

*Walter Pater, Second-Hand Stylist**Scarlett Baron*

Walter Pater, Oxford scholar, classicist, lover of the art of the Renaissance and other periods, author of ‘imaginary portraits’ and ‘appreciations’, might seem to belong in a different universe from that which presided over the emergence of intertextual theory in the intellectually and politically effervescent Paris of the mid to late 1960s. While his name is virtually synonymous with the idea of subjective aesthetic response, the notion of intertextuality, first named and honed at the hands of Julia Kristeva, Roland Barthes, and Michel Foucault, is, by contrast, tightly intertwined with the idea of authorial impersonality. Yet these realms and modes of style and thought are not as dichotomous as they may initially appear, however starkly distinct their critical languages. Over the decades since his death, Pater’s works have given rise to considerable comment regarding his use of source material. As such, his extensively ‘second-hand’ writing – to use a term suggested by Antoine Compagnon’s history of quotation – begs for consideration alongside the writings of those prose modernists such as Flaubert and Joyce, whose extreme citational practices paved the way for the emergence of intertextual theory.<sup>1</sup> While such a comparison opens up the possibility of a neutral – descriptive rather than judgemental – assessment of Pater’s sometimes surprising treatment of his sources, it also highlights the nature and scale of the difference between his compositional methods and those of these later practitioners of the second-hand.

‘Style’ is a salient case to examine in this context. The opening essay of *Appreciations* (1889), first published in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1888, is a piece which not only engages with Flaubert – whom the coiners of intertextuality placed at the origin of a new kind of citationality – but does so in ways which are both markedly intertextual and highly curious.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Pater’s ostensible alignment with Flaubert in the piece rests upon a number of compositional peculiarities and argumentative tensions.<sup>3</sup> On the one hand, Pater makes distinctly odd use of Flaubert’s correspondence in quotation and shrouds in silence the name of an important source of

knowledge about him; on the other, he glosses over significant points of difference between their conceptions of writing.

The fact of Pater's dependence on source material for information and inspiration is well established. As Billie Andrew Inman puts it, 'he turned to the writings of others for substance and fire', or, as Robert MacFarlane remarks, for Pater 'creation was never a primary act but only a response to or renovation of pre-existing matter'.<sup>4</sup> Among many identified instances of Pater's practice of appropriating and modifying other authors' words, his treatment of Flaubert in 'Style' stands out as 'particularly noteworthy'.<sup>5</sup> In 1914, Samuel C. Chew, Jr. led the way in an article devoted to 'Pater's use and misuse of citations from various authors'.<sup>6</sup> Chew lists among Pater's persistent habits 'the separation of passages joined in the original, the junction of passages far distant in the original, unnoted omissions, and, in some cases, mistranslations'.<sup>7</sup> In support of these claims, he provides numerous instances of acts of textual 'tamper[ing]', all carried out 'with no indication of the liberties taken with the text' of another.<sup>8</sup> At the heart of Chew's demonstration sits the revelation of Pater's handling of Flaubert's letters in 'Style'. Having checked Pater's Flaubertian quotations against the text of the first volume of the newly published Flaubert *Correspondance* (which Pater reviewed for the *Pall Mall Gazette* three months before 'Style' was first published), Chew finds the result 'really astonishing':

Pater pieces together sentences, and even clauses, that, in the French, are many pages apart. Moreover, he says that several of them are addressed to 'Madame X.' (i.e., Louise Colet) that are in reality addressed to other correspondents.<sup>9</sup>

In the course of his detailed analysis of these quotations, Chew itemises the components of 'an astonishing amalgam' consisting of sentences drawn from several letters to two different recipients and derived, in reverse order, from five different sections of the book.<sup>10</sup> Though Chew's amazement is clear, John J. Conlon, writing several decades later, calls this 'conflation of excerpts' a 'classic case of [Paterian] misrepresentation'.<sup>11</sup>

As well as silently altering the verbal contents and addressees of Flaubert's letters, Pater withholds the name of the author of the preface to the *Lettres de Gustave Flaubert à George Sand*, which had appeared in 1884, and on which he relies for his portrait.<sup>12</sup> Various referred to as 'a sympathetic commentator', 'our French guide', and 'Flaubert's commentator', the mystery source is none other than Pater's famous if rather scandalous contemporary Guy de Maupassant ('Style', *App.*, 29, 36).<sup>13</sup> If Pater's *bricolage* with Flaubert's letters is relatively well known, his

anonymisation of Maupassant has received little attention.<sup>14</sup> In an essay so invested in scholarship (the writer, Pater declares, is a 'scholar writing for the scholarly'), such choices raise compositional and ethical questions (17). To what end does Pater produce such misrepresentations and partial representations, and with what consequences?

