OPHELIA

by

Paolo Giudici

Thesis submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

65,948 words

School of Arts & Humanities
Royal College of Art

5 January 2022

Declaration

This thesis represents partial submission for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Royal College of Art. I confirm that the work presented here is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis. During the period of registered study in which this thesis was prepared the author has not been registered for any other academic award or qualification. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

Date: 5 January 2022

Signed: Paolo Giudici

Abstract

Ophelia (1851-2) is the title of a Pre-Raphaelite painting by John Everett Millais narrating the final moments of Shakespeare's heroine in *Hamlet* (1599-1601): the former is considered the best-known picture in all Victorian art and the latter, the greatest work in English literature. Nonetheless, Ophelia owes its significance and enduring popularity to these monumental artworks, as well as the fantasies of "Woman" she embodies in successive discourses, and the material, semantic, and social networks she progressively integrates. The eight-hundred years span of such networks, their size and complexity across media and cultures, seem proof enough to consider Ophelia a "hyperobject." Although Timothy Morton introduced it as a philosophical and ecological concept to deal with "things that are massively distributed in time and space relative to humans," Ophelia shows the same characteristic properties (viscosity, nonlocality, temporal undularity, phasing, interobjectivity) and ontological structure, a mesh constituted by a dynamic mixture of strands in which component objects interact, and gaps in which they withdraw remaining unknowable. The reconceptualization constructs Ophelia as a new object of transdisciplinary research, overcoming limitations of previous studies that focused on character analysis, historical period, or discipline. Further, the hyperobject provides an ideal medium in which Ophelia arises, develops, and is resolved or abandoned as problem, and of which the answers to that problem are also part. The chapters that follow will address three questions about Millais' *Ophelia*: What is Millais' answer to Ophelia? Where does *Ophelia* fit in art history and modernity? What did Millais want from *Ophelia* and what does *Ophelia* want from the public?

(260 words)

Table of Contents

Introduction **6**

Motivations 6

Field of Research 8

Problems and Questions **16**

Allegory as Concept 16

Allegory as Genre 23

Academic theory of genres 23

History Painting and Reynolds 26

The Royal Academy and Pre-Raphaelites 30

Are the Pre-Raphaelites Modern? 37

Allegory as mode of expression and interpretation 39

What are the sources of Pre-Raphaelite allegory? 39

What story does Ophelia tell? 46

What is Ophelia's artistic criticism of Hamlet? 50

Methodology **59**

In the Middle 59

What Is a Cultural Hyperobject? 61

Viscosity, Nonlocality, and Temporal Undulation 61

Phaseness and Interobjectivity 64

A Hyperobject Called Ophelia **69**

Becoming Ophelia 69

Subjectification 69

Problematisation 71

The Court of Justice 74

After Ophelia: The Asylum and the Morgue 87

A Dangerous Method 111

Coda 114

A Sermon in Painting **115**

Maimed Funeral Rites 116

A Huguenot ... 122

The Black Brunswicker ... 133

Changing Discourse ... 138

Appendix. Fee (A Meta-Fiction) ... 145

Story of a Letter ... 145

To Ophelia (9 May 2014) ... 150

Mother's Painting ... 151

Water and Oil ... 152

Queen Elizabeth I ... 153

Susanna and the Elders ... 156

Pamela Writing ... 157

Three Ladies ... 159

Lady Macbeth ... 160

Flatford Mill ... 161

The Woman in White ... 167

The Lady of Shalott ... 172

Editor's Notes ... 176

References ... 204

Texts ... 204

Images ... 243

Film and Theatre ... 252

Other Media ... 253

Introduction

Motivations

This research begun from the question "What is artistic research?" that I first encountered implicit in the inaugural "Editorial" of the *Journal for Artistic Research*, written by its editor in chief Michael Schwab (2011) and my PhD co-supervisor. The article admitted that artistic research "is a term that has been, and still is, suspended in its definition" but in the intervening years, the problem it implied seems to have lost its currency and that suspension has became its epistemic condition. Despite promising results (cf. Schwab 2013; 2018), the artist-researchers community moved on, either because the question may be philosophically unanswerable in the given context, or because the burgeoning field did not need an answer, gaining in return, the capacity to adapt quickly to different cultural and institutional milieus across the globe, and mingle with disparate academic disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and STEM.

This anti-foundational stance is rather common in the history of science as Imre Lakatos pointed out, quoting D'Alembert's encouragement to the early students of the calculus: "push on and faith will catch up with you" (1978: 126, original in French; trans. in Mackay 2019: 66). At the same time, I felt uneasy with the tacit assumptions that enabled the success of artistic research and led to its disciplinarisation. Artistic research (in its various denominations) is a fairly recent discipline born from the institution of third-cycle degrees in art after the Bologna process (1999) but, as activity, it has been practised and documented by artists at least since the Renaissance (Burgin 2006). The initial debate around artistic research reflected the attempts to map the activity into the discipline (e.g. Dombois 2006; Klein 2008), but artistic research was constructed as a hybrid between "practice" as defined in BA and MA curricula, and "research" as defined by assessing bodies in other disciplines (OECD 2002; 2015). This shift is made clear at the very beginning of *Artistic Research Methodology. Narrative, Power and the Public*:

> . . . the core message of the book is as follows: artistic research ≠ art and art making. Thus we are not interested here in taking part in the well-worn discussions on the arts and art making (frequently understood as artistic creativity and originality) or their intrinsic value. Instead, we try to advance research on the arts in the academic context and for the audiences around academia, that is, to contribute to the development of the research culture of the area. (Hannula, Suoranta and Vadén 2014: xi)

How far this position can be taken to represent the field, or whether the renunciation of a "utopian perspective" (Bordorff 2013: 153) is indeed a sign that artistic research attained "maturity" (Hanula, Suoranta and Vadén 2005: 34 ff.), may be difficult to ascertain, but the disconnection of artistic research from "art and art making" and on the other side, its alignment with research "in the academic context and for the audiences around academia", fundamentally changed for me the initial question "what is artistic research?" into "what is artistic research for?"

By establishing academia as the locus of knowledge production in art, academic artistic research reproduces the same epistemic-aesthetic division it was supposed to address. Heteronomous goals and methodologies of academic research overcode artistic practices and are internalised (or mimicked) by artists in academia, who become disconnected from art's own research programmes and histories. While academic artistic research may provide a favourable environment for artists to conduct their own research sheltered from pressure from other disciplines and the art market, it also risks sandboxing artists into a niche discipline that on one side is cut off from funding and professional opportunities and on the other, undermines transdisciplinarity.[1]

Such considerations dissuaded me from engaging in a debate that I felt remote and frankly uninspiring, pushing me to pursue an alternative route instead. I begun by assuming that Modern and Contemporary Art, say after Eduard Manet's *Le Déjeuner sur l'Herbe* from 1863 to give a convenient and rather uncontroversial reference (Fried 1996), can *only* be the outcome of artistic research, understood as the collective knowledge (tacit and explicit) necessary to construct the painting as artwork *and* object of knowledge. All other components of practice and reception being equal, the artist needs artistic research to embody ideas and concepts in the appropriate medium and form, situate the artwork in a socio-cultural milieu, embed criteria for its reflexive and inter-subjective evaluation and fruition, and contribute to the conditions for its presentation, dissemination, study, and archiving.

