22–23; 23:23–24; 183:19; 232:7–14.
Biographical Supplement of the Biographia Literaria: 13:f.n.
Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit: 11:25–26; 18:18–19; 29:29; 30:26; 34:19–20; 35:7–36:4; 35:8–9; 35:10; 35:11–13; 35:13–15; 35:17–23; 35:24; 35:24–29; 36:7; 36:8–9; 36:9–11; 36:9–11; 36:12–13.
Constitution of Church and State: 183:19.
Christabel: 50:36; 196:26–29; 197:1–2; 197:4–8; 203:8–10; 203:25–27; 203:29–30; 204:1–2; 204:8–26; 204:33.
Christabel & c.: 191:9–11; 192:21; 193:26–28; 203:8–10.
 “Dejection. An Ode”: 8:30–9:4; 192:21; 193:29; 195:28; 196:3–4; 196:6–7; 197:11–18.
 “Fears in Solitude”: 197:19; 197:26–28; 197:29–198:3; 198:4–5; 198:6–7; 198:12.
 “France: An Ode”: 198:30–199:15; 199:24–25.
 “Frost at Midnight”: 192:21; 197:18.
 “Human Life.... A Fragment”: 192:21.

“Kubla Khan”: 191:9–11; 193:26–28; 203:8–10.
 “Lines Addressed to Joseph Colt”: 195:27.
 “Lines Written in the Album at Elbingerode”: 196:19–23.
Literary Remains: 11:25–26; 24:15–16; 24:19–23; 24:24–34; 26:25–26; 26:30–31; 26:31–32; 26:33–35; 26:35–37.
 “Love”: 192:21.
 “Monody on the Death of Chatterton”: 200:25–26.
Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare: 26:25–26.
 “On Observing a Blossom”: 193:7–14.
On the Constitution of Church and State: 11:25–26; 12:10–11; 12:11; 183:19.
Poems: 195:27.
Poems on Various Subjects: 191:6–7; 192:37–193:1; 195:27.
Poetical and Dramatic Works: 191:15–21; 192:21.
Poetical Works: 191:15–21.
Shakespeare, with Introductory Matter on Poetry 24:24–34.
Sibylline Leaves: 191:11–14; 193:29.
 “Sonnet”: 192:21.
 “Sonnet. Composed on a Journey Homewards”: 192:21.
The Complete Works: 26:25–26; 33:7–8; 33:8; 33:15–16.
 “The Eolian Harp”: 192:21.
The Friend; A Series of Essays: 33:15–16.
 “The Nightingale”: 197:19; 197:20–23.
 “The Pains of Sleep”: 191:9–11; 193:26–28; 203:8–10.
The Rime of the Ancient Mariner: 192:21; 201:2–3; 203:8–10; 203:16–17.

- The Statesman's Manual*: 33:7–8; 33:8; 192:11–12.
 “Time, Real and Imaginary”: 192:21.
 “To a Young Ass”: 200:1–2.
 “To Wordsworth”: 192:29; 193:30–34; 195:5–7; 195:14–17; 195:19–20; 195:23–24.
Zapolya: 191:3–5.
- Colet, Louise (Madame X):
 91:9–14; 92:14–16; 96:9–13; 120:1–20; 120:28–12:3; 121:8–17; 121:25–122:21; 123:1–14; 123:20–28; 124:1–11; 124:16–125:2; 125:6–15; 125:23–25; 125:26–29; 125:30–126:2; 126:3–5; 126:6–12; 126:13–15; 126:16–17; 126:18–20; 126:21–23; 126:24–27; 126:28–127:2; 127:3–7.
- Collinson, James: 82:25.
- Colquhoun, John Campbell:
 15:4–5.
Scattered Leaves of Biography: 15:4–5.
- Colvin, Sidney: 115:10.
Children in Italian and English Design: 59:26.
Keats: 59:26.
Landor: 59:26; 59:26.
 Review of *The Renaissance* (1873): 59:6.
Works of R. L. Stevenson: 59:6.
- Commanville, Caroline (*see*: Hamard, Caroline; Franklin-Gourt, Caroline): 91:16–20; 92:1–3.
 “Souvenirs Intimes”: 91:16–20; 91:16–20; 95:13–18; 95:18–23; 95:28–31; 96:14–20.
- Commanville, Ernest: 91:16–20; 96:33–34.
- Comte, Auguste: 55:22.
- Conlon, John J.: 163:5–10.
Walter Pater and the French Tradition: 163:5–10.
- Constable, John: 82:19–22; 140:29.
- Constance of Sicily (Queen): 210:35–211:1.
- Constantine (Roman Emperor): 210:15–19.
- Corot, Jean-Baptiste-Camille:
 137:14; 137:29–138–1; 138:15; 139:6; 139:23–31.
View of the Forest of Fontainebleau: 139:6.
- Cottle, Joseph: 14:8–10; 17:13; 195:27.
Alfred: 195:27.
Early Recollections: 195:27.
Malvern Hills: 195:27.
Poems: 195:27.
Reminiscences: 195:27.
The Fall of Cambria: 195:27.
- Courtney, W. L.: 101:13–15.
The Life of John Stuart Mill: 101:13–15.
- Crabbe, George: 110:32–33.
- Croesus (King of Lydia): 11:20–21.
- Cromwell, Oliver: 217:2.
- Curthoys, M. C.: 147:29.
The History of the University of Oxford: 147:29.
- Cuvier, Jean, Baron: 21:24.
- D’Annunzio, Gabriele: 109:10.
Città Morta: 109:10.
Il Piacere: 109:10.
- Da Vinci, Leonardo: 66:33–67:6; 138:26–28; 235:20–37.
- Darwin, Charles: 160:10–161:13; 160:26–28; 185:1–2; 185:17.
The Origin of Species: 192:11–12.
- Daubigny, Charles-François: 139:6.
- David, Gerard: 102:33–34; 226:12–15.
- De Quincey, Thomas: 181–2; 47:9–13; 101:28–29.

- Literary Reminiscences*:
101:28–29.
“Samuel Taylor Coleridge”:
181–2.
“The English Mail-Coach”:
47:9–13.
- Degas, Hilaire Germain Edgar:
137:23–25.
- Delacroix, Eugène de: 82:23;
109:22.
- Dennistoun, James: 65:28–30.
Memoirs of the Duke of Urbino:
65:28–30.
- Descartes, René: 31:27–28.
- Díaz, Narcisse Virgilio: 139:6.
- Dickens, Charles: 235:20–37.
- Dio, Lucius Cassius: 163:25.
Roman History: 163:25.
- Dionysius (Pseudo-Aeropagite):
21:17.
- Domitian (Roman Emperor):
163:25; 164:34.
- Domitianus: 167:30–33.
- Domitilla, Flavia: 163:25;
167:30–33.
- Domitilla, Flavia (the Younger I):
167:30–33.
- Domitilla, Flavia (the Younger II):
167:30–33.
- Domitian (Roman Emperor):
167:30–33.
- Donoghue, Denis: p. 35.
*Walter Pater: Lover of Strange
Souls*: p. 35.
- Douglas, Lord Alfred: 131:2.
- Dover, Kenneth: 37:26–27.
- Dryden, John: 112:13–14.
- Du Camp, Maxime: 93:22–25;
93:30–32; 93:36–94:31;
119:13–16.
- Duff-Gordon, Lucy: 50:35.
The Amber Witch: 50:35.
- Dupré, Jules: 139:6.
- Dürer, Albrecht: 138:26–28.
- Dutilleux, Constant: 139:23–31.
- Eckhart, Master: 232:7–14.
- Edward III: 51:24–26.
- Eliot, T. S.: 44:16; 132:9:15.
*Notes Towards the Definition of
Culture*: 132:9:15.
The Waste Land: 44:16.
- Elizabeth I: 115:16.
- Epictetus: 166:2.
- Epicurus: 132:9:15; 132:35–36.
- Erckmann, Émile: 177:1–12.
- Euripides: 41:28–29; 73:1–2.
Danae: 73:1–2.
Iphigenis in Tauris: 41:28–29.
- Eusebius of Caesarea: 167:30–33.
- Eyck, Jan van: 102:33–34;
226:12–15.
- Fabre, Ferdinand: 177:1–12;
184:36–37.
Barnabé: 177:1–12.
Feuilles de lierre: 177:1–12.
Julien Savignac: 177:1–12.
L'Abbé Tigranne: 177:1–12.
La petite mère: 177:1–12.
Les Courbezons: 177:1–12;
184:36–37.
Lucifer: 177:1–12.
Ma Vocation: 177:1–12.
Mon Oncle Célestin: 177:1–12.
Monsieur Jean: 177:1–12.
Norine: 177:1–12.
Toussaint Galabru: 178:25–34;
184:36–37.
Xavière: 177:1–12.
- Fauriel, Claude Charles: 45:35.
Histoire de la Poésie Provençale:
45:35.
- Fénelon, François: 151:18–19.
- Ferris Greenslet: p. 35.
Walter Pater: p. 35.
- Feuillet, Octave: 163:5–10;
250:36.
Journal d'une Femme: 250:36.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb: 22:16–17;
191:24–27; 223:6.