Flaubert makes his first appearance in 'Style' as the author of *Madame Bovary*, which Pater praises as 'a composition utterly unadorned', without 'removable decoration' (19). As such, it represents the realisation of Pater's ideal of stylistic '[s]elf-restraint'. '[A] skilful economy of means, *ascêsis*', he writes, 'that too has a beauty of its own' (17). What matters in style, 'as Flaubert was aware', is to banish '[t]he otiose, the facile, surplusage' in favour of 'conscious artistic structure' (23, 21, 24).

The central section of the essay, starting a few pages later, draws on Maupassant to sketch its portrait of 'the martyr of literary style' (27). In his prefatory *étude* to the Flaubert-Sand correspondence, Maupassant recalls that 'a single passion, the love of letters, filled his life to his last day. He loved it furiously, absolutely, uniquely'.<sup>15</sup> Pater, following suit, refers to Flaubert's 'leading passion' for literature – one to which 'a living person could be no rival', and one which assumed a quasi-religious place in Flaubert's life (28). While Maupassant mentions the sanctity of Flaubert's writing instruments ('as sacred to him as objects of worship to a priest'), Pater depicts his art as a 'cloistral refuge' (18).<sup>16</sup>

Maupassant also provides the basis for Pater's emphasis on scholarship and revision, referring to Flaubert as an 'insatiable reader' and 'indefatigable researcher', and repeatedly wondering at his 'formidable', 'superhuman', 'beloved', and 'excruciating' labour.<sup>17</sup> It is not surprising that Pater should have felt drawn to such descriptions. He too was an author whose work was 'always the result of much patient and unseen labour' and, as such, 'a travail and an agony'.<sup>18</sup> ('Style' was, fittingly enough given its celebration of literary graft, an especially demanding piece of work.<sup>19</sup> 'Pater once told me', wrote Arthur Symons, 'that the most laborious task he ever set himself to accomplish was his essay on Style'.<sup>20</sup>)

For Flaubert, 'the problem of style' entailed a thrilling and tormenting quest for '[t]he one word for the one thing, the one thought, amid the multitude of words, terms, that might just do' (*App.*, 29). Here, Pater paraphrases an assertion by Maupassant which he has in fact already given in translation just above. Flaubert, states Pater's anonymised 'French guide', was '[p]ossessed of an absolute belief that there exists but one way of expressing one thing, one word to call it by, one adjective to qualify, one verb to animate it' (29).<sup>21</sup>

This obsession with the selection of the ‘unique and just expression’ is linked by both Maupassant and Pater to Flaubert’s conviction that ‘the style therefore had to be, as it were, impersonal’.<sup>22</sup> Pater quotes Maupassant’s account of Flaubert’s theory of style:

Styles (says Flaubert’s commentator), *Styles*, as so many peculiar moulds, each of which bears the mark of a particular writer, who is to pour into it the whole content of his ideas, were no part of his theory. What he believed in was *Style*: that is to say, a certain absolute and unique manner of expressing a thing, in all its intensity and colour. For him, the *form* was the work itself.<sup>23</sup> (36–7)

It is in the attempt to reconcile Flaubert’s commitment to impersonality with his own contrary investment in subjectivity that Pater finds himself stating that ‘If the style be the man . . . it will be in a real sense “impersonal”’ (38). Though presented as paraphrase, this rewriting is framed with signs of hesitancy – the opening conditional ‘If’, the distancing quotation marks around ‘impersonal’. And for good reason, for Pater’s formulation completely alters Maupassant’s meaning, proclaiming as it does that a work’s impersonality is, in a rich paradox, a factor of the personality of its style. This idea that ‘the style is the man’ (thrice repeated in ‘Style’) encapsulates precisely the common view Flaubert opposed (35, 36, 37). As Maupassant explains:

By ‘style’ we generally mean the particular way each writer sets out his thinking; thus the style would be different depending on the man, flashy or sober, abundant or concise, according to temperament. Gustave Flaubert held that the personality of the author should disappear into the originality of the book; that the originality of the book must not derive from the singularity of its style.<sup>24</sup>

By contrast, ‘Style’ accords a defining primacy to an author’s subjective apprehension. True art, affirms Pater, consists not in the mere transcription of fact but in the rendition of an author’s ‘sense of it, his peculiar intuition of a world’ (8). ‘[F]ine art’, he continues, is such in proportion to its success in communicating the author’s ‘vision within’, in delineating ‘a specific personality’ (10). Pater’s conception of style, as it emerges here and elsewhere, is, to a significant extent, circular: both the matter of art and the style deployed to convey it are ‘the man’.<sup>25</sup> Pater’s ostensible alignment with Flaubert, then, conceals a stark discrepancy.