This description is admittedly sketchy and abstract but still manages to capture enough of the way in which *Le Déjeuner sur l'Herbe* was constructed as "epistemic object" (on this concept, see Rheinberger 1997; Knorr Cetina 2001; Schwab 2013; on Manet's "symbolic

[1] Some of these issues are raised as questions in Caviezel and Schwander 2015, and an analysis of the epistemic politics of artistic research can be found in Holert 2020. "The Vienna Declaration on Artistic Research" seems to acknowledge these points (AEC et al. 2020), and recent trends in artistic research are addressing the issue of transdisciplinarity as may be gathered from the outline of the new Transdisciplinary Artistic PhD Programme at the Zurich University of the Arts in Dombois 2018, or contrasting the proceedings of the 9th SAR Conference 2018 "Artistic Research Will Eat Itself" at the University of Plymouth, with programme of the forthcoming 13th SAR Conference 2022 at the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar.

revolution", see Bourdieu 2017; Foucault 2009; Shapiro 2014). If *Le Déjeuner sur l'Herbe* is an epistemic object, then the painting in its expanded context of production and reception can be used to show how artistic research constituted it as such. Rather than focussing on artists' practice, on which artistic research is usually defined (e.g. Sullivan 2005; Barrett and Bolt 2007; Biggs and Karlsson 2011; Nelson 2013), I focussed on the artwork and its field of material-semiotic agencies and considered artistic research neither an artist's activity nor an academic discipline, but the power of the material-semiotic network of the artwork to produce new knowledge.

My initial goal became that of finding a suitable case study to be modelled. Often utilising "intersemiotic translation" (Jakobson 1959: 233), allegory (Owens 1980; Bukloh 1982) and "transposition" (Schwab 2018) in photography, video, performance, and text, my art practice guided the choice of case study (see section 1.2) and aroused an initial interest in Walter Benjamin (see section 2). When I began, I was expecting the research to eventually feed back into my art practice but did not think that the project required its direct involvement. Instead, and for reasons I will explain later (see section 4), I planned to present the research outcomes in form of fiction, a plan that unfortunately, proved to be overambitious and I had to abandon after the first chapter, although I did not entirely give up the idea of reviving it in the near future.

Field of Research

This project begun as an inquiry into the epistemology of artistic research and in many respects still concerns this field even if it does not define it. Instead, this research starts from a problem, the relationship of art practice and criticism exemplified by Millais' *Ophelia* (1851-2, Tate Britain, London), and proceeds outwards from the painting with a transdisciplinary exploration of its sources, references, interpretations across different media and milieus. The initial idea for using a case study came from an early project in artistic research project at the Hochschule der Künste Bern. *Neuland/Foundland* (Dombois 2009) aimed at collecting "historical and contemporary examples of artistic research" that could serve as foundation for academic artistic research. This was my first encounter with with the then new research field and had a decisive influence because it represented early attempts to charter a new territory of knowledge and map artistic research into academic artistic research. Although this exploratory approach was soon abandoned, allegedly because it did not rest on "robust definitions of

research" (Biggs and Karlsson 2012: 409), *Neuland* recognised the continuity of academic artistic research with historical artistic practices and modes of artistic research within other disciplines.

Artistic research and the humanities present a "self-evident kinship" (Borgdorff 2012: 150-1) that dates back at least to the Renaissence (cf. Butt 2017; Bell 2019). The painter and architect Giorgio Vasari who is considered the "inventor of art history" (Rowland and Charney 2017; see also Williams 2016) for his *Lives of the Artists* (1550, 2nd ed. in 3 vol. 1568), is also the promoter of the first art academy in the world (Sartori 2014), the Accademia e Compagnia delle Arti del Disegno founded by Cosimo I Medici in 1563, "so that with its help those who did not know could learn, and those who knew, motivated by honourable and admirable competition, could gain more knowledge" (Vasari 1759-60 v. 3: 101, my translation). The Accademia di San Luca in Rome, lead by the painter Federico Zuccari, followed the Florence academy model in 1577, and the painter and art theorist Charles Le Brun organised the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture on the Rome academy, founded 1648 in Paris and on which all art academies across Europe and beyond, were directly or indirectly based, including Joshua Reynolds' Royal Academy of Arts (1768). This uninterrupted tradition of art making and art training was not only the milieu in which the Pre-Raphaelites' artistic research and critique formed around 1848, but also the historical paradigm for the reformation of British painting they dreamed of. Placed in the context of art disciplinarization that begun towards the end of the Renaissance, artistic research is less distinct from art practice than the new academic discipline makes it appear (cf. Klein 2009) and at the same time, its relationship with other academic disciplines becomes less stable.

Take for instance, Galileo Galilei, modern scientist, critic (Panofsky 1956) and accomplished draughtsman, appointed member of the Florence Academy in 1613. In *Galileo's Muse: Renaissance Mathematics and the Arts* (2011), Mark Peterson shows that it was the mathematics Galileo took from Renaissance arts rather than the sciences that became modern science. In Padua during the autumn 1609, Galileo observed "from life" the phases of the Moon, realising six watercolours that are the first realistic depiction of the its surface and, as artist's renderings, may count as an early example of artistic research, also included in *Neuland.* Although it may seem that Galileo is bridging the "two cultures" (Leavis 2003), the last complete thinker of the Renaissance (Garin 1993) is probably a point of bifurcation in the history of capitalism and knowledge (Stremlin 2004), when artistic research can no longer produce techno-scientific knowledge, but rather appropriates or occasionally, infiltrates it. Can this mean that the future of academic artistic research lays less in the ability to achieve a

different disciplinary status (Haaman 2019) than on the one hand, in the capacity to accept art history and post-disciplinary condition (Betzwieser 2011; Darbellay 2020), and on the other, in the ability to pursue "non-technocratic transdisciplinarity" (Maniglier 2019)?

As mentioned above, the *Neuland* project showed the heuristic potential of examples to investigate the epistemology of artistic research in historical context. Art education and artistic research follow a paradigmatic logic which explains the high number of case studies published in artistic research, as may be gathered surveying the first ten years of the *Journal for Artistic Research* (2011-21). Case study research is also used in other disciplines to explore and explain complex open problems by deploying multiple strategies (see Yin 2018) and both reasons suggested that this type of research would be particularly suitable to our project centred on a problem. Unlike transdisciplinary case study research in which "problem" is understood negatively as an obstacle that needs to be made more or less graspable for it to be removed or managed, we understand a problem positively as the proper object of thought.

We will introduce the hyperobject in our methodology to model a problem as a dynamic network of material-semiotic interactions across dimensions, such as media, historical periods, sociocultural regions and research fields. The characteristic properties of the hyperobject, viscosity, nonlocality, temporal undulation, and interobjectivity, will further support our adoption of transdisciplinarity, rather than occupying any disciplinary field of research. Meanwhile, a passage from Deleuze's "The Brain Is the Screen," originally part of a round table organised by Cahiers du cinéma for the publication of his *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (1986 [1985]), may serve as an anticipation:

> It is not when one discipline begins to reflect on another that they come into contact. Contact can be made only when one discipline realizes that it has to resolve on its own terms and for its own needs a problem similar to one another discipline is also confronted with. We can imagine similar problems which, at different moments, in different circumstances, and under different conditions, send shock waves through various fields: painting, music, philosophy, literature, and cinema. The tremors are the same, but the fields are different. All criticism is comparative (and cinematic criticism is at its worst when it limits itself to cinema as though it were a ghetto), because every work in whatever field is already self-comparing. Godard confronts painting in Passion and music in Prenom Carmen. He makes a serial cinema, but he also makes a cinema of catastrophe in a sense very close to the mathematical conception of René Thom. Every work has its beginning or its consequence in others arts. I was able to write on cinema not because I have some right to reflect on it, but because certain philosophical problems pushed me to seek out solutions in cinema, even if this only serves to raise more problems. All research, scholarly or creative, participates in such a relay system. (Deleuze, 2007: 284–5)

In the remaining part of this section, we will explain what is the problem that *Ophelia* exemplifies and, in the next section, why we chose Millais' painting to study it.

