

BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Calè, Luisa (2015) 'A Gallery in the Mind'? Hazlitt, Spenser, and the Old Masters. *Tate Papers* 24 , ISSN 1753-9854.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/13338/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

‘A Gallery in the Mind’? Hazlitt, Spenser, and the Old Masters

Summary:

‘An old lady, to whom Pope one day read some passages out of Spenser’s “Faerie Queene,” said that he had been entertaining her with a gallery of pictures’. Published in Joseph Spence’s *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men* (1820), this scene of reading reached a new public brought together by a new culture of Old Master paintings shaped by the establishment of temporary exhibitions at the British Institution. Drawing on Francis Haskell’s notion of the ephemeral museum, this paper explores William Hazlitt’s association of Spenser with the Old Masters in his Lecture on Chaucer and Spenser (1818) and his essay on ‘Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim’, which was the last instalment of his British Galleries of Art published in the *London Magazine* in 1823. Building on the work of Jonathan Richardson, who had placed an intermedial art of memory at the centre of his ‘science of a connoisseur’, Hazlitt advocated a practice of ‘reading with the eyes of a connoisseur’. Through the pages of the *Faerie Queene* Hazlitt imagined a new gallery of painting, a ‘gallery of the mind’ that could be abstracted from the aristocratic world of old master collections and the Spenserian productions of modern painters.

Keywords: William Hazlitt, Edmund Spenser, periodical press, *London Magazine*, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, Art of Memory, Ephemeral Museum, Jonathan Richardson, Allegory, Portraiture, British Institution, Blenheim Palace, Poussin, Rubens, Titian, Ekphrasis.

Through the pages of Edmund Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* (1596) William Hazlitt imagined a new gallery of paintings abstracted from the aristocratic world of Old Master collections and the Spenserian productions of modern painters. His critical interventions illuminate new ways of seeing opened up with the invention of the temporary exhibition in the early nineteenth century, a phenomenon captured by Francis Haskell’s notion of *The Ephemeral Museum*.¹ Hazlitt’s art criticism explored how viewers treasured pictures ‘in the chambers of the brain’, or in ‘a gallery in the mind’, and learned to ‘read poetry with the eyes of a connoisseur’. In this essay I will explore Hazlitt’s association of Spenser with the Old Masters starting with his Lecture on Chaucer and Spenser (1818) and ending with the poet’s reappearance in

the last of Hazlitt's *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England*, 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim', first published in 1823 in the *London Magazine*. Founded in 1820 to express the culture of the metropolis, this periodical aimed 'to convey the very "image, form, and pressure" of that "*mighty heart*" whose vast pulsations circulate life, strength, and spirits, throughout this great empire'.² From the public lecture to the medium of the periodical, Hazlitt used Spenser's poetry as a way into a world of Old Master paintings temporarily available on the London scene. Imagining the Old Masters translating Spenser's visionary art on canvas involves an exercise in hypothetical history: going against the record of early modern painting Hazlitt opened up an alternative visual tradition fuelled by the visionary power of literary invention.

'When artists or connoisseurs talk on stilts about the poetry of painting, they shew that they know little about poetry, and have little love for the art'.³ This denunciation of the cant of criticism appears in 'On Poetry in General', Hazlitt's first Lecture on the English Poets delivered at the Surrey Institution in January 1818. Hazlitt's claim about the specificity of poetry harks back to Edmund Burke's influential argument about the differences between the arts, and challenges the critical tradition that drew on Aristotle's concept of *enargeia* to interpret poetry in terms of its visual power to produce images in the eye of the reader.⁴ Editing Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene* in 1758, John Upton declared the Elizabethan poet 'unrivalled in the visionary art of bringing objects before your eyes, and making you a spectator of his imaginary representations'.⁵ How this visionary art could be captured on canvas was a challenge modern painters took up in works exhibited year after year at the Royal Academy from 1772 and at the British Institution from 1809. In the first Arts Column published in the *Analytical Review* in June 1788 Henry Fuseli argued that 'the excellence of pictures or of language consists in raising clear,

complete, and circumstantial images, and turning readers into spectators'.⁶ Fuseli's claim gave prominence to Thomas Macklin's Poets' Gallery, where Fuseli's 'Prince Arthur's Vision' as well as John Opie's *The Freeing of Amoret, by Britomartis*, Richard Cosway's *Sans Loy Killing the Lyon*, and *Amoret rapt by Greddie Lust* by Martin.⁷ In 1818 Hazlitt's point against poetical paintings went against an established tradition in modern art.

However, Hazlitt's pattern of thinking as an essayist involved trying out reverse positions. In his second Lecture on the English Poets, dedicated to Chaucer and Spenser, he went on to imagine a gallery of portraits coming out of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*: 'The description of Hope, in this series of historical portraits, is one of the most beautiful in Spenser: and the triumph of Cupid at the mischief he has made, is worthy of the malicious urchin deity'.⁸ Hazlitt's art historical language turns Spenser's stanzas into a series of pictures. His gallery of words prompts easy referential anchoring to the modern exhibition scene. A generation of sitters had been taking the allegorical features of characters from the *Faerie Queene*. The first was a portrait exhibited at the third Royal Academy exhibition in 1772 under the title of 'Una' by Benjamin West,⁹ who had played a key role in establishing the Royal Academy and was appointed Historical Painter to the King in the same year. A review indicated that the subject 'is founded upon a passage in Spencer [sic], which as the author is but little read at present, I shall take the liberty of giving you at length', and went on to quote two stanzas from the *Faerie Queene*.¹⁰ Spenser's poem reached the new public of exhibitions in the form of catalogue entries, print captions, and articles in newspapers and periodicals. In anchoring portraits to quotations, paintings circulate the poem as a gallery of excerpts. Conversely, literature offered a store of subjects for modern painters keen to establish a British

School of painting. The visual power of literary invention to elevate portraiture to the higher genre of poetical painting is crystallized in Sir Thomas Lawrence's portrait of Lady Leicester as Hope at Sir John Fleming Leicester's Gallery of British Paintings, which opened to the public in Spring 1818.¹¹

Yet Hazlitt's choice ignores the work of modern painters. As private collections opened to the public and temporary exhibitions brought Old Master paintings to the British Institution, Spenser's 'visionary art' took on new aesthetic possibilities:

In reading these descriptions, one can hardly avoid being reminded of Rubens's allegorical pictures; but the account of Satyrane taming the Lion's whelps and lugging the bear's cubs along in his arms while yet an infant, whom his mother so naturally advises to 'go seek some other play-fellows,' has even more of this high picturesque character. Nobody but Rubens could have painted the fancy of Spenser.¹²

The choice to celebrate Spenser for his fancy in 1818 marks Hazlitt's rejection of S.T. Coleridge's recent critical appraisal of the respective powers of fancy and imagination in *Biographia Literaria* (1817). For Coleridge, Aristotle's psychology spells out 'the universal law of the *passive* fancy and the *mechanical* memory': in Aristotle's system 'ideas by long having been together acquire a power of recalling each other; or every partial representation awakes the total representation of which it had been a part'.¹³ In his review of Coleridge's *Biographia* Hazlitt ridiculed Coleridge's attempt to 'desynonymize' the imagination from the fancy and to assign them to different faculties: 'the author deludes us with a view of the Promised Land

that divides the region of Fancy from those of the Imagination'.¹⁴ While Coleridge's poetic genealogy supports the autonomy of the imagination, Hazlitt embraces Spenser's pictorialism to articulate a 'Romantic counter-poetics of the fancy'.¹⁵ In bringing Rubens to the eyes of the reader, Spenser's 'picturesque' mythological compositions activate an intermedial power of invention.

What is involved in comparing Spenser to Rubens? What does Rubens mean for the public of Hazlitt's lectures? For *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Hazlitt's lecturing exemplifies 'the egotism of the Cockneys', 'lecturers of the Surrey Institution, and editors of Sunday papers', 'Hunt, the Cockney Homer, Hazlitt, the Cockney Aristotle, and Haydon, the Cockney Raphael'. Lecturing at the Surrey Institution provides the scene for Hazlitt: 'Mr Hazlitt cannot look round him at the Surrey, without resting his smart eye on the idiot admiring grin of several dozens of aspiring apprentices and critical clerks'.¹⁶ *Blackwood's* social satire captures the cultural breadth and ambition of Hunt and Hazlitt, and then debunks them through the choice of adjective, which localises their cultural referents and thus challenges the credibility of culture for the urban middle classes. By contrast, Hazlitt's association of Spenser to Rubens opens up a cosmopolitan field of comparison, and situates English literature and the metropolitan exhibition scene within a European visual tradition.¹⁷ In bringing Old Masters to public view, the invention of the temporary exhibition generates new ways of seeing, new forms of comparison, and a new critical practice. Hazlitt's writing addresses its new public and shapes art as a subject for 'Table Talks' around a new 'Round Table', which reimagines the communal culture of Arthurian Romance as a virtual gathering for a periodical reading nation.¹⁸ How did his readers see Old Master paintings? How did the

'substantial entertainment' of painting make them 'read poetry with the eye of a connoisseur'?¹⁹

At the British Institution

Hazlitt's pictorial Spenser is best understood in the context of Old Master exhibitions at the British Institution. In comparing Spenser to Rubens Hazlitt could count on his readers' memory of the Rubenses in the loan exhibition of Flemish and Dutch paintings at the British Institution in 1815.²⁰ Rubens's allegories were on view when he discussed Spenser as 'the painter of abstractions'.²¹ Another loan exhibition of the Italian and Spanish Schools brought paintings by Titian, Poussin, Raphael, Correggio, and Claude to the British Institution the following year.²² The comparative canon of these temporary exhibitions helped Hazlitt articulate the concept of 'gusto' as 'power or passion defining any object', made apparent in the 'flesh-colour' of Titian, which 'seems sensitive and alive all over; not merely to have the look and texture of flesh, but the feeling in itself'. Its 'truth of passion' is conveyed by 'that sort of tingling sensation to the eye, which the body feels within itself'. The experience of the senses is not subsumed under more disembodied frames of artistic appreciation; instead, the encounter with the Old Masters produces a physical awakening in which 'the impression made on one sense excites by affinity those of another'.²³ Hazlitt's physiological account of the effects of painting opens up an empiricist and multisensorial aesthetic.