- Ficino, Marsilio: 215:17.
- Fitzalan-Howard, Henry (15th Duke of Norfolk): 183:19.
- Fitzgerald, Edward: 25:23–24.
- Flaubert, Achille-Cléophas: 92:10–14; 93:34–35; 93:34–35.
- Flaubert, Gustave: 91:2; 92:10–14; 96:33–34; 96:36–37; 137:17–18.
- Bouvard et Pécuchet*: 91:2.
- Correspondance*: 119:1–2; 125:21.
- Dictionnaire des idées reçues*: 91:2.
- L'Éducation sentimentale*: 91:2.
- La Peste à Florence*: 91:2.
- La Tentation de Saint Antoine*: 91:2; 124:16–125:2; 124:25–26.
- Le Candidat*: 91:2.
- Le Château des cœurs*: 91:2.
- Lettres a George Sand*: 91:2; 91:17.
- Lettres a sa Nice Caroline*: 91:16–20.
- Madame Bovary*: 91:2; 94:33–34; 96:7; 119:8; 124:16–125:2.
- Mémoires d'un fou*: 91:2.
- Notes de Voyages*: 93:30–32; 119:13–16.
- Œuvres Complètes*: 91:2; 119:13–16.
- Par les chemins et par le grèves*: 93:22–25.
- Rêve d'enfer*: 91:2.
- Salammbô*: 91:2; 95:18–23; 119:16.
- Souvenirs, notes et pensées intimes*: 91:2.
- Trois Contes*: 91:2.
- “St. Julien l’Hospitalier”: 156:31.
- “Un cœur simple”: 156:31.
- “Hérodiad”: 119:16; 156:31.
- Flaubert, Justine Caroline: 93:30; 119:19–25.
- Flavia, Julia: 167:30–33.
- Flaxman, John: 59:5–6; 61:13–18.
- Ford, John: 184:33.
- Forster, John: 18:2–3.
- “Charles Lamb; His Last Words on Coleridge”: 18:2–3.
- Fragonard, Jean Honoré: 62:13.
- Francis, St.: 209:8–13.
- Franklin-Grout: 91:16–20.
- Franklin-Gourt, Caroline (*see*: Hamard, Caroline; Commanville, Caroline): 91:16–20; 119:13–16.
- Lettres de Gustave Flaubert a sa Niece Caroline*: 91:16–20.
- Frederick II, the Great: 15:32; 210:35–211:1.
- Frederico da Montefeltro: 65:28–30; 67:12–14.
- Fricker, Edith: 14:18–19.
- Fricker, Sarah: 14:18–19.
- Fronto, Marcus Cornelius: 166:2.
- Froude, Richard Hurrell: 192:11–12.
- Gainsborough, Thomas: 82:9; 102:20–21; 26:3.
- Gautier, Théophile: 56:12–13; 102:12–14; 225:32–36.
- Gilchrist, Alexander: 201:28–34.
- The Life of William Blake*: 201:28–34.
- Gillman, James: 13:4–11; 14:26; 15:2–4; 17:f.n.; 191:3–5.
- The Life of Coleridge*: 13:4–11; 14:26; 15:2–4; 17:f.n.; 18:14–16; 18:22–33; 191:3–5.
- Giotto (di Bondone): 102:33–34; 209:8–13; 210:35–211:1; 211:10; 226:12–15.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von: 7:14; 9:17; 11:14–16; 23:15; 41:1–52:19; 209:8–13; 232:24; 245:38.
- Faust. Eine Tragödie*: 44:13–14; 50:35; 124:25–26; 202:4–7; 232:24.

- Italian Journey*: 209:8–13;
 210:35–211:1.
Götz von Berlichingen: 41:28–29.
Gott und Welt: 9:17.
Iphigenia in Tauris: 41:28–29.
The Sorrows of Young Werther:
 23:15; 26:10; 37:16–17.
*Wilhelm Meister's Apprenti-
 ceship*: 18:18–19.
*Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman
 Years*: 245:38.
 Gore, Charles: 192:11–12.
 Gosse, Edmund: 137:17–18.
 Graecina, Pompeia (*see*: Lucina,
 St.): 167:27–168:3; 167:30–33.
 Graves, Robert: 201:7.
The Greek Myths: 201:7.
 Gray, John: 115:10.
 Gregory IX, Pope: 210:35–211:1.
 Gregory, XI Pope: 235:15.
 Guidobaldo da Montefeltro:
 67:14–15.
 Hadrian: 133:22.
 Hamard, Caroline (Flaubert's
 niece; *see*: Commanville, Caro-
 line; Franklin-Gourt, Caroline):
 91:16–20; 94:23–24.
 Hamard, Caroline (Flaubert's
 sister): 91:16–20; 92:10–14;
 93:13–14; 93:34–35.
 Hardy, Thomas: 177:1–12.
 Hartley, David: 15:7–8; 22:24.
Observations on Man: 15:7–8.
 Hasdrubal, the Fair: 119:16.
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel: 18:7–9;
 250:38–251:2.
The House of the Seven Gables:
 18:7–9; 250:38–251:2.
 Hazlitt, William: 15:2–4.
 Headlam, Stewart Duckworth:
 192:11–12.
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich:
 20:29–31; 21:10–11; 55:22;
 191:24–27; 223:6; 232:20–23.
*Grundlinien der Philosophie des
 Rechts*: 20:29–31.
 Hegesias: 132:35–36.
 Heine, Heinrich: 19:34–35;
 19:f.n.; 42:9; 76:22; 160:10–
 161:13; 160:17–20; 184:3–4.
*On the History of Religion and
 Philosophy in Germany*: 19:f.n.
 32:17–33:2.
 Henry I, Beauclerc: 243:2.
 Henry II, Curtmantle: 243:2.
 Henry VI (Emperor): 210:35–
 211:1.
 Heraclitus of Ephesus: 5:29–30;
 56:5–6.
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von:
 88:34.
*Letters for the Advancement of
 Humanity*: 88:34.
 Herod Antipas: 119:16.
 Herod I, the Great: 119:16.
 Herod II: 119:16.
 Herodias: 119:16.
 Herodotus: 11:20–21; 124:25–26.
Histories: 11:20–21.
 Herrick, Robert: 116:14.
 Hilton, Walter: 164: 35–36.
The Ladder of Perfection: 164:
 35–36.
 Hogarth, William: 81:19.
 Holbein, Hans (the Younger):
 138:26–28.
 Homer: 49:38–50:1.
The Odyssey: 74:37–75:1.
 Honorius II, Pope: 160:25.
 Horace: 218:1 f.n.
 Horne, Herbert: p. 35.
 Hugo, Victor: 42:8; 92:10–14;
 102:12–14; 185:1–2; 225:32–36;
 230:11–16.
Les Misérables: 55:25–26;
 235:10–11.
Notre Dame de Paris: 44:5.
Ruy Blas: 123:11.
 Hunt, James Henry Leigh: 192:23.