The *Lives of the Artists* monumentalised the Italian "*rinascita*" and the cultural primacy of Florence, as Vasari saw them from an end of history perspective. It was after the death of

Michelangelo and the retirement of Cosimo I (1564; for the date, cf. "Epilogue: Remebrance of Things Past" in Najemy 2006), when the economic and political status of the city was lost, when art commissions and practice in Florence were declining, that "*la nostra professione,*" as Vasari calls it, needed a history and an academy to support it (Biow 2018). George Didi-Huberman summarises this shift from practice-driven to theory-oriented artistic research in *Confronting Images*:

> We are, then, at the point where art, in the discourse of its history, seems to have acknowledged its true intent and formulated its true destiny through the terms of a philosophy of knowledge. But in the meantime something strange happened, perhaps due to the fact that famous artists, gathered in academies, themselves elaborated this new field that would be called the history of art: namely, a recuperation of the object by the subject and of the subject by the object. The discipline sought to arrogate to itself the prestige of its object of study; by grounding it intellectually, it sought to regulate it. As for the knowledge about art whose field it opened up, it resolved henceforth to envisage or accept only an art conceived as knowledge: as reconciliation of the visible and the Idea, denial of its visual powers, and subjection to the tyranny of *disegno*. Art was acknowledged less as a thinking object—which it had always been— than as an object of knowledge, all genitive senses conflated. (Didi-Huberman 2005: 82)

If Vasari's art history comes after artistic practice and for it, history preceded Modern art, not just in the chronological sense but as the task of emancipating itself from it. For instance, Manet exhibited the *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* at the Salon des Refusés in 1863 defying Giorgione's *Concert Champêtre* on display at the Louvre (1509, now re-attributed to Titian; on the relation Manet-Giorgione see Fehl 1957; Venturi 1985; for a more nuanced analysis of Manet's sources, see Fried 1996: 56 ff.), whereas the Pre-Raphaelites harked back to an invented art history before Raphael, that Vasari had constructed as patron saint of the future academy: “Now for those who have survived him, it remains for us to imitate the good, or rather the truly excellent style left behind by him as an example, and, as his talent deserves and our duty requires, to preserve the most graceful memory of his talent and always to pay homage to it.” (Vasari 1991: 337)

From the beginning—Antiquity, the Renaissance or the Enlightenment matters little here (cf. Venturi 1964)—art criticism cannot be clearly distinguished from art history (Baxandall 1979) or theory (Newman 2008). Its relation to art practice, and artistic research for that matter, has been ambiguous too, changing from 17th century reception side criticism to production side, the transition being clearly marked in Britain by John Ruskin's defence of the late Turner in *Modern Painters I* (1843, 2nd rev. ed. 1846) and the Pre-Raphaelites (first and second letter to *The Times* 1851). On either side, the art critic's influence raised steadily throughout the XIX century (Wright 1974) with the expansion of art markets and print media. With it, also grew the tension with artists that was about power and influence but articulated in terms of

knowledge. Typically, journalistic criticism focused on artistic skills and artists' writings on artistic research.

The libel suit brought by James Abbott McNeill Whistler against Ruskin in 1878 emphasised this fault line. Ruskin had written a harsh review of Whistler's eight pictures on show at the new Grosvenor Gallery on Bond Street. There were eight of them including *Nocturne in Black and Gold: The Falling Rocket* (1875): “For Mr. Whistler’s own sake, no less than for the protection of the purchaser, Sir Coutts Lindsay ought not to have admitted works into the gallery in which the ill-educated conceit of the artist so nearly approached the aspect of wilful imposture. I have seen, and heard, much of Cockney impudence before now; but never expected to hear a coxcomb ask two hundred guineas for flinging a pot of paint in the public’s face.” (Ruskin 1903-12 v. 29: 160). Although Whistler neither got an apology nor a compensation despite winning the case, he was successful in putting into question the authority of the most influential critic of his age, as John Holker's cross examination of Whistler dramatizes:

> — Now, Mr. Whistler. Can you tell me how long it took you to knock off that nocturne?
> — … I beg your pardon? (*Laughter.*)
> — Oh! I am afraid that I am using a term that applies rather perhaps to my own work. I should have said, 'How long did you take to paint that picture?'
> — Oh, no! permit me, I am too greatly flattered to think that you apply, to work of mine, any term that you are in the habit of using with reference to your own. Let us say then how long did I take to—'knock off,' I think that is it—to knock off that nocturne; well, as well as I remember, about a day.
> — Only a day?
> — Well, I won't be quite positive; I may have still put a few more touches to it the next day if the painting were not dry. I had better say then, that I was two days at work on it.
> — Oh, two days I The labour of two days, then, is that for which you ask two hundred guineas!
> — No; I ask it for the knowledge of a lifetime. (*Applause.*)
> (Whistler 1922: 4-5; for a more accurate account, see Aitken 2001)

Jacques Ranciére identifies an "aesthetic revolution" at the end of the long Eighteenth century it in *The Distribution of the Sensible*:

> I call this regime aesthetic because the identification of art no longer occurs via a division within ways of doing and making, but it is based on distinguishing a sensible mode of being specific to artistic products. The word aesthetics does not refer to a theory of sensibility, taste, and pleasure for art amateurs. It strictly refers to the specific mode of being of whatever falls within the domain of art, to the mode of being of the objects of art. In the aesthetic regime, artistic phenomena are identified by their adherence to a specific regime of the sensible, which is extricated from its ordinary connections and is inhabited by a heterogeneous power, the power of a form of thought that has become foreign to itself: a product identical with something not produced, knowledge transformed into non-knowledge, *logos* identical with *pathos*, the intention of the unintentional, etc. (Ranciére 2004: 22-3)

The "modernist historicism" (Scheffer 2000) and historical accuracy of Ranciére’s aesthetic regime may be put into question but it is useful to highlight the new relation to knowledge that Modern and Contemporary art has to knowledge. As "the distinctiveness of

artistic research . . . derives from the paramount place that artistic practice occupies as the subject, context, method, and outcome of the research" (Bordorff 2012: 147), "the intertwinedness of knowledge and non-knowledge under conditions of receding ontological stability describes the context within which artistic research can be epistemologically situated." (Schwab 2018: 193) It seems thus reasonable to conclude that "considering contemporary theories of aesthetic experience, one can reasonably criticize the claims of artistic research as being contradictory to one another. While they tend to lean on the production of knowledge through artistic forms, the inherent "aestheticity" of the materialized objects of this production leads to the undermining of all conceptualization" (Mühl 2016).

Jonathan Miles also notices this "double impasse" and suggests artistic research as a "third space" where art and theory "negotiate" their meaning (2012: 225), that somehow supports the disciplinarisation and hybrid identity of academic artistic research. Instead, we take the conversation between art and criticism since the Early Romantics to be the leading motif ofRanciére's aesthetic regime, and we will show that a change of discourse in painting occurred in Britain at the end of Pre-Raphaelitism analysing Rossetti's *Lady Lilith* (1864-73).