The pulse of nature defines Hazlitt's preference for the Old Masters over modern painters in his polemical response to the satirical *Catalogue Raisonné of the British Institution*, an anonymous attack attributed to Robert Smirke and penned within Royal Academy circles, which expressed the position of modern painters

against the aristocrats and connoisseurs associated with the British Institution. For Hazlitt 'the works of the moderns are not, like those of the Old Masters, a second nature', which provides 'the stay, the guide and anchor of our purest thoughts; whom having once seen we always remember, and who teach us to see all things through them'. Hazlitt's defines second nature through a quotation from William Wordsworth's *Tintern Abbey*.²⁴ Wordsworth's poem celebrates the power of nature as an underlying presence, which acts differently from 'a landscape to a blind man's eye': its memory is 'felt in the blood, and felt along the heart'. Hazlitt inflects Wordsworth's lines to articulate a different kind of 'restoration' effected by the enhanced experience of nature captured in Old Master paintings, which provide a source of energy that can counteract absence and the intervals of time.²⁵ At the heart of Hazlitt's argument is 'Rubens, around whose pencil gorgeous shapes thronged numberless, startling us by the novel accidents of form and colour, putting the spirit of motion into the universe, and weaving a gay fantastic round and Bacchanalian dance with nature'.²⁶ Rubens's *Bacchanalians*, on loan to the British Institution from the collection of the Duke of Marlborough at Blenheim, is central to Hazlitt's 'Fine Arts' entry of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* written in the same year, in which he declares Rubens unrivalled 'in the grotesque style of history', for the 'striking contrasts of form are combined with every kind of rapid and irregular movement [...] Witness his Silenus at Blenheim, where the lines seem drunk and staggering'.²⁷ Hazlitt's appreciation of Rubens is in stark contrast to the *Catalogue Raisonné*, which denounces Rubens's 'bestial production' for 'the brutal and disgusting exhibition it offers to the eyes of the spectator', judged particularly inappropriate 'in an Exhibition which is made the medium of collecting together the female branches of the higher classes'. Rubens's eroticism marks the boundary

between the martial virility of the first Duke of Marlborough and the gendered economy of early nineteenth-century public exhibitions. For the *Catalogue Raisonné* Rubens's painting presents 'monsters that must put every degree of feminine decency and delicacy to the blush',²⁸ for Hazlitt it captures the energy of the elemental powers of nature.

In focusing on the physiological pleasures of painting, Hazlitt's appreciation of Rubens participates in the embodied aesthetic stigmatized by John Gibson Lockhart in a series of eight articles published in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* under the title 'The Cockney School of Poetry' between October 1817 and July 1825.²⁹ Lockhart's attacks denounce the effeminacy, libertinism, and heterodox sexuality of the poetry published by the urban group of writers and artists revolving around the radical writer and editor Leigh Hunt and his publication network. The 'extreme moral depravity of the Cockney School' is exemplified, for Lockhart, by Hunt's *Story of Rimini* (1816).³⁰ Hazlitt collaborated with Hunt on the Round Table series published in Hunt's *Examiner* between 1814 and 1817 and collected as a collaborative volume under Hazlitt's name in 1817. Set against *Blackwood's* denunciation of the Cockney School in 1817, Hunt's Preface to *Foliage* (1818) reads like a 'cockney manifesto', argues Jeffrey Cox,³¹ for it promotes a middle-class sensibility that delights in the physical response to art criticized by Lockhart. Hunt advocates 'Grecian mythology not as a set of school-boy commonplaces which it was thought manly to give up, but as something which it requires more than mere scholarship to understand'.³² Reclaiming mythology from the restricted circulation of the classically educated and offering it to a broader public involved formulating an 'aesthetics of pleasure' for a new aesthetic subject.³³ Against the 'frigid imagination' of Boileau, Quinault and modern criticism, against the commodification of gods and goddesses as 'a set of

'toys for the ladies', shepherds and shepherdesses on mantle-pieces, Hunt turned to the Elizabethans and Jacobeans: 'Spenser, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher evidently sparkled up, and had their most graceful perceptions upon them, whenever they turned to the fair forms and leafy luxuries of ancient imagination'.³⁴ In Hunt's account Elizabethan and Jacobean literature activated the palpable pleasures of nature. Rubens had a similar potential for nineteenth-century viewers: his paintings opened up a classical world ready to break loose from the restraint of a culture of commonplaces. While the *Catalogue Raisonné* saw in the 'abominable and gross sensualities' of Rubens's painting the bad judgement and morality of the British Institution Directors, suggesting that its exposure subverted codes of public display, for Hazlitt it offered an alternative form of aesthetic appreciation based on passion and embodiment rather than control and detachment.

This aesthetic is crucial to reading Spenser in 1818. To argue that Spenser's *Faerie Queene* brings to mind 'Rubens's allegorical pictures' is to activate their erotic charge, to reclaim the text from its circulation as a store of aristocratic inflections of female virtue, and therefore to discard modern painters' fancy portraits. If 'nobody but Rubens could have painted the fancy of Spenser', his corpus is likely to generate images incompatible with modern re-enactments such as Miss Elizabeth Beauclerk posing as Sir Joshua Reynolds's Una,³⁵ or Lady Leicester as Sir Thomas Lawrence's Hope. Opting for Rubens instead means rejecting portraiture and freeing up Spenser's text from its appropriations as a series of moral portraits illustrating commonplace conduct book virtues. Abstracted from aristocratic ownership, patronage networks, and the strictures of modern painters and their codes of public display, Rubens and Spenser can flesh out an alternative 'reawakening of the poetical faculty'. Their allegories open up new 'realities of the imagination'.³⁶

Hazlitt's engagement with the world of exhibitions may seem contradictory: on the one hand he lectured and wrote for radical periodicals, presenting the pleasures of the Old Masters to a wider urban constituency of viewers, who could peruse Old Master paintings on loan to the British Institution, or experience them vicariously through the pages of periodicals. On the other hand, in defending the Old Masters rather than modern painters, Hazlitt took sides with the connoisseurs rather than the Royal Academicians. His denunciation of the short-sighted position of modern painters was part of his critique of corporate interests and restrictions on the practice, codification, and judgment of art;³⁷ it was not a retrograde identification with the Directors of the British Institution. Hazlitt's politics of art is best understood in relation to the republican field of art embodied in the Louvre, which had opened to the public as the museum of French citizens in 1793.³⁸ Hazlitt expresses his support for a republican field of art in discussions about the restitution of Napoleonic spoils in 1814 and 1815.³⁹ Memories of his personal encounter with the republican sublimity of the Louvre during the Peace of Amiens in 1802 keep coming back in later years. Remembering being hailed as a citizen by the republican porters meant thinking of the republican promise of art as a temporary possibility.⁴⁰ The restitution of the Napoleonic spoils emphasized the dynamic of presence, absence, and the memory of alternative orders of painting in the ephemeral museum. Ways of seeing in the ephemeral museum are central to Hazlitt's writing of the early 1820s. The experience of painting involved a new art of memory.

A Gallery in the Mind

The relationship between memory, place, and painting is rooted in classical ekphrasis, which preserves paintings that have not survived in the form of a

collection of words. This technique of memory can be extended to pictures seen on the Grand Tour or at temporary exhibitions. In turn, the experience of paintings can shape reading practices that bring pictures before the eyes of the reader. On the complementary relationship between poetry and painting Hazlitt drew on the painter, collector, and art critic Jonathan Richardson. 'By Painting we are taught to form Ideas of what we read', he argued in *An Essay on Theory of Painting* (1715).⁴¹ In his attempt to establish the 'science of a connoisseur' Richardson expanded his analysis of the cognitive connections between seeing and reading. Central to this science is a peculiar practice of collecting, 'the getting a fine Collection of Mental Pictures'. This virtual collection harks back to the tradition of the art of memory, which turned texts into a series of images to be mentally arranged into consecutive places within an architectural space, usually a series of rooms in a palace, or of doors along a road. In turn, composition would consist in a mental walk through the topology of memory.⁴² Drawing on this early modern tradition, Richardson emphasized the interdependence of poetry and painting. His intermedial art of memory consisted in 'furnishing the Mind with Pleasing Images; whether of things Real, or Imaginary; whether of our own forming, or borrow'd from Others. This is a Collection which every one may have, and which will finely employ every vacant moment of ones time.'⁴³ What Richardson meant by 'everyone' is quite different from Hazlitt's early nineteenth-century periodical reader. Richardson addressed 'people of condition' coming back from the Grand Tour when he gave 'a Specimen or two of these in the Delicate, and in the Great kind, or to speak more like a Connoisseur, in the *Parmegiano*, and in the *Rafaelle* Taste; and both out of *Milton*'.⁴⁴ However, radical changes in the culture of art brought these gestures of critical appreciation home to Hazlitt's early nineteenth-century periodical reader.