For Max Saunders, the apparent espousal in ‘Style’ of an impersonal aesthetic positions Pater at the source of modernism:

aestheticism's style-worship turns the autobiographic into the impersonal. . . . Modernism's negation of personality begins here, as does its advocacy of stylistic and technical self-consciousness.<sup>26</sup>

Yet such a reading neglects to register the contortions involved in Pater's attempt to telescope the subjective and the objective. Far from advocating the prose equivalent of the 'elocutionary disappearance of the poet' evoked by Mallarmé in 'Crise de Vers' (1897) or the 'depersonalization' advocated by T. S. Eliot in 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' (1919), Pater's essay presents style as, in Ian Fletcher's phrase, 'a total responsive gesture of the whole personality'.<sup>27</sup> The incompatibility of impersonality with Pater's enduring partiality for subjectivity is indicated by the change of mind discernible in his review of the second volume of Flaubert's letters, published the following year.<sup>28</sup> There he states that

Impersonality in art, the literary ideal of Gustave Flaubert, is perhaps no more possible than realism. The artist *will* be felt; his subjectivity must and will colour the incidents, as his very bodily eye *selects* the aspects of things.<sup>29</sup>

In other words, the style *is* the man, and it *cannot* be impersonal. This revision would seem to testify to Pater's realisation that his argument about impersonality in 'Style' was, as Conlon puts it, 'an aberration from the personal note in literature and art he consistently admired and found so exciting and praiseworthy in the Romanticism of any age'.<sup>30</sup>

These shifting formulations do not exhaust Pater's fascination with the 'im/personality' dyad (to use Saunders' contraction).<sup>31</sup> His essay on Mérimée, published two years after 'Style', suggests a way in which the pair might be reconciled.<sup>32</sup> Mérimée's 'superb self-effacement, his impersonality', argues Pater, is 'itself but an effective personal trait' (*MS*, 37). Thus is impersonality redeemed as a litmus test revealing the lineaments of the very authorial personality it is intended to conceal.

Why, then, to return to our overarching enquiry, does Pater obscure Maupassant's contribution to his portrait (while acknowledging his recourse to *a* source), and what, more generally, are we to make of Pater's extensive and at least partly covert practice of the second-hand? While his copying-and-pasting of Flaubert's letters may conceivably have been motivated by the wish to set out his notion of style 'with a skilful economy of means', the withholding of the name of a well-known contemporary – and a fortiori that of a man of letters like himself – is perplexing (*App.*, 17). The case is not unique. As Inman notes, 'Pater's errors and omissions in regard to proper names are baffling'.<sup>33</sup> Any explanation is necessarily conjectural, but one plausible hypothesis is that

Pater was impelled by a reluctance to risk arousing disapproval: '[h]e had', as Inman states, 'learned to engage in controversy indirectly', and 'would occasionally omit an author's name or omit some suggestive details to avoid being thought decadent'.<sup>34</sup> Such a theory would fit the facts of Maupassant's reputation in England in the 1880s.

'Style' was written at a time when Maupassant was beginning to receive increased attention in the English periodical press. As George Worth chronicles, he 'emerged into the literary world in the 1880s under the dual sponsorship of Zola and Flaubert'.<sup>35</sup> Maupassant was then a far more controversial figure than Flaubert. While the connection to Flaubert worked to Pater's benefit – the trial of *Madame Bovary* lay more than three decades in the past and his death in 1880 had further dimmed memories of his alleged 'offenses against morality and religion' – the connection to Zola and the naturalists was detrimental to his standing.<sup>36</sup> An anonymous essayist writing in 1892, for example, described the naturalists as counting 'among the most dangerous enemies that France has nourished in her bosom', bemoaning their irredeemable 'brutality' and 'putrescence'.<sup>37</sup> It was, Worth observes, extremely common for critics to oppose form and matter in their discussions of Maupassant in this period, castigating him for what they deemed to be his salacious subjects on the one hand, and praising him for his exceptional prose style on the other.<sup>38</sup> (The perceived mismatch, if Pater reflected on it, might have made Maupassant seem a less than ideal expositor of Flaubert's theory of style, prescribing as it does a perfect accommodation of form and matter.) George Saintsbury, for instance, deplored Maupassant's obsession with sex ('He can write on nothing else'), but also called him 'a man of genius' and 'the most really gifted writer, both in prose and verse, that has happened in France in more than twenty years'.<sup>39</sup> Henry James published a long and influential piece on Maupassant, also in the *Fortnightly Review*, two months later. Referring to Flaubert as Maupassant's 'great initiator', he took aim at the unrelenting crudeness of his subject-matter while simultaneously dubbing him 'a master of his art' and 'a writer with whom it is impossible not to reckon'.<sup>40</sup> James' and others' references to Maupassant as Flaubert's disciple make it clear that Pater's choice to cite his French guide under cover of anonymity comes at the cost of establishing the special authority of his source – one based on a close personal relationship and years of a 'long and hard apprenticeship of letters' undergone at Flaubert's hands.<sup>41</sup> But maybe the price seemed worth paying to avoid association with an author by whom so many were powerfully repelled.