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of "double capture" describes the way two heterogeneous systems may engage, re-purposing one another for their own ends but without assimilation or erasure of difference:

> Nuptials are always against nature. Nuptials are the opposite of a couple. There are no longer binary machines: question-answer, masculine-feminine, man-animal, etc. This could be what a conversation is - simply the outline of a becoming. The wasp and the orchid provide the example. The orchid seems to form a wasp image, but in fact there is a wasp-becoming of the orchid, an orchid-becoming of the wasp, a double capture since 'what' each becomes changes no less than 'that which' becomes. The wasp becomes part of the orchid's reproductive apparatus at the same time as the orchid becomes the sexual organ of the wasp. One and the same becoming, a single bloc of becoming, or, as Remy Chauvin says, an 'a-parallel evolution of two beings who have nothing whatsoever to do with one another'. (Deleuze and Parnet 2007: 2-3; see also Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 10-1)

The double capture of art and other fields of research enables to reconnect artistic research with art practice and history, as they were never apart in the first place. On the other hand, it uncouples artistic research from the institutional, economical and political demands made on it as academic discipline. Instead, artistic research is conceptualised as pure transdisciplinarity that produces knowledge by constantly interacting with other fields of knowledge, such as criticism, art history and theory, poetry and literature, science and technology, etc. without itself being a third space but rather an epistemic transformation both within art practice and in the other field that can be differentially exposed.

The "becoming criticism of art" and the "becoming art of criticism" can be traced, for instance, to ekphrastic procedures in Classic Antiquity (Carrier 1993; Elsner 2010; Squire 2015) and in contemporary art writing (Fusco 2011). Nevertheless, these a-parallel evolutions seem to fall through the cracks of art, criticism and even, more often than not, artistic research (cf. Caduff and Wälchli 2019). In the "Round Table: The Present Conditions of Art Criticism" convened for the 100th issue of *October*, art historian James Meyer raises the issue of "the relationship of artistic practice to criticism," noticing that "there seems to be a loss of interest or belief in criticism as something necessary and valuable for its own sake, something to follow. And (although the connection is perhaps less than obvious) we see a disinterest in criticality as well: an artistic method engaged with critical thought, with critical issues. Much work at present does not bother to speak back to critics and to criticism" (203) The critic Benjamin Buchloh puts forward a historical explanation:

> This was partially initiated in the context of Conceptual art. I could flip the entire logic of what I said earlier by focusing on the fact that it is from within the purview of the most radical artistic practices of the sixties and their subsequent developments that not only the commodity-status of the work of art or its institutional frame are targeted one of the targets of this work was also the secondary discursive text that attached itself to artistic practice. Criticism and all secondary discourse were vehemently attacked. That is something we should not underestimate or forget. So we can construct a more dialectical image of the contemporary situation by saying that readers' competence and spectatorial competence had reached a level where the meddling of the critic was historically defied and denounced. (2002: 205)

He later gives the example of Joseph Kosuth and "Andrea Fraser, who has contested the viability of the role of the critic. I don't think that Andrea's work calls for critics at all since she is engaging-or so she claims-various functions that would have been at least partially addressed by critics in the past." (206) Buchloh's position remains isolated in the *October* round table (cf. Helen Molesworth, ibid, 206-7), the artist-critic is barely mentioned in *The State of Art Criticism* (cf. Blake Gopnik, Elkins and Newman 2007: 262), and Patricia Bickers only dedicates a few pages in *The Ends of Art Criticism* to Donald Judd who "was here both artist and critic, since he was really writing about, creating a context for, his own work" (2020: 64), concluding that "the question whether art criticism or critical writing is or can be art, meanwhile, has not gone away" (69).

Since 1990s, the opposition to criticism and criticality has grown in artistic practice and the public, and theory-driven criticism gave way to "lighter" forms of critical writing (Brenson 2004; Rubinstein 2006), whereas the correlation of these trends with the raise of artistic research in academia has gone mostly unnoticed (cf. Davis 2013). Although these developments float on top of larger material and historical changes in society, they show that the negotiation between art and criticism is not the kind of problem that may some time "go

away" but expresses their double capture in different discourses and under different historical conditions. On the verge of Modern Art, Millais' *Ophelia* sets the scene of their nuptial from which this transdisciplinary research sets out.

Problems and Questions

Allegory as Concept

The previous chapter introduced artistic criticism as a form of artistic research, but the proposition remains empty if the underlying problem that holds together the double capture of art and criticism is not defined. In Deleuze's example of double capture, the wasp and the orchid are locked in their nuptial by the problem of reproduction, in the case of art criticism it is expression that is, how meaning is embodied in the artwork and how that meaning is interpreted and understood. It ought to be already clear from what we said before, that this is not a general problem of art, although one might find that "art as communication" is a line of enquiry far from exhausted (for instance, Dewey 1980; Tolstoy 1995), but rather a specific problem of artistic criticism, the problem that characterises its field and although we investigate artistic criticism where the research might yield clearer results, focusing on a well-known narrative painting with a recognisable and distributed subject, we believe that the results can be extended even where the elements of passage may less descernable, one may think for instance of the artistic collaboration between Andy Warhol and Jean-Michel Basquiat (1983-5) recently explored in a play written by Anthony McCarten.

Concepts are creative responses to the problem and the artistic critical concept we identified operative in Ophelia is allegory. In the following section we will give a working definition of allegory and reconstruct its trajectory leading to the first Pre-Raphaelites. This will allow us to introduce the main references in the literature and the main research questions they raise. The next sections will articulate the questions according to three modes of allegory: as a historical genre of painting that the Pre-Raphaelites receive in their artistic training and was under revision in the 1840s, as a "mode of expression" (Benjamin 1998: 167) as it is put to work in Millais' *Ophelia*, and as "mode of interpretation" (ibid. 175) where Millais' painting interprets (and is interpreted) Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and on the other hand, is interpreted by (and interprets) MacCarthy's film *Ophelia*. In the next chapter, we will present the methodology of this study using the notion of "allegoresis" an expanded and generalised notion of allegory as mode of expression and interpretation (Sayre Greenfield in *The Ends of Allegory* considers "the differentiation allegory/allegoresis problematic or impossible", 1998: 55; also Zhang 2018: 62-3).

Allegory is one of the twelve tropes that Quintilian introduces in *The Institutes of Oratory* (8.6.44): Allegory, which is translated in Latin by *inversio*, either presents one thing in words and another in meaning [*aliud verbis aliud sensu*], or else something absolutely opposed [*interim contrarium*] to the meaning of the words." (1996 v.3: 327) The second meaning of allegory merges with the next trope (8.6.54): "On the other hand, that class of allegory in which the meaning is contrary to that suggested by the words [*contraria ostenditur*], involve an element of irony [*ironia est*], or, as our rhetoricians call it, *illusio*." (333). Quintilian's definition is the foundation of virtually all subsequent treatments of allegory but is usually dismissed as of purely historical interest and too broad to be of any critical use. We believe, however, that this definition of allegory brings out the necessary characteristics of allegory and sufficient with some adaptation for understanding artistic criticism.