- Hunt, William Holman: 82:25.
Hutchinson, Mary: 101:24–27.
Hutton, R. H.: 101:24–27.
- Infessura, Stefano: 67:26–68:18.
Diarium urbis Romae: 67:26–68:18.
- Ingres, Jean-Auguste-Dominique: 137:14; 137:23–25; 137:29–138–1.
La Grande Odalisque: 139:2.
La Source: 138:17.
Venus Anadyomene: 138:17.
- Innocent VIII, Pope: 68:6.
- Isabella Augusta, Lady Gregory: 137:17–18.
- Jacopo del Cassero: 109:24.
- James I: 115:16; 156:31; 160:10–161:13; 168:19–30; 169:3–25.
- James, Henry: 87:3–4; 184:36–37.
Review of Zola's *Nana*: 184:36–37.
- Jerome, St.: 161:29–32; 167:30–33; 231:30–31.
- Jesus: 73:1–2; 124:25–26; 185:1–2.
- John the Baptist: 119:16.
- Johnson, Lionel: p. 35.
- Johnson, Samuel: 212:18–23; 217:17–23.
Rasselas: 156:25; 212:18–23.
- Jonson, Ben: 65:10.
- Jouffroy, Théodore Simon: 160:10–161:13; 160:17–20.
- Julianus, Flavius Claudius (Roman Emperor): 5:21–23.
- Kant, Immanuel: 18:18–19; 19:12–13; 22:16–17; 22:f.n.; 32:8–10; 191:24–27; 191:29; 192:10–11; 192:11–12; 223:6; 224:13; 232:7–14; 233:19–31; 235:20–37; 236:5–11.
Critique of Practical Reason: 32:8–10; 132:9:15.
- The Critique of Pure Reason*: 19:12–13; 32:8–10; 132:9:15; 223:6; 224:13; 235:20–37.
Critique of the Power of Judgment: 56:12–13; 132:9:15; 233:19–31; 235:20–37.
What is Enlightenment? 66:2–2.
- Kaufmann, Walter: 44:13–14; 202:4–7; 232:24.
- Keats, John: 56:12–13; 59:6; 101:24–27; 200:25–26; 226:21.
Lamia, Isabella, The Eve of Saint Agnes, and Other Poems: 226:21.
The Eve of Saint Agnes: 226:21.
- Keble, John: 76:15–16; 192:11–12.
- Kempis, Thomas à: 30:4–5.
The Imitation of Christ: 30:4–5.
- Knight, William Angus: 101:1–5.
Selections from Wordsworth: 101:1–5.
Wordswothiana: 101:1–5.
- La Menais, Félicité Robert de: 161:29–32.
- Lacordaire, Jean-Baptiste: 5:21–23; 160:26–28; 161:29–32.
- Lactantius: 231:30–31.
- Laertius, Diogenes: 103:18; 132:35–36.
Lives of the Eminent Philosophers: 103:18; 132:35–36.
- Lamartine, Alphonse de: 125:8–10; 160:10–161:13; 160:17–20.
- Lamb, Charles: 18:2–3; 56:12–13.
- Landor, Walter Savage: 59:26.
- Le Poittevin, Alfred: 92:22–27; 92:27–31; 96:9–13.
- Lee-Hamilton, Eugene Jacob: 87:3–4.
- Lee, Vernon: 87:3–4.
A Culture-Ghost: 87:23.
A Phantom Lover: A Fantastic Story: 87:23.
Baldwin: 87:6–8; 87:23.
Belcaro: 87:6–8; 87:23.

- Euphorion*: 87:1–3; 87:3–4;
87:6–8; 87:23.
Dedication to Pater, in “Valediction”: 87:3–4.
Juvenilia: 87:23.
Juvenilia I: 87:23; 88:15–16.
“Apolio the Fiddler”: 88:15–16.
“Botticelli at the Villa Lemmi”: 88:15–16.
“Introduction: *Juvenilia*”: 87:1–3; 87:20–22.
“Prosaic Music and Poetic Music”: 88:15–16.
“Rococo”: 88:15–16.
“The Lake of Charlemagne”: 88:15–16.
Juvenilia II:
“Christkindchen”: 88:16–20.
“Don Juan (*con Stenterello*)”: 88:16–20.
“Epilogue”: 88:16–20.
“Lombard Colour Studies”: 88:16–20.
“Perigot”: 88:16–20.
“Signor Curiazio”: 88:16–20.
“The Immortality of the Maestro Galuppi”: 88:16–20.
Miss Brown: 87:1–3; 87:23.
Ottilie: An Eighteenth Century Idyl: 87:23.
Renaissance Fancies and Studies: 87:3–4.
Study on Pater: 87:3–4.
Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy: 87:6–8; 87:23.
The Countess of Albany: 87:6–8; 87:23.
The Prince of the Hundred Soups: 87:23.
Legros, Alphonse: 151:10–11.
Leighton, Robert: 12:7.
A Modest Defence of Moderate Episcopacy: 12:7.
An Exposition of the Creed, Lord’s prayer and Ten Commandments: 12:7.
Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life: 12:7.
Lemaître, Jules: 5:21–23; 151:18–19.
En marge des vieux livres: 151:18–19.
Impressions du Théâtre: 151:18–19.
Journal des Débats: 151:18–19.
Les Contemporains, Études et Portraits Littéraires: 151:18–19.
Les Médailleurs: 151:18–19.
Petites Orientales: 151:18–19.
Revue des Deux Mondes: 151:18–19.
Serenus, and Other Tales: 5:21–23.
Sérénus, histoire d’un martyr—Contes d’autre foi et d’aujourd’hui: 151:5–7; 163:5–10.
“Boun”: 151:5–7; 156:17–18; 156:28–29.
En Nourrice”: 151:5–7; 154:29–30.
“L’Ainée”: 151:5–7; 153:29; 172:35.
“La Grosse Caisse”: 151:5–7; 151:8.
“La Mère Sainte-Agathe”: 151:5–7; 152:5.
“Les Deux Fleurs”: 151:5–7; 151:7–8; 156:30; 157:6–159:4.
“Les Deux Saints”: 151:5–7; 151:20; 154:5.
“Les Funérailles de Firdousi”: 151:5–7; 156:17–18.
“Les Trois Manières de Garnoteau”: 151:5–7; 151:8.
“Pauvre Âme”: 151:5–7; 159:5; 159:8–22; 160:10–161:13; 162:1–163:4.