If wariness of controversy or fear of being classed a decadent prompted the erasure of Maupassant's name from 'Style', it may also explain Pater's disalignment from Flaubert in the essay's closing peroration. The central Flaubert-focused section of 'Style' manages to convey strong admiration in spite of its contradictions. The final paragraph, however, introduces a new conundrum for the reader by effecting a sharp turn away from Flaubertian principles (as indeed from views expressed elsewhere in Pater's oeuvre).<sup>42</sup> Just pages earlier, 'the martyr of literary style' had been quoted railing against the idea that art should have a 'moral end', or any end other than the creation of 'the beautiful' (29). But Pater's epilogue distances itself from this 'art for art's sake' position by training its sights on the definition of 'great' rather than merely 'good' art (38). Where Flaubert's dedication to style over matter was so absolute as to engender his fantasy of 'a book about nothing . . . sustained only by the inner force of its style', Pater's conclusion stresses the importance of subject matter, and indeed right-thinking causes, to the production of 'great' art.<sup>43</sup> 'Great art', writes Pater, will be distinguished by its 'dignity of interests', 'its compass, its variety, its alliance to great ends, or the depth of the note of revolt, or the largeness of hope in it'. If it 'be devoted further to the increase of men's happiness, to the redemption of the oppressed, or the enlargement of our sympathies with each other, or to such presentment of new or old truth about ourselves and our relation to the world as may ennoble and fortify us in our sojourn here, or immediately, as with Dante, to the glory of God' or if 'it has something of the soul of humanity in it', it will also be great art (38). The vague and tautological nature of these criteria (as encapsulated by the gnostic assertion that 'great art' must be allied to 'great ends') is striking. But the listing is sufficiently flavoured with Christian language ('redemption', 'ennoble', 'fortify', 'our sojourn here', 'the glory of God', 'the soul of humanity') to suggest a thoroughly orthodox understanding of the purpose of 'great art'. Such a stance would have been anathema to Flaubert, as Pater cannot but have known – not least because it would also have been anathema to other versions of himself.<sup>44</sup> As René Wellek observes:

There could not be a fuller and more explicit revocation of [his] earlier aestheticism. It is a recantation at the expense of any unified, coherent view of art. It . . . introduces a double standard of judgment or shifts the burden of criticism to the subject matter. Pater ends in a dichotomy destructive of his own insights into the nature of art.<sup>45</sup>

Pater's attitudes to his sources, whether they be considered through the prism of his misquotations or failures of acknowledgement, have aroused

ambivalence in even firm admirers. Chew, ultimately a defender of Pater's borrowings, acknowledges the discomfort caused by misquotations which verge on the 'dishonest'. '[H]as the critic a right to do this?'<sup>46</sup> he asks, at the close of his catalogue of such discoveries. Conlon, as was mentioned above, refers to Pater's inexactitudes and omissions as 'misrepresentations'. About the collage of Flaubert's letters in 'Style' specifically, he comments that:

This is clearly the sort of editorial and authorial practice we would find unacceptable in contemporary research. . . . Such a modern response would be entirely appropriate in the exposition of shoddy scholarship since we have . . . both explicit and implicit expectations of those who engage in academic discourse and of their work.<sup>47</sup>

Inman, meanwhile, acknowledges '[t]he liberties that Pater took with his sources' and the 'evasive strategy' he sometimes deployed 'as a defense against misinterpretation and criticism'.<sup>48</sup> Others are less ambivalent. Christopher Ricks impugns Pater's 'inappropriate appropriatingness' and 'play[ing] loose' with other authors' words, deploring a 'faith to one's meaning' which comes at the cost of 'faithlessness to another's meaning'.<sup>49</sup>

For champions of Pater, the answer to the problems raised by his less than scrupulous handling of second-hand language is to take him on his own terms – the terms, set out in 'Style' and elsewhere, which make the artist himself the matter of his art, and make of criticism 'a form of creative self-portraiture'.<sup>50</sup> The solution, in other words, involves an adjustment of the reader's 'horizon of expectations', to use Jauss' phrase.<sup>51</sup> Thus, for Chew, 'when we find him transposing, omitting, re-arranging, mis-ascribing, and in a few cases even apparently substituting his own for somebody else's ideas, there is needed but a generous interpretation of what Pater conceived to be the function of criticism, namely, that it has in it something of the creative art'.<sup>52</sup> For Conlon, Pater's procedures should be understood as intentional aspects of a project to 'make a high art of misrepresentation'.<sup>53</sup> And for Inman, too, the problem is fundamentally generic:

he was introducing a new type of criticism that required a special type of reading . . . *aesthetic criticism* . . . the aesthetic critic does not approach a work of art as a critic, but as a lover, an amateur, a complete humanist, yielding himself to the influence of the work.<sup>54</sup>

As much is suggested, of course, by the title of *Appreciations*.