At the core of allegory is difference: something is presented or interpreted as something else. Quintilian points out that allegory is produced by the difference that the listener perceives between the meaning of the sentence he expects (*sensus literalis,* or literal sense) and the sense constructed by the speaker (*sensus figuralis*, or figural sense). Although allegory may involve metaphors, hence the Neoclassical definition of "extended metaphor", Quintilian distinguishes the two tropes rather clearly (8.6.8-9):

"On the whole metaphor is a shorter form of simile, while there is this further difference, that in the latter we compare some object to the thing which we wish to describe, whereas in the former this object is actually substituted for the thing [*pro ipsa re dicitur*]. It is a comparison when I say that a man did something *like a lion*, it is a metaphor when I say of him, *He is a lion*." (305)

Allegory appears to be an intermediate trope between metaphor, that blends figural meaning into the literal, and irony that negates the former by the latter.

Having introduced into expression a doubling, allegory needs to keep in balance the levels of meaning, preventing them from collapsing onto one another or falling apart. This equilibrium is sustained by the discursive dimension of allegory that makes a heavy demand on the listener's knowledge, rather than simply assume competence. Conversely, the speaker needs to provide sufficient cues for the allegory to be recognised as such and understood to a sufficient degree. Quintilian comments on this point (8.6.52): "When, however, an allegory is too obscure, we call it a riddle [*aenigma*]: such riddles are, in my opinion, to be regarded as blemishes, in view of the fact that lucidity is a virtue; nevertheless they are used by poets, . . ." (331)

Allegory not only structures hierarchically meaning and the discursive positions of speaker and listener, but also relies for its effective communication on a metalanguage common to its actors made of formal patterns, intertextual references, and imitation. Quintilian stresses the importance of the latter (10.2.1-3):

> . . . there can be no doubt that in art no small portion of our task lies in imitation, since, although invention came first and is all-important, it is expedient to imitate whatever has been invented with success. And it is a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others. It is for this reason that boys copy the shapes of letters that they may learn to write, and that musicians take the voices of their teachers, painters the works of their predecessors, and peasants the principles of agriculture which have been proved in practice, as models for their imitation. In fact, we may note that the elementary study of every branch of learning is directed by reference to some definite standard [*praescriptum*] that is placed before the learner. We must, in fact, either be like or unlike those who have proved their excellence. It is rare for nature to produce such resemblance, which is more often the result of imitation [*Similem raro natura praestat, frequenter imitatio*]. (1996 v. 4: 75)

Quintilian's passage summarises the classical theory of mimesis, still relevant to painting until the end of the 19th century and to the Pre-Raphaelites, and shows that mimesis is constituted by two independent processes of representation that Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* combines in the concept of "figura":

"In this conception, an occurrence on earth signifies not only itself but at the same time another, which it predicts or confirms, without prejudice to the power of its concrete reality here and now. The connection between occurrences is not regarded as primarily a chronological or causal development but as a oneness within the divine plan, of which all occurrences are parts and reflections. Their direct earthly connection is of secondary importance, and often their interpretation can altogether dispense with any knowledge of it." (2003: 555)

We believe on the contrary that the "oneness" of the figura, which is another name for allegory (cf. Auerbach 2003: 569), only conceptualises the difference between resemblance to nature and imitation of art that precedes it historically and logically. Mimesis had always been double or what would be meaning of Parrhasius's painting contest with Zeuxis recounted by Pliny the Elder?

Still, imitation went further. It was not limited to excellence within each artistic medium but covered a wide range of intermedial practices. Ecphrasis between poetry and sculpture or painting was the most significant (Hefferman 1993) but the idea that art practices were all connected in mutual imitation and emulation was established in Classical Antiquity and represented by Apollo Musagetes, god of music and poetry, leader of the muses: "'Tis Apollo comes leading / His choir, the Nine. / —The leader is fairest, / But all are divine." as Matthew Arnold introduces him in "Empedocles on Etna" ([1852] 1903 v. 2: 294; for a commentary, Houghton 1958). He presides over Horace's *ut pictura poesis* ("as is painting so is poetry" *Art*

of Poetry v. 361; on the political role under the emperor Augustus, Miller 2009), to Leonardo's *Paragone* (c. 1500; a modern edition of the manuscript, Farago 1992; on the humanistic theory of art, Lee 1940), to Charles Batteux's modern system of the arts (*The Fine Arts Reduced to a Single Principle,* [1746] 2015; on the system, Kristeller 1952), to the Romantics, the Pre-Raphaelites and until modernist intermedial practices (for instance Stravinsky's ballet "Apollo, Leader of the Muses from 1928).

This genealogy is confusing and most literature busied itself to disentangle what Horace meant (Trimpi 1973) from the various layers of interpretations. Our question goes in the opposite direction, why did this critical idea of Classical Antiquity survive? "Survival" (*Nachleben*) refers, of course, to Aby Warburg's central problem, "the continuity or afterlife and metamorphosis of images and motifs—as opposed to their renascence after extinction or, conversely, their replacement by innovations in image and motif." (Didi-Huberman 2003: 273) Our reliance on Warburg and his school in the wider sense (Panofsky, Gombrich, and Wind but also Benjamin, Malraux, and Didi-Huberman) will be clear in the course of this study, whereas here we should point out at the main difference. Survival is not an identity moving across history, but a "problem" sustaining the multiplicity of its answers.

Horace's formula survived because it continued to produce artistic and critical answers to the problem of which allegory is the concept: the difference of the visible and stateable. Deleuze explains their gap in his 1985-86 course on Foucault:

> So that's where we are now. Ultimately… we aren't moving on, but we are advancing within the same problem, and it is by dint of advancing within this problem or pushing this problem forward that we will get to the end. This problem is this: that we are still faced with two irreducible forms: the form of the visible, the form of the statable [*l'énonçable*]. There isn't an isomorphic nature to these forms. In other words, there is neither a form common to the visible and the statable, nor a correspondence between the two forms. So, there is neither conformity – a common form – nor a one-to-one correspondence from one form to the other. There is a difference in nature or, according to [Maurice] Blanchot's terminology, there is a "non-relation" [*non-rapport*], a non-relation between the visible and the statable, thus, a disjunction, a gap [*une disjonction, une béance*]. This is the disjunction of light (as the form of the visible) / language (as the form of the statable). (Deleuze 1985-86; cf. visible/articulable in Deleuze 1988: 47 ff.)

The Deleuze-Foucault-Blanchot's "relation without relation" (Blanchot 1993: 73) between visible and statable seems to match the superficial structure of Baroque painted allegories, Andrea Alciato's *Emblemata* (2009; Augsburg 1531, Paris 1534; Alciato 2009) translated in as German *Sinnbild* (lit. "meaningful image") or in Dutch as *Denkbeeld* (lit. "thought image." For a critical history of the "pensive image" until Benjamin and Adorno, see Grootenboer 2021). The alignment of visible with image and stateable with text, somehow repeats the publication history of the *Emblemata* the Latin verse texts (*subscriptio*) placed under the image (*pictura*) as their caption are Aciato's emblems proper, whereas the woodcuts

were produced for the publication independently from Alciato and entirely derived from his text. The motto that gives to each emblem its title, clearly places both image and verse text in the domain of the stateable, and where Alciato's plain descriptions repeat the coarse woodcuts that illustrates them, his moralising message has no correspondence (on the hieroglyphic, ecphrasis and *ut pictura poesis* in the *Emblemata*, see Mino Gabriele's introduction in Alciato 2009; on the other hand, for Alciato's naturalism, see Carlisle 2018).