Hazlitt first mentioned Richardson as a bad influence on Sir Joshua Reynolds, the first President of the Royal Academy, whose ‘logical acuteness’, Hazlitt argued, ‘was not such as to enable him to detect the verbal fallacies and speculative absurdities which he had learned from Richardson’.⁴⁵ Hazlitt’s own debt to Richardson comes across in ‘On the Pleasure of Painting’, the fifth essay published in the Table Talk series, which appeared as the opening feature in *The London Magazine* in December 1820. Hazlitt’s essay ends with pages of quotations from Richardson’s *Science of a Connoisseur*,⁴⁶ and thus transfers the extended powers of vision that Richardson had promised connoisseurs to the periodical reader of his Table Talks: ‘their Eyes being once open’d ’tis like a New Sense, and New Pleasures flow in as often as the Objects of that Superinduc’d Sight present themselves’.⁴⁷ A memory of Richardson’s enhanced sensorium marks the language of visual enthusiasm adopted by Hazlitt to describe his encounter with paintings exhibited at the sale of the Orléans Gallery: ‘a mist passed away from my sight: the scales fell off. A new sense came upon me, a new heaven and a new earth stood before me’.⁴⁸ Hazlitt’s visual transfiguration endows Richardson’s promise of a new sight with medical and religious iconography. Alluding to the eye condition of Saul in the Acts of the Apostles and Adam in book XI of *Paradise Lost*, Hazlitt draws on the symptoms and remedies of eye medicine to present the transition from print to painting as an enhanced power of vision comparable to the effects of a cataract operation.⁴⁹ The new field of the visible is equated to the new heaven and earth of Revelation.⁵⁰ Yet this is where the transfiguration takes on a secular turn, for instead of the vision of the holy city, Hazlitt conjures up a new world of Old Master paintings.

In ‘On the Pleasure of Painting’ Hazlitt followed Richardson’s curatorial injunction to assemble in a mental gallery paintings dispersed in different collections,

which he later discussed in a series of essays published in the *London Magazine* in 1822-23, and collected in volume form under the title *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England* in 1824. His selection includes the Clades in Lord Radnor's Park, Van Dyck at Wilton-house and Blenheim, 'where there is ... the most magnificent collection of Rubenses in the world':

The young artist makes a pilgrimage to each of these places, eyes them wistfully at a distance ... at last, is ushered into the room where his treasure is, the idol of his vows – some speaking face or bright landscape! It is stamped on his brain, and lives there thenceforward, a tally for nature, and a test of art. He furnishes out the chambers of the mind from the spoils of time, picks and chooses which shall have the best places – nearest his heart.⁵¹

Like Napoleon's, abstracted from their physical locations, Hazlitt's 'spoils' articulate an alternative order.⁵² The curatorial hang in 'the chambers of the mind' expresses the painter's 'interest in them of which the owner is scarce conscious'.

The anatomy of Hazlitt's mental gallery harks back to 'Remarks on the Systems of Hartley and Helvetius', published in 1805, in which Hazlitt draws on Locke's metaphor of the closet and the camera obscura to explain perception as the production of images in the tabula rasa of the mind:

If the mind is but a sort of inner room where the images of external things like pictures in a gallery are lodged safe, and dry out of the reach of the turbulence of the senses, but remaining as distinct from, and if I may so say as perfectly unknown to one another as the pictures on a wall, there being no general faculty to overlook and give notice of their several impressions, this

medium is without any use.⁵³

In Hazlitt's associationist analysis, the picture gallery stands for the possibility of a well-ordered perception as well as for its dystopian alternative, a series of disconnected and random images 'unknown to one another as the pictures on a wall'. The turn from Locke's camera obscura to Hazlitt's picture gallery is symptomatic of competing orders of viewing in early nineteenth-century visual culture. Unreasonable hanging criteria are central to the *Catalogue Raisonné of the British Institution*, which criticises the directors for relegating Poussin's historical compositions out of the way, in corners, and requests 'the proprietors of the better works, to look and see whose and what those are, which occupy the best lights and the most prominent places. Let Mr Hope turn his eyes to his Temptation of Christ by Titian; Mr West, to his Guido, Lord Egremont, to his Claude; Lady Lucas, to her Titians; the owners of all the Nichola Poussins [sic], to their Pictures – and say, if these works, which are truly admirable, are not sacrificed by their situations?' The conclusion suggests that the hang reflects the interests of the Directors, 'gentlemen and other dealers'.⁵⁴

By contrast, choice, rather than chance or blind mechanism, governs the painter's mental collection. A meritocratic art of memory revives Richardson's eighteenth-century art of reading and selects pictures from aristocratic collections for the chambers of the brain of the middle-class reader. Which paintings should be hung in the mental gallery becomes the critical question. This is the new dialogic ground for the argument between modern painters and Old Masters. While *The Examiner* enjoins the public of taste who cannot afford to buy Benjamin Robert Haydon's picture of *Christ's Agony in The Garden* to hang it 'in the gallery of their

minds',⁵⁵ Hazlitt draws on *Hamlet* and an Old Master painting at the British Institution to reassert his choice in 'On a Landscape of Nicolas Poussin': 'It is a luxury to have the walls of our rooms hung round with them, and no less so to have such a gallery in the mind, to con over the relics of ancient art bound up "within the book and volume of the brain, unmixed (if it were possible) with baser matter!"'⁵⁶ Hazlitt applies the *Examiner's* formula of 'the gallery in the mind' to produce an alternative canon. 'From the table of my memory / I'll wipe away all trivial fond records, / all books, all forms, all pressures past', says Hamlet, to preserve the commandment of the father. Hazlitt shares Hamlet's desire to devote undivided attention to his relics, wipe out all trivia, and make space for the Old Masters. Instead of Haydon, Hazlitt opts for Poussin.

Through *Hamlet* Hazlitt's recollection of the Old Masters takes on an intermedial form. In the incongruous space of the brain, the dimensions of the gallery can find a place within a book and within the brain. Hazlitt's virtual play points to the materiality of the medium and hybrid practices of inscription.⁵⁷ His reference to binding suggests a shift from the gallery to the codex as a support of memory - an archival form in which extraneous objects can be interleaved, treasured, preserved. From the walls of the British Institution, as 'a set of chosen images, a stream of pleasant thoughts passing through the mind', pictures take temporary virtual form on 'the walls of our rooms' and in 'a gallery in the mind'. Finally, they are 'bound up "within the book and volume of the brain"'. While alliteration attempts to seal the analogy between 'book' and 'brain', the rhetorical figure of the hendiadys rewards the 'book' in the 'volume of the brain', and indicates the metamorphic dynamism of its unfolding.⁵⁸ The expanding capacity of this medium suits Hazlitt's image of a repository that can welcome the endless store of Old Masters on view at the British

Institution year after year. As a material inscription that requires the binding of loose sheets within a pre-existing volume, Hazlitt's mental gallery evokes the dynamic and hybrid form of the extra-illustrated book.

Mary Favret argues that 'the move from gallery to book replicates Hazlitt's biographical (and vexed) turn away from a career in painting to a career in writing'.⁵⁹ For Deidre Lynch Hazlitt's quotation from Hamlet mediates the metamorphosis of art into literature.⁶⁰ Yet the hybrid form in which Old Masters are entered within the volume of the brain indicates that art and literature cannot be kept distinct. In an earlier essay Hazlitt had argued that 'the arts of painting and poetry are conversant with the world of thought within us, and with the world of sense without us, with what we know, and see, and feel intimately'.⁶¹ In 'On the Pleasure of Painting' the conversation between the arts depends on a specific material form. Its intermedial art of memory exemplifies the work of art in the age of technical reproducibility. Painting and poetry become mutually reinforcing complementary practices when temporary exhibitions can be recollected and reimagined through the medium of the book as a support for the convergence of reading and viewing.

'How painting can teach the viewer 'to read poetry with the eye of a connoisseur' is articulated in Hazlitt's essay on the poetry of George Crabbe, published in the *London Magazine* in May 1821. Sir Joshua Reynolds's recommendation of Crabbe's *The Village* to Samuel Johnson is part of a story that attributes to the study of the fine arts the ability to restore 'our eye for nature', doing away with 'book-learning, the accumulation of wordy commonplaces, the gaudy pretensions of poetical diction'. As an imitative art that 'cannot subsist for a moment on empty generalities',⁶² painting acts as a corrective to the abstractions of writing: 'little captivated with smooth, polished, unmeaning periods', the connoisseur 'would

turn with double eagerness and relish to the force and precision of individual details, transferred as it were to the page from the canvas. Thus an admirer of Teniers and Hobbima [sic] might think little of the pastoral sketches of Pope or Goldsmith'. Turning away from what Thomson 'sees in his mind's eye', 'the adept in Dutch interiors, hovels, and pig-styes must find in such a writer as Crabbe a man after his own heart'. If Dutch painting shaped a taste for Crabbe, his poetry was subjected to the test of the exhibition and found less effective than the paintings of David Wilkie.⁶³ Complementary practices of reading and viewing generated an intermedial art of criticism.

In the early 1820s reading Spenser's *Faerie Queene* as an ekphrastic work that could preserve, recall, or invent a world of pictures was supported by one of Alexander Pope's anecdotes from the previous century: 'after my reading a canto of Spenser two or three days ago to an old lady between 70 and 80, she said that I had been showing her a collection of pictures'.⁶⁴ Published in Joseph Spence's *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men* (1820), reviewed in the *London Magazine* in February, and by Hazlitt in the *Edinburgh Magazine* in May, this scene of reading reached a new public. Through Pope's Spenser and Richardson's intermedial art of memory Romantic periodicals could appropriate and reinvent earlier ways of seeing and measure up changes that had taken place in emerging art practices. What paintings did Pope's old lady see in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*? What could readers of Romantic periodicals see in Spenser's poem in the 1820s?