It is also relevant to recall that twentieth- and twenty-first-century notions of critical writing are misplaced in the apprehension of a piece



written at the contested dawn of English Studies. The institutionalisation of literary criticism to which Pater objected (wary of literature being turned into a 'long, pedantic, mechanical discipline'<sup>55</sup>), and the concomitant regimentation of the essay form over subsequent decades, have fostered expectations of punctilious quotation and formal citation which were, as Inman has explored, not then as entrenched as they have since become.

How, finally, does Pater's practice of second-hand writing compare with that of modernists whose reputation is in large part founded on their deployment of a form of sustained intertextuality designed to facilitate the apprehension of literature as a realm governed by repetition? First, it is important to note that a valuation of the second-hand had been underway for some time when Pater set to work on 'Style'. As MacFarlane has shown, 'from the late 1850s onwards, unoriginality – understood as inventive reuse of the words of others – came increasingly to be seen as an authentic form of creativity'. At the *fin-de-siècle*, 'the idea of literary originality *ex nihilo* came under greater pressure than ever before', with authors such as Pater, Wilde, and Lionel Johnson placing 'great emphasis upon the concept of stylish reuse'.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, there is evidence that Pater himself regarded second-handness as a defining feature of all writing. In 'Style', he makes reference to the ineluctable secondariness of the literary artist's relationship to language itself: 'the material in which he works', he avers, 'is no more a creation of his own than the sculptor's marble' (12). The scholar-artist, in other words, operates within the realm of the *déjà*, working with inherited linguistic materials, meticulously chiselling them to meet particular needs. In *Plato and Platonism* (1893), Pater goes considerably further, articulating a strikingly post-structuralist conception of literary originality as intertextuality:

in Plato, in spite of his wonderful savour of literary freshness, there is nothing absolutely new: or rather, as in many other very original products of human genius, the seemingly new is old also, a palimpsest, a tapestry of which the actual threads have served before . . . . Nothing but the life-giving principle of cohesion is new; the new perspective, the resultant complexion, the expressiveness which familiar thoughts attain by novel juxtaposition. In other words, the *form* is new. (*PP*, 8)

Pater's assertion that 'there is nothing absolutely new' in Plato, as well as his metaphors of the 'palimpsest' and 'tapestry of which the actual threads have served before' are remarkably aligned with statements which have become emblematic of intertextual theory. Gérard Genette, for instance, entitled his study of 'second-degree' literature *Palimpsestes*. Sarah Dillon,

too, following Genette, seizes on the image of the palimpsest as a figure for intertextuality. Barthes invokes a textile metaphor in referring to texts as 'tissue[s] of quotation'.<sup>57</sup> With this in mind, Pater's handling of sources can be viewed less as the sign of suspect dependence and more as a self-conscious embrace of what he, like Barthes, recognised as 'the truth of writing, [that] the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original'.<sup>58</sup> Viewed in such light, Pater, too, can be cast as a forerunner to twentieth-century theory. As indeed he has been: in 1976, Hillis Miller wrote of him as 'a precursor of what is most vital in contemporary criticism'.<sup>59</sup>

If Flaubert, in association with whose name the notion of intertextuality emerged, can be celebrated as being, in André Topia's words, 'among the first to have deliberately blurred the hierarchy between the original text and the secondary text', should Pater be eligible for similar appreciation?<sup>60</sup> Intertextual theory's founding axiom that 'any text is a mosaic of quotations' is relevant to Pater's case in that it has the power to parry any imputation of plagiarism or overdependence by declaring 'absorption and transformation' to be a universal law of writing.<sup>61</sup> Certainly, Paterians have used the term to give a neutral assessment of the density of appropriated words and ideas in his works. Pater's 'attitudes toward sources and techniques of using them', comments Inman, 'created in his works a profound intertextuality that is essential to his remarkable style'.<sup>62</sup>

That being granted, major differences obtain between Pater's intertextual writing and that of the most radically intertextual modernists. The most fundamental relates to the nature of the intention underpinning these authors' deployment of the second-hand. Intertextuality, in Pater's case, appears to have been incidental rather than programmatic – a means to the end of aesthetic criticism or self-portraiture (whichever one takes to have been his aim). His objective was not to highlight the fact of second-handness as a constitutive feature of all writing, but to *style* his borrowings in service of his own ends. By contrast, Flaubert's and Joyce's final works, *Bouvard and Pécuchet*, the *Dictionary of Received Ideas*, and *Finnegans Wake*, were assembled through the mobilisation of extremely extensive systems of intra- and intertextual writing, as these authors' enormous manuscript archives testify.<sup>63</sup> In these works, intertextuality becomes an end as well as a means: a compositional principle in and of itself. They were, to reprise Topia's adverbial emphasis, *deliberately* designed to cultivate the reader's sense of language and literature as realms of the *déjà*. This insight is proclaimed in the title of Flaubert's *Dictionary of Received Ideas*; narratively literalised in Bouvard and Pécuchet's decision to devote the