Benjamin already remarked that "the allegory of the seventeenth century [is] not convention of expression, but expression of convention" (Benjamin 1998: 175), because it privileges imitation over resemblance "providing a corrective . . . to art itself" (176), and "at one stroke the profound vision of allegory transforms things and works into stirring writing." (176) For Benjamin, allegory as much as "criticism means the mortification of the works. . . . not then - as the romantics have it - awakening of the consciousness in living works, but the settlement of knowledge in dead ones. Beauty, which endures, is an object of knowledge." (1998: 182; for a critique of Benjamin's allegory in the *Trauerspiel*, see Hoxby 2010). What matters to us, instead, is that in Alciato's paradigmatic example of allegory, the image can only perform its function of *pictura* if it expresses "less" than its corresponding text (motto and *subsriptio*). This allows to align the formal difference between literal and figural sense, that constitutes the allegory, with the difference in the *Emblemata* between woodcut and typography, image and text. At the same time, that "lack" in the image reveals precisely that no alignment with perceptual modality is possible and the ontological gap between visible and stateable cannot be eliminated but only disavowed. Visibilities and stateabilities that to Alciato appeared to overlap, remain on different ontological planes, the former being "intensities" or differences, the latter "extensities," or identities (we appropriate and simplify Deleuze's concepts following Sauvagnargues 2009: ch. XII and De Landa 2002; Zizek's *Parallax View* is also a source: "The parallax is not symmetrical, composed of two incompatible perspectives on the same X: there is an irreducible asymmetry between the two perspectives, a minimal reflexive twist. We do not have two perspectives, we have a perspective and what eludes it, and the other perspective fills in this void of what we could not see from the first perspective." 2007: 29).

How ontological visibilities and stateabilities are distributed in the socio-historical epistemes at different scales, from large cultural formations such as Early Victorian visual culture down to individual artworks such as Millais' *Ophelia*, is a question that the concept of allegory can help formulate precisely in each milieu while, at the same time, its double structure and discursiveness allow to avoid instituting an aesthetic regime (on Foucault's archaeology of

vision, see Jay 1993; Shapiro 2003; "The Visible" in Lawlor and Nale 2013: 534-9; for a critique of the regime, see Jay 1988). The concept of allegory articulates the problematics of this study around five concerns that test the concept of allegory laid out at the beginning of the section.

First, how does allegory in painting realise visibility/stateability and the opposites that complete the couple: the representation of the non-visible in Early-Modern painting as empirical non-visual and intellectual abstraction (Merleau-Ponty 1968; Hammer-Tugendhat 2015) and on the other side, the Romantic quest for representing the non-stateable as transcendental subject (Berlin 1999; Abrams 1971) and poetic metalanguage (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy 1988; Gasché 1992).

Second, the proposition that criticism is allegorical (for instance, Benjamin 1998: 182; for his theory of allegory, Cowan 1981; also De Man 1979; for a comparison on allegory in both authors see Hansen 2004) is often attributed to Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* (1953):

> It is not often realized that all commentary is allegorical interpretation, an attaching of ideas to the structure of poetic imagery. The instant that any critic permits himself to make a genuine comment about a poem (e.g., "In Hamlet Shakespeare appears to be portraying the tragedy of irresolution") he has begun to allegorize. Commentary thus looks at literature as, in its formal phase, a potential allegory of events and ideas. The relation of such commentary to poetry itself is the source of the contrast which was developed by several critics of the Romantic period between "symbolism" and "allegory," symbolism here being used in the sense of thematically significant imagery. The contrast is between a "concrete" approach to symbols which begins with images of actual things and works outward to ideas and propositions, and an "abstract" approach which begins with the idea and then tries to find a concrete image to represent it. This distinction is valid enough in itself, but it has deposited a large terminal moraine of confusion in modern criticism, largely because the term "allegory" is very loosely employed for a great variety of literary phenomena. (Frye 2006: 82-3)

As our concept of allegory is different from that of Benjamin and De Man, and artistic criticism cannot be Frye's "commentary" this raises questions on how our concept of allegory can support artistic criticism. For instance, what are the difficulties of assigning primary and secondary sense (literal and figural) to visiblity and stateability that are non-hierarchical and dynamic? how does artistic criticism operate across their gap? how does allegory account for reflexive and affective interpretation in artistic criticism? and for re-presentation of artistic criticism in another text?

Third, if the general form of artistic research is transpositional ("the articulation of something as something else" Schwab 2018: 191) and thus allegorical, can allegory bridge the separation discussed in the previous section, between artistic research as practice and as discipline? And that between artistic research as historical practice since the Renaissance and as academic research today?

Fourth, how does the concept of allegory help in the analysis of intermedia insofar as intermedial translations (ecphrasis, paraphrase, adaptation, parody, etc,) are in or perspective, allegorical procedures (in "The Task of the Translator" Benjamin speaks of a "single spot where the echo is able to give, in its own language, the reverberation of the work in the alien one" 2007: 76; in as much as allegory generalises metaphor, see Guldin 2016: ch. 1)?

Our fifth and most important concern is the general application of our concept of allegory in criticism. The idea that all art is allegorical has circulated since Plato's allegory of the cave in various guises until its consecration as form of postmodernism (Owens 1980). Brenda Machosky's account of allegory in *Structures of Appearing: Allegory and the Work of Literature* (2012) serves the even broader agenda of liberating poetry from the judgement of philosophy. Because allegory is "the phenomenon in which two things (impossibly, illogically) occupy the same space at the same time, allegory is the work of art with which Aesthetics simply cannot contend" (26), then allegory is "that mode of appearance peculiar to art" and "implicit in all forms of language," including "the symbol, … especially in its poetic form" so that, Machosky concludes, philosophy itself "depends on allegory, on poetry, in order to achieve its ends" (26-27). The thesis that all art is allegorical fails art on both ends of allegory. Referring to our working definition we derived from Quintilian, if allegory resolves entirely into metaphor, then art becomes redundant once its meaning has been extracted. On this account, Heidegger criticises Plato and Hegel's end of art theory:

Allegory and symbol provide the conceptual frame within whose channel of vision the artwork has long been characterized. But this one element in a work that manifests another, this one element that joins with another, is the thingly feature in the artwork. It seems almost as though the thingly element in the artwork is like the substructure into and upon which the other, proper element is built. And is it not this thingly feature in the work that the artist properly makes by his handicraft? Our aim is to arrive at the immediate and full actuality of the work of art, for only in this way shall we discover actual art also within it. Hence we must first bring to view the thingly element of the work. (Heidegger 1992: 146)

Conversely, if allegory resolves into metonymy or irony of which it is a form (Athanasiadou 2017) then as Machosky's own "mode of appearence" (see her chapter "Allegory as Metonymy: The Figure without a Face", 2012) allegory becomes yet another aesthetic concept, too generic to be of critical use, as Frederic Jameson criticizes in *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*:

> The allegorical, then — whether those of DeMan or Benjamin, of the revalorization of medieval or of non-European texts, of Althusserian or Levi-Straussian struc-turalisms, of Kleinian psychologies or Lacanian

> psychoanalysis— can be minimally formulated as the question posed to thinking by the awareness of incommensurable distances within its object of thought, and as the various new interpretive answers devised to encompass phenomena about which we are at least minimally agreed that no single thought or theory encompasses any of them. Allegorical interpretation is then first and foremost an interpretive operation which begins by acknowledging the impossibility of interpretation in the older sense, and by including that impossibility in its own provisional or even aleatory movements. (Jameson 1991: 168)