Mythological and ekphrastic writing was singled out as a characteristic of cockney poetry by *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, with Leigh Hunt's pictorial allusions to Polyphemus debunked as 'nothing more than a copy in words of a picture in oil'. The Cockney School's use of public spaces as sites of composition

was deplored for the ostentatious ‘fashion of firing off sonnets … in Sir John Leicester’s Gallery’.⁶⁵ Keats’s *Endymion* exercised *Blackwood’s* for belonging to ‘the Cockney School of Politics, as well as the Cockney School of Poetry’: ‘Endymion is not a Greek shepherd, loved by a Greecian goddess; he is merely a young cockney rhymester, dreaming a phantastic dream at the full of the moon’.⁶⁶ In turning an apprentice away from the respectable profession of medicine, Keats’s metromania is for *Blackwood’s* emblematic of the disease that is perverting society. The *London Magazine* was founded as an organ of metropolitan culture with the express aim to challenge ‘The Mohock Magazine’. *Blackwood’s* Cockney School series was an express target of its satire, and ‘Cockney Writers’ were defended among its celebrated contributors.⁶⁷ The very different politics of the *London Magazine* is measured by its review of Keats’s *Endymion*, which reads his Spenserian poem through Michelangelo, Raphael and Correggio. In evoking paintings, music, and perspective views, Keats’s poem takes on architectural dimensions in the reader’s mind: if it is not a ‘regular fabric’ that will meet the approval of a surveyor, it is ‘a glittering and fantastic temple’, ‘as well adapted to the airy and fanciful beings who dwell in it, as a regular Epic Palace’.⁶⁸ This imaginary house of poetry illustrates how writing can appropriate and mediate the architecture of the gallery for the urban middle-class reader. As a medium for imagining the gallery poetry presents ‘the student of art as interloper and interior decorator, furnishing a country estate within his brain and imagining the region of his mind as a country estate’, as Favret argues.⁶⁹ It is in this context that Hazlitt’s art criticism for the *London Magazine* should be read. In the age of the temporary exhibition poetry and painting share a new order of things.

At Blenheim

Spenser's association with Rubens comes back in 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim' (1823). This last essay on English picture galleries vicariously brings the urban readers of the *London Magazine* to Blenheim palace, the seat of the Dukes of Marlborough in Woodstock, Oxfordshire. Reference to Spenser mediates the encounter with Rubens, abstracts it from its context at Blenheim, and articulates it in the gallery in the mind to bring it before the eyes of the readers of periodicals. If Spenser brings Rubens to the eyes of the reader in Hazlitt's 1818 lecture, Rubens brings Spenser to the eye of the viewer in the 1823 essay. While in 1818 he saw Rubens in the stanzas of the *Faerie Queene* and turned Spenser's poem into an imaginary ekphrasis, a reverse ekphrasis takes place at Blenheim, where Hazlitt's experiment in 'superinduc'd sight' goes from painting to text to imagine a one-man show:

Rubens was the only artist that could have embodied some of our countryman Spenser's splendid and voluptuous allegories. If a painter among ourselves were to attempt a SPENSER GALLERY, (perhaps the finest subject for the pencil in the world after Heathen mythology and Scripture History,) he ought to go and study the principles of his design at Blenheim! –The *Silens* and the *Rape of Proserpine* contain more of the Bacchanalian and lawless spirit of ancient fable than perhaps any two pictures extant. We shall not dispute that Nicolas Poussin could probably give more of the abstract, metaphysical character of this traditional personages, or that Titian could set them off better, so as to 'leave stings' in the eye of the spectator, by a prodigious gusto of coloring, as in his *Bacchus and Ariadne*: but neither of them gave the same undulating outline, the same humid, *pulpy* tone of the flesh, the same graceful involution

to the grouping and the forms, the same animal spirits, the same breathing motion.⁷⁰

Hazlitt's description activates the erotic charge of the painting in a series of comparisons and quotations from his essay on Gusto.

In William Mavor's guides to Blenheim, the Rubenses are strongly associated with the martial campaigns of the first Duke of Marlborough. Of the three Rubenses hanging in The Dining Room in 1820 two are presented as public gifts to the Duke of Marlborough in recognition of his military achievements: *Venus and Adonis: a present from the Emperor of Germany*, *Lot and his Daughters*; another present from the Emperor, hung in the same room as *The Bacchanalians*; *Rubens, His Wife, and Child* was given to the Duke by the City of Brussels.⁷¹ Like the series of Loves of the Gods attributed to Titian given to him by the King of Sardinia, these gifts mark out the Duke's martial vigour and virility, and the house and collection as a public memorial. In 1766 Titian's Loves were recorded still hanging in the Great Hall, underneath the apotheosis of the Duke of Marlborough painted by Sir James Thornhill.⁷² Two decades later the Loves of the Gods had been moved out of view: 'It is said these pictures were discovered in an old lumber-room by Sir Joshua Reynolds' in 1788.⁷³ No mention was made of the Titian Room, nor of the Titians, in William Mavor's 1789 *New Description of Blenheim*. In 1806 Mavor announced that 'after long lying hid from public view, [they] are now liberally displayed, chiefly for the sake of amateurs in the pictorial art'.⁷⁴ Yet in 1810 Charles Lamb expressed the concern that he would never gain admittance.⁷⁵ The trajectory of the Loves of the Gods illuminates the attempt to shift from military valour to intimacy and retirement associated with the third Duke, as Mark Hallett and Kate Retford have pointed out.⁷⁶

When Hazlitt wrote about the Blenheim collection for the urban public of the *London Magazine*, he abstracted the paintings from the public iconography of Blenheim.

Through the pages of the periodical press they become part of a virtual gallery without walls.

Hazlitt's essay regenders the iconography of Rubens's *Bacchanalians*. Rather than representing the vigorous masculine world of the Duke of Marlborough memorialised at Blenheim, Rubens identifies for Hazlitt the taste and discrimination of his wife, Sarah Churchill, Duchess Marlborough: 'she had, during her husband's wars and negotiations in Flanders, a fine opportunity of culling them, "as one picks pears, saying, this I like, that I like still better."⁷⁷ Hazlitt's focus may be influenced by Sir Godfrey Kneller's portrait of the Duchess in the guise of Minerva, which perhaps functions for him as a relay for the other pictures hanging in the Dining Room. In an earlier essay on 'Character of Sir Joshua Reynolds', Hazlitt wrote that Van Dyck's portrait of the Duchess of Buckingham with her children hanging in the East Drawing Room 'produces the same sort of respect and silence as if the spectator had been introduced into a family circle of the highest rank, at a period when rank was a greater distinction than at present'.⁷⁸ Rubens's *Bacchanalians* and Van Dyck's *Duchess of Buckingham* were recorded hanging in the same room in early catalogues of Blenheim palace.⁷⁹ However, while Van Dyck's portrait conjures up the intimate sphere of the sitters, Rubens's *Bacchanalians* articulates an alternative scene for an alternative community.

Hazlitt's reference to a Spenser Gallery shifts the focus of the essay towards a new way of seeing. Going against the aristocratic world of Blenheim, Rubens's imaginary contribution to a Spenser Gallery participates in the dynamic of the ephemeral museum. Thinking about Rubens through the poetry of Spenser produces

a new order of comparison. Poussin and Titian abstract Rubens from its physical location. While Hazlitt dwells at length on the Loves of the Gods in the Titian Room at Blenheim,⁸⁰ it is not to these Titians that he compares Rubens as a Spenserian painter. If access to the Titian Room was still limited, Hazlitt's metropolitan reader could supplement Hazlitt's references with the visual memory of exhibition culture. His comparison takes Rubens's *Bacchanalians* away from Blenheim, reintegrating it in the ephemeral series of pictures on view at the British Institution: Rubens's *Bacchanalians* from the Flemish and Dutch exhibition of 1815 comes together with the Poussin and Titian on loan from Thomas Hamlet's collection in 1816.⁸¹ In the British Institution catalogue paintings were entered with an indication of their provenance and current owners. The juxtaposition encouraged viewers to piece together a heterotopic gallery, which overlaid the space of the exhibition room with the imagination of the paintings' current collections and of the Renaissance palaces where they had originally hung. Architectural space comes across as a condition of possibility for painting in Hazlitt's discussion of the Rubens's in the Grosvenor collection: 'The spectator is [...] thrown back by the pictures, and surveys them, as if placed at a stupendous height, as well as distance from him [...] They were painted to be placed in some Jesuit church abroad'.⁸² Hazlitt's analysis here captures painting's power to project an architectural space outside the frame, and the resulting clash between the painting's ideal and actual viewing positions. However, the architectural anchorings of painting are erased in the gallery of the mind.

Freed from their original abodes, works selected from the temporary exhibitions come to occupy a shared and synchronic comparative space. Poussin's superiority in the 'abstract, metaphysical character of his traditional personages' is pointed out in Hazlitt's essay 'On a Landscape of Nicolas Poussin', where he

considers Poussin's 'allegorical abstractions' 'with minds more inwardly depraved',⁸³ whereas in discussing the Blenheim pictures he goes back to the Bacchanalian movement that he had celebrated in Rubens's brushwork in his 1816 essays: 'in that sort of licentious fancy, in which a certain grossness of expression bordered on caricature, and where grotesque or enticing form was to be combined with free and rapid movements, or different tones and colours were to be flung over the picture as in sport or in a dance, no one ever surpassed the Flemish painter'.⁸⁴ The pleasure of painting involves the rhythm of physical exercise; it combines body and mind, and blurs distinctions between painting and painter, the world within and outside the frame. Rubens's painting embodies a physical practice that breaks through the boundaries of form.