remainder of their lives to the manual copying-out of books; and self-referentially inscribed in *Finnegans Wake*'s mentions of 'piously forged palimpsests', 'pelagiarist pens', 'borrowed plumes', and 'quashed quotations'.<sup>64</sup> By contrast, Pater, though a 'scissors and paste man' (to use words Joyce once used to describe himself), and one fully aware of the part played by repetition in language and literature, appears to have been a far more discreet, if not secretive, practitioner of the second-hand, even by the standards of his own day.<sup>65</sup> '[M]uch fin-de-siècle writing', writes MacFarlane, 'was more open about its borrowings, appropriations, and renewals than any preceding literary period of the century.'<sup>66</sup> Against such a background, 'Style' stands out for its silent alterations and at best only partial openness about its sources.

Another difference, touched upon above, pertains to the idea of impersonality. Where '[s]ubjectivity – the self – is ... the beginning, the end, and the persisting basis in all Pater's writings', Joyce and Flaubert picture the author as an invisible author-god.<sup>67</sup> Intertextual theory was shaped by this modernist intertwining of extensive citationality and authorial impersonality – defined, from the outset, as antithetical to ideas of authorial and readerly subjectivity. As Kristeva points out in the essay in which the concept was first named, '[t]he notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity'.<sup>68</sup> And as Barthes puts it in 'The Death of the Author', '[w]riting is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost'.<sup>69</sup>

To these discrepancies of purpose and aesthetic disposition can be added discrepancies of scale. The sheer feats of endurance involved in the deployment of Flaubert's and Joyce's intertextualities are arresting. Flaubert claimed to have read 15,000 books in preparation for the writing of *Bouvard et Pécuchet*; 3,848 pages of notes survive to testify to this labour. Joyce amassed 25,000 pages of manuscript material – many of them filled with reading notes – over the seventeen-year-long genesis of *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>70</sup> Though Flaubertian critics have wondered whether Flaubert 'falsif[ies] the character of what he quotes', the distortions and decontextualisations Joyce wrought on his borrowings are both far more obvious (altering the very make-up of words as his portmanteaus do) and far more numerous – so numerous, indeed, as to have prompted speculation that every single word in the *Wake* may be traceable to a source.<sup>71</sup> Moreover, the effects of Pater's derivations on the one hand, and Flaubert's and Joyce's on the other, are sharply distinct, for reasons relating to genre. Whatever the relative freedom of nineteenth-century essayists to gloss over their debts and 'misrepresentations', and whatever Pater's ambition to 'dissolve

the critical and creative acts into one another', expectations of careful quotation and faithful translation are nonetheless greater in the reading of discursive prose than in the encounter with that fastest-evolving and 'most fluid of genres', the novel; greater, too, in the experience of a personal, recognisable style than in the immersion in the kind of impersonal, unstyled textuality produced by Joyce in *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>72</sup>

If the extremity of such writing methods paved the way for the emergence of intertextual theory, that theory has in turn given rise to new ways of experiencing literary texts – ways driven not by censoriousness but by a neutral acceptance of the second-handness of all writing. If Pater's silences about his sources suggest a high degree of caution (about courting controversy and owning up to his debts and manipulations), it is also possible to see the idiosyncrasy of his approach as a sign of the poise of one 'bold enough to think himself an artist to whom interfering rules of the antiquarian or the scholar did not apply'.<sup>73</sup> In that disposition, at least, he and his modernist successors are aligned. '[A] brilliant original who did not originate',<sup>74</sup> he had the confidence to know that *styling* the second-hand was art enough.

### Note

- 1 Antoine Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation* (Paris 1979). This genealogy of intertextuality is set out in Scarlett Baron, 'Strandentwining Cable': *Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality* (Oxford 2012).
- 2 Walter Pater, 'Style', *Fortnightly Review* 44 (December 1888), 728–43. Roland Barthes makes *Bouvard and Pécuchet* the signal example of intertextuality in 'The Death of the Author': 'The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. Similar to Bouvard and Pécuchet, those eternal copyists . . . the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original' (Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author' [1967], in *Image Music Text*, ed. and trans. Stephen Heath (1977), 142–8 (146)). Michel Foucault refers to *The Temptation of Saint Anthony* as 'the first work' to enter into an 'essential relationship to books': 'it opens a literary space wholly dependent on the network formed by the books of the past' ('Fantasia of the Library' [1967], in *Michel Foucault: Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca, NY 1977), 86–109 (92, 91)).
- 3 A. C. Benson goes so far as to call it 'the summary of Pater's artistic creed' and even 'perhaps the only direct and personal revelation of his theory of art' (*Walter Pater* [1906] (1921), 151).

- 4 Inman (1981), ix.; Robert MacFarlane, *Original Copy: Plagiarism and Originality in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Oxford and New York 2007), 179–80.
- 5 John J. Conlon, 'Walter Pater and the Art of Misrepresentation', *Annals of Scholarship* 7 (1990), 165–79 (172).
- 6 Samuel C. Chew, Jr., 'Pater's Quotations', *Nation* 99 (1 October 1914), 404–5.
- 7 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 404.
- 8 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 404.
- 9 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 405; [Walter Pater], 'The Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert', *Pall Mall Gazette* (25 August 1888). John Coates and Samuel Wright, among others, regard 'Style' as in part an expansion of Pater's review of Flaubert's letters: John Coates, 'Controversial Aspects of Pater's "Style"', *Papers on Language and Literature* 40 (2004), 384–411 (384); Samuel Wright, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Walter H. Pater* (New York 1975), 31–2.
- 10 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 405.
- 11 Conlon, 'Art of Misrepresentation', 173–4.
- 12 *Lettres de Gustave Flaubert à George Sand, précédées d'une étude par Guy de Maupassant* (Paris 1884). Pater's first review of Flaubert's letters mentions (and misdates) this tome (to 1885), without however naming the author of the introduction (Pater, 'Life and Letters of Gustave Flaubert', 52). Pater probably drew on the introduction to the *Correspondance* penned by Flaubert's niece, Caroline de Commanville, who, however, is not even credited in the peculiarly anonymous way reserved for Maupassant: 'Souvenirs Intimes', *Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert*, Première Série (1830–50) (Paris 1887).
- 13 Conlon identifies Maupassant as Pater's source in *Walter Pater and the French Tradition* (Lewisburg, PA 1982), 120, 123, 125, 134n5.
- 14 Like 'intertextuality', 'bricolage' entered literary-critical terminology in the 1960s. The term was first used by Claude Lévi-Strauss in relation to mythical thought in *The Savage Mind* ([1962] (Chicago, IL 1966), 11). Denis Donoghue, though intent on arguing that 'Style' is 'desultory work', seems not to know of its debts to Maupassant, of whom no mention is made in the relevant chapter of *Walter Pater: Lover of Strange Souls* (New York 1995), 222–9.
- 15 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', in *Lettres de Gustave Flaubert à George Sand*, lxxviii. All translations from the French are my own.
- 16 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', lxxviii. Commanville remembers her uncle as an art 'fanatic': 'he had taken art for his god' (Commanville, 'Souvenirs Intimes', 10). That Pater would have identified with such descriptions is suggested by Benson's recollection that 'There is always something holy, even priestly, about Pater's attitude to art' (Benson, *Walter Pater*, 212).
- 17 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', liii, lxv, lxi, lxiii.

- 18 Benson, *Walter Pater*, 211; Edmund Gosse, 'Walter Pater: A Portrait', *Contemporary Review* 66 (December 1894), 795–810 (806).
- 19 Marcus Waithe, "'Strenuous Minds": Walter Pater and the Labour of Aestheticism', in *The Labour of Literature in Britain and France, 1830–1910: Authorial Work Ethics*, ed. Marcus Waithe and Claire White (2018), 152.
- 20 Arthur Symons, *A Study of Walter Pater* (1932), 61.
- 21 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', lxii.
- 22 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', lxi.
- 23 See Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', lxi.
- 24 Maupassant, 'Gustave Flaubert', lxi.
- 25 As Pater states in *The Renaissance*, 'the genius of which Botticelli is the type usurps the data before it as the exponent of ideas, moods, visions of its own' (*Ren.*, 42).
- 26 Max Saunders, *Self Impression: Life-Writing, Autobiographical Fiction, and the Forms of Modern Literature* (Oxford 2010), 60.
- 27 Stéphane Mallarmé, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Bertrand Marchal (Paris 2003), ii. 211; T. S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' [1919], in *Selected Essays* [1932], 3rd edn (1963), 17; Ian Fletcher, *Walter Pater* (1959), 31.
- 28 'The focus of all Pater's writing is personality', argues J. Hillis Miller ('Walter Pater: A Partial Portrait', *Daedalus* 105 (1976), 97–113 (100)).
- 29 'Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert', *Athenaeum* (3 August 1889), repr. in Walter Pater, *Uncollected Essays* (Portland, ME 1903), 101–14 (108).
- 30 Conlon, *Walter Pater and the French Tradition*, 129.
- 31 See Saunders, 'Im/personality: The Imaginary Portraits of Walter Pater', in *Self Impression*, 29–50.
- 32 Walter Pater, 'Prosper Mérimée', *Fortnightly Review* 48 (December 1890), repr. in *Studies in European Literature, being the Taylorian Lectures 1889–1899* (Oxford 1900), 31–53 (52).
- 33 Inman (1981), xxii.
- 34 Inman (1990), xlix, and Billie Andrew Inman, 'How Walter Pater Might Have Countered Charges That He Misused Sources: A Dialogue between Graduate Student Walter Pater and Professor Samantha Marks at Great State University, U.S.A., in 2003, with an Addendum', *Nineteenth-Century Prose* 35 (2008), 173.
- 35 George John Worth, 'Maupassant in England', PhD thesis, University of Illinois, 1954, 4.
- 36 Worth, 'Maupassant in England', 79.
- 37 'The French Decadence', *Quarterly Review* 74 (April 1892), 504 (quoted in Worth, 'Maupassant in England', 116).
- 38 Worth, 'Maupassant in England', 113.
- 39 George Saintsbury, 'The Present State of the Novel. II', *Fortnightly Review* 43 (January 1888), 112–23 (117, 122, 116).
- 40 Henry James, 'Guy de Maupassant', *Fortnightly Review* 43 (March 1888), 364–86 (379, 385).
- 41 Arthur Symons, 'Guy de Maupassant', *Athenaeum* (15 July 1893), 97.

- 42 Maupassant states that Flaubert was deeply opposed to moral didacticism in literature: 'Les romanciers ... n'ont pas mission pour moraliser, ni pour flageller, ni pour enseigner.' ('Novelists ... have no mission to moralise, or flagellate, or educate.') ('Gustave Flaubert', xiv).
- 43 Flaubert to Louise Colet, 16 January 1852, in Gustave Flaubert, *Correspondance*, ed. Jean Bruneau (Paris 1973–2007), vol. 2 (1980), 31.
- 44 In *Plato and Platonism*, for example, Pater argues that 'in the creation of philosophical literature, as in all other products of art, *form*, in the full signification of that word, is everything, and the mere matter is nothing' (8).
- 45 René Wellek, 'Walter Pater's Literary Theory and Criticism', *Victorian Studies* 1 (1957), 29–46 (43).
- 46 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 404–5.
- 47 Conlon, 'Art of Misrepresentation', 174.
- 48 Inman (1990), xxxviii.
- 49 Ricks, 'Misquotation', 406, 408, 403.
- 50 Gerald Monsman, *Walter Pater's Art of Autobiography* (New Haven and London), 14.
- 51 Hans Robert Jauss, 'Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature', repr. in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff (2000), 127–47 (143).
- 52 Chew, 'Pater's Quotations', 405.
- 53 Conlon, 'Art of Misrepresentation', 167.
- 54 Inman (1981), xxvi.
- 55 Walter Pater, 'English at the Universities. – IV.', *Pall Mall Gazette* (27 November 1886), 1–2 (1).
- 56 MacFarlane, *Original Copy*, 8, 162–3.
- 57 Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature du second degré* (Paris 1982); Sarah Dillon, *The Palimpsest: Literature, Criticism, Theory* (2007); Barthes, 'Death of the Author', 146.
- 58 Barthes, 'Death of the Author', 146.
- 59 Hillis Miller, 'Walter Pater', 97.
- 60 André Topia, 'The Matrix and the Echo: Intertextuality in *Ulysses*', in *Post-Structuralist Joyce*, ed. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer (Cambridge 1984), 103–25 (104).
- 61 Julia Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel' [1966], in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Art and Literature*, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, ed. Leon S. Roudiez (New York 1980), 64–89 (66).
- 62 Inman, 'A Dialogue', 168.
- 63 See Baron, 'Strandentwining Cable', 242–75.
- 64 James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (1939), 182–3.
- 65 James Joyce to George Antheil, in *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. i, ed. Stuart Gilbert (1957), 297.
- 66 MacFarlane, *Original Copy*, 183.
- 67 Hillis Miller, 'Walter Pater', 100; 'L'artiste doit être dans son oeuvre comme Dieu dans la création, invisible et tout-puissant' ('The author in his work must be like God in creation, invisible and all-powerful'), writes Flaubert

- (Flaubert to Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie, 18 March 1857, *Correspondance*, vol. 2, 691); 'The artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails', says Stephen Dedalus, covertly misquoting Flaubert, in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. Jeri Johnson (Oxford 2000), 181.
- 68 Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel', 66.
- 69 Barthes, 'Death of the Author', 42.
- 70 See Baron, 'Strandentwining Cable', 255–6.
- 71 René Descharmes, *Autour de 'Bouvard et Pécuchet'* (Paris 1921), 91. See James Joyce's *The Index Manuscript: 'Finnegans Wake' Holograph Workbook VI.B.46*, ed. Danis Rose (Colchester 1978), xiii.
- 72 MacFarlane, *Original Copy*, 179; Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin, TX 1981), 11.
- 73 Inman (1981), xxix.
- 74 Inman (1981), xxix.