In the next chapter we will resume this discussion on the proposition that all art is allegorical to introduce our methodology of the hyperobject but we can conclude this section by stating what allegory as we defined it, is not. Allegory is neither metaphor nor metonymy because it is a difference, a gap. Allegory is not purely linguistic, because visible and stateable do not follow the signifier/signified distinction. Allegory is not a theoretical concept because it is practical, embodied in the materiality of the artwork (cf. Herzogenrath 2020), and socio-historical, embedded in a discourse between different agents (artist, viewer, patron, dealer, etc.) in and across different milieus. Finally, allegory is not a definition of art because meaning, that allegory articulates and modulates, may well be necessary (Danto 1981; Stecker 1997) but remains at the margin of artistic practice: "Content is a glimpse of something, an encounter like a flash. It's very tiny—very tiny, content." (Willem de Koonig quoted in Susan Sontag's "Against Interpretation", 1966: 3)

Allegory as Genre

After introducing a working definition of the concept in previous section, we will now apply allegory to the Pre-Raphaelites showing why and how this became one of the defining features of the movement. This section will outline the academic theory of genres at the foundation of their academic training, the conditions that brought history painting and allegory at the centre of the cultural debate, and the artistic transformation that the Pre-Raphaelites introduced before introducing, in the next section, the allegorical structure of Millais' *Ophelia.*

Academic theory of genres

The basic function of genre is to classify paintings according to their subject, required by the progressive commodification of art in 16th century Italy (for a case study, Holmes 2003). Subjects differentiated to meet demand and paintings were sold and resold outside their context of production, pushing the thematic specialisation of painters and collectors. From the consolidated paradigms characterising each genre, the Paris academy codified rules that provided artists with a practical schema and publics with a horizon of expectations that helped

navigate the gap between visible and stateable (for a performative theory of genre, see Frow 2005). The theoretical framework produced values and boundaries that structured training, practice and market but also opened possibilities for creative transgressions, for instance that of still-live into allegory, or portrait into history as Rembrandt did in the *Night Watch* (1642; for an analysis see Berger 2007) and later the Pre-Raphaelite, *Ophelia* being a case in point.

André Félibien, historian and art critic at the court of Louis XIV, is credited with the codification of the system of genres in the *Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellents peintres anciens et modernes* (1725 [1667]; for a reappraisal of Félibien's system, see Alderman 2006):

> He who makes perfect landscapes is above another who only paints fruit, flowers, or seashells. He who paints living animals is worthier of estimation than those who paint only things that are dead and without movement. And as the figure of man is the most perfect work of God on earth, it is also certain that he who becomes an imitator of God by painting human figures is much more excellent than all the others. However, even though it is no small thing to make the figure of a man appear as if alive, and to give the appearance of movement to that which has none, nevertheless a painter who only makes portraits . . . may not pretend to the honour accorded to the most learned. For that, it is necessary to progress from the single figure to the representation of several together, to depict history and myth [*il faut traiter l'histoire et la fable*], to represent great actions as the Historians or pleasing subjects as the Poets; and ascending further, it is necessary through allegorical compositions, to know how to hide under the veil of myth the virtue of great men and the most elevated mysteries. (Félibien 1725 v. 5: 310-1; trans. modified from Duro 1997: 9-10)

Still-life, landscape, genre, portraiture, and history painting are ranked in ascending order of difficulty of realisation and nobility of subject that conversely, "ennobles the artist by a more illustrious work." Thus, history is the highest genre, a rank that is also reflected in terms of picture size and market value, because by representing groups of human bodies in movement and action, it fulfils the neoclassical ideal and is the most exacting, especially for the intellectual parts of invention and composition. Félibien gives two more reasons for the superiority of the genre: it "deals" with "great actions as the Historians or pleasing subjects as the Poets," and further in its highest degree, history becomes allegorical in order to convey "under the veil of myth the virtue of great men and the most elevated mysteries."

The system of genres complements a system of "parts." In Leonardo's *Trattato della pittura* ch. 47 (c. 1540, principal edition, Paris 1651) painting is subdivided geometrically: "Painting is divided into two principal parts, of which the first is figure [shape], that is, the line that differentiates the figures of bodies and their details; and the second is the color contained within these boundaries." (2008: 636) From the subdivision, a long debate ensues in the Paris Academy (1671-1717) on the relative importance of *disegno,* sustained by the Poussinists, or *colore*, sustained by the Rubenists who "won the argument." On the other hand, the parts were elaborated into a new category that mediated painting practice with teaching and theory.

Charles-Alphonse Du Fresnoy describes four of them: invention, disposition, drawing and colour in *De arte graphica* (Paris 1668; translated by John Dryden, London 1695; by William Mason with annotations by John Reynolds, London 1782). The intellectual parts of practice (invention and disposition/composition) are those determining and determined by the genre of the painting. In history painting, genre also becomes a critical category that mediates between painting practice and the literary subject, placing them on equal footing, which changes the logic of *ut pictura* from competition into a coordination between the sister arts. Thus, genre is not only the key towards the modern system of arts, introduced by Jean-Bapriste Du Bos in *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* (Paris 1719; Young 2015) and codified by Charles Batteux in *System of the Fine Arts* ([1746] 2015), but also to the widening of the gap between visible and stateable. Although all arts represent nature, Du Bos introduces a semiotic distinction: painting, sculpture, and music use natural signs that represent because they resemble their objects, whereas poetry and literature use artificial signs that are arbitrary or conventional.

The "allegorical compositions" in which Félibien's historical genre culminates, are personification allegories, but considerations can be more general. Placed at the intersection of painting and literature as sub-genre of history painting, allegory multiplies the critical functions of the genre by those of the trope. It can comment, judge and even subvert ironically the subject it receives from literature, but at the price of folding painting back onto the text. The veiling of virtue and mystery contrasts with the greater naturalism of the other genres, a landscape resembles nature more than a paining can imitate a text, and requires an additional interpretation on the *sensus literalis* that is depicted to understand the *sensus figuralis* that is stated.

On one hand, "the traditional term of allegory that Benjamin . . . helped to restore to some of its full implications is frequently used . . . to describe a tension . . . that can no longer be modelled on the subject-object relationships derived from experiences of perception, or from theories of the imagination derived from perception." (De Man 1983: 173-4) On the other, Du Bos' theory brings that tension within allegory, wresting it away from classical and Renaissence mimesis based on resemblance and imitation. It is the prelude to the "linguistic turn" in aesthetics that came into visibility later with Johannes von Herder, one of the "roots of Romaticism" (Berlin 1976, 1999; for the philosophy of language in Germany from Herder to Romanticism, see Foster 2010, 2011 and particularly, the chapter "Aesthetics" in 2018; also, Bowie 1999; for philosophy of language in France from Du Bos to Condillac, see Aarsleff 2016; Juilard 2016 and Nye 2000) As visual language, painting represents reality through

natural signs rather than direct resemblance, and by applying rules of art, such as those that could be taught and learned in the academy, rather than directly imitating the old masters by practice. Foucault's separation of visible and stateable at the end of the Classical Age is not so much an "aesthetic revolution" in Ranciére's sense (2002; 2004), but the result of a "linguistic turn" that gives rise to a new artistic research programme, the Romantic quest for a universal and poetic metalanguage. While resolving the relation of painting to literature in the *ut pictura poesis*, the semantic is fatal to allegory as genre, notwithstanding its persistence "as an archaism in public art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." (Brown 2007: 1), and "reinvention" as mode of expression and interpretation (Kelley 1997).

History Painting and Reynolds

Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses on Art* (delivered between 1769 and 1790; 1778, 1st ed. of seven discourses; 1798, 2nd ed. complete of fifteen) take Félibien's system of genres for granted but introduce important revisions, for instance allegory is no longer considered a genre. With all their inconsistencies, the *Discourses* don't claim to be a theoretical work (Leypoldt 1999) but lectures that reflect Reynolds' effort to "inculcate . . . great principles and great models" (134), update, simplify and adapt theory from a variety of sources for his audience of students. Although he touches on the "correspondence with the principles of the other arts, which, like this, address themselves primarily and principally to the imagination." (1905: 349) and other theoretical aspects of painting (genius, taste, the sublime, etc.), Reynolds insists on practice (e.g. 20) that he reduced to his own single principle, often repeated in the *Discourses*:

> The value and rank of every art is in proportion to the mental labour employed in it, or the mental pleasure produced by it. As this principle is observed or neglected, our profession becomes either a liberal art, or a mechanical trade. . . . I have formerly observed, that perfect form is produced by leaving out particularities, and retaining only general ideas: I shall now endeavour to show that this principle, which I have proved to be metaphysically just, extends itself to every part of the Art ; that it gives what is called the grand style, to Invention, to Composition, to Expression, and even to Colouring and Drapery. (Reynolds 1905: 71-2)

The grand style is opposed to the ornamental based on "the principles by which each is attained . . . so contrary to each other, that they seem, in my opinion, incompatible, and as impossible to exist together, as that in the mind the most sublime ideas and the lowest sensuality should at the same time be united." (88) The principles follow Locke's distinction between simple ideas, derived from sensation by reflection, and general ideas, derived from simple ideas by abstraction leaving out all the particular circumstances of time and place, which would limit the application of an idea to a particular individual (Hipple 1953; Asfour and Williamson 1997). For Reynolds, the canvas is the mind itself, Locke's *tabula rasa*, and the painter is not

imitating nature, painting or literature, as much as imitating the mind that abstracts and connects simple ideas regardless of their origin (Nathaniel Horne seems to caricature this aspect of Reynolds in his painting *The Conjuror* from 1775. On Reynolds' practice, see Gombrich 1942)

As in Locke and Hume one finds no Platonic incompatibility, so in Reynolds blendings between grand style and ornamental are frequent and a "composite style" is even considered (100). The "grand style" is better understood as a practical and critical scheme. As we saw above, the grand style guides "every part of the Art," it discriminates a pure historical genre from the "splendid or ornamental style" that incorporates elements of lower genres (100); privileges Poussinist *disegno* over Rubenist *colore* (however see Reynolds' preference for Rubens in the 5th Discourse, 1905: 127 ff.); judges schools and individual styles to imitate, the Florentine and French schools over the Venetian and Dutch; finally, it frames a significant moment in art history. Elaborating on a detail in Vasari's "Life of Michelangelo" (1991: 441), Reynolds describes Raphael's "sight" of Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel as a conversion from the Gothic style of his training based on the particular, to the "grand style" that was later referred to as Renaissance:[2]

> Raffaelle . . . had not the advantage of studying in an Academy; but all Rome, and the works of Michel Angelo in particular, were to him an Academy. On the sight of the Capella Sistina, he immediately from a dry, Gothic, and even insipid manner, which attends to the minute accidental discriminations of particular and individual objects, assumed that grand style of painting, which improves partial representation by the general and invariable ideas of nature. (1905: 7-8)

The transition from early works in the Umbria region is slower and begins earlier, at least since 1504 when he moves to Florence and studies not only Michelangelo, but also Leonardo and other painters of the Florentine school. Nonetheless, 1508 is an extraordinary year in the Italian Renaissance (Labella 1990) when Michelangelo begins the *Cappella Sistina* (1508-12)

---

[2] The term is first documented (OED 3rd ed.) in Thomas Trollope's *A Summer in Brittany* 1840 in the context of architecture with pejorative connotation referring to church of Notre-Dame at Saint-Thégonnec (Finistére, Brétagne) completely built between 1563 and 1599 but later heavely Baroquized (Pérouse de Montclos 2002): "I could not much admire the church of St. Thégonec. It is built in that heaviest and least graceful of all possible styles, the "renaissance," as the French choose to term it. The fabric is vast, gloomy, and darksome, and, to my taste, superlatively ugly." (Trollope 1840 v. 2: 234) Ruskin still uses "renaissance" sporadically and descriptively in the third edition of *Modern Painters I* (for instance, 1846: 101/ 1903 v. 3: 202) and clearly opposes Renaissance architecture to Gothic in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1848/1903 v. 12: 98) that he intends as "an introduction" (Preface to 2nd edition, 1903 v. 8: 7) to *The Stones of Venice* where he defines it as "this rationalistic art is the art commonly called Renaissance, marked by a return to pagan systems." (1903 v. 9: 3). However, it is used pejoratively throughout the the three volumes in aesthetic and moral sense. In a later lecture (*Crown of Wild Olive,* "Lecure 2. Traffic. Delivered in the Town Hall, Bradford," 21 April 1864") Ruskin goes so far as to maintain that "he had from beginning to end, no other aim than to show that the Gothic architecture of Venice had arisen out of, and indicated in all its features, a state of pure national faith, and of domestic virtue; and that its Renaissance architecture had arisen out of, and in all its features indicated, a state of concealed national infidelity, and of domestic corruption." (v. 18: 443)

and Raphael the *Stanza della Segnatura* (1508-11). For Roger de Piles, on whose *The Art of Painting* (1706) Reynolds relies, Michelangelo is "one of the first that banished the *little manner*, and the remainders of the Gothic out of Italy" (De Piles 1706: 160, emphasis added). Of Raphael, he says that "there has been no Painter since *the Restoration* of the art in Italy, who acquired such a reputation as Raphael" (1706: 126, emphasis added). In *Balance des peintres* (1708) where De Piles ranks 49 painters based on their score in the four parts of painting (composition, drawing, color, expression), Raphael has the highest overall score (65) with Rubens (the ranking was criticised since it was published, Puttfarken 1986: for an innovative use, Ginsburgh and Weyers 2002)

Reynolds saw in Raphael not only the completion of the stylistic transition from the Gothic to the grand manner begun by Michelangelo, but an ideal model for the students of the Royal Academy, that could copy the "Raphael Cartoons" (1515-6) directly or from the high-quality copies. Although the importance of Raphael can be overestimated both in Reynolds' writings and in the practice of the Academy, Raphael signified for the Pre-Raphaelites the Academic style against which they sought to define their practice and the end of the Gothic from which they intended to move backwards in search for alternative models and a new ethics of painting.

In his first letter to *The Times* (13 May 1851) Ruskin remarks that:

> These pre-Raphaelites (I cannot compliment them on common sense in their choice of a *nom de guerre*) do *not* desire nor pretend in any way to imitate antique painting as such. They know very little of ancient paintings who suppose the works of these young artists to resemble them. As far as I can judge of their aim—for, as I said, I do not know the men themselves—the Pre-Raphaelites intend to surrender no advantage which the knowledge or inventions of the present time can afford to their art. They intend to return to early days in this one point only—that, as far as in them lies, they will draw either what they see, or what they suppose might have been the actual facts of the scene they desire to represent, irrespective of any conventional rules of picture-making; and they have chosen their unfortunate though not inaccurate name because all artists did this before Raphael's time, and after Raphael's time did *not* this, but sought to paint fair pictures, rather than represent stern facts ; of which the consequence has been that, from Raphael's time to this day, historical art has