



Exploratory Workshop Scheme

Scientific Review Group for the
Humanities

ESF Exploratory Workshop on
Re-valuing Aestheticism and Modernism
Through their (Dis)credited Figures.
Aesthetics, Ethics and Economics
1860-1940

Montpellier (France), October 2-4, 2013

Convened by:
Christine REYNIER ^①, Bénédicte COSTE ^②
and Catherine DELYFER ^③

① Université Montpellier 3—EMMA, FR

② University of Burgundy—TIL, FR

③ University Toulouse 2—CAS, FR

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary

The meeting was held at the University of Montpellier 3, at the Site St Charles over 3 days. 25 participants from 12 different countries (10 European countries plus Canada and the USA) took part in the workshop. Located in the historic downtown, St Charles is next to a tramway station and within walking distance of the hotels where the participants were accommodated. This made the venue particularly attractive. St Charles is an old 17th-century building that was renovated two years ago: it has charm as well as all the modern facilities to be expected from a brand new convention centre. The seminar room is equipped with a round table, conducive to exchanges and discussions, and an interactive board, which made powerpoint presentations easy to set up. The university technician came at the beginning of every session to provide the necessary help and test the electronic material. Computers were available and participants could check their e-mails, etc. easily during the breaks. Photocopies could be requested and made on the spot. Next to the seminar room was the office of the research centre EMMA where the secretary welcomed the participants and helped them fill in the forms needed for their travel expenses to be refunded.

Coffee-breaks were organised in a nearby room by 2 highly effective and dedicated PhD students. Buffet lunches were provided in the sunny inner courtyard of the building, under the chestnut trees; these informal meals enabled the participants to walk around, meet, talk and relax for an hour or so. The buffet lunches were different every day (traditional French food, nouvelle cuisine, Mediterranean food, with vegetarian options). In the evening, the participants were invited to walk from their hotels across the old historic centre of Montpellier to have dinner in two different upmarket places: a refined French restaurant and an Art Nouveau Brasserie. Valuable informal interactions as well as fruitful scientific discussions were greatly facilitated by such a comfortable and pleasant work environment. Participants very willingly remained together for most of the 3 days and were reluctant to part. Convenors, participants and the ESF representative were all instrumental in creating a very convivial atmosphere, particularly productive in terms of debate. The workshop was on the whole satisfactory both from a professional and a social point of view.

The scientific objectives of the workshop were the following:

Focusing on the period 1860-1940, our project meant to re-examine historiographical assumptions about two major British literary movements, Aestheticism and Modernism, in order to highlight the (dis)connections between them, thus revealing the working processes of aesthetic change. This approach has two important consequences. First of all, one is led to broaden the attention from a few icons to a wider number of actors who played a significant, if often unacknowledged, role in shaping the writing and thinking of the period. Secondly, our approach foregrounds contextual analysis and cross-disciplinary study, in order to illuminate the philosophic, economic and political fabric of Aestheticism and Modernism.

These issues were broached in the participants' individual talks that were systematically followed by about 15 minutes of discussion. The discussions were particularly rich and tended to be more and more nourished as the meeting went on. No participants were left out; all were eager to debate the issues. This workshop clearly answered a real need in our scholarly community where scholars tend to be more and more specialised in one specific area or period. The workshop offered the possibility to bring together some of the best specialists of Aestheticism and Modernism who have little opportunity to meet and work together. It enabled scholars specialising in literature, visual arts, philosophy, economics or history to come to grips with common objects and problems. The focus of the workshop

having been defined clearly enough, the assembled scholars had an immediate grasp of what was at stake and what was debated. But they also all had the distinct impression of being intellectually stretched, stimulated and challenged. All experienced and commented on the fruitfulness of thinking across the centuries, across the disciplines and across the discourses which are so familiar to them.

The crisscrossing of our various methodologies and fields of expertise opened onto challenging conclusions and insights. The topic proved extremely rich and is far from being exhausted. Many new perspectives emerged as we went along, which suggests the necessity of pursuing research and renewing this type of scientific encounter. The conclusions we reached are stimulating while being only provisional and begging further exploration. Our aim is to go on meeting and working together.

2. Scientific content of the event

Abstracts in appendix can be published.

Rethinking the Great Divide

Lyn PYKETT launched the debate at the heart of the project by tackling and revisiting the Great Divide between high and low culture which is often said to have been opened up by the advent of mass culture. She argues the Great Divide developed in mid-nineteenth-century, together with a changing market and readership, a media revolution that anticipated that of the twentieth century. She showed how what is often associated with Modernism (fragmentation, consumption, difficulty, ephemerality, etc.) begins in the 1850s. She mainly traced lines of continuity between the 1850s-60s and Modernism through periodicals. The debate showed how welcome this revision was and highlighted the way in which higher-class writers appropriated lower-class forms in the 19th and early 20thc.

Elisa BIZZOTTO presented the neglected but seminal figure of Arthur Symons (1865-1945) and devoted her talk to discussing texts he published in the symbolist magazine *The Savoy* (1896) and in *Figures of Several Centuries*. These writings appear as indispensable to understand the turn of the century and the early Modernist period. Usually seen as a late proponent of the Aesthetic movement Symons nevertheless appears to be also vindicating the claims of “good art”. The ensuing talk demonstrated how Symons still gives rise to different readings, some of them foregrounding his emphasis on form, some of them his remarkable capacities as a mediator of cosmopolitanism. The need for a new annotated edition of some of his most influential writings was also voiced.

Elke D'HOKER looked at a little-known corpus of fin-de-siècle short stories by women writers and showed, extending Hunter's and Korte's work, how influential they may have been in shaping the Modernist short story, usually defined as Chekhovian, its formal, aesthetic and ethical concerns. Another important point brought forward and debated afterwards was how these women's writings engaged with 'life' and thus led to revise assumptions about 'disengaged' Aestheticism. These conclusions could perhaps be extended to male short story writers of the time.

Max SAUNDERS proposed to connect Aestheticism and Modernism through the concept of 'autografiction', personality, portraiture and impression: Pater and Joyce, Lee and Stein thus unexpectedly and convincingly came close together. The discussion showed how this proved a fruitful way of revisiting the imp/personality debate of Modernist times and the conception of the subject.

Debts and (Dis)credited Figures

Christine FROULA focused on a neglected figure of literature, Leonard Woolf. She placed him at the centre of the complex interrelations of art, ethics, economics and British sensibilities of the early 20th c. She showed how rich his varied work is and how much it has

to tell us about the (anti-)imperial conscience of post-1860 Great Britain and how influential he may have been not only in socialist political circles but also in the artistic world he belonged to. This re-appraisal of Leonard Woolf's work raised questions about his positioning towards Empire, the reasons for his love of India and his legacy to the postcolonial world.

Lene ØSTERMARK-JOHANSEN discussed a lesser-known imaginary portrait by Walter Pater which she linked with *Orlando* by Virginia Woolf. "A Prince of Court Painters" (1885) is remarkable as it is the only Paterian portrait narrated and focalized by a woman, Marie-Marguerite Pater. Lene Østermark-Johansen showed how deeply rooted in Pater's double-gendered text Woolf's view of history and its connections with gender is. Questions of tradition, literary heritage and transmission were discussed.

The idea of a break between 19th and 20th c aesthetics, promoted by the Modernists themselves, was also taken to task by **Christine REYNIER** in her reading of the essays Virginia Woolf published in *Good Housekeeping* in the 1930s. She showed how these essays only make sense when read together alongside Ruskin's work and ideas on architecture, photography, economics and politics. This led to a reappraisal of Ruskin's Aestheticism and Woolf's Modernism. The discussion showed that bringing together Aestheticism and Modernism could defamiliarise canonical figures; it was also suggested that Woolf's knowledge of Ruskin was first-hand but possibly also mediated by fin-de-siècle periodicals, which opened new perspectives.

Scott McCracken then embarked on a detailed explanation of the different meanings of "speculation" which he linked to late-nineteenth debates on identity and on the psyche. His ground-breaking research on Dorothy Richardson, informed by his reading of her letters and taking into account the contradictions of *Pilgrimage* as well as its connections with *Emma Bovary* and Plato, led to his coining the concept of "wet Aestheticism" which received wide approval amongst the workshop participants.

Ethics, Aesthetics and Value

Jean-Paul ROSAYE presented the British Idealist philosopher Bradley and showed how his writings contributed to defining an important aspect of late-nineteenth century ethics. He also underlined how such a vein of speculation had been defeated and repressed by modern analytical and empiricist philosophies. The ensuing discussion focused on a very important point, also broached by Pykett, Froula, and Reynier—the dissemination of philosophical speculation on ethics thanks to networks of sociability and publications in periodicals. Studies on networks of sociability and periodical publications may prove a highly valuable contribution to our initial question of the transition between Aestheticism and Modernism.

Emmanuelle de CHAMPS's work is on Utilitarianism and on Bentham. Her talk focused first on a useful presentation of Bentham's main concepts (including utility), then, on their interpretation and evolution under the influence of the Victorian Utilitarians such as Henry Sidgwick. She showed how Utilitarianism changed, increasingly taking the role of the state in providing some means of achieving societal happiness. The lively discussion subsequently allowed participants to have a clearer understanding of Victorian Utilitarianism, a somewhat neglected and much vilified tradition. Both Ms de Champs and Prof. Rosaye certainly enabled participants to measure the importance of philosophy and philosophers in assessing the values undergirding different epochs.

Catherine DELYFER discussed *The Far Horizon* by Lucas Malet. This lesser-known novel by a not so neglected literary figure is a striking picture of an educated public's understanding of the several meanings of value at the beginning of the 20th century. Malet weaves together economics, ethics and aesthetics and pits them against religious values and more precisely against Catholicism. The discussion underlined how literature has the unique ability of knitting together different issues and offers a valuable material for understanding the past. Other novels with similar topics were mentioned, with some belonging to Modernism.

Michael KINDELLAN presented various editions of E. Pound's *Cantos* and explored the connections between the content of some of the *Cantos* where Pound reflects on economic issues and the printing of those editions. Pound, who came to disparage Aestheticism, also replicated the Aesthetes's concern with beautiful books and exclusive editions. However, he was more vocal than them in his exposure of the deployment of capitalism and of its attending commodification of poetry. Most questions focused on Pound's editions and highlighted the need for further exploration of the material culture of literature.

Rainer EMIG addressed a corpus of late-19th c and early-20th c poems and argued that their aesthetics can be related through concepts of economics and ethics. Exploring waste and excess in these poems, he showed that the Decadent element is of paramount importance in Modernist poetry. The following discussion focused on this underexplored issue which throws new light on the concept of tradition and others.

Aestheticism, Modernism and Economics

Bénédicte COSTE's paper focused on the writings of two important literary critics, the Victorian Vernon Lee and the twentieth-century rhetorician I. A. Richards, to examine the unsuspected links between the two. Coste made a highly valuable contribution to exploring the Modernists' debt to late-Victorian thought about the value of words. Questions led to a discussion of works by related figures, such as Walter Pater and J. A. Symonds.

Stephen ROSS's paper productively uncovered the etymological underpinnings of the terms "speculation" and "neglect" to discuss issues of currency, spectrality, unreadability, and illegitimacy in late-Victorian and Modernist writings. In the case of little-read Modernist Lewis Grassic Gibbon, Ross showed how his work deliberately solicits neglect in order to contribute to the emergence of a new ethics based on a resistance to conventional forms of knowing and to consumerism. The ensuing debate probed the related issue of turn-of-the-century skepticism concerning the performativity of language.

Rob HAWKES examined two non-canonical Modernist novelists writing after the crisis of 1929, Evelyn Waugh and Ford Madox Ford. Reflecting on the financial context informing their 1930s novels, Hawkes analyzed how trust/mistrust (whether construed as aesthetic (dis)honesty or financial (in)stability) operates within their works. By making comparisons with late-Victorian texts, such as Oscar Wilde's *An Ideal Husband*, Hawkes contributed to bridging the gap between Aestheticism and Modernism. Questions that followed focused on the related issue of insurance/assurance, on the question of honesty and authority as defined by the Victorian economic philosopher Henry Sidgwick, and on how today's economic commentators treat the notion of defiance and mistrust.

Mary POOVEY's presentation attempted to charter the rise of abstraction in economic thought at the turn of the century and the emergence of econometrics in the twentieth century. From a deductive science focusing on real people and observable data, economics became an increasingly inductive, speculative discipline, relying almost exclusively on mathematical modelling, with little or no basis in reality, yet with the power of drastically impacting world economies. Reactions to this paper were mixed, due to the presenter's narrow, or at least biased, view of economic theory, and her minimal efforts at making links with Aestheticism and Modernism.

Artistic Networks

Fabio VERICAT revisited the notion of intermediality, which lies at the core of Pre-Raphaelitism and Aestheticism, by considering the role of sound and acoustics in Henry James's fiction and T.S. Eliot's poetry, as well as the general impact of new sound technologies on Modernist poetics and politics. The discussion focused on Aestheticist and Modernist ambivalence towards mass culture.

Tina O'TOOLE examined the fiction of New Woman writer George Egerton, in particular her semi-autobiographical novel *The Wheel of God* (1898) and her two collections of short stories, *Keynotes* (1893) and *Flies in Amber* (1905), to explore understudied connections between Egerton, the realist George Moore, and the Modernist James Joyce. Focusing on the construction of urban space in relation with gender, her analysis of the fin-de-siècle “flâneuse” was highly valuable, as the questions and debate showed, in that it revealed one of the missing links between the late-Victorian Baudelairean *flâneur* and the Woolfian Modernist *flâneuse*—a topic more specifically addressed by Christine Reynier in her own paper.

Sandra MAYER presented the fin-de-siècle and turn-of-the-century reception of the writings of Oscar Wilde in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and more especially in Vienna. Once again, networks of sociability came to the fore as the presentation centered around 3 individuals and their peers who engaged with Wilde’s writings for different reasons including his belonging to the Decadent movement or his exposure of the nascent power of the fourth estate. Wilde is an interesting case which illustrates the fate of Aestheticism in non-anglophone countries and shows that the national dimension should also be taken into account when attempting to have a clearer picture of the transition between Aestheticism and Modernism.

Ana Parejo VADILLO presented the nowadays forgotten figure of Madame Darmsteter. Before marrying the French linguist Darmsteter, Mary Robinson had been a respected poet belonging to Aesthetic circles, notably through her parents’ salon in London. Her marriage put an end to her partnership with Vernon Lee, but gained her entry into the Parisian intellectual world of the Nineties. Her salon gathered all literary cosmopolitan celebrities and she continued to publish poetry. Her poems show her as an alert witness to France’s political instability and as a gifted cosmopolitan writer. This presentation also raised issues of national and literary boundaries whose porousness needs to be explored afresh.

Discussing the way in which William Morris’s (and John Ruskin’s) ideas were taken up by the Bauhaus, **Ann Banfield** grappled with the notions of pleasure, labour, production, surplus energy, value, rest or slow enjoyment. She traced lines of (dis-)continuity between Ruskin, Morris and Gropius. In the process, the political dimension of art for art’s sake was emphasized, a dimension not usually connected with Aestheticism. This particular point was picked up on during the discussion since it helped to redefine art for art’s sake, one of the aims of the workshop. Ann Banfield also argued that if Modernism introduced a break, it was to be understood in a technical sense rather than an aesthetic one.

Visual Arts

Stefano EVANGELISTA discussed Vernon Lee’s and Kit Anstruther-Thomson’s little known psychological aesthetics. Their collaborative experiments in museums meant to probe why we see certain objects as beautiful and are affected by them. Evangelista showed that Lee’s psychological aesthetics is a precursor of the Modernist interest in the exploration of the Freudian ‘unconscious’. What was deemed controversial and eccentric at the fin de siècle also appeared extremely modern to the participants in light of what modern studies in psychology or neurosciences are developing.

Elena GUALTIERI explored the photographic discourses of the 1860s and their antithetical understanding of photography as mimetic or as a critique of modernity. She then showed that these two ways of thinking about instantaneous photography informed Roger Fry’s writings, one of the main sites of modern art’s antagonism to Victorian and late-Victorian aesthetics. Photography was thus shown to be a foundational element in Fry’s aesthetic doctrine. This persuasive analysis departs from more conventional approaches which usually present Fry’s theories in relation to painting. The ambiguity of modern art’s relation to mid-nineteenth century aesthetics was then debated as essential to our understanding of the period.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

General results

Overall the workshop confirmed our sense that re-valuing Aestheticism and Modernism requires:

- to take into account the two aesthetic movements together
- to tackle these movements as encompassing not only literary works of art but also all the other art forms (painting, photography, sculpture, architecture, etc.) as well as technological changes
- to approach art in its historical, political, economic and philosophical context.

Our ambitious interdisciplinary project aimed at mapping out the complex relations between Aestheticism and Modernism and to question the radical break between 19th- and 20th-century art practises which many Modernist writers (like Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis or Virginia Woolf) flaunted. But our specificity as regards similar projects attempting to re-think Aestheticism and Modernism was to broaden the field considerably in order to attend to the historical, political, economic and philosophical contexts.

The talks presented during the workshop traced as many lines of continuity as of discontinuity between the two movements and periods. On the whole, they drew a complex and nuanced picture of two overlapping and interconnected movements. They highlighted the mediating role of late Victorian discourses and art forms. Rather than a climactic moment or a moment of closure signaling the fin de siècle, Aestheticism was shown to be intimately connected with the development of Modernism and the lens through which Modernism appraised and appropriated 19th-century art.

The workshop also helped to question some generally held critical assumptions about Aestheticism and Modernism, derived from influential critics. It foregrounded more innovative approaches and topics such as periodical publication, networks of sociabilities, and it underlined the tensions between tradition, national forms, cosmopolitanism and cultural exchange.

Main points discussed:

Modernism has tended to dwarf its predecessors. With Modernist innovations often being over-emphasised, Modernism has generally been assumed to be the norm, the apogee, the canon whose emergence previous movements merely prepared. Such a tendency towards reverse chronology needs to be resisted. Teleological approaches need to be revised to arrive at a more accurate picture and take into account the contribution of less canonical writers, misfits from either side of the fin de siècle whose influence on their contemporaries is now better acknowledged .

The experimental nature of Aestheticism needs to be analyzed alongside the Modernist experiments: If transgression is turned into a paradigm in Modernist literature, it is equally crucial in fin-de-siècle literature. Similarly, the Aesthetes' challenges to conventional norms of success and progress may productively be read alongside the Modernists' deliberate courting of failure. Indeed failure looms large in the Modernists' critical discourse.

In an attempt to question the teleological drive which governs the literary and cultural history of Aestheticism and Modernism, several participants showed that this drive was often resisted by artists themselves who built on their predecessors' work, not merely to continue but often to inflect or even reverse it.

Introducing transitional concepts and intermediary movements, such as Impressionism, also helps to question this teleological drive and blur the linear development from one aesthetic movement to another--hence the crucial issue of mediation, whether embodied in networks of sociability, texts, and means of publication.

However satisfactory the workshop and its debates, such an interdisciplinary project can only give partial and provisional results. It is a project that begs **to be pursued**.

The follow-up actions that we are determined to undertake at this point are the following:

- Publication of the workshop proceedings in a high-profile collection or a journal issue with international visibility
- Application to existing European programmes in order to pursue this work through regular meetings with the same group (and possibly an enlarged group of people on some occasions).
- Creation of an interdisciplinary network that may continue our initial work by disseminating it and by creating appropriate syllabi.

4. Final programme

Wednesday 2 October 2013

09.00-9.30 **Welcome by Convenors-coffee**

09.30-09.50 **Introductory words by Convenors**
Bénédicte COSTE (University of Burgundy—ITL)
Catherine DELYFER (University Toulouse 2—CAS)
Christine REYNIER (University Montpellier3—EMMA)

09.50-10.00 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
Dr. Nina KANCEWICZ-HOFFMAN, Senior Science Officer for
Humanities and Social Sciences

10.00-13.00 Morning Session: Rethinking the Great Divide

10.00-10.30 **Presentation 1**

"When was the Great Divide? Mapping the Great Divide"
Lyn PYKETT (Aberystwyth University, UK)

Discussion

10.40-11.10 **Presentation 2**
"(Re)Crediting Arthur Symons, Decadent-Modernist Literary Ghost"

Elisa BIZZOTTO (University of Venice, Italy)

Discussion

11.20-11.40 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.40-12.10 **Presentation 3**
"Preparing Modernism?"
The Fin-de-Siècle Short Story by Women Writers"
Elke D'HOKER (University of Leuven, Belgium)

Discussion

12.20-12.50 **Presentation 4**
"Autobiografictional Genealogies of Modernism"
Max SAUNDERS (King's College London, UK)

Discussion

13.00-14.30 *Lunch*

14.30-17.30 Afternoon Session: Debts and (Dis)credited Figures

14.30-15.00 **Presentation 1**
"Leonard Woolf and the Subject of Empire"
Christine FROULA (Northwestern University, USA)

Discussion

15.10-15.40 **Presentation 2**
"From Periphery to Centre: the Female Writer in Pater and Woolf"
Lene ØSTERMARK-JOHANSEN (University of Copenhagen, Denmark)

Discussion

15.50-16.10 *Coffee / tea break*

16.10-16.40 **Presentation 3**
"Woolf and Ruskin in *The London Scene*: Challenging the (Dis)-Connections between Modernism and Aestheticism"
Christine REYNIER (University Montpellier 3—EMMA)

Discussion

16.50-17.20 **Presentation 4**
"Plato's Tank: Aestheticism, Dorothy Richardson and the Idea of Democracy"
Scott McCracken (University of Keele, UK)

Discussion

19.30 *Dinner in Town*

Thursday 3 October 2013

09.00 Morning Session: Ethics, Aesthetics and Value

09.00-9.30 **Presentation 1**
"F. H. Bradley's Neoplatonic Turn in *Ethical Studies* (1876)"
Jean-Paul ROSAYE (University of Artois, France)

Discussion

9.40-10.10 **Presentation 2**
"Art and Utility: Mapping a Victorian Debate"
Emmanuelle de CHAMPS (University Paris 8, France)

Discussion

10.20-10.50 **Presentation 3**
"Debt, Credit and Value in Four Speculation Novels of the *Fin de Siècle*"
Catherine DELYFER (University of Toulouse 2, France)

Discussion

11.00-11.20 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.20-11.50 **Presentation 4**

"On First Editions': Ezra Pound's Economic Objects"

Michael KINDELLAN (Humboldt Fellow, University of Bayreuth, Germany)

Discussion

12.00-12.30 **Presentation 5**

"Modernists as Decadents: Excess and Waste in G.M. Hopkins, T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound and Others"

Rainer EMIG (Leibniz University, Hannover, Germany)

Discussion

12.40-14.00 *Lunch*

14.00-17.40 Afternoon Session: Aestheticism, Modernism and Economics

14.00-14.30 **Presentation 1**

"The independence of the word': Words, Styles, Literature, and the Question of Value between 1880 and 1920"

Bénédicte COSTE (University of Burgundy, France)

Discussion

14.40-15.10 **Presentation 2**

"Speculative Modernism"

Stephen ROSS (University of Victoria, Canada)

Discussion

15.20-15.50 *Coffee / tea break*

15.50-16.20 **Presentation 3**

"Money, Modernity and Trust in Evelyn Waugh and Ford Madox Ford"

Rob HAWKES (Teesside University/Leeds Trinity University)

Discussion

16.30-17.00 **Presentation 4**

"The Modernist Trajectory of Economics"

Mary POOVEY (New York University, USA)

Discussion

20.00 *Dinner in Town*

Friday 4 October 2013

09.00 Morning Session: Artistic Networks

09.00-9.30 **Presentation 1**

"Playing it by Ear: Pictorial Aestheticism and the Political Challenge of Acoustic Modernity in Henry James's Narrative Method"
Fabio VERICAT (University Complutense, Madrid)

Discussion

9.40-10.10 **Presentation 2**

"The New Woman Flaneuse? George Egerton's Urban Aesthetic"
Tina O'TOOLE (University of Limerick, Ireland)

Discussion

10.20-10.50 **Presentation 3**

"Literary Cosmopolitans and Agents of Mediation: Oscar Wilde and Fin-de-Siècle Viennese Artistic Networks"

Sandra MAYER (University of Vienna, Austria)

Discussion

11.00-11.20 *Coffee / Tea Break*

11.20-11.50 **Presentation 4**

"An (Expatriate) Aesthete in Paris"
Ana Parejo VADILLO (Birkbeck College, London, UK)

Discussion

12.00-12.30 **Presentation 5**

"Pioneers of Modern Design or from Artisan-worker to Designer"
Ann BANFIELD (University of California, Berkeley, USA)

Discussion

12.40-14.00 *Lunch*

14.00-17.30 Afternoon Session: Visual Arts

14.00-14.30 **Presentation 1**

"Perception, Taste and the Eros of the Art Object in Vernon Lee (and Sigmund Freud)"
Stefano EVANGELISTA (Trinity College, University of Oxford, UK)

Discussion

14.40-15.10 **Presentation 2**

"Going Dutch: Instantaneous Photography and Aesthetic Values 1860s-1920s"
Elena GUALTIERI (University of Groningen, Netherlands)

Discussion

15.20-16.30 **Discussion on follow-up activities/networking/collaboration/publication**

16.30 -17.30 Farewell cocktail

End of Workshop

5. Final list of participants (name and affiliation is sufficient)

Convenor:

1. **Christine REYNIER**
Université de Montpellier 3, France

Co-Convenors:

2. **Bénédicte COSTE**
Université de Bourgogne, Dijon, France
3. **Catherine DELYFER**
Université Toulouse 2 – Le Mirail, France

Rapporteur

4. **Dr. Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman**
Strasbourg, France

Participants:

5. **Ann BANFIELD**
University of California, Berkeley CA, USA

6. **Elisa BIZZOTTO**
IUAV, Venezia, Italy

7. **Eike D'HOKER**
University of Leuven, Belgium

8. **Emmanuelle DE CHAMPS**

Université Paris 8, France

9. **Rainer EMIG**
Leibniz University Hannover, Germany

10. **Stefano M. EVANGELISTA**

Trinity College, University of Oxford, UK

11. Christine FROULA

Northwestern University, US

12. Elena GUALTIERI

University of Groningen, Netherlands

13. Rob HAWKES

Teesside University/Leeds Trinity University, UK

14. Michael KINDELLAN

Universität Bayreuth, Germany

15. Sandra MAYER

University of Vienna, Austria

16. Error! Reference source not found.

Keele University, UK

17. Lene ØSTERMARK-JOHANSEN

University of Copenhagen, Denmark

18. Tina O'TOOLE

University of Limerick, Ireland

19. Mary POOVEY

New York University, USA

20. Lyn PYKETT

Aberystwyth University, UK

21. Jean-Paul ROSAYE

Université d'Artois, France

22. Stephen ROSS

University of Victoria, Canada

23. Max SAUNDERS

King's College London, UK

24. Ana PAREJO VADILLO

Birkbeck College - School of Arts, London, UK

25. Fabio L. VERICAT

Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

6. Statistical information on participants (age bracket, countries of origin, M/F repartition)

Age bracket: 30-40: 4; 40-50: 12; 50-60: 4; 60-70: 5

Countries of origin: Austria (1), Belgium (1), Canada (1), Denmark (1), France (6), Germany (2), Ireland (1), Italy (1), Netherlands (1), Spain (1), United Kingdom (6), United States (3).

M/F repartition: 9/16

Appendix

Abstracts of the workshop (may published on the ESF website).

Re-valuing Aestheticism and Modernism through their (Dis)credited Figures

Aesthetics, Ethics, and Economics 1860-1940

Ann Banfield

University of California, Berkeley, USA

Pioneers of Modern Design or from Artisan-worker to Designer

The subtitle of Nikolaus Pevsner's *Pioneers of Modern Design*—"from William Morris to Walter Gropius"—sets forth a hypothesis about the provenance of the modern style in the decorative arts scarcely apparent to the uninstructed eye. From a style highly ornamental, complicated, floral and naturalistic to one bare, unornamented and functional, with, as Pevsner puts it, "unadorned surface", the evolution, in no way visibly obvious, must be traced via a set of principles. If Morris is the source of

the theories which passed through the Arts and Crafts to the Modern Movement in architecture and the decorative arts, their adoption by the latter required an interpretation of them which, I argue, has completely ignored one half of the theory which animated Morris' principles of design. That theory revolves around two tenets which define for Morris the ideal relation between "art and society", one involving distribution and consumption and the other production. With respect to the first, Morris wrote, "I don't want art for a few, any more than education for a few, or freedom for a few." "What business have we with art at all unless all can share it?"

Up to this point, Pevsner can approve: "So far," he writes, "Morris is the true prophet of the twentieth century. We owe it to him that an ordinary man's dwelling-house has once more become a worthy object of the architect's thought, and a chair, a wallpaper, or a vase a worthy object of the artist's imagination." "However," Pevsner goes on, "this is only one half of Morris' doctrine." The other half remained committed, in Pevsner's view, to nineteenth-century style and "historicism". "Proceeding from Gothic handicraft, he [Morris] defined art simply as 'the expression by man of his pleasure in labour.'" What is thus in Morris prophetic of the twentieth century is, for Pevsner, the emphasis on equitable distribution and consumption of beautifully designed objects of use while the idea that art is a kind of work the worker takes pleasure in belongs to a dead-end of the nineteenth century.

That pleasurable or free labor is visible in the working of surface called "ornament" or "decoration", terms borrowed from Ruskin: "the decoration of workmanship, what is it but the expression of man's pleasure in successful labour?" Decoration is that point at which labor escapes function, the utilitarian. The distance from Morris to Gropius is just that between a partially free workmanship and art as design, where the designer is divorced from the labor process. Does modern design mark the drudgery of contemporary work?

Elisa Bizzotto
IUAV University of Venice, Italy

(Re)Crediting Arthur Symons, Decadent-Modernist Literary Ghost

Thirty years ago, in their critical collection *Strangeness and Beauty: An Anthology of Aesthetic Criticism 1840-1910*, Eric Warner and Graham Hough characterized Arthur Symons (1865-1945) – poet, critic, journalist, editor, literary and cultural theorist and translator – as “the man who brought the diverse swarm of aesthetic ideas in the late nineteenth century closest to their modern formulation” and “one of the principal links between nineteenth-century poetics and the poetics of Modernism”. However, notwithstanding his role as a mentor for such Modernist authors as W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot and James Joyce is by now generally recognized, Symons still remains “one of the ghosts of literary history”, just like Warner and Hough described him in 1983.

Surprisingly enough, in-depth studies of this essential and unique mediator in the passage between nineteenth and twentieth century arts, philosophy and culture have always been rather sporadic, despite the fact that Symons shared Yeats’s first literary experiences in the 1890s and introduced him to contemporary French literature, as the Irish poet himself was to acknowledge in later years. Through *The Symbolist Movement in Literature* (1899), the ground-breaking volume Symons dedicated to Yeats, Eliot as a Harvard student likewise became familiar with the poetry of Jules Laforgue and the Symbolists who would be central to the development of his verse. Moreover, Symons was instrumental in acquainting Joyce with European Decadence and with the work of Gabriele D’Annunzio, whom Joyce admired and began to envision as a model for his early prose writing also thanks to Symons’s translations. In particular, D’Annunzio’s *Il piacere* (1889), which Symons co-translated with Georgina Harding as *The Child of Pleasure* and prefaced in 1898, proved paradigmatic for Joyce’s use of language and imagery in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916).

Less famously, other Modernist figures bore the mark of Symons’s influence and it seems especially appropriate to focus on them. His radical essays on interart aesthetics, collected in *Plays, Acting and Music* (1903) and *Studies in Seven Arts* (1906), which were ultimately elaborated on the basis of Walter Pater’s “The School of Giorgione” (1877), invited cross-disciplinary study and contributed to shape Gordon Craig’s revolutionary conception of the stage. Virginia Woolf’s aesthetics and views on the role of the critic also reveal points of contact with Symons, whose ability of bringing “all his imagination and all his skill to the understanding of the work before him” she appreciated. Through Craig and Woolf, then, Symons’s principles were most probably passed on to their circles.

Symons was prominent not only in defining the poetics of individual authors and artists of Modernism. In fact, his outstanding role as literary editor and co-founder of *The Savoy* (1896), the most important “little magazine” of the *fin de siècle*, was instrumental in paving the way for editorial projects and periodicals of the British avant-gardes which shared the artistic and social commitment, experimentalism across the arts and – quite predictably – short-livedness of their 1890s predecessor. Varied and eclectic in a context of fundamental theoretical coherence, Symons’s inspiring writings span almost the whole period considered in this workshop. More than other artists and thinkers, thus, he represents an example of (dis)continuity between Aestheticism, Decadence, Modernism and even well into the interbellum era. He necessitates to be (re)credited in order to throw comprehensive light on the arts and thought of those times.

Bénédicte Coste
University of Burgundy, France

‘The independence of the word’: Words, Styles, Literature, and the Question of Value between 1880 and 1920

As has been extensively documented the mid and late nineteenth century saw the emergence of new periodicals and consequently of a new kind of journalists/essayists/writers. Periodicals such as the *Fortnightly Review* became the venue for a new approach to literary criticism from scholars, budding or more established writers and increasingly professional journalists. Other publications such as the little magazines of the 1890s also engaged in presenting new kinds of fiction and criticism, mostly influenced by French writers and critics and steeped in cosmopolitanism.

Among other topics, most of those writers offered analyses of current and canonical literature and attempted to offer various theories both of literature and of criticism mostly indebted to M. Arnold’s “Function of Criticism” (1864). In the 1880s the debate focused on the issue of style, taken by some in a Flaubertian way of “le mot juste”. Discussions on style involved discussion on words (use and usage,) and language which at the same time, as L. Dowling has shown, was becoming a field of study obeying laws and sometimes divorced from oral expression. The newly-gained strange autonomy of the written word turned language into a material that could be shaped according not only to the writer’s thoughts it was meant to express but also to specific or rather ‘aesthetic’ purposes and

led in turn to discussion about words, styles and literature. Such a discussion never ended in the period I want to consider—1880-1920—and contributed to define minor, great, enduring or canonical literary texts. Whether we take Walter Pater's 1888 "On Style", John Addington Symonds's 1890 "Style" (an answer to Pater), E. Gosse's 1893 *Questions at Issue*, John Middleton Murry's *The Problem of Style* (1920) and *Aspects of Literature* (1920, rpt. 1921), and Vernon Lee's *The Handling of Words* (1922), all of these essayists who published in periodicals engaged in valuing words, styles and literature according to different criteria, themselves explored, discussed, and revalued. What was the value of words, of style and of literature between 1880 and 1920? Was there a continuity or rupture that may have contributed to the divide between late-nineteenth-century Aestheticism (understood in a liberal way) and Modernism? Are we deluded by dates and literary histories when assessing those writers in 2013?

In the perspective of this workshop devoted to revaluing (dis)credited figures that partially make up the intellectual landscape of the 1860-1940 period, I want to focus on how literary value was defined, then assessed and attributed, how words, style and language were variously described and how canonical and non-canonical works emerged. Pater, Symonds, Gosse, Middleton Murry and the later writings of Lee will be used as a basis for discussion.

Emmanuelle de Champs

University Paris 8, France

"Art and Utility: Mapping a Victorian Debate"

Throughout the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, artistic and literary circles routinely presented utilitarianism as the selfish individualist doctrine of a soul-less industrial age. Among the early Victorians, Charles Dickens, Thomas Carlyle and Matthew Arnold are well-known for their vocal rejection of Benthamism. In the following decades, one finds echoes of their various arguments in the writings of Walter Pater and John Ruskin.

This opposition between art and utility was in turn reinforced by the Utilitarians' ambiguity towards aesthetics as a field of philosophical enquiry. Though John Stuart Mill and Henry Sidgwick emphatically moved away from Bentham's view that "prejudice apart, the game of push-pin is of equal value with the arts and sciences of music and poetry", their contribution to aesthetic theory has been underestimated.

Twentieth-century scholarship has further contributed to present Aestheticism and Modernism as a reaction to the utilitarian spirit of the Victorian age, through the highly influential criticism of F. R. Leavis and textbooks such as R. Altick's *Victorian People and Ideas*. However, recent studies both in literature and in intellectual history have shown such an opposition to be largely rhetorical – and political and rehabilitated the contribution of a number of Utilitarians to nineteenth-century artistic movements (see I. Armstrong, *Victorian Poetry. Poetry, poetics and politics*, 1993; D. Winch, "Mr. Gradgrind and Jerusalem", 2000; K. Blake, *Pleasures of Benthamism*, 2009; M. Quinn, *Utilitarianism and the Art School*, 2012).

This paper delineates the contours of the recurring debate on art and utility throughout the Victorian and the Edwardian periods. It recalls the context in which these arguments were aired and traces their genealogy. It lays particular emphasis on the European dimension of this debate, especially in French philosophy and criticism.

Catherine Delyfer

University Toulouse 2 Le Mirail, France

Debt, Credit and Value in Four Speculation Novels of the *Fin de Siècle*

This paper focuses on four speculation narratives of the turn of the century to interrogate the narrative functions of financial panics in *fin-de-siècle* fiction and to examine how, as fiscal plots became increasingly self-reflexive, they engaged with or contested the inextricability of aesthetic, moral, and commercial discourses on value. Because, as Mary Poovey has suggested, episodes of fiscal crisis reveal the fictions inherent in the modern credit economy, the panic plots I study serve as privileged occasions for exploring the problematic of representation in general and challenging prevailing models of value.

Though Britain had been plagued by financial crashes since the 1720 South Sea Bubble and through the nineteenth century, it seems that the late-Victorians, however, had a much better grasp of how speculative panics developed and spread. In his popular *Lombard Street* (1873), economist Walter Bagehot explained the workings of the monetary market in plain language and demystified the operations of the City for ordinary readers, while William Stanley Jevons's *Money and the Mechanism of Exchange* (1875) and *Primer on Political Economy* (1878) were also written in a fresh, popular, descriptive style. Literary writers were quick to appropriate economic themes for fictional treatment, gradually mining current financial events for characters and plots which, I shall argue, enabled them to remodel the novel and articulate their growing sense of cultural, social, political and linguistic instability. Margaret Oliphant's novel about the tangled history of a family bank, *Hester* (1883), for example, describes how "once the first whisper of suspicion has been roused it flies fast, and the panic with which rural depositors rush upon a bank which has awakened the ghost of an apprehension, is even more cruel and unreflecting than other panics" (*Hester*, Oxford UP: 2009, p. 9). At the same time, like Ouida's *The Massarenes*, *Hester* used fiscal instability less for realistic effect than in order to redefine literary conventions by challenging the inheritance plot as well as the marriage narrative. In 1897 (six years after the publication of Zola's *Money*) George Gissing compared the money market to a big "whirlpool" in the novel by that name: following the rise and fall of the great financier Bennet Frothingham—and of his daughter's musical career—Gissing analyzed how Britannia Loan, Assurance, Investment, and Banking Company, Ltd excited greed and speculative fever, "perturbing quiet industry with the passion of the gamester, inflating vulgar ambition, now at length scattering wreck and ruin" (*The Whirlpool*, London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1897, p. 45). Here too, the novel's absorption of pressing financial anxieties comes to express a wider sense of uncertainty—in fact an ontological instability, a loss of substance, a crisis in representation. Such a sense of crisis achieves a fuller expression in Lucas Malet's *The Far Horizon* (1906): in its combined engagement with spiritual salvation and speculative banking, religious conversion and modern capitalism, art and the marketplace, beauty and greed, this text constitutes a unique, if forgotten, late-aestheticist reflection on the status of self-interest, disinterestedness and social good at the dawn of the twentieth century. In this text, I shall argue, the novelist takes as a key turning point a financial crisis loosely modelled on the Panic of 1890, deliberately poisoning her tale at a critical moment of intersection between individual self-doubt and national confidence crisis, in order to explore competing definitions of value (monetary versus ethical, economic versus aesthetic), challenge the dominant capitalist system and promote an alternative model of value. By stressing the gap that separates the monetary sign from its referent (gold), this text calls attention to what Mary Poovey calls "the deferral or obfuscation of [the sign's] authenticating ground" (*Genres of the Credit Economy*, p. 6)—and therefore to the growing potential for a fiduciary crisis which lies at the heart of Modernism.

Elke D'Hoker

University of Leuven, Belgium

Preparing Modernism? The Fin-de-Siècle Short Story by Women Writers

The short story as it was developed by modernist writers such as Woolf, Mansfield, and Joyce has come to shape the genre in defining ways. The paradigmatic "modern short story" as taught and written today still privileges mood and psychology over plot, uses symbolism and epiphany, foregrounds a defining moment in a character's life, and is unified and condensed in terms of events, setting and characters. Usually, the influence of Chekhov as well as modernist aesthetics as a whole are pointed to as formative influences in the development of the modern short story in Britain. In

recent years, however, short story critics (such as Adrian Hunter (2007) and Barbara Korte (2006)) have also drawn attention to the wave of experimentation in the fin-de-siècle period as an important preparatory stage in this development. In my paper, I want to continue this exploration by investigating the short fiction of women writers of the 1890s and 1900s with a view to determining the extent of their influence on the modern(ist) short story, with regard to both the formal aspects of their writing and the larger aesthetic and ethical concerns they explore in their stories.

A fin-de-siècle short story writer whose short fiction has especially been singled out as “proto-modernist” is George Egerton (cf. Lynn Pykett (1996), Clare Hanson (1989)) because of its use of focalization and interior monologue. Yet, as I hope to show, short stories of writers such as Ella d’Arcy, Olive Schreiner, Vernon Lee and Sarah Grand also embody elements that anticipate the modernist story. What is also interesting, however, are the formal and narrative innovations of these writers which were not taken up by the Modernists: e.g. Schreiner’s use of parable and dream structures for her stories, the technique of embedding stories (used by several writers), Lee’s historical stories, and Schreiner’s technique of neutral narration.

In a second part, this essay will zoom in on a few short stories which stage art and artists as they contain interesting information about these writers’ aesthetic ideals and their engagement with the Aestheticist movement. Stories such as Egerton’s “A Lost Masterpiece”, D’Arcy’s “The Elegie”, Grand’s “The Undefinable”, and Lee’s “Lady Tal”, for instance, criticize a male writer or artist’s disengagement from ordinary life and his reductive treatment of female models or muses. Yet even though the male artists these stories ridicule have clear aestheticist overtones, the writers certainly do not entirely dissociate themselves from Aestheticism. Similarly, in their attempt to formulate an alternative aesthetic model that does more “justice” to people and to life, they often appear torn between ethical and aesthetic concerns.

In my conclusion, I want to bring together these formal and thematic aspects by exploring whether the formal innovations and experiments of these writers can in any way be linked by their ethical concerns. Schreiner’s open-ended stories, Lee’s unreliable narrators, Grand’s embedded narratives and Egerton’s shifting focalization could perhaps be interpreted as responses to their ambition for an art that does not only promote a more “just” society in terms of gender equality, but that also does justice to the world they seek to depict. In this way too, these short stories may be seen to prepare the modernist short story, in particular Woolf’s “ethical” short stories (cf. Reynier (2009)).

Rainer Emig

Leibniz University, Hannover, Germany

Modernists as Decadents: Excess and Waste in G.M. Hopkins, T.S. Eliot, Ezra Pound and Others

Although it is well-known that Ezra Pound’s early poetry was so artificial in tone that he later discarded it as “stale cream puffs”, the tangent between fin-de-siècle Aestheticism and early twentieth-century Modernism remains underexplored. Pound’s poems have only merited one essay by Helen V. Emmitt from 1993 that looks at their place in European Aestheticism. There is a similar dearth of assessments of the decadent elements in T.S. Eliot’s works – despite David Weir’s brave intervention *Decadence and the Making of Modernism* of 1995 and the critically acknowledged indebtedness of Eliot’s early poetry to that of Jules Laforgue, the symbolist poet who also wrote for both *Le Décadent* and *La Vie Moderne*. Although Russell Ames published an essay entitled “Decadence in the Art of T.S. Eliot” as early as 1952, only very few critical voices (among them Jean-Paul Rosaye and Vincent Sherry) have followed this trajectory. Their investigations, however, are focused on Late-Victorianism and Empire respectively, i.e. on cultural and political contexts.

It is the aim of my proposed paper to attempt an assessment of the related aesthetics of Aestheticism and Modernism through theoretically motivated concepts of economics and ethics. In excess and waste – theorised by Georges Bataille among others, and the text’s ethical and moral positions towards them, the paper will locate a common element in Aestheticism and Modernism. It will argue that this commonality helps us to throw new light not only on their relationship, but also on their positions as relevant forms of cultural critique. Bataille’s *part maudite* will feature prominently in this respect, as will the poetry of G.M. Hopkins as an important early attempt to combine symbolic and material economy and ethics in a poetry that, against its own expressed intentions, often swerves in a direction of what would a little later be called “decadent”.

The proposed paper will develop ideas first expressed in the chapter entitled “Towards an Economy of the Modernist” poem in my *Modernism in Poetry* (1995) by re-connecting them to the Aestheticist poetry of the final years of the nineteenth century.

Stefano Evangelista
Trinity College, University of Oxford

Perception, Taste and the Eros of the Art Object in Vernon Lee (and Sigmund Freud)

Like other writers affiliated to Aestheticism and Decadence, Vernon Lee pioneered a new mode of art criticism that emphasised immediacy of sensation, actual physical contact with the art object, and emotional investment. After producing early work on aesthetics that was heavily influenced by John Ruskin and Walter Pater, in the last few years of the nineteenth century, Lee, together with her intimate friend Clementina Anstruther-Thomson (Kit), elaborated one of the most eccentric but interesting offshoots of nineteenth-century aestheticism: a so-called science for the study of the effects produced by art objects on the body which they named “psychological aesthetics”. The two women disseminated their theories in the form of a series of articles published in the periodical press and two volumes, *Beauty and Ugliness* (1911) and *Art and Man* (1924), the latter of which was published after Kit’s death. Psychological aesthetics is, as the name suggest, a hybrid of aesthetics, psychology, and “new” art history. It tries to bring together the German notion of *Einfühlung* (or empathy, elaborated by the theorist Theodor Lipps), the modern psychological theories of William James, the Danish neurologist Carl Lange and the Italian Giuseppe Sergi, and the art-historical theories of Giovanni Morelli and Bernhard Berenson – the last of whom would famously accuse the two women of plagiarism. Psychological aesthetics sets out to examine the mechanism of how we perceive the form of art objects by seeking a scientific explanation for why we perceive certain art objects as beautiful.

My paper examines Lee’s understanding of sculpture in her writings on psychological aesthetics, focusing on the ways in which she appropriates and re-configures the exhibition space in her essays, theatrically staging narratives of intense encounters between the human body and sculptural objects. Her main interest is in creating experimental textual hybrids of aesthetics and psychological science that enable her to investigate the nature of desire in the form of autobiographical narratives: in trying to get to grips with the seductive power of the sculptural object, Lee uses the art-historical essay as a genre of enquiry into the role of the body in the process of artistic perception and into the overlap between artistic taste and sexual desire.

Lee’s “science” of psychological aesthetics developed, in the early twentieth century, alongside Freudian psychoanalysis, as a discipline for the articulation and examination of the impression of art objects on the mind of the viewer. Both Freud and Lee formulated radical theories of subjective response in which the objective knowledge seemingly embodied by the material art object (statue) is debunked in favour of narratives of interiority, doubt, haunting and neurosis. Freud and Lee never met and they do not seem to have been aware of each other’s work. Yet their aesthetic writings on sculpture show remarkable similarities. They are both concerned with the ‘legibility’ of sculpture as an artistic medium in the modern age. In particular, though, they both build on the theories of empathy formulated by Lipps and the new method of art historical scholarship developed by Morelli in order to investigate the effects produced by sculptural objects on the body of the viewer. The influence of psychoanalysis on the genesis of Modernism is well documented; my paper will seek to establish Lee’s psychological aesthetics as an overlooked precursor of the modernist interest in the exploration of the “unconscious”.

Christine Froula

Northwestern University, USA

Leonard Woolf and the Subject of Empire

“You may have guessed, dear boy, that Morgan and I are cads!” Addressing a visiting Indian writer whom he had just jovially greeted as “wog,” Leonard Woolf (1880-1969) reportedly flaunted the offense that Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924) and his own novel *The Village in*

the Jungle (1913; based on his seven years of service as a colonial administrator in Ceylon) presented to his true-blue British imperialist countrymen. In respect to contingencies and conflicts of value, art and literature exist at a tangent to economic developments and mediate them in myriad ways, as writers from Oscar Wilde (“The Soul of Man under Socialism,” 1891) to Ezra Pound (*ABC of Economics*, 1953) suggest. This paper will sketch slow shifts in literary depictions of the British empire in the aftermath of the 1857 Indian uprising, then referred to as the Mutiny, through the 1919 Amritsar massacre and *A Passage to India*. Christopher Herbert’s *War of No Pity: The Indian Mutiny and Victorian Trauma* (2008) frames a corpus of some sixty English novels published after 1860 as sites of remembering, repeating, and attempting to work through the “traumatic break” of 1857 in Britons’ moral confidence in the imperial system that helped to sustain their economy. In 1900, Kipling’s *Kim*, a family romance writ large as an imperial romance, appears to have moved past the “moral shock” of 1857, at almost the same moment that Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899) reopens—and, to some extent, displaces—the challenge to the conscience of empire of its manifest economic interests and devastations. A decade later, Leonard Woolf returned from Ceylon to depict the Sinhalese people and their struggles to subsist under the British economic and legal rule he had helped to administer from the perspective of the fictional villagers themselves. Another decade would pass, during which the 1919 Amritsar massacre would occur, before Forster, with Woolf’s encouragement, completed *A Passage to India*—a novel of manners in a cultural contact zone whose transformative impact on British sensibilities has been compared to that of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* on the American conscience in the era of slavery.

Within this context of literary representation, aesthetics, and anti-imperial conscience from 1860 through the early twentieth century, Leonard Woolf—spouse of Virginia Woolf, co-founder with her of the remarkably successful Hogarth Press, and a central, long-lived, highly productive figure among the Bloomsbury artists and intellectuals—stands out as a tremendously generative but relatively neglected thinker whose long public career—first as a colonial civil servant, later as a writer of novels, essays, and a distinguished autobiography, editor, publisher, member of the Labour Party committees on international and imperial affairs, critic of economic and cultural imperialism and exponent of a radical consumer-governed socialism—has much to tell us about the evolving, complex, often contradictory, interrelations of art, ethics, economics, and British sensibilities over these decades. As a British subject, Leonard Woolf embodied and lived the contradictions of empire in private and public life, in his own creative and critical work and in his impact on the thought and art of his associates, not least, his wife Virginia Woolf. Placing Leonard Woolf at center stage, this paper will explore both his many interrelated contributions to the art and thought of his time and the legacy his work offers a postcolonial world still contending with the economic, ethical, and aesthetic questions of his time.

Elena Gualtieri
University of Groningen, Netherlands

Going Dutch: Instantaneous Photography and Aesthetic Values 1860s-1920s

In this paper, I will explore the ways in which instantaneous photography operates in aesthetic discourses of the 1860s and 1920s, outlining the development of a theory of aesthetic value that insistently figures instantaneous photography – the snapshot – as its negation. I will follow through the first articulation of this framework in the photographic discourses of the 1860s, in which two antithetical understandings of instantaneous photography confront each other. On the one hand, instantaneous photography functions there to signify the perfection of mimesis and reproduction and to prefigure the birth of cinema. On the other, instantaneous photography participates in a critique of modernity,

industrialisation and its effects on human physiology and becomes more closely aligned with an artisan tradition, or rather a pre-modern understanding of artistic production that precedes the institution of the academy and the professionalisation of the figure of the artist.

My argument is that these two ways of thinking about instantaneous photography continue to be operative in modernist art criticism of the 1910s and 1920s, and specifically in Roger Fry's writings. Fry's work is one of the originary sites in which the antagonism and antipathy of modern art towards Victorian and late-Victorian aesthetics take root. The role played by photography, and specifically by the development of instantaneous photography, in Fry's critical framework has often been overlooked. Repeatedly, though, Fry aligned the work of late-Victorian painters such as Alma Tadema with what he called "the Kodak method", linking the advent of snapshot photography in the 1890s to the birth of a lower-middle class public for which he argued there was effectively no difference between wares and icons, commodities and paintings. This dismissal of snapshot, mass popular photography was not, I argue, incidental, but rather a foundational element in his aesthetic doctrine.

I shall concentrate in particular on Fry's late writings on Flemish Art with two aims in mind. The first one will be to show that in Fry's modernist criticism instantaneous photography inherited the same indifferent preoccupation with the materials and details of everyday life that he saw exemplified in Dutch painting of the early Renaissance. The second one is to argue that Fry's theory of modern art effectively reverses the terms of mid-nineteenth-century realist aesthetics, while also preserving the epistemology that subtends them. I shall then conclude by suggesting that what Dutch painting was for George Eliot, instantaneous photography was for the modernist novel – with the difference that in the case of modernist literature the relationship was one of negation rather than affirmation.

Rob Hawkes

Teesside University/Leeds Trinity University, UK

Money, Modernity and Trust in Evelyn Waugh and Ford Madox Ford

As Marshall Berman puts it, borrowing from Marx, modernity is a social order under which 'all that is solid melts into air'. Modernity, in other words, is characterised by change, by the continual overturning of established beliefs and practices and, therefore, by profound and pervasive forms of uncertainty and doubt. Under the conditions of modernity, there is a powerful sense in which we cannot *know* and so we have to rely instead on *trust*. As the recent collection *Incredible Modernism* (Ashgate, 2013) makes clear, trust is also a pressing concern in much modernist writing due, in part, to its preoccupation with sincerity, authenticity and self-reflexive fictionality. This paper will examine Evelyn Waugh's *Vile Bodies* (1930) and Ford Madox Ford's *The Rash Act* (1933) in the context of the 'Great Crash' of 1929 and in relation to the issues of money, modernity and trust. Waugh has been described as both a 'middlebrow' and an 'intermodernist' writer in recent years, and his position in relation to modernism itself has never been an easy one to define. Indeed, Waugh himself dismissed the work of high modernists like James Joyce and Gertrude Stein as 'gibberish'. However, in his book *Confused Roaring: Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition*, George McCartney argues that Waugh's writing continually 'pays parodic tribute to modernist art and literature'. Ford's reputation as a central modernist is more established, resting primarily on his best-known novels *The Good Soldier* and the First World War tetralogy *Parade's End* and on his role as editor of the *English Review* and the *transatlantic review*. However, Ford's 1930s fiction is less-straightforwardly modernist and at times, as Cornelia Cook has argued, goes 'beyond modernism' by challenging the notions of subjectivity on which much modernist writing depends. I want to argue that, in the case of both novels, there is a question of trust at stake when we try to read them in relation to modernism. I propose, furthermore, that this question of trust be read in the light of the historical and especially the financial contexts informing both novels.

Although published in 1930, *Vile Bodies* was written in 1929, on the eve of the Wall Street crash, while Ford's *The Rash Act* was written as a self-conscious attempt to 'do for the post-war world and the Crisis what the Tietjens tetralogy did for the war'. Both novels present money as elusive, transient and unstable whilst also posing questions about character, identity, realism and authenticity. Even if, with McCartney, we can regard Waugh as paying 'parodic tribute' to modernism, it remains difficult to decide how to read his novel. Does Waugh draw on and develop modernist techniques or satirise them? If Cook is right, and Ford goes 'beyond modernism', is he a proto-postmodernist? Or a more politically-implicated 'intermodernist'? I will propose that, in these respects, both novels problematise trust at a formal/structural level whilst the financial instability represented in and by both

works offers a new perspective from which to read Waugh and Ford in relation to the issues of modernism, modernity and trust.

Michael Kindellan
Humboldt Fellow
University of Bayreuth, Germany

“On First Editions”: Ezra Pound’s Economic Objects

In an unpublished essay called “On First Editions”, Ezra Pound wrote that “until readers rise sufficiently from the hog=pen [sic] to understand the rudiments of contemporary economics [...] all other discussion is out of place”. One such rudiment, Pound argues in this short but revelatory piece, is that capitalism’s inherent suppression of the arts leads to “the problem of [his] time” and occupation, namely, “the feeding of the few authors who do honest work”. Pound goes further to suggest that it is “obviously a disgrace to our pretended civilisation that it cannot produce books which are AS MATERIAL OBJECTS, paper, printing etc. equal to those produced several centuries ago” thereby implicitly albeit not very subtly setting into dialectical relation the for-profit mass-production of literary commodities, and rarefied literary artifacts which are capable of signaling the end of what he calls “ECONOMIC DISEASE”. As Pound concludes “On First Editions”: “The way to good first editions is VIA economic reform”.¹ What’s at stake, as ever, is little less than the struggle for cultural hegemony.

In my paper I will present my research into Pound’s writings concerning the various interconnections between economics and literature during his “high modernist” period (roughly 1917-1935). While criticism pertaining to Pound’s economics already exists, I hope to extend this body of work by specifically framing my consideration of his “economics” through the lens of the economics of *literary* production. Like Pound’s aesthetics more generally, his larger considerations of economics make grandiloquent refusals of immediate forebears promulgating accepted doctrine only to smuggle in lesser known writers neglected by the capitalist process of willfully imposed ignorance he called “historic blackout”. (Non-canonical economic theorists such as C. H. Douglas and Silvio Gesell are both specifically mentioned in “On First Editions”, for instance). In this vein, I will forward a thesis that suggests certain less conspicuous aspects of Aestheticism influenced Pound’s formative thinking about economics. Particularly, Pound’s mature refusal of many of Aestheticism’s literary forms and techniques belies the extent to which his taste for fine materials and *de luxe* editions evolved directly out of 19th century precedents set by printers such as William Morris and William Bowden. For Pound, the traditional methods of printing espoused and practiced by, only most notably, the Kelmscott Press offered a model of anti-capitalist utopian thinking that he tried to emulate and evolve. Though the aesthetic protocols of Pound’s modernist poetics reject the poetic styles of Kelmscott’s authors, the press’s commitment to beautiful objects was a paradigm Pound continued to value highly. In fact, the very notion of a radically integrated *house style*, one consistent with the authors’ and publishers’ social beliefs, gives *economics* (from *oikos*, “house” + *nomos* “custom”) an entirely new literary complexion.

Practically, my presentation will stay close to primary sources (letters, published and unpublished essays, actual first editions); its core texts will be comprised of Pound’s 1925 *de luxe* edition of *A Draft of XVI Cantos of Ezra Pound, for the Beginning of a Poem of some Length*, published by William Bird’s Three Mountains Press in Paris—itsself a pivotal document in the history of small press literary modernism; unpublished letters between Pound and Bird, as well as between Pound and numerous commercial publishers (many of whom were hopeful of publishing poems from *de luxe* editions in trade paperbacks) and the artists who engraved the *Draft of XVI Cantos’* initials; I will also discuss the correspondence between Pound and the publisher Nancy Cunard, who took over William Bird’s Three Mountains Press in 1930, renaming it *Hours Press* and who published Pound’s *XXX Cantos* (1930), along with work by other modernist writers. The aim of the presentation is to demonstrate how the seemingly unimportant details of literary production and its accompanying economics—print runs, setting costs, paper quality—are significant indicators of Pound’s interconnected ideas about economics and aesthetics, and how, despite all of Pound’s revolutionary rhetoric, this aspect of his practice is inextricable from 19th century examples.

Sandra Mayer
University of Vienna, Austria

¹ Ezra Pound Papers. Yale Collection of American Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library. “On First Editions”. No date. Box 122; folder 5009. YCAL MSS 43.

Literary Cosmopolitans and Agents of Mediation: Oscar Wilde and Fin-de-Siècle Viennese Artistic Networks

In 1892, Hermann Bahr once more affirmed his uncontested status as the chief propagator of modern European literature within the budding “Young Vienna” movement by lending the young Hugo von Hofmannsthal a copy of Oscar Wilde’s *Intentions*, which had recently been published in London and Leipzig. Enthusiastically, the 18-year-old aspiring author noted in a letter to his mentor: “This is the book I have been waiting for, without knowing it, for fifteen-and-a-half years.”

At a time when Wilde’s literary reputation was still unaffected by the frenzied coverage of his court trials and when the author had as yet largely escaped the notice of German-speaking audiences, Hofmannsthal’s impassioned response intriguingly illustrates the intense reception of English literature within fin-de-siècle Viennese reading culture. Sharply distancing themselves from the stagnant and repressive official cultural policy of the Habsburg Monarchy, the intellectual circles grouped around key figures of Vienna’s innovative literary scene proved to be highly receptive to the regenerative impulses offered by the artistic avant-garde movements that had taken root in other European countries. Notably, this tendency was vigorously fed by extensive multilateral synergies and dynamic interaction within a tightly-meshed network that allowed for multiple instances of artistic cross-fertilisation and channels of stimulating personal exchange and communication.

Exploring the ways in which the reception and critical discussion of Oscar Wilde and his works presented a common denominator among the closely interacting proponents of Vienna Modernism, this paper will highlight the crucial role played by avant-garde writers and critics as cross-cultural literary mediating agents. In addition, an examination of the parameters of Wilde’s multi-faceted impact on Vienna’s turn-of-the-twentieth-century cultural scene will allow for striking insights into British-Central European cultural exchange during a period of crisis and transformation. Based on an approach that takes into account the material framework of cultural production and consumption, this paper draws on both Bourdieu’s field theory and network analysis as crucial methods of exploring the multi-level interdependence of individual action and historically conditioned socio-economic framework.

Scott McCracken

University of Keele, UK

Plato’s Tank: Aestheticism, Dorothy Richardson and the Idea of Democracy

On 30 April 1919, Dorothy Richardson replied to a letter from Lady Ethel Desborough which had asked what “subtle intention” lay behind her long novel cycle, *Pilgrimage*:

It may perhaps be answered in part by the remaining volumes of the series; I do not know. I agree almost entirely with your impatience with Miriam. She is so far nearly all hyperaesthetic senses. But there are glimpses of other aspects; a tussling mind; & solitudes with regard to some of her fellows, her mother, criminals, servants, strangers seen sympathetically in flashes. Still, these things do not come first with her so far certainly. Nor perhaps will they ever to the extent demanded by the view of life as entirely an affair of the heart. But if I can carry through there is something that should emerge, which will carry with it many other things blossoming fully in their right place.

The idea that Miriam, Richardson’s heroine, was “all hyperaesthetic senses” not only connects Richardson’s experiment in form with late nineteenth-century Aestheticism, it raises a number of questions about modernist aesthetics in general. Miriam’s “hyperaesthesia” was an attempt to evade existing cultural, social, and sexual hierarchies by insisting on the primacy of the feminine voice. Just as Schönberg imposed artificial constraints on his compositions through the use of the twelve-tone

scale, so in Richardson's long modernist novel, the reader only sees what its protagonist, Miriam, sees, hears what she hears, feels what she feels. The text's rich sensorium of the visual, the musical, and the haptic, are only perceived through Miriam. In principle, the narrative is only as self-aware as Miriam herself becomes self aware.

As Richardson's reply suggests, it was at least her hope that as the narrative progressed, it would become more accessible; because Miriam would gradually become more self-aware and therefore more able to articulate her hitherto unmediated impressions. Nonetheless, an account of the aesthetic of limits found in *Pilgrimage's* early volumes (of which only four had been published by April 1921) can only partially account for what is a voluminous, limitless, unending (actually not finished at Richardson's death, although, like the unfinished *A la recherche du temps perdu*, it does have an ending) text. There is, in *Pilgrimage*, a productive contradiction between the emergence of a distinctive, unique, subjectivity (the feminine and gradually emerging feminist (modernist) subject in process) and the narrative's web of allusions, its rich intertextuality, its multiple references to the cultural ocean in which Miriam swims, "hyperaesthetic", but only dimly aware (at first) of what lies beyond her myopic vision, her untutored ear, her fumbling touch.

This paper will explore two aspects of this contradiction, both of which have a wider relevance for modernist aesthetics generally. First, Richardson's simultaneous embrace of and resistance to a new feminine Aestheticism. Second, the extent to which her contradictory engagement with Aestheticism implies a new idea of democracy. Jacques Rancière has argued that Flaubert, the advocate of "la littérature pure", kills Emma Bovary because she makes visible a more democratic aesthetic, one more available to a "un monde commun". While Flaubert's style gives the impression of treating all subjects with the same equal distance, he maintains what Rancière calls "un repartage du sensible" between the author, who has the right to aestheticise the everyday and his character, who does not. This paper will ask whether Miriam is a literary-political response to Emma: an attempt to overcome Flaubert's division, to achieve a new "repartage du sensible", and by implication a new vision of democracy in which women's voices are heard. The clue to the paper's title is that both aspects of the paper will draw on the surreal revision of Plato's cave found in Richardson's letters, where his cave becomes an underwater "tank", which earlier male novelists (notably Henry James, whom she compares to an octopus) have mistaken for a much larger ocean. Richardson's submarine rewriting of Plato offers new perspectives on Aestheticism, on Modernism, and a gendered idea of democracy.

Lene Østermark-Johansen
University of Copenhagen, Denmark

From Periphery to Centre: the Female Writer in Pater and Woolf

This paper revolves around two writers, often associated with flow, flux, and continuity, and it aims to demonstrate stylistic, thematic and gender-political continuities between Aestheticism and Modernism. Walter Pater and Virginia Woolf have been linked more generally by scholars, but in this paper I want to focus on gender and the female writer in two specific texts: Walter Pater's "A Prince of Court Painters" (1885) and Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* (1928). Pater's text is highly unusual in his oeuvre for having a female narrative voice in the character of Marie Marguerite, sister of Watteau's only pupil, Jean-Baptiste Pater. The metropolitan world of the Rococo painter is explored from the sideline of the provincial girl, constantly on the margin of events and consequently misconstruing them. In her eventless life, minor events are turned into major dramas. Pater's text thus addresses the marginalization of the female in the world of art, while the double-gendered writer explores a lesser-known aspect of himself, yet one he knew through his sisters Clara and Hester. In her "Preface" to *Orlando* Woolf hailed Pater as a dead, illustrious friend who had helped her write her book, as one in a long line of writers going back to the sixteenth-century Thomas Browne. I am interested in the way in which Woolf perceives herself as part of a literary tradition and transposes that literary heritage in the fluid timeline of her novel, which passes from the Renaissance to Modernity. Part of my argument is that Woolf has adopted this fluid view of history from Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (1873), and that her intriguing confluence of history and gender has profound roots in Pater's double-gendered text. Woolf's protagonist is hurled into the metropolitan world of politics and diplomacy, while also maintaining a strong identity as a writer, and her novel questions the interrelationship between the passing of an individual life and the passing of history. Where Marie Marguerite's chronicled life stops with the death of Watteau, *Orlando* is one ever-ongoing case of the continuity of life and of writing.

Tina O'Toole

University of Limerick, Ireland

The New Woman Flâneuse? George Egerton's Urban Aesthetic

Concentrating on the literary experiments of New Woman writer, George Egerton [Chavelita Dunne] (1859-1945), this paper will take account of the 'cross-lines' between her work and that of her Irish peers, George Moore and James Joyce. All three, if we take Joyce's early work into account, may be seen as transitional figures in the nexus of Aestheticism and Modernism. In the Irish literary canon, the landscape we tend to associate with the turn of the twentieth century is the rural west coast of Revival literature. By contrast, contemporary New Woman and Aesthetic literature concentrated on urban experience. Dublin is the contact zone for *fin-de-siècle* adventures in the work of Egerton, Moore, and Joyce; the *flâneur* is a key figure in the work of all three. Homing in on two urban scenes: a girl at a book barrow on Fownes' Street, and a woman carrying her dying comrade down Mecklenburgh Street (the red-light district known popularly as 'the Monto', which is the backdrop for Joyce's 'Nighttown' episode), this paper centres on the gendering of cosmopolitan space. Drawing on recent scholarship on the *flâneuse*, the paper foregrounds the interconnected work of Irish writers and broader counter-cultural movements at the Irish *fin de siècle*.

Lyn Pykett

Aberystwyth University, UK

When was the Great Divide? Mapping the Great Divide

Modernism came of age in a period in which the role, even the survival, of art in a print-saturated, democratic society, was uncertain.... (Patrick Collier, *Modernism on Fleet Street*)

In the last 20 years or so there has been an increasing tendency to link, in one way or another, "emerging modernisms" (significantly in the plural) to "emerging media" – to use the words in the subtitle of Ann Ardis and Patrick Collier's jointly edited 2008 essay collection, *Transatlantic Print Culture 1880-1940*. The essays in this collection explore various aspects, implications and impacts of what its editors describe in their introduction as the "sea-change" in Anglo-American book, newspaper, and periodical publishing at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which took the form of an exponential increase in the number and range of titles in a variety of formats aimed at increasingly wide audiences. In its attentiveness to the complexities and details of a "radically transforming print ecology", this book is a good example of the more nuanced approach to the media revolution, variously located in the closing decades of the nineteenth century or the beginning of the twentieth century, which has so often been described in terms of the "great divide" opened up by the advent of mass culture – a divide which has played an important part in many accounts of the development of Modernism.

The extent of the turn-of-the-century print revolution is evident from the numbers: between 1885 and 1905 some 7,500 new periodical titles were established in the USA; in the same period there was a dramatic increase in both the number and circulation of newspapers in the UK and by 1922 the UK had more than 50,000 periodical titles. Equally evident is the cultural upheaval associated with this growth of the press and its audiences. Accounts of the development of literary modernism have often focused on the response of intellectuals to this cultural upheaval, exploring the ways in which they "voiced their hostilities and anxieties about the emergence of mass culture" [Carey] or sought to deploy the new opportunities offered by the new media and new technologies of media production – in their work and manifestos, both of which often appeared in the pages of what we know as the "Little Magazines".

But in many ways these debates were extensions of debates which had begun in an earlier phase of this print revolution in the mid nineteenth-century. My paper will revisit the rhetoric the debate about the “Great Divide” that opened up between high and low culture as a consequence of the rise of mass media and mass audiences at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This cultural fracture is often linked to the Northcliffe revolution in the newspaper press, inaugurated by the publication of the *Daily Mail* in 1896 and heralded by the development of the New Journalism of the 1880s, and specifically and the Newnes revolution associated with the founding of *Tit-bits* in 1881. Without seeking to deny the specificities of the circumstances of early twentieth-century print culture, I will focus on the way in which the terms of the Great Divide debate were developed in the mid-nineteenth-century. Eschewing modernist narratives of rupture – especially narratives of the break with the Victorian past – I will focus more on the continuities of the terms of debate in relation to longer term structural changes in the literary marketplace and the cultures of reading and writing. I shall examine various aspects of the mid-nineteenth-century response to the proliferation periodicals and newspapers, focusing on the construction of the modern, nervous, distracted subject. I shall also look, briefly at how mid-nineteenth-century Aestheticism responded to this media revolution in way which anticipated the development of early twentieth-century Modernisms.

Mary Poovey
New York University, USA

The Modernist Trajectory of Economics

Between 1870 and 1940—roughly the same period in which the generic conventions of Victorian realism were replaced by modernist conventions—the discipline of economics also experienced a dramatic change. In this paper I examine some of the stages of this change, which culminated in the discipline’s full embrace of mathematical formalism in the 1970s. I argue that economists’ turn to mathematics helped address a tension inherent in the most basic project of economics, as this practice had developed in Britain and the U. S. since the eighteenth century: the tension between the use of “literary” language to create a “true” description of empirically observable data, which was sometimes called “realism,” and the desire to state in theoretical and logical terms the inherent, supposedly universal “laws” of the economy. I examine three significant episodes in the discipline’s trajectory: William Stanley Jevons’s attempt to marry economics to mathematics in the 1870s; the 1920s debate about how to construct index numbers; and the translation, in 1937, of John Maynard Keynes’s theories about the national economy into a mathematical model. I leave it to members of the conference to discuss the implications of what looks like an overlap between aesthetic Modernism and its counterpart in economics, but I provide enough details about economics to begin the conversation.

Christine Reynier
University Montpellier 3—EMMA, France

Woolf and Ruskin in *The London Scene*: Challenging the (Dis)-Connections between Modernism and Aestheticism

In the early 1930s, when she had already made a name for herself by publishing *To the Lighthouse* or *The Waves*, Virginia Woolf wrote six essays, neither for the *TLS* nor for *The Criterion*, but for *Good Housekeeping* magazine, a magazine for women. In those essays, she takes up the tradition of the London sketch, a humble tradition without much ambition beyond that of the guidebook and the ethnographic exploration (Morehead).

I will argue that in those essays which have received little sustained critical attention, Woolf revitalises the tradition of the London sketch through a dialogue with John Ruskin, an aesthete who has long been banished from accounts of aestheticism focusing on Decadents but whom recent scholarship has claimed as belonging to “a more inclusive British aestheticism” (Maltz), inherently politicised, encompassing the art-loving aesthete as well as the reformer, Oscar Wilde as well as John Ruskin or William Morris. Likewise, in the book they edited on *Ruskin and Modernism*, Giovanni Cianci and Peter Nicholls point out that if Ruskin has remained a *point de repère* for historians of architecture and art, his “name has all but disappeared from the histories of literary modernism”; they argue that “Ruskin’s thought

none the less insinuated itself into the modernist aesthetic” of T. S. Eliot especially but also of Ford Madox Ford or D. H. Lawrence.

The aim of this article is to show that at a time when Ruskin was ignored or denounced, when F. R. Leavis, W. Empson and I.A. Richards “did not take into account visual arts in their analysis of the ‘modern movement’” (Cianci and Nicholls), Woolf wrote six essays on London that deal with architecture and photography, the two art forms Ruskin privileged, and enters into a silent dialogue with him. Turning to the detail of these somewhat discredited works published in a little magazine, I will show that they help to challenge some received ideas in modernist criticism (the break between modernism and its nineteenth-century predecessors, the great divide, etc.), ideas that New Modernist Studies have begun to question. Analysing the way in which Woolf inhabits and transforms Ruskin’s art and thoughts will highlight connections and disconnections between the modernist writer and “the generous-minded aesthete” (Gagnier) and between modernism and aestheticism themselves.

Jean-Paul Rosaye
University of Artois, France

F. H. Bradley’s Neoplatonic Turn in *Ethical Studies* (1876)

F. H. Bradley is usually referred to as one of the British neo-Hegelians of the late Victorian period. But the intersection of Hegelian thought with British philosophy at that time was not synonymous with total subservience to Hegel’s metaphysics, and Bradley’s philosophical development offers an appropriate perspective to assess the importance of this case.

The impact of the German idealist influence in the 19th century, and of Hegel’s in particular, is a major philosophical issue as it revealed the British capacity for producing a genuine form of idealism, suited to the British intellectual climate and respectful of a long-bred “tradition” to Platonism, or Neoplatonism.

The Hegelian influence on the British monists of the late 19th century (Edward Caird, Henry Jones, Bernard Bosanquet, F. H. Bradley) is now a well-known fact, and it has been increasingly studied since the 1980’s. But attention to the Platonic tinge in the English form of Idealism has been neglected despite its growing importance from Coleridge’s literary philosophy to Benjamin Jowett’s translation of Plato’s dialogues in the 1860’s, at a time when the Idealist movement started to challenge the existing philosophical schools.

Interestingly, this Platonic element had received some treatment at the beginning of the 20th century. Dean Inge had remarked the vantage point of using Bradley’s works as an introduction to Plotinus’ philosophy in his Gifford Lectures (1917-18), and he had referred to Bradley one more time in *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought* (1926) to unveil the tradition of “a third type of Christian thought and belief”. It was only a few years later (1931) that John Muirhead – for whom Bradley was the soul of the English Idealist movement – offered his classical analysis of the influence of Platonic thought in Anglo-Saxon philosophy.

That there might be some connection between this Platonic heritage and the gradual demise of the Idealist movement still remains to be fathomed.

Bertrand Russell, who acted as the main opponent to Idealism in England at the beginning of the 20th century, had been a Hegelian before changing tack and laying down the foundations of analytical philosophy in England. His book *My Philosophical Development* clearly exposes that his attack on Bradley capitalized on a bifurcation in the Idealist movement, due to some misunderstanding over the Hegelian influence. It is our contention that the source of this bifurcation can be traced back to Bradley’s Neoplatonic turn in his *Ethical Studies* (1876). In this book, Bradley meticulously designed a gradual transformation of his former Hegelian positions towards Neoplatonic intimations of the reflexive motion of the self towards consciousness and complete realization. The general acceptance of *Ethical Studies* as a key text in Idealist ethics confirmed the resurgence of interest in Platonism and the refusal of

Hegel's strong suggestion that philosophy was a science capable of reaching Absolute knowledge.

Bradley never stuck to just one school, or cherished just one single influence. His intention, clearly exposed in the prefaces of all his books, has always been to dynamize the study of philosophy in England, and the very fact his own ideas were challenged and gave rise to contrary philosophical movements was to him the proof he had succeeded in his efforts.

Accordingly, there are reasons to think that Bradley's turn from pure Hegelianism to aspects of the Platonic tradition had important consequences in the subsequent history of the British Idealist movement up to the rise of analytical philosophy in the 20th century. It is a point that Edward Caird might have foreseen in his preface to *Essays in Philosophical Criticism* (1883), a text meant to represent the Idealist manifesto before the split introduced by Seth in *Hegelianism and Personality* (1893), shortly after Bradley's publication of *Appearance and Reality* (1893).

**Stephen Ross,
University of Victoria, BC, Canada**

Speculative Modernism

My paper begins with a rise in the fortunes of speculation in the late nineteenth century in finance, science, philosophy. In finance, I refer to the sudden expansion of the Paris Bourse and the NYSE in the 1860s-1880s, the financial panics of 1873 and 1893, and the emergent shift from industrial to finance capitalism. In science, I refer to the rise of theoretical streams of inquiry such as evolution, psychoanalysis, and eventually relativity, which moved away from empiricism towards speculative approaches. In philosophy, I refer to the shift away from positivism and empiricism towards speculation, uncertainty, and indeterminacy exemplified in the career of Henry Sidgwick. In all three, speculation overcomes empiricism and installs faith in the unseen.

I then discuss two corresponding responses to this move: Aestheticism and Spiritualism. Both concern themselves with questions of economic and philosophical value. Aestheticism de-instrumentalizes aesthetic experience as a means to an end, and insists upon the inherent value of experience. That is, it eschews the temporal circuit of exchange altogether in favour of a full presence to experience that escapes ephemerality, yet without positing a noumenal realm to which aesthetic experience affords access. Spiritualism, by contrast, articulates a multitude of *fin-de-siècle* concerns about ethics and religion certainly, but also about money, matter, empire, sex, and property. Contrary to aestheticism, spiritualism was often instrumentalised as a means to discover eternal, familial, or personal truths. Indeed, so eminent a rationalist as Sidgwick served as president of the Society for Psychical Research and conducted work on their behalf in his quest for a non-religious metaphysical guarantee for ethics. Both Aestheticism and Spiritualism are speculative, but in different ways that correspond to different meanings of *speculation's* root word, *speculārī*: to observe *versus* to infer.

Modernism responds to these two formations by taking up the incitement to speculate itself as the locus of value: by making a virtue out of *neglect*. A work that is neglected, that is neg-ligible, is overlooked, to be sure, but at least implicitly because it is also un-readable. Neglect of paranormal phenomena motivates Sidgwick to join the SPR, and neglect of the beautiful in the everyday motivates the aesthete to contemplate. Modernist formal experimentation turns to a great extent on making works that are neg-ligible, that invite neglect. It presents us with objects that resist easy contemplation (Aestheticism) or translation into ends (Spiritualism). It thus generates both economic and philosophical value. Economically, it produces a commodity whose value lies in its resistance to consumption. It enforces speculation rather than exchange as a strategy of valuation by claiming status as high culture, worthy of collection. It produces philosophical value through the same strategy of resistance, challenging readers to engage with its difficulty as an incitement to speculate about the problem of difficulty itself. In this sense, it formally performs the resistance to knowing that Emmanuel Levinas insists is the key to wisdom: not overcoming alterity but embracing it and living with its challenge.

Unfortunately, making a virtue of neg-ligibility may succeed too well. The fourth and final part of my paper will discuss Lewis Grassie Gibbon in this context. Gibbon's *A Scots Quair* stages the conflict in value that I've outlined above in Chris Guthrie's experience of the deadlock between nature/intuition/tradition versus culture/learning/modernity, without privileging either side. Instead, Gibbon demonstrates how such tensions incite us to speculate, by allowing them to generate a

narrative that resists consumption and solicits neglect. Gibbon's prose holds us at a distance, keeping us from understanding fully what is happening. The same is true of Chris herself, and of the novel's Scottish modernism. I conclude by suggesting if we can learn to read *A Scots Quair's* neglect as a sign of value we can begin to confront Scottish modernism as a kind of speculative realism *avant la lettre*, an object-oriented ontology that challenges the *subject of modernism* in all its various valuations.

Max Saunders
King's College London, UK

Autobiografictional Genealogies of Modernism

One of the chief forms in which prose writers presented aesthetic experience at the turn of the century was through the kinds of narrative that Stephen Reynolds in 1906 defined as "autobiografiction": "a record of real spiritual experiences strung on a credible but more or less fictitious autobiographical narrative". Drawing on the exploration of this concept in my book *Self Impression: Life-Writing, Autobiografiction and the Forms of Modern Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), I shall propose that autobiografiction represents an important current flowing from Aestheticism into Modernism.

At stake are four related terms which are renegotiated as Aestheticism turns into Modernism: autobiography; personality; portraiture; impression. The inward – and impressionist – turn of the late nineteenth-century ushers in a new awareness of the autobiographical aspect of all perception and expression. But paradoxically – and as we see most clearly in the case of Walter Pater – the very impressionism that resolves the external world into our perceptual awareness of it, simultaneously dissolves the perceiving subject into the flux of those impressions. Look for the Child in the House, and you're left with the glimpses of the House in the Child. The focus on subjectivity finds not the subject, but the object. Something similar happens in Wilde and Nietzsche, who argue for the primacy of personality, but whose personalities – as they present them in their writings – appear artificial, paradoxical, and profoundly unfamiliar quantities. The quest to luxuriate in the self engenders a profound scepticism about that self.

Something comparable occurs within the notion of portraiture, as Pater introduces the concept of the "imaginary portrait". Again, the artist's giving of their attention to the look of the other here turns into an expression of the imaginative powers of the observer. The portrait to that extent becomes a self-portrait – an expression of the subject's imagination. But again a self portrait that doesn't resemble the self: that, in Žižek's Lacanian terminology, is in a condition of parallax; not identical with itself. The act of portraiture opens up a space between the subject and its representation.

Autobiografiction proves an agile means of negotiating these issues. It's posing of the other as (like the) self – the fictionalized character whose fictionalized story nonetheless captures the author's truest experiences – conversely expresses the way the self can seem (like the) other. Once such self-consciousness is reintroduced into life-writing forms (after all, it had been prominent in the novel, and autobiography, in their eighteenth-century manifestations), they become sites of modernist irony and play.

All of these moves are detectable in Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist*, say. The trope of portraiture for the capturing of aesthetic experience; the paradoxical play of im/personality in the attempt; the resultant foregrounding of impressionist intensity at the expense of narrative subjectivity.

The paper will contrast specific modes in which Modernism returns to, and upon, *fin-de-siècle* autobiografiction. First, the collection of imaginary portraits, in which the lineages of Pater's *Imaginary Portraits* and Symonds' *Spiritual Adventures* might be traced in Richard Aldington's *Soft Answers* or even Joyce's *Dubliners*. Second, the production of heteronymic autobiography, from Mark Rutherford to Alice B. Toklas. And third, when aesthetic life writing is turned to verse, as in Eliot's "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" or Pound's *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley*.

Ana Parejo Vadillo
Birkbeck College, London, UK

An (Expatriate) Aesthete in Paris

"Darling", wrote the aesthete and poet A. Mary F. Robinson (a close friend of Walter Pater, Oscar Wilde and of the Jewish writer Amy Levy) to her soon-to-be husband the French philosopher James Darmesteter, "shall I tell you something: I am so glad you are a Jew! I used to dislike Jews so much I could not bear to know them; and I was always very honestly ashamed of this prejudice which

however I could not conquer: & lo! In one day it is utterly gone" (Anglais 249). A shocking reminder of the anti-Semitic strain of British Aestheticism, this unpublished letter captures a clear and radical shift in Robinson's ethics and aesthetics which changed the landscape of British Aestheticism. Against the wishes of her family and friends (including Henry James and John Addington Symonds), Robinson left her lover, the aesthete Vernon Lee, to marry Darmesteter. She also left London, where she had held an aesthetic salon attended by the key figures of British Aestheticism, and moved to Paris where her cosmopolitan at homes in Rue Bara became the centre of a complex international network of aesthetes, from Arthur Symonds, Henry James, Havelock Ellis and Ernest Renan to Paul Bourget and Bahramjee Malabari. Poets, historians, journalists and scientists, who spoke Gujerati, Hebrew, French, and English, came from all over the world to Robinson and Darmsteter's "square white salon of the Rue Bara" (Robinson, *Cosmopolis* l:l p. 398).

This paper examines what the expatriation of A. Mary F. Robinson did to her poetics and to her vision of what we call today "British" aestheticism. Focusing on Robinson's 1893 volume of poems *Retrospect*, her first book of new poems after moving to Paris, this paper looks at how Robinson re-invented the model of cosmopolitanism she had constructed in London by opening the door of her "at homes" (and the door of her poetry) to thinkers and writers whose views about poetics, politics and race placed them at the forefront of radical European thinking about nationhood and empire. I will argue that while in her previous work, her poetry belonged to a model of cosmopolitan life based on love (what I call "affective cosmopolitanism"), her new work, with vivid poems about La Seine, Parisian crowds and marching soldiers sees her engaging and turning linguistically to other cultures, the East, and to other intellectual influences, in particular French philosophy of science (her term), while her poetry remained distinctly English and distinctly decadent. Her new poetry, I will argue, was above all about re-inscribing into the fin de siècle a historical humanist poetics.

Fabio Vericat
University Complutense, Madrid

Playing it by Ear: Pictorial Aestheticism and the Political Challenge of Acoustic Modernity in Henry James's Narrative Method

This paper wants to argue that the visual bias of Victorian Aestheticism belied the uproar of popular culture increasingly laced with mechanic sounds and the raised voices of those wanting to make themselves heard. An unfolding interest in acoustics, scientific, technological and political, gradually permeates into literary aesthetics by, for example, redefining its sounds, which had been traditionally dominated by the lyricism of an idealized human voice, closer to music than actual speech.

Henry James was clearly attracted by the latest development in Pre-Raphaelite painting as a narrative model. It helped him reconcile French Realism with his American literary inheritance, the Romance. Thus, his initial misgivings about what he called "erudite painting" also offered him a way of making his writing more representational by bridging the gap between image and text. It was, for the novel, a way out of a suffocating sense of entrapment in the alphabetic abstraction of its typography by reaching out towards the superior status of the visual arts. Yet, the developments in the scientific understanding of acoustic and its ensuing technology (phonetic shorthand, the phonograph, the telegraph, the telephone) throughout the 19th century would increasingly remind the writer that, after all, his natural register was acoustic, that of the phonetic alphabet. Thus, James's initial enthusiasm for the lessons of visual Aestheticism in the 1860s though the 1880s in practice dwindles proportionally to his awareness that reading a novel need not be understood simply in terms of ocular experience but of performance. Yet in his final years James was still holding on to the Pre-Raphaelite model in praising Balzac's literary realism in terms of the aesthetic lesson learnt from painting.

Such reticence about literary sounds has its roots in the fear that the acoustic realm is potentially a disabling blindness, but also a register dominated by the voices of the masses. I would like to argue that such anxiety is inherited by Modernist aesthetics, as illustrated, for instance, by T.S. Eliot's ambivalent suspicion of the "auditory imagination" in poetry and

outright condemnation of the “inner voice” in politics. For his part, in “The Question of Our Speech” (1905), James had demanded that proper speech is only legitimate when warranted by literary enunciation. It is a testament of Modernist caution about the acoustic rupture provoked by the fruits of 19th-century mass literacy. Even if such empowerment may have been democratizing, it also suggested the cacophonous threat posed by voices on the loose. The challenge for Modernists was to rethink its inherited imagistic bias or else drown in the uproar of the disenfranchised.