- "Sérénus": 151:5–7; 151:20;
 163:5–10; 163:14–20;
 164:16–30.
 "II. Manuscrit de Sérénus":
 164: 35–36; 165:1–34;
 166:8–36; 166:10–24;
 167:27–168:3; 168:9–15;
 168:19–30; 169:3–25;
 169:34–170:6; 170:30–
 171:26.
Théâtre de Jules Lemaitre:
 151:18–19.
 Leonidas: 73:12.
 Leopardi, Giacomo: 160:10–
 161:13; 160:17–20.
 Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim:
 34:22–23.
Emilia Galotti: 25:27–29;
 25:30–33.
*On the Origin of Revealed Reli-
 gion*: 27:24.
On the Religion of Christ: 27:24.
*On the Reality of Things Outside
 God*: 27:24.
The Christianity of Reason:
 27:24.
 Lilly, William Samuel: 183:19.
A Century of Revolution: 183:16;
 183:23; 184:30.
*Ancient Religion and Modern
 Thought*: 183:16.
Chapters in European History:
 183:16.
*Christianity and Modern Civil-
 ization*: 183:16.
Essays and Speeches: 183:16.
First Principles in Politics:
 183:16.
*Four English Humourists of the
 Nineteenth Century*: 183:16.
Idola Fori: 183:16.
On Right and Wrong: 183:16.
Renaissance Types: 183:16.
*Studies in Religion and Literatu-
 re*: 183:16.
The Claims of Christianity:
 183:16.
The Great Enigma: 183:16.
The New France: 183:16.
 Livy: 163:16.
 Locke, John: 16:1; 31:27–28.
 Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth:
 216:10; 216:20.
 Lorrain, Claude: 82:23; 139:10–20.
 Louis IX (of France): 5:21–23;
 42:4.
 Louis XVI (of France): 223:27.
 Lowell, James Russell: 115:1–5.
 Lucia of Syracuse, St. (*see* Alighie-
 ri, Dante): 218:1 f.n.
 Lucina, St. (*see* Graecina, Pom-
 peia): 167:30–33.
 Lucretius: 132:35–36.
De Rerum Natura: 73:20–21.
 Luini, Bernardino: 151:10–11.
 Luther, Martin: 5:21–23.
 Machiavelli, Niccolò: 65:27–28;
 66:25–26; 67:17–19.
Florentine Histories: 66:25–26.
The Prince: 65:27–28; 65:28–30;
 68:34.
 Mackail, John William: 73:1–2.
Love in Idleness: 73:1–2.
 "After Parting": 74:33–34.
 "Envoy": 73:1–2.
 "For a Drawing": 77:2–7.
In Limine: 75:34.
 "In Scheria": 74:33–34; 74:37–
 75:1; 75:1–4.
 "Ireland. 1821": 75:13.
 "Ireland. 1822": 75:13.
 "Jealousy": 74:33–34.
 "Lines by a Person of Quality":
 73:19.
Loca senta situ: 75:18; 75:22.
Luna Fatifera: 75:16.
 "Magdalen Gardens and Mag-
 dalen Bridge": 75:11–12.

- "Nocturne—Chopin, op 37, 1": 77:2–7.
 "Nocturne—Chopin, op 40, 2": 77:2–7.
 "On a Drawing by Burne Jones": 77:2–7.
 "On a Drawing of Lionardo...": 77:2–7.
 "On a Madonna and Child by Bellini": 77:2–7.
 "On the Birth of Venus by Botticelli": 77:2–7.
 "Santa Cruz": 75:7–8.
 "Song": 77:2–7.
 "The Handmaid of the Lord": 76:12–13.
 "The History of Philip the Deacon": 76:12–13.
 "The Last Tennis-Party": 76:19.
 "The Lost Self": 76:5.
 "The Nature of Things": 73:20–21.
 "To Erato": 73:1–2.
Loves' Looking Glass: A Volume of Poems: 73:1–2.
Review of Marius the Epicurean (1885): 73:1–2.
 Macpherson, James: 200:22–24.
The Poems of Ossian: 200:22–24.
 Madame X: *see* Colet, Luise.
 Maestro delle Vele: 209:8–13.
 Magdalene, Mary: 209:8–13.
 Mallock, William Hurrell: 56:12–13.
The New Republic: 56:5–6; 132:32–33.
 Mandelbaum, Allen: 109:24; 210:35–211:1; 215:18 f.n.; 217:27:28.
 Manet, Édouard: 137:14; 137:17–18; 38:4–6; 140:7–8.
 Marlowe, Christopher: 202:4–7.
Doctor Faustus: 202:4–7.
 Marriot, Charles: 192:11–12.
 Martin, St.: 209:8–13.
 Marvell, Andrew: 217:2.
 "An Horatian Ode": 217:2; 217:4–6.
 Massacio: 102:33–34; 226:12–15.
 Matarazzo, Francesco: 68:11.
Chronicles of the city of Perugia: 68:11.
 Matilda, Empress: 243:2.
 Maupassant, Guy de: 91:2; 91:17.
 Maurice, Frederick: 101:13–15; 192:11–12.
 Mayer, Elizabeth: 209:8–13.
 Medici, Giuliano de: 67:17–19.
 Medici, Lorenzo de: 67:17–19.
 Meinhold, Johannes Wilhelm: 230:11–16.
Maria Schweidler, die Bernsteinhexe: 50:35.
 Meleager: 73:12.
 Menander: 73:12.
 Mérimée, Prosper: 76:1.
Arsène Guillot: 76:1.
 Messina, Antonello da: 133:19–20.
 Michaelson, Alexander (*see*: Raffalovich, Marc-André).
 Mill, James: 101:11–12; 236:5–11.
 Mill, John Stuart: 101:11–12; 101:13–15; 192:10–11; 192:11–12; 236:5–11.
Autobiography: 101:13–15.
 "Utilitarianism": 236:5–11.
 Millais, John Everett: 82:25.
 Millet, Jean François: 137:14; 137:23–25; 139:6.
 Milsand, J.: 26:9.
 Milton, John: 210:15–19.
Paradise Lost: 26:35.
 Modigliani, Anna: 68:11.
 "Pontani, Gaspare": 68:11.
 Molière, Jean-Baptiste: 33:25.
Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme: 33:25.
 Monet, Oscar-Claude: 137:14; 38:4–6; 140:7–8; 140:9–11.

- Monica, St.: 161:29–32.
 Montaigne, Michel de: 125:3.
 Essais: 125:3.
 Montalembert, René de: 161:29–32.
 Moore, George Augustus: 137:17–18.
 A Drama in Muslin: 137:17–18.
 A Modern Lover: 137:17–18.
 A Story-Teller's Holiday: 137:17–18.
 Celibates: 137:17–18.
 Confessions of a Young Man: 137:17–18.
 Conversations in Ebury Street: 137:17–18.
 Elizabeth Cooper: 137:17–18.
 Esther Waters: 137:17–18.
 Flowers of Passion: 137:17–18.
 Hail and Farewell!
 Ave: 137:17–18.
 Salve: 137:17–18.
 Vale: 137:17–18.
 Heloise and Abelard: 137:17–18.
 Impressions. And Opinions: 137:17–18.
 Martin Luther: 137:17–18.
 Modern Painting: 137:14; 137:17–18.
 Reminiscences of the Impressionist Painters: 137:17–18.
 The Apostle: 137:17–18.
 The Bending of the Bough: 137:17–18.
 The Brook Kerith: 137:17–18.
 The Coming of Gabrielle: 137:17–18.
 The Lake: 137:17–18.
 The Strike at Arlingford: 137:17–18.
 The Untilled Field: 137:17–18.
 Ulick and Soracha: 137:17–18.
 Morley, John: 103:2–3.
 Fortnightly Review: 101:13–15.
 Recollections: 101:13–15.
 The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth: 101:5; 101:16–23; 101:24–27; 103:2–3; 103:2–3.
 “The Death of Mr. Mill” (1873): 101:13–15.
 Morris, William: 44:7; 73:1–2; 87:1–3.
 “King Arthur’s Tomb”: 44:8; 44:11.
 “Sir Galahad, a Christmas Mystery”: 44:13–14.
 “Summer Dawn”: 46:2–21.
 “The Blue Closet”: 44:17; 44:20–45:2; 47:4.
 “The Defence of Guenevere”: 42:5.
 The Defence of Guenevere: and Other Poem: 42:11; 44:8; 44:13–14; 44:17; 46:26.
 The Earthly Paradise: 51:24–26; 51:30; 52:1–8.
 “Apology”: 52:1–8.
 “ATALANTA’S RACE”: 52:1–8.
 “OGIER THE DANE”: 52:1–8.
 “Prologue: the Wanderers”: 52:1–8.
 “Pygmalion and the Image”: 52:1–8.
 “The Author to the Reader”: 52:1–8.
 “The Doom of King Acrisius”: 52:1–8.
 “The Lady of the Land”: 52:1–8.
 “The Love of Alcestis”: 52:1–8.
 “The Man born to be King”: 52:1–8.
 “The Proud King”: 52:1–8.
 “The Story of Cupid and Psyche”: 50:15; 52:1–8.
 “The Watching of the Falcon”: 52:1–8.
 “The Writing on the Image”: 52:1–8.

- "The Son of Croesus": 52:1–8.
The Life and Death of Jason:
 47:20–26; 48:10; 48:12–13;
 48:14–16; 48:22–23; 49:1–12;
 50:30–31; 50:34; 51:1–13.
 Murat, Caroline (Queen of
 Naples): 139:2.
 Musset, Alfred de: 160:10–161:13;
 160:17–20.

 Nantiporto, Notaio de: 68:11.
 Neale, John Mason: 192:11–12.
 Nello: 109:24.
 Nero (Roman Emperor): 163:12;
 165:1–34; 165:1; 165:17; 167:27–
 168:3; 167:30–33; 167:34–35;
 170:30–171:26.
 Newman, John Henry: 5:21–23;
 25:23–24; 185:18; 192:11–12.
 Newton, Isaac: 21:24.
 Nicholas, St.: 209:1–2.
 Nichols, John Bowyer Buchanan:
 73:1–2.
A Little Book of English Sonnets:
 73:1–2.
Inez de Castro: 73:1–2.
Love in Idleness: 73:1–2.
 "After Parting": 74:33–34.
 "Envoy": 73:1–2.
 "For a Drawing": 77:2–7.
In Limine: 75:34.
 "In Scheria": 74:33–34; 74:37–
 75:1; 75:1–4.
 "Ireland.1821": 75:13.
 "Ireland. 1822": 75:13.
 "Jealousy": 74:33–34.
 "Lines by a Person of Quality":
 73:19.
Loca senta situ: 75:18; 75:22.
Luna Fatifera: 75:16.
 "Magdalen Gardens and Mag-
 dalen Bridge": 75:11–12.
 "Nocturne—Chopin, op 37,
 1": 77:2–7.

 "Nocturne—Chopin, op 40,
 2": 77:2–7.
 "On a Drawing by Burne Jo-
 nes": 77:2–7.
 "On a Drawing of Lionar-
 do...": 77:2–7.
 "On a Madonna and Child by
 Bellini": 77:2–7.
 "On the Birth of Venus by Bot-
 ticelli": 77:2–7.
 "Santa Cruz": 75:7–8.
 "Song": 77:2–7.
 "The Handmaid of the Lord":
 76:12–13.
 "The History of Philip the
 Deacon": 76:12–13.
 "The Last Tennis-Party":
 76:19.
 "The Lost Self": 76:5.
 "The Nature of Things":
 73:20–21.
 "To Erato": 73:1–2.
*Loves' Looking Glass: A Volume
 of Poems* 73:1–2.
Poems by Bowyer Nichols:
 73:1–2.
*Words and Days: A Table Book
 of Prose and Verse*: 73:1–2.
 Nietzsche, Friedrich: 43:22–23;
 235:10–11.
 Norfolk, Duke of: *see* Fitzalan-
 -Howard, Henry.
 Novalis (Friedrich von Har-
 denberg): 54:29.
Logologischen Fragmente: 54:29.

 Octavia, Claudia: 167:34–35.
 Omar Khayyám: 25:23–24.
Rubáiyát: 25:23–24.
 Orcagna: 102:33–34; 226:12–15.
 Origen of Alexandria: 231:30–31;
 231: 37–38; 235:15.
De principiis: 231:30–31.
 Ovid: 163:16.

- Paget, Violet (*see* Lee, Vernon): 115:10.
- Palladio, Andrea: 209:1–2.
- Panaetius: 166:2.
- Pandolfini, Agnolo: 67:15–17.
Treatise on the Family: 67:15–17.
- Parker, Theodore: 31:17; 115:1–5.
- Parmenides: 19:12–13; 21:16; 232:20–23.
- Parnell, Charles Stewart: 75:13.
- Pascal, Blaise: 92:1–3.
- Pater, Walter: 7:9.
Appreciations (1889): p. 35; 41:1–52:19; 103:2–3; 229:23–24; 234:17–18; 251:23–24.
“Aesthetic Poetry”: p. 35–36; 41:1–52:19.
Appreciations (1890): p. 35; 101:1–5; 251:23–24.
“Postscript” 42:8; 61:35–36.
“Shakespeare’s English Kings”: 24:8–12.
“Style”: 22:16–17; 217: 17–23; 229:20; 251:18–27.
“Wordsworth”: 61:35–36; 101:1–5.
“Coleridge’s Writings”: 22:16–17; 25:23–24; 44:16; 183:19; 250:38–251:2.
Essays from “The Guardian”: 33:25; 151:10–11; 177:1–12; 183:19.
“English Literature...”: 33:25.
“Ferdinand Fabre”: 151:10–11; 177:1–12.
“Robert Elsmere”: 183:19.
Gaston de Latour: 19:36; 13:26; 232:20–23.
“Suspended Judgment”: 125:3.
“The Lower Pantheism”: 21:16.
Greek Studies: 43:7.
“A Study of Dionysus” 43:7.
House Beautiful, The: 61:35–36; 66:33–67:6; 69:1; 69:26–28; 235:15; 235:17.
- Imaginary Portraits: 131:26.
“An English Poet”: 251:18–27.
Marius the Epicurean: 73:1–2; 131:26; 132:9:15; 151:18–19; 163:5–10; 214:1; 231:1–6.
(4) “The Tree of Knowledge”: 69:1.
(5) “The Golden Book”: 50:15.
(6) “Euphuism”: 51:24–26; 73:20–21.
(8) “*Anima Vagula*”: 235:20–37.
(9) “New Cyrenaicism”: 235:20–37.
(15) “Stoicism at Court”: 132:9:15; 166:2.
(16) “Second Thoughts”: 97:19–20; 132:9:15; 214:1.
(18) “The Ceremony of the Dart”: 25:23–24.
(23) “Divine Service”: 43:7.
(24) “A Conversation not Imaginary”: 47:4.
(28) “*Anima naturaliter Christiana*”: 235:20–37.
- Miscellaneous Studies*: p. 35.
“Art Notes in North Italy” 151:10–11.
“Diaphaneité”: 236:15–17.
“Prosper Mérimée”: 76:1; 236:5–11.
“Mr. Rose”, as: 6:12–13.
“On Wordsworth”: 48:2; 101:13–15; 231: 37–38; 235:34–35.
Plato and Platonism: 18:18–19; 65:27–28; 69:1; 115:10; 231: 37–38; 232:20–23; 251:18–27; 251:32–35.
“Lacedæmon”: 69:1.
“The Doctrine of Number”: 231: 37–38.
“The Republic”: 18:18–19.
“Plato’s Aesthetics”: 46:32; 251:18–27.

- "Poems by William Morris": p. 35–36; 42:8; 132:9:15.
Renaissance, Studies in the History of the (1873): 52:34–56:15; 66:33–67:6.
 "Conclusion": 52:34–56:15; 56:5–6.
Renaissance (The): Studies in Art and Poetry (1877, 1888, 1893): 7:9; 41:1–52:19; 65:27–28.
 "Conclusion": 22:16–17; 22:f.n.; 52:34–56:15; 56:5–6; 56:12–13; 131:26; 132:9:15; 132:35–36.
 "Pico della Mirandola" 56:9–10; 67:4–7; 215:20–22.
 "Sandro Botticelli": 137:29–138–1.
 "The Poetry of Michelangelo": 215:17.
 "The School of Giorgione": 47:4; 151:10–11; 224:13.
 "Two Early French Stories" 42:6; 61:35–36.
 "Winckelmann" 7:9; 41:1–52:19; 210:4–6.
 "Romanticism" 42:8.
 "Samuel Taylor Coleridge": 202:33–34; 224:13.
 "The Character of the Humourist. Charles Lamb" (1878): 56:12–13.
 Paul, St.: 163:12.
 Paula, St.: 161:29–32.
 Paulina, Pompeia: 167:27–168:3; 167:30–33.
 Pausanias: 43:7–8.
Description of Greece: 43:7–8.
 Pellegrini, F. C.: 67:15–17.
 "Agnolo Pandolfini e il Governo della Famiglia": 67:15–17.
 Penicuik, Sir John Clerk of: 74:20.
 Perceval, John James (3rd Earl of Egmont): 15:4–5.
 Percy, Thomas: 200:22–24.
Reliques of Ancient Poetry: 200:22–24.
Pervigilium Veneris: 73:20–21.
 Peter, St.: 163:12; 209:1–2.
 Petrarca, Francesco: 11:14–16; 209:1–2; 215:17.
 Phasaël II: 119:16.
 Phidias: 43:7.
Zeus at Olympia: 43:7.
Athena Parthenos: 43:7–8.
 Pierre, Frédéric-Alfred: 161:29–32.
 Pissarro, Camille: 137:14; 140:9–11.
 Pius II, Pope: 235:15.
 Pius IX, Pope: 16:19; 235:15.
 Placci, Carlo: 87:1–3.
 Plato: 7:9; 11:14–16; 21:16; 34:3; 51:26–28; 56:12–13; 67:14–15; 110:17; 160:10–161:13; 160:17–20; 191:24–27; 209:1–2; 215:17; 217: 17–23; 231:30–31; 232:20–23.
Cratylu: 56:5–6.
Letters: 34:3.
 Letter VII: 34:3.
Phaedrus: 7:9; 224:27–29.
Phaedo: 231:30–31.
Republic: 34:3; 65:27–28; 69:1; 231:30–31.
Symposium: 37:26–27.
Timaeus: 232:20–23.
 Plautius, Aulus: 167:30–33.
 Pliny: 49:38–50:1; 124:25–26.
 Plotinus: 21:16; 231:30–31.
 Plumptre, Frederick Charles: 217:4–6.
 Poe, Edgar Allan: 132:25.
 "William Wilson": 132:25.
 Polibus: 119:16.
Histories: 119:16.
 Pontani, Gaspare: 68:11.
 Pope, Alexander: 42:6; 112:13–14.
 "Eloisa to Abelard": 42:6.
Essay on Criticism: 218:1 f.n.

- “Lines by a Person of Quality”: 73:19.
- Portfolio (The), An Artistic Periodical*: 59:1.
- Posidonius: 166:2.
- Pradier, Jean-Jacques: 92:10–14; 94:10.
- Praetorius, Johannes: 50:35.
Blockes-Berges...: 50:35.
- Prévost, Abbé: 92:1–3.
Manon Lescaut: 92:1–3.
- Proclus: 21:17.
- Purchas, Samuel: 200:34–201:1.
Purchas, his Pilgrimage: 200:34–201:1.
Hakluytus Posthumus: 200:34–201:1.
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie: 192:11–12.
- Pythagoras: 103:18; 231: 37–38; 232:7; 232:20–23.
- Rabelais, François: 97:19–20.
- Racine, Jean: 151:18–19.
- Raffalovich, Marc-André: 115:10.
Cyril and Lionel, and Other Poems: 115:10.
In Fancy Dress: 115:10; 116:21–23.
It is Thyself: 115:1–5; 115:10.
L’uranisme. Inversion sexuelle congenitale: 115:10.
The Thread and the Path: 115:10.
Tuberosa and Meadowsweet: 115:10.
- Regnier, Mathurin: 97:19–20.
- Rembrandt: 139:9; 139:10–20; 139:23–31.
- Renan, Joseph Ernest: 11:14–16.
Histoire des Origines du Christianisme: La Vie de Jésus: 25:30–33; 36:24–25.
Les Apôtres: 36:24–25.
Saint Paul: 36:24–25.
L’Antéchrist: 36:24–25.
- Les Évangiles et la seconde génération chrétienne*: 36:24–25.
L’Église chrétienne: 36:24–25.
Marc Aurèle ou la fin du monde antique: 36:24–25.
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua: 59:21; 82:9; 102:20–21; 140:29; 141:4–6; 226:3.
- Robbia, Luca della: 67:19–23.
“Recitazione del caso di Pietro Paolo Boscoli...”: 67:19–23.
- Robsahm Carl: 202:4–7.
Memoirs of Swedenborg: 202:4–7.
- Roebuck, John Arthur: 101:13–15.
- Romano, Ezzelino da: 66:33–67:6.
- Rosenblatt, Louise M.: 163:5–10.
“Marius l’Épicurien... et ses points de départ français”: 163:5–10.
“The Genesis of Pater’s *Marius the Epicurean*”: 163:5–10.
- Rossetti, Christina: 76: 14–15.
- Rossetti, Dante Gabriel: 47:4; 82:25; 87:1–3; 216:12–13.
The Blue Closet: 44:17; 47:4.
(Dante’s) *Vita Nuova*: 216:12–13.
- Rossetti, William Michael: 82:25.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: 14:22–23; 42:21; 43:28; 102:12–14; 151:18–19; 184:3–4; 185:1–2; 225:32–36.
Emile, or On Education: 23:15; 45:34.
The Confessions: 55:32–56:3.
- Rousseau, Théodore: 139:6.
- Rubens, Peter: 141:4–6.
- Rudel, Geoffrey: 43:22–23.
- Rufinus, Tyrrannius: 231:30–31.
- Ruisdael, Jacob van: 141:4–6.
- Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn Muammad: 115:1–5.
“Two Friends”: 115:1–5.
- Ruskin, John: 81:22; 131:2; 251:2–5.
Modern Painters: 251:2–5.

- Praeterita*: 251:2–5.
 Preface to *The English School of Painting*: 81:22.
- Sabina, Poppaea: 167:34–35.
 Sabinus II, Titus Flavius: 167:30–33.
 Sabinus III, Titus Flavius: 167:30–33.
 Sabinus IV, Titus Flavius: 167:30–33.
 Sabinus, Titus Flavius (Roman Emperor): 167:30–33.
 Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de: 14:22–23.
 Sainte-Beuve, Charles-Augustin: 97:19–20.
 Saintsbury, George: 137:17–18.
 Sales, Francis de: 30:5.
Introduction to a Devout Life: 30:5.
 Salome: 119:16.
 Sand, George (Amantine Dupin): 91:2; 91:17; 230:11–16.
La Mare au Diable: 230:11–16.
La Petite Fadette: 230:11–16.
François le Champi: 230:11–16.
 Sanzio, Raffael: 25:27–29; 25:30–33; 151:8.
 Sappho: 73:12.
 Sargent, John Singer: 141:4–6.
 Savonarola, Girolamo: 65:27–28; 69:6–9.
 Schelling, Friedrich W. J. von: 11:25–26; 19:12–13; 19:34–35; 21:10–11; 22:f.n.; 191:24–27; 191:29; 192:10–11; 192:11–12; 223:6; 232:7–14; 232:20–23.
System of Transcendental Idealism: 19:12–13.
 Schiller, Friedrich: 18:18–19; 132:9:15.
 Scott, Sir Walter: 42:1; 201:14.
Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border: 200:22–24.
- Seeley, Sir John Robert: 56:9–10.
Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ: 56:9–10.
- Senancour, Étienne Pivert de: 102:12–14; 225:32–36.
Obermann: 102:12–14; 225:32–36.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus: 166:2; 167:27–168:3; 167:30–33; 167:34–35.
- Serenus: 167:34–35.
- Seurat, Georges: 140:9–11.
- Sforza, Francesco: 65:27–28.
- Shadwell, Charles Lancelot: p. 35; 210:35–211:1; 211: 24–28; 211:30–212:4; 212:9–11; 213:7–16; 214:10–13; 214:15–19; 214:26–215:2; 215:12–14; 215:18 f.n.; 216:10; 216:22–23; 216:26–27; 216:34–217:1; 217: 27:28; 218:1 f.n.; 218: 5–6; 218:18–21.
- Shakespeare, William: 8:2; 73:1–2; 201:14; 202:4–7; 215:29–30; 224:13.
A Midsummer Night's Dream: 49:38–50:1.
Hamlet: 202:4–7; 252:20; 252:22.
Henry V: 194:28–30.
Love's Labours Lost: 73:1–2.
Richard II: 24:8–12.
Romeo and Juliet: 24:8–12; 45:27–29.
Sonnets: 8:2; 234:15–17.
- Shelley, Mary: 192:23.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe: 65:10; 101:24–27; 102:25; 192:23; 196:8; 96:16–17; 200:25–26; 228:2–3.
Defence of Poetry: 210:15–19.
 “Music when Soft Voices Die (To—)”: 73:24.
Peter Bell the Third: 92:23; 228:2–3.

- Sidney, Sir Philip: 65:10.
 Signac, Paul: 140:9–11.
 Singleton, Charles S.: 210:15–19;
 212:9–11; 212:14; 213:32–33;
 215:5; 216:22–23; 218:1 f.n.
 Sisley, Alfred: 137:14; 38:4–6;
 140:7–8.
 Smith, Anker: 115:1–5.
 Smith, John Thomas: 201:28–34.
Nollekens and his Time:
 201:28–34.
 Smith, Logan Pearsall: 73:1–2.
 Smithers, Leonard: 109:10.
 Socinus, Lello Francesco Maria:
 15:7.
 Socrates: 231: 37–38; 235:20–37.
 Solon: 11:20–21.
 Sophocles: 123:20; 123:20–28;
 215:29–30.
 Sorbon, Robert: 160:29.
 Sordello da Goito (*see* Alighieri,
 Dante; Browning, Robert):
 26:9; 218:4.
 Southey, Robert: 13:21; 14:18–19;
 104:7; 192:35; 195:27.
 Sozzini, Fausto Paolo: 15:7.
 Sparkes, John Charles Lewis:
 81:2–3.
 “The Fine-Art Library”: 81:3–4.
 Spinoza, Baruch de: 31:15;
 232:20–23.
 Staël, Madame de: 13:31.
De l’Allemagne: 13:31.
 Statius (*see* Alighieri, Dante).
 Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle):
 109:22.
Chroniques italiennes: 66:15–18.
Histoire de la peinture en Italie:
 66:15–18.
Le rouge et le noire: 109:22.
Oeuvres complètes: 66:15–18.
 Stephen (King of England): 243:2.
 Stephen, St.: 30:26.
 Stephens, Frederic George: 82:25.
 Sterling, John: 101:13–15.
 Stothard, Thomas: 59:5–6; 60:20:38.
 Swedenborg, Emanuel: 202:4–7;
 232:7–14.
 Swetchine, Anne Sophie: 161:29–32.
 Swetchine, Nicholas Sergeyevich:
 161:29–32.
 Swinburne, Charles: 56:12–13.
 Symonds, John Addington:
 65:10; 87:3–4; 121:25–122:21;
 137:17–18.
 Biography of Ben Jonson: 65:10.
 Biography of Percy Bysshe
 Shelley: 65:10.
 Biography of Philip Sidney:
 65:10.
In the Key of Blue: 65:10.
Renaissance in Italy: 65:1–4.
The Age of the Despots: 65:1–4.
The Revival of Learning:
 65:1–4.
The Fine Arts: 65:1–4.
Italian Literature I: 65:1–4.
Italian Literature II: 65:1–4.
The Catholic Reaction I:
 65:1–4.
The Catholic Reaction II:
 65:1–4.
Studies of the Greek Poets:
 65:13–14; 73:1–2.
Walt Whitman, a Study: 65:10.
*Vita di Benvenuto di Maestro
 Giovanni Cellini*: 65:10.
 Symons, Arthur William: 109:10.
A Study of Walter Pater: 109:10.
Days and Nights: 109:10.
 “A Café-Singer”: 111:8.
 “A Lover’s Progress”: 110:10–
 12.
 “A Revenge”: 110:10–12.
 “A Village Mariana”: 112:4.
 “An Act of Mercy”: 110:10–12.
 “Confession.—From Villiers
 de l’Isle-Adam”: 111:8.
 “Esther Bray”: 110:35.

- "Helena and Faustus": 110:13–14; 110:15–16; 110:17; 110:22.
 "Margery of the Fens": 110:35; 111:1–5.
 "Posthumous Coquetry.—From Gautier": 111:8.
 "Prologue": 111:31.
 "Red Bredbury's End": 110:35.
 "Scenes de la Vie de Bohème": 111:8.
 "The Opium-Smoker": 111:8; 111:12–13.
 "The Street-Singer": 111:8.
 "Venus of Melos": 111:19–20.
 Synesius of Cyrene: 21:17.
 Tacitus: 68:30.
 Tafel, R. L.: 202:4–7.
 Documents Concerning... Emanuel Swedenborg: 202:4–7.
 Taine, Hippolyte: 66:15–18.
 Philosophie de l'art en Italie: 66:15–18.
 Tasso, Torquato: 66:33–67:6.
 Taylor, Jeremy: 15:8–10; 16:1.
 The Worthy Communicant: 15:8–10.
 Tennant, Charles: 96:26–31.
 Tennant Gertrude Barbara Rich: 96:26–31.
 Tennyson, Alfred: 25:23–24; 87:1–3; 202:4–7.
 In Memoriam: 25:23–24; 87:1–3.
 Maude: A Monodrama: 202:4–7.
 Tertulla, Arrecina: 167:30–33.
 Tertulla, Clementina: 167:30–33.
 Theocritus: 43:12; 73:12.
 Theodorus: 132:35–36.
 "Idyll II" (*Pharmaceutriai*): 43:12; 43:22–23.
 Tibullus: 163:16.
 Titus (Roman Emperor): 164:34.
 Toni, Diomedes: 68:11.
 Trajan (Roman Emperor): 210:15–19; 215:18 f.n.
 Trelawny, Edward John: 196:8.
 Recollections of the Last Days of Shelley and Byron: 196:8.
 Troyon, Constant: 139:6.
 Turner, Joseph William: 81:22; 82:19–22; 96:16–17.
 Urban IV, Pope: 210:35–211:1.
 Varchi, Benedetto: 68:32.
 Vaughan, Henry: 231: 37–38; 34:17–18.
 Silex Scitillans: 34:17–18.
 "The Retreat": 231: 37–38; 34:17–18.
 Verhaeren, Émile: 109:10.
 Les Aubes: 109:10.
 Verlaine, Paul: 109:10.
 Vernon, Peter J.: 115:10.
 "Pater's Letters to Andre Raffalovich": 115:10.
 Veronese, Paolo: 46:32.
 Vertue, George: 81:16–18.
 Vespasian (Roman Emperor): 164:34; 164: 35–36; 167:30–33.
 Vespasianus: 167:30–33.
 Vinci, Leonardo da: 66:33–67:6; 138:26–28.
 Virgil (*see* Alighieri, Dante): 73:1–2; 109:24; 160:10–161:13; 160:17–20; 210:15–19; 211:30–212:4; 212:9–11; 215:5.
 The Aeneid: 74:35–36; 75:18; 163:16; 210:15–19.
 The Eclogues: 74:35–36.
 The Georgics: 74:35–36.
 Volkman, Johann Jacob: 209:1–2.
 Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet): 55:32–56:3; 209:1–2.
 Dictionnaire Philosophique: 209:1–2.
 "Dante": 209:1–2.
 Waddington, Samuel: 115:1–5.

- "A Persian Apologue": 115:1–5.
 Wallace, Vincent: 50:35.
 Walpole, Horace: 81:16–18.
 The Amber Witch: 50:35.
 Ward, Thomas Humphrey: 192:21.
 The English Poets, IV: 192:21.
 Webster, John: 251:23–24.
 Whistler, James: 38:4–6; 138:15;
 141:4–6.
 Whitman, Walt: 65:10.
 Wikipedia: 87:1–3; 87:3–4;
 197:26–28.
 Wilde, Oscar: 23:15; 131:2.
 A House of Pomegranates: 131:2.
 A Woman of no Importance:
 131:2.
 De Profundis: 131:2.
 Intentions: 131:15; 131:26.
 "The Critic as Artist": 131:15.
 "The Decay of Lying": 131:10;
 131:15; 131:19:22; 131:22–26.
 "Pen, Pencil and Poison":
 131:15.
 "The Truth of Masks": 131:15.
 Lady Windermere's Fan: 131:2.
 *Lord Arthur Savile's Crime and
 Other Stories*: 131:2.
 Poems: 131:2.
 Poems in Prose: 131:2.
 Salome: 119:16; 131:2.
 Review of *Tuberose and Mea-
 dowsweet*: 115:10.
 The Ballad of Reading: 131:2.
 *The Happy Prince and Other
 Tales*: 131:2.
 The Importance of Being Earnest:
 131:2.
 The Picture of Dorian Gray:
 115:10; 131:2; 131:16; 131:26.
 The Sphinx: 131:2.
 Wilkie, Sir David: 81:24.
 William I, the Conqueror: 243:2.
 William II of Sicily: 210:15–19.
 William II, Rufus: 243:2.
 Williams, Raymond: 132:9:15.
 Wodhull, Michael: 73:1–2.
 *The Nineteen Tragedies and
 Fragments of Euripides*: 73:1–2.
 Woolner, Thomas: 82:25.
 Wordsworth, William: 7:32;
 33:15–16; 101:13–15;
 101:24–27; 102:29–30; 104:7;
 110:32–33; 151:10–11; 192:23;
 192:35; 195:27; 200:25–26;
 202:38; 223:27; 224:13; 226:10;
 231:1–6; 235:34–35; 236:5–11;
 251:7–10; 252:1.
 "An Evening Walk": 227: 24–25.
 Ecclesiastical Sonnets: 231:1–6.
 "Forms of Prayer at Sea":
 231:1–6.
 "Her Eyes are Wild": 230:27–28.
 "I wandered lonely as a cloud":
 234:5–6.
 *Lyrical Ballads, with a Few
 Other Poems* (1798): 7:32.
 "The Thorn": 104:3–6;
 228:20–23; 230:17.
 "Tintern Abbey": 8:19–20,
 8:21–22; 232:1.
 *Lyrical Ballads, with Other
 Poems* (1800): 7:32; 203:8–10;
 234:5–6.
 Preface: 229:12–17; 229:23–
 24; 234:21–22; 236:27–33;
 252:1.
 "The Brothers": 230:26–27.
 *Lyrical Ballads, with Pasto-
 ral and Other Poems* (1802):
 226:30.
 "Michael, a Pastoral Poem":
 230:7–10; 230:28–29;
 230:29–30.
 "Ruth": 230:7–10.
 "The Pet-Lamb. A Pastoral":
 226:30.
 "The Two April Mornings":
 234:5–6.
 "Three Years she Grew in Sun
 and Rain": 226:33–227:1.

- Lyrical Ballads* (1815): 223:1-4; 223:22-24; 234:21-22; 236:27-33; 252:1.
 Preface: 223:1-4; 223:22-24; 234:21-22; 236:27-33; 252:1.
Memorials of a Tour in Italy: 227:12-14; 251:7-10.
Memorials of a Tour in the Continent: 251:7-10.
 "Ode: Intimations of Immortality...": 231: 37-38; 231: 37-38.
Peter Bell: 192:23.
Poems in Two Volumes: 226:19; 231: 37-38.
 "Resolution and Independence": 8:22-23; 104:3-6; 226:19; 228:20-23; 229:3.
 "Stanzas Suggested in a Steam-Boat...": 230:23-26.
 "Stepping Westward": 104:3-6; 228:20-23.
The Excursion: 8:3-11; 103:2-3; 227: 24-25; 230:19-20.
The Complete Poetical Works (1889): 101:5; 101:16-23; 101:24-27; 103:2-3; 103:2-3.
The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth: 223:12-15.
The Prelude: 103:2-3; 193: 30-34; 226:24-25; 226:26-27; 226:28-29; 226:33-227:2; 227:12-14; 231:1-6; 231:18-22; 232:5; 233:1-2; 237:4-5.
The Recluse: 8:3-11; 101:1-5; 103:2-3.
The Ruined Cottage: 230:19-20.
 "The Westmoreland Girl": 230:16-17.
 "To the Moon": 234:15-17.
Yarrow Revisited, and Other Poems: 230:19-20.
 "The Earl of Breadalbane's Ruined Mansion...": 230:19-20.
 Wright, Ichabod: 217:4-6.
 Wright, Samuel: p. 35.
A Bibliography of the Writings of Walter Pater: p. 35.
 Wright, Thomas: 37:26-27.
The Life of Walter Pater: 37:26-27.
 Yeats, W. B.: 137:17-18.
 Zeno of Citium: 166:2.
 Zola, Émile: 137:17-18; 177:28; 184:33; 184:36-37.
L'Assommoir: 184:36-37.
Nana: 184:33; 184:33-34; 184:36-37.