Compare the domain of writing in Hazlitt's lecture 'On Chaucer and Spenser': 'the imagination of a poet brings such objects before us, as when we look at wild beasts in a menagerie; their claws are pared, their eyes glitter like harmless lightning; but we gaze at them with a pleasing awe, clothed in beauty, formidable in the sense of abstract power'.⁸⁵ Just as Hazlitt is about to convey a sense of Chaucer's peculiar kind of 'gusto', the power of literature takes the form of a spectacular enclosure.⁸⁶ How can Spenser's allegorical inventions break through the boundaries of form? Bringing together Hazlitt's Lecture 'On Chaucer and Spenser' with 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim' helps illuminate the dynamic of poetry and painting in Hazlitt's criticism.

Allegorical Inventions and Counterfactuals

'Abstract power' is central to Hazlitt's literary appreciation in his Lecture 'On Chaucer and Spenser'. While Chaucer's descriptions 'have a sort of tangible character belonging to them, and produce the effect of sculpture on the mind',⁸⁷ Spenser 'is the painter of abstractions'.⁸⁸ While Hazlitt celebrates his 'fantastic delineations' and 'inexhaustible imagination', he acknowledges those who 'cannot understand it on account of the allegory. They are afraid of the allegory, as if they thought it would bite them: they look at it as a child looks at a painted dragon, and think it will strangle them in its shining folds. This is very idle: if they do not meddle with the allegory, the allegory will not meddle with them.'⁸⁹ From wild beasts imprisoned in a cage to a painted dragon, the abstract power of poetry is again presented through an image of disempowerment. We are far from the Bacchanalian force of Rubens's satyrs, but the distinction cannot be simply mapped on the difference between painting and poetry. The next step Hazlitt takes is to expose the implausible position of anybody who lets allegory stand in the way of reading through a pictorial comparison: 'it might as well be pretended that we cannot see Poussin's pictures for the allegory, as that the allegory prevents us from understanding Spenser'. A gallery of examples follows to prove that Spenser's poetry can be understood without paying attention to the allegory. Hazlitt's defence of Spenser, 'unjustly charged with a want of passion and of strength',⁹⁰ involves incorporating his poetry in a pictorial poetics of gusto, in which painting can supply the sensory stimulation. If Spenser's 'ideas ... seem more distinct than his perceptions',⁹¹ the erotic power of Rubens, Poussin, and Titian can bring these ideas before the eye of the reader.

Hazlitt's Spenser Gallery is shaped in the potential world of conditionals and counterfactuals, a form of imaginary history that literally 'goes against facts' to imagine alternative worlds.⁹² In 1818 reading Spenser and seeing Rubens leads to

the conclusion that ‘nobody but Spenser could have painted the fancy of Spenser’. The logic of counterfactuals requires a negative outcome to act as a prompt for a series of alternative scenarios.⁹³ Rubens did not paint pictures from Spenser, but regret for the unrealised possibility is counterbalanced by the potentiality of what might have happened. Hazlitt’s negative claim includes an implicit hypothetical clause: ‘if Rubens had painted Spenser...’. Rubens did spend time in England painting grand commissions for Charles I. The patronage and the dispersal of Charles I’s collection were central to eighteenth-century discussions about why Britain lacked a tradition of epic and historical painting and how it might invent a new tradition. What if Rubens had painted Spenser? What visual culture would English literature have produced? Against the history of what failed to happen the alternative histories of what might have happened open up a world of future possibility.

When Hazlitt comes back to Rubens and Spenser in 1823, the hypothetical association between the painter and the poet takes on a more potential formulation: Rubens ‘could have embodied some of our countryman Spenser’s splendid and voluptuous allegories’. The negative claim of 1818 has gone. Hazlitt’s exercise in counterfactual thinking involves establishing the false antecedent, then reshaping the past that never was with an act of ideal attribution. Hazlitt’s intervention reads Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* for the pictures and brings Rubens’s allegories before the eyes of the readers. This is the critical gesture that Leigh Hunt will flesh out, turning Spenser into a virtual gallery of Old Master paintings for the *New Monthly Magazine* a decade later.⁹⁴ Having established Rubens’s Bacchanalia as a potential illustration to the *Faerie Queene*, this act of reverse ekphrasis generates an invented tradition. The next step is to turn Rubens into a school of painting, a model for a new generation of modern painters: ‘if a painter amongst ourselves were to attempt a

Spenser Gallery, [...] he ought to go and study the principles of his design at Blenheim!' As Nelson Goodman argues, 'any counterfactual can be transposed into a conditional with a true antecedent and consequent'.⁹⁵ Turning his critical appreciation to pragmatic ends, Hazlitt addresses the painters among his readers, an inclusive first person plural to whom the unrealised possibility of a Spenser Gallery of Old Masters is presented as a model for future practice.

However, Hazlitt's address to painters involves an act of strategic amnesia. Hazlitt's hypothetical clause ignores and effectively erases from the record an ever growing catalogue of Spenserian pictures by modern painters exhibited at the Royal Academy and the British Institution year after year. Sir Thomas Lawrence's portrait of *Lady Leicester as Hope, from Spenser* celebrating the wife of Sir John Fleming Leicester was reviewed in *The Examiner* with a quotation and discussion of the Spenserian source in Spring 1818 when his Gallery of British Painters opened; it was again in the papers when the picture was exhibited at the Royal Academy Exhibition the following year, and featured prominently in the Catalogue edited by William Carey in Spring 1819.⁹⁶ In 1819 the Royal Academy chose *Una in the Cave of Despair*, from book one of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, as a subject for the prize in Historical Painting won by Joseph Severn, a painter Hazlitt knew well. Against the record of modern painters and patrons, Hazlitt's imaginary ekphrasis invents an alternative tradition.

The modern exhibition scene shapes a new practice of reading and viewing. As a physical space the gallery establishes the visual paradigms that shaped and institutionalised the orders of painting. The medium of the exhibition shows the role played by poetry as a source of subjects for painters, which can promote fancy portraits to the status of poetical or historical painting. The Royal Academy and the

British Institution display Spenser's allegories domesticated and neutralized in the form of excerpts anchored to static and pious historical portraits that declared the allegorical virtues of Spenserian aristocrats. However, in presenting paintings on view the gallery also opens up an imaginary space. Writing about paintings in the age of technical reproducibility, André Malraux invites readers to think about an 'imaginary museum' in which what is on display calls upon what is absent. In other words, the museum acts as a potential form. This dynamic can take the form of a desire for completion, but it can also produce alternative forms. As Rosalind Krauss argues, the museum opens up a 'conceptual space of the human faculties: imagination, cognition, judgment'. As a place that activates the play of the human faculties, the Romantic 'gallery in the mind' challenges the limitations of art; it becomes a prompt for thinking about alternative imaginary pasts and alternative ways in which the 'imaginary museum' can reinvent *The Museum Without Walls*.⁹⁷ Going against the record of Spenserian paintings, Hazlitt's critical invention turns Spenser's *Faerie Queene* into a counter-gallery. In this 'gallery in the mind' Rubens, Poussin, and Titian offer alternative forms that can break through the social and aesthetic limitations of modern painting. Reading poetical through pictorial allegories Hazlitt reveals Spenser as 'the poet of our waking dreams'.⁹⁸

¹ Francis Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Paintings and the Rise of the Art Exhibition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 64-81.

² 'Prospectus of the London Magazine', *London Magazine*, 1 (1820), iv. In its identification with the capital, the magazine aims to challenge the cultural hegemony of the *Edinburgh Review*, see 'The Mohock Magazine', *London Magazine*, 1 (December 1820), 666-684. On Hazlitt's collaboration with the *London Magazine*, see Mark Parker, 'A Conversation between Friends: Hazlitt and the *London Magazine*', *Literary Magazines and British Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 135-156.

³ 'Of Poetry in General', *Lectures on the English Poets*, quoted from *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P.P. Howe, 21 vols (London: Dent, 1930-1934), V, 10, hereafter abbreviated as HH. Hazlitt's lecture was delivered at the Surrey Institution in January 1818, repeated at the Crown and Anchor in March, and collected in volume later in the year.

⁴ See Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757), ed. J. T. Boulton (London, 1958), 59-62 and 167-173, and Luisa Calè, *Fuseli's Milton Gallery: 'Turning Readers into Spectators'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), 106-111, for a discussion

of Aristotelian enargeia in relation to Milton as a case study for the blindness of poetry. Hazlitt mentions a different aspect of Burke's *Enquiry* in the first lecture on the English poets (HH, V, 7), and puts forward a Burkean argument about the rhythmical power of poetry (HH, V, 11-12); for Hazlitt's relation to Burke, see David Bromwich, *Hazlitt: The Mind of a Critic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 288-300.

⁵ Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. A New Edition with a Glossary and Notes Explanatory and Critical, ed. John Upton (London: Tonson, 1758), xxxii.

⁶ [Henry Fuseli], 'The Arts', *Analytical Review* (June 1788), 216, discussed in Calè, *Fuseli's Milton Gallery*, Chapter 2.

⁷ *A Catalogue of the First Exhibition of Pictures, Painted for Mr. Macklin, by the Artists of Britain, illustrative of the British Poets* (London: 14 April, 1788), p. 7, no. VIII; p. 13, nos. XVI, XVII; p 15, no XX.

⁸ Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, Book III, Canto XII, hereafter abbreviated as FQ.

⁹ Benjamin West, 'Una, from Spenser's Fairy Queen, book 1, canto 3, verses 4 and 5', now at the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Connecticut, was engraved by Richard Earlom and published by John Boydell on 10 August 1772; see Helmut von Erffa and Allen Staley, *The Paintings of Benjamin West* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), no. 218, 277 and Elizabeth Mankin Kornhauser, *American paintings before 1945 in the Wadsworth Atheneum* (Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), no. 484, II, 782-783. The subject of Spenser's Una was also depicted by Reynolds (RA 1780), Stubbs (RA 1782), Graham (RA 1783), Clarke (RA 1795), Westall (RA 1804; BI, 1808), Hilton (RA 1818, 1832; BI, 1835 and 1840), Marshall (RA 1840), LeJeune (RA 1842).

¹⁰ *Middlesex Journal*, no. 480, 25-28 April 1772, p. 4, quoted in von Erffa and Staley, 277, and Kornhauser, II, 782-783.

¹¹ Sir J.F. Leicester's Gallery of British Paintings', *The Examiner*, no. 539, 26 April 1818, 269-70; William Carey, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Paintings by British Artists, in the Possession of John Fleming Leicester, Bart.* (London: Nichols and Son, 1819), 65-75.

¹² 'On Chaucer and Spenser', *Lectures on the English Poets*, HH, V, 42; see FQ, I, VI, 28. For the eighteenth-century tradition of Spenserian paintings, see Laurel Bradley, 'Eighteenth-Century Paintings and Illustrations of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*: A Study in Taste', *Marsyas*, 20 (1979-1980), 31-51; see also Greg Kucich, *Keats, Shelley, and Romantic Spenserianism* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 1991).

¹³ S.T. Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions*, ed. by James Engell and Walter Jackson Bate, 2 vols (London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul, 1983), I, 82-83; 102-104.

¹⁴ [William Hazlitt], 'Art. X. Biographia Literati, or Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions', *Edinburgh Review*, 28 (August 1817), 488-515 (HH, XVI, 115-138): 'With chapter IV begins the formidable ascent of that mountainous and barren ridge of clouds piled on precipices and precipices on clouds, from the top of which the author deludes us with a view of the Promised Land that divides the region of Fancy from those of the Imagination' (p. 495; HH, XVI, 121); for Hazlitt's appreciation of fancy in poetic diction and his defense pf Spenser contra Coleridge, see pp. 512-513 (HH, XVI, 135).

¹⁵ Jeffrey Robinson, 'Leigh Hunt and the Poetics and Politics of the Fancy', in Nicholas Roe, ed., *Leigh Hunt: Life, Poetics, Politics* (Routledge, 2012), p. 157. For an account of Hazlitt's engagement with Coleridge, which takes account of the Unitarian background they shared in their analysis of the unity of the imagination, see Uttara Natarajan, 'One Undivided Spirit: Hazlitt, Coleridge, and the Unity of the Imagination', *Studies in Romanticism*, 37:2 (Summer 1998), 235-258.

¹⁶ 'On the Cockney School of Poetry. No. V', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 5 (April 1819), 97-100; the connection between the Cockney School series and Hazlitt's lectures at the Surrey Institution is announced in 'To Correspondents', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (January 1818), 362; *Blackwood's* published lengthy and positive reports on Hazlitt's lectures in February, March, and April 1818.

¹⁷ On literary aspects of the European frame of reference within Hunt's circle, see Jeffrey Cox, 'Cockney Cosmopolitanism', *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 32:3 (September 2010), 245-259.

¹⁸ On the virtual reading community of periodicals, see Jon Klancher, *The Making of the English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

¹⁹ William Hazlitt, 'Living Authors. No. V. Crabbe', *London Magazine* (May 1821), 481-490, on 485 (HH, XIX, 51-62, on 53).

²⁰ Rubens's *Bacchanalians* from the collection of the Duke of Marlborough is one of 16 Rubens paintings listed in British Institution for Promoting the Fine Arts in the United Kingdom, *Catalogue of Pictures by Rubens, Rembrandt, Vandyke, and other Artists of the Flemish and Dutch Schools, with which the Proprietors have favoured the British Institution for the Gratification of the Public, and for the Benefit of the Fine Arts in General* (London: Bulmer, 1815), p. 14, no. 16.

²¹ Review of Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de Sismondi's *De la littérature du midi de l'Europe*, *Edinburgh Review* (June 1815), 59-60, 62 (HH, XVI, 24-57, on 53-54 and 56); a claim Hazlitt repeats almost verbatim in the 1818 Lecture, see HH, V, 35.

²² British Institution, *Catalogue of Pictures of the Italian and Spanish Schools, with which the Proprietors have favoured the British Institution for the Gratification of the Public, and the Benefit of the Fine Arts in General* (London: Bulmer, 1816), including Titian's *Bacchus and Ariadne* from the Aldobrandini Palace owned by Thomas Hamlet (p. 12, no. 11), *Europa from the Orleans Gallery* and *Adonis going to the Chace*, both owned by the Earl of Darnley (p. 13 no 29 and p. 18 no. 125).

²³ 'The Round Table. No. 40', *The Examiner*, 26 May 1816, 332 (HH, IV, 77-80).

²⁴ 'The Catalogue Raisonné of the British Institution', *The Examiner*, 17 Nov 1816, p. 728 (HH, XVIII, 104-111); republished in *The Round Table: A Collection of Essays on Literature, Men, and Manners*, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London: Archibald Constable and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1817), II, 231. In 'Lines Written a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye during a Tour, July 13, 1798' William Wordsworth declared himself 'well pleased to recognize / In nature and the language of the sense, / The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse, / The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul / Of all my moral being', *Lyrical Ballads* (Bristol: Cottle, 1798), p. 208. Hazlitt's allusion to *Tintern Abbey* is repeated across a range of essays, functioning as a shorthand to articulate what provides the continuity of experience and identity in a variety of situations, from the experience of returning to the Louvre recounted in Lecture VII 'On the Works of Hogarth – on the grand and familiar style of painting', *Lectures on the English Comic Writers* (1819), 300; HH, VI, 149; to the functioning of reason in his essay on Godwin in *Spirit of the Age* (1825), 40 (HH, XI, 16-28, on 21).

²⁵ On Hazlitt's selective quotations, and the suppression or repurposing of their original terms, see David Bromwich, 'The Politics of Allusion', *Hazlitt: The Mind of a Critic*, Chapter VIII, especially 275 and 278.

²⁶ 'The Catalogue Raisonné of the British Institution', 728.

²⁷ William Hazlitt, 'Fine Arts', *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Supplement to 4th and 5th edns (1816-24), HH, XVIII, 121.

²⁸ *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Pictures Now Exhibiting at the British Institution* (London, 1815), 58-59.

²⁹ [John Gibson Lockhart], 'On the Cockney School of Poetry, No. 1', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 2:7 (October 1817). 38-41; further attacks on the Cockney School were published in November 1817, July 1818, April 1819, October 1819, and August 1825.

³⁰ 'On the Cockney School of Poetry', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 7 (October 1817), 40. For an analysis of the Cockney School attacks, see Jeffrey Cox, 'Leigh Hunt's Cockney School: The Lakers' "Other"', *Romanticism on the Net*, 14 (1999); In *Poetry and Politics in the Cockney School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Chapter 1, Jeffrey Cox provides a rationale for using the term 'Cockney School' to define the school of poetry gathered around Leigh Hunt, who had hailed the new school in an article entitled 'Young Poets', published in the *Examiner* in 1816 (1 December 1816), 761-762, devoted to Percy Bysshe Shelley's *Alastor*, John Henry Reynolds's *The Naiad*, and John Keats's *On First Looking into Chapman's Homer*; followed by a review of Keats's *Poems* the following year: *The Examiner* (1 June, 6 July, and 13 July 1817), 345, 428-429, 443-444. On the stylistic aspects of the Cockney School, see William Keach, 'Cockney Couplets: Keats and the Politics of Style', *Studies in Romanticism*, 25 (Summer 1986), 182-96

³¹ Jeffrey Cox, 'Leigh Hunt's *Foliage*: A Cockney Manifesto', in Roe, *Leigh Hunt: Life, Poetics, Politics*, Chapter 4.

³² Leigh Hunt, 'Preface, including Cursory Observations on Poetry and Cheerfulness', *Foliage, or Poems Original and Translated* (London, 1818), 23.

³³ Ayumi Mizukoshi, *Keats, Hunt and the Aesthetics of Pleasure* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

³⁴ Hunt, 'Preface', 20-21.

³⁵ Reynolds's *The Character of Spencer's Una*, exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1780, and engraved by Thomas Watson on 15 April 1782, see David Mannings, *Sir Joshua Reynolds: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 81, no. 143.

³⁶ Leigh Hunt, 'On the Realities of the Imagination', *The Indicator*, 2 (22 March 1820), 185-90.

³⁷ William Hazlitt, 'Fine Arts. Whether they are promoted by Academies and Public Institutions', *The Champion*, 28 August and 11 September 1814, HH, XVIII, 37-51. The article is discussed in John Barrell's *The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt: 'The Body of the Public'* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 330-338.

³⁸ On the Louvre as a republican museum, see Edouard Pommier, 'Idéologie et musée à l'époque révolutionnaire', in Michel Vovelle, ed., *Les images de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1988), pp. 57-78; Id., *L'art et la liberté: doctrines et débats de la Révolution française* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991); Andrew McClellan, 'The Revolutionary Louvre', *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 91-123, esp. 91-92; Dominique Poulot, 'Le droit au musée: un droit de citoyen', in Michel Vovelle, ed., *Les droits de l'homme et la conquête des libertés: des Lumières aux révoltes de 1848* (Grenoble: PUG, 1988); Dominique Poulot, *Musée, nation, patrimoine, 1789-1815* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997). Barrell argues that Hazlitt's art criticism separates 'the republic of taste from the political republic' and opposes civic humanist positions on art articulated by Reynolds, James Barry, and Fuseli; the pleasures of painting 'are offered to us as we are private individuals, not private citizens', see *The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt*, 338, 315. On the divergent political implications of Hazlitt writings about picture galleries, and specifically the divergent meanings that the National Gallery could take on after the purchase of the Angerstein's Collection depending on its final location and the differences in politics between Hazlitt's and Patmore's more conservative picture gallery series, see Quentin Bayley, 'Hazlitt and the "Old Pictures"; Westmacott, Patmore, and the Role of Art Criticism', *Wordsworth Circle*, 41:2 (Spring 2010), 114-119, on 115.

³⁹ William Hazlitt, 'The Louvre', *The Morning Chronicle*, 24 March 1814, HH, XIX, 125-128; 'Literary Notices. No. 2. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Elgin Marbles. - Murray', *The Examiner*, 16 June 1816, 379-80, reprinted as 'The Elgin Marbles', HH, XVIII, 101-102; 'On the Works of Hogarth – On the Grand & Familiar Style of Painting', *Lectures on the English Comic Writers* (1819), HH, VI, 148-149.

⁴⁰ For Hazlitt's take on the temporaneity of republican art encountered at the Louvre in 1802, recollected in 1820 after the restitution of the Napoleonic spoils, see 'Table-Talk: No. V. On the Pleasure of Painting', *London Magazine*, 12:2 (December 1820), 604 (HH, X, 108); Jonah Siegel, *Desire and Excess: The Nineteenth-Century Culture of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 175; Stephen Cheeke, 'Hazlitt and the Louvre', *Keats-Shelley Journal*, 56 (2007), 111-; Maureen McCue, "'A Gallery in the Mind": Hazlitt, The Louvre, and the Meritocracy of Taste', *The Hazlitt Review*, 1 (2008), 51-62.

⁴¹ Jonathan Richardson, *An Essay on the Theory of Painting* (London: Bowyer, 1715), p. 13.

⁴² See Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, XI, ii, 17-22; F. A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge, 1966), 22; Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Lina Bolzoni, *The Gallery of Memory: Literary and Iconographic Models in the Age of the Printing Press*, trans. by Jeremy Parzen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Norman Bryson, 'Philostratus and the Imaginary Museum', in Stephen Melville and Bill Readings, eds., *Vision and Textuality* (London: Macmillan, 1995) 174-194, on 190.

⁴³ Jonathan Richardson, *A Discourse on the Dignity, Certainty, Pleasure and Advantage, of the Science of a Connoisseur* (London: Churchill, 1719), in *Two Discourses* (London: Churchill, 1719), p. 191.

⁴⁴ Richardson, *Science of a Connoisseur*, pp. 191-2.

⁴⁵ Richardson is associated to Coypel as a bad influence on Reynolds: see 'Character of Sir Joshua Reynolds', *The Champion* (30 October and 6 November 1814), HH, XVIII, 52.

⁴⁶ Richardson's *Discourse on the Science of a Connoisseur* is quoted by Hazlitt in 'On the pleasure of Painting', *London Magazine* (December 1820), republished in *The Table Talk* in 1821, HH, VIII, 10; 'On Personal Character', *The Plain Speaker*, HH, XII, 238.

⁴⁷ Richardson, *Science of a Connoisseur*, p. 199

⁴⁸ William Hazlitt, 'On the Pleasure of Painting', *London Magazine* (December 1820), 603; HH, VIII, 5-13.

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Heather Tilley for helping me think about the metaphoric of cataracts and the medical discussions and practices that this metaphor mobilizes by 1820, which deserve a separate investigation.

⁵⁰ *Revelation* 21:1; *Acts* 9:18; Milton, *Paradise Lost*, XI, 411-429; on the metaphoric of vision and blindness in the gallery, see also Hazlitt's *Notes of a Journey through France and Italy* (1826), HH, X, 106-107.

⁵¹ [William Hazlitt], ‘Table-Talk: no. V. On the Pleasure of Painting’, *London Magazine*, December 1820, 603 (HH, X, 13-14).

⁵² For the Republican ring of Hazlitt’s spoils of time in relation to Napoleonic spoils, see Cheeke, ‘Hazlitt and the Louvre’, 123.

⁵³ ‘Remarks on the Systems of Hartley and Helvetius’, *An Essay on the Principles of Human Action* (London: Johnson, 1805), HH, I, 69-70. On Hazlitt’s engagement with associationism, see Bromwich, *Hazlitt*, pp. 58-103; Uttara Natarajan, *Hazlitt and the Reach of Sense: Criticism, Morals, and the Metaphysics of Power* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), pp. 52ff.

⁵⁴ *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Pictures Now Exhibiting at Pall Mall* (n.p., 1816), Part 1, 42, a propos of Poussin’s *Bacchanalia*, and Part 2, 39.

⁵⁵ ‘Those whose sensibilities are cultivated till they acquire Taste, but who are unable to possess themselves of capital works like this, may still be said to possess them, as the gift of an unerasable recollection. They hang them up in the Gallery of their mind. This work of Mr Haydon occupies that honourable station.’ See ‘Mr Haydon’s Picture of Christ’s Agony in the Garden’, *The Examiner*, no. 687, 4 March 1821, 141-142, on 142; for Hazlitt’s negative review and reference to the trope of the Old Masters as admiring viewers of Haydon’s picture adopted by the *Examiner*, see XVIII, 140-145.

⁵⁶ ‘Table-Talk XI, On a Landscape of Nicolas Poussin’, *London Magazine* (August 1821), 179; HH, VIII, 168-174, on 173; quoting Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act I, scene 5.

⁵⁷ Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, John Franklin Mowery, and Heather Wolfe, ‘Hamlet’s Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 55:4 (Winter 2004), 379-419; Rhodri Lewis, ‘Hamlet, Metaphor, and Memory’, *Studies in Philology*, 109:5 (Fall 2012), 609-641.

⁵⁸ G.T.Wright, ‘Hamlet and Hendiadys’, *PMLA*, 96:2 (1981), 168-93; Alex Newell, *The Soliloquies in Hamlet: The Structural Design* (Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1991), 26.

⁵⁹ Mary Favret, ‘A Home for Art: Painting, Poetry, and Domestic Interiors’, in *At the Limits of Romanticism*, ed. by Mary Favret and Nicola Watson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 63-65, 67.

⁶⁰ Deidre Shauna Lynch, *Loving Literature: A Cultural History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 125.

⁶¹ William Hazlitt, ‘Fragment on Art. Why The Arts are Not Progressive’, *The Morning Chronicle*, 15 January 1814, HH, XVIII, 9.

⁶² William Hazlitt, ‘Living Authors. No. V. Crabbe’, *London Magazine* (May 1821), 481-490, on 485

⁶³ Wilkie is compared to Crabbe in ‘Notices of the Fine Arts’, *London Magazine* (January 1820), 71: ‘in one minute to receive a more lively and distinct impression of joyous and gentle hearts at his penny wedding, than Crabbe’s admirable pen could excite in an hour. So immediate and forcible is the painter’s power when rightly employed! ’.

⁶⁴ Joseph Spence, *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters, of Books and Men* (London: Murray, 1820), p. 86; reviewed in *The London Magazine* (Feb 1820), 191-4; and by Hazlitt in *The Edinburgh Magazine* (May 1820), 302-30, HH, XVI, 165.

⁶⁵ Leigh Hunt, ‘To Charles Lamb’, *The Examiner* (25 August 1816), 536-37; ‘On the Cockney School of Poetry, VI’, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 6 (October 1819), 70-76, on 74 and 76; see Mizukoshi, *Keats, Hunt and the Aesthetics of Pleasure*, p. 88.

⁶⁶ ‘On the Cockney School of Poetry’, *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, 3 (August 1818), 519-524, on 522.

⁶⁷ Prospectus, *London Magazine*, 1 (January 1820), iv; ‘The Mohock Magazine’, *London Magazine*, 1 (December 1820), 666-667, which announces publications that parody the *Blackwood’s* attacks, including ‘The Reckie School – (as a companion to the ‘Cockney School by Z’); see also ‘The Lion’s Head’, *London Magazine*, 2 (January 1821), iv, which quotes *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*’s reaction to the previous article, which defines the *London* ‘a paltry publication, which is hardly known beyond the limits of Cockaigne’. The *London Magazine*’s celebration of professional occupations as breeding ground for writing is theorized in Charles Lamb’s contributions to the first volume:

‘Recollections of the South Sea House’ is published in the August issue; ‘Oxford in the Vacation’ opens the October issue; the magazine’s argument against *Blackwood’s* is made explicit in ‘Cockney Writers’, *London Magazine*, 2 (January 1821), 69-71.

⁶⁸ ‘He has at least raised a glittering and fantastic temple, where we may wander about, and delightedly lose ourselves while gazing on the exquisite pictures which every here and there hang on its sun-bright walls – the statues and flower-vases which ornament its painted niches – the delicious prospects opening upon us from its arabesque windows – and the sweet airs and romantic music

which come about us when we mount upon its pleasant battlements. And it cannot be denied that the fabric is at least as well adapted to the airy and fanciful beings who dwell in it, as a regular Epic Palace – with its grand geometrical staircases, its long dreary galleries, its lofty state apartments, and its numerous sleeping-rooms – is to its kings and heroes.' See [Peter George Patmore], 'Endymion, A Poetic Romance, by John Keats', *London Magazine*, 1 (April 1820), 385-6, quoted in Mizukoshi, *Keats, Hunt and the Aesthetics of Pleasure*, p. 87.

⁶⁹ Favret, 'A Home for Art: Painting, Poetry, and Domestic Interiors', p. 64.

⁷⁰ William Hazlitt, 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim', *London Magazine*, 3 (November 1823), 509-513, on 510-11, republished in *Sketches of the Principal Picture Galleries in England* (1824), HH, X, 71-72.

⁷¹ Mavor, 1820, 34.

⁷² *The English Connoisseur: Containing an Account of whatever is curious in Painting, Sculpture, &c. In the Palaces and Seats of the Nobility and Principal Gentry of England, both in Town and Country*, 2 vols (London: Davis, 1766), I, 15. On the gift of Victor Amadeus, King of Sardinia, to John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, their original hang, and the fire, see Marian Fowler, *Blenheim: Biography of a Palace* (London: Viking, 1989) 26, 157. Titian's Loves of the Gods were destroyed by fire on 5 February 1861. Reproductions of the pictures may be found in Bodleian Library, sig: G.A.Oxon.a.110.

⁷³ Hazlitt, 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim', 512 (HH, X, 69-75 on 73-74).

⁷⁴ *A New Guide to Blenheim Palace, the Seat of his Grace the Duke of Marlborough* (Oxford: Slatter, 1806 and 1810), pp. 50-51

⁷⁵ Charles Lamb to William Hazlitt, 9 August 1810, in *The Letters of Charles and Mary Ann Lamb*, ed. E.W.Marrs, 3 vols (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976) III, 54.

⁷⁶ Mark Hallett, 'A Monument to Intimacy: Joshua Reynolds's *The Marlborough Family*', *Art History*, 31:5 (November 2008), 691-720; Kate Retford, *The Art of Domestic Life: Family Portraiture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London, 2006), 215-34.

⁷⁷ On the Duchess of Marlborough, see Marcia Pointon, 'Material Manoeuvres: Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough and the Power of Artefacts', *Art History*, 32:3 (June 2009), 485-515.

⁷⁸ 'Character of Sir Joshua Reynolds', *The Champion*, 30 Oct and 6 Nov 1814, HH, XVIII, 56-7. Hazlitt compares Reynolds with Van Dyck, referring to them as hanging in the same room, earlier described as 'in the Gallery of Blenheim'. The Reynolds portrait is presented in the Dining Room in W.F. Mavor, *A New Description of Blenheim, the Seat of his Grace The Duke of Marlborough*, 1789, 1793 p. 42; 1797, p. 52, 1800, pp. 39-40, which adds that Reynolds's portrait was an attempt to outdo Van Dyck's family piece at Wilton House; see also 10th edn (Oxford: Munday and Slatter, 1817), 39. In the 1817 edition Mavor lists Reynolds's portrait in the Great Drawing Room (p. 35). (HH, XVIII, 56-57).

⁷⁹ In 1789, 1793, and 1800 William Mavor lists Rubens's *Bacchanalia* in the East Drawing Room, with Titian's full-length portrait of Philip II, King of Spain, and Rubens's *Andromeda Chained to the Rock*. another wall hung 'A Holy Family, supposed by Raphael', the Marchioness de Havre; the Duchess of Buckingham and Offspring; Mary of Medicis; all by Vandyke.' Portraits of King William III by Sir Godfrey Kneller; - Death of the Virgin Mary, by Guido; - A Holy Family, by Vandyke; - the Annunciation, by Correggio; - an oval portrait of Lady Chesterfield, by Vandyke'. On other walls hung Rubens's *The Offering of the Magi* and his portrait of himself, his wife and child, 'a present to the first Duke, by the city of Brussels', Reynolds's portrait of *Lady Charlotte Spencer in the character of a Gipsey*, see Mavor, *Blenheim* (1800), pp. 32-3. In 1817 Rubens's *Bacchanalia* is listed in the Dining Room (p. 41), where a Bacchanalian piece by Van Dyck had hung in previous guides, with a portrait of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough as Minerva by Sir Godfrey Kneller, Rubens's pictures of 'Venus and Adonis, a present from the emperor of Germany', 'The three Graces, or Rubens's three Wives', 'Lot and his Daughters, another present from the Emperor, in the finest style'; two battle-pieces by Wouvermans, seven portraits of members of the Marlborough family by Reynolds, and Veronese's *The Rape of Europa*.

⁸⁰ Hazlitt, 'Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim', 512.(HH, X, 73-74)

⁸¹ Titian's *Bacchus and Ariadne* from the Aldobrandini Palace and Poussin's *Bacchanalian Dance* were exhibited at the British Institution in 1816, cat nos. 11 and 122, and Thomas Hamlet is listed as the proprietor of both pictures, acquired from him by the National Gallery in 1826. See *A Catalogue of Pictures in the National Gallery* (London, 1842), pp.12-13 (Titian) and p. 20: 'A Bacchanalian Dance': 'This classical composition is arranged in so admirable a manner as to require no elucidation. It is one of N.Poussin's capital performances; and was formerly in the Collection of Compte Vaudrieul, afterwards in those of Monsieur de Calonne and of the late Lord Kinnaird, and was purchased by Parliament from Mr. Hamlet'.

⁸² William Hazlitt, 'Lord Grosvenor's Collection of Pictures', *London Magazine* (July 1823), HH, X, 52.

⁸³ ‘Rubens’s are noble specimens of a class; Poussin’s are allegorical abstractions of the same class, with bodies less pampered, but with minds more secretly depraved. The Bacchanalian groups of the Flemish painter were, however, his masterpieces in composition. Witness those prodigies of colour, character, and expression, at Blenheim. In the more chaste and refined delineation of classic fable, Poussin was without a rival.’, ‘On a Landscape of Nicolas Poussin’, HH, VIII, 172.

⁸⁴ Hazlitt, ‘Pictures at Oxford and Blenheim’, 511 (HH, X, 72).

⁸⁵ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 26.

⁸⁶ Compare ‘The Poet framed, glazed, and hung in a striking light: [...] a powdered beau, a sycophant plant, an exotic reared in a glass-case’, William Hazlitt, ‘On the Aristocracy of Letters’, HH, VIII, 205-214, on 211.

⁸⁷ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 22.

⁸⁸ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 35.

⁸⁹ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 38.

⁹⁰ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 42.

⁹¹ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 35.

⁹² Nelson Goodman, ‘The Problem of Counterfactual Conditionals’, *The Journal of Philosophy*, 44:5 (February 1947), 113-28; Niall Ferguson, ‘Introduction: Virtual History: Towards a “chaotic” theory of the past’, *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (London: Picador, 1997), esp. 48, 85-89; Catherine Gallagher, ‘Forum: Counterfactual Realities’, *Representations*, 98 (2007), 51-52; Neal J. Roese and James M. Olson, ‘Counterfactual Thinking: A Critical Overview’, in *What Might Have Been: The Social Psychology of Counterfactual Thinking* (1995; New York: Psychology Press, 2014), 1-3.

⁹³ Goodman, ‘The Problem of Counterfactual Conditionals’; Roese and Olson, ‘Counterfactual Thinking’, 1.

⁹⁴ Leigh Hunt, ‘A New Gallery of Pictures. Spenser, the Poet of the Painters’, *New Monthly Magazine*, 38 (June 1833), 161-177; see Luisa Calè, ‘Leigh Hunt’s Romantic Paper Gallery: Reading Spenser through the Old Masters, 1833, 1844’, *La Questione Romantica* (forthcoming).

⁹⁵ Goodman, ‘The Problem of Counterfactual Conditionals’, 114.

⁹⁶ ‘Sir J.F.Leicester’s Gallery of British Paintings’, *The Examiner*, no. 539, 26 April 1818, 269-70; William Carey, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Paintings by British Artists, in the Possession of John Fleming Leicester, Bart.* (London: Nichols and Son, 1819), 65-75; ‘Memoirs of Sir John Fleming Leicester’, *New Monthly Magazine* (1819), 428-38, on 433; *The Examiner* (1819), 429; ‘Sir John Leicester Gallery’, *New Monthly Magazine*, 3 (1821), 220-222, on 222. On Sir John Fleming Leicester as patron of British painting, see Dongho Chun, ‘Public Display, private glory: Sir John Fleming Leicester’s gallery of British art in early nineteenth-century England’, *Journal of the History of Collections*, 13:2 (2001), 175-189; and Dongho Chun, ‘Patriotism on display: Sir John Fleming Leicester’s patronage of British art’, *The British Art Journal* (2003), 23-28.

⁹⁷ Rosalind Krauss, ‘Postmodernism’s Museum Without Walls’, in Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne, eds, *Thinking About Exhibitions* (London: Routledge, 1996), 341, reflecting on the English translation of André Malraux’s *Le Musée imaginaire* as *The Museum without Walls*, trans. by Stuart Gilbert and Francis Price (London: Secker and Warburg, 1967).

⁹⁸ Hazlitt, ‘On Chaucer and Spenser’, HH, V, 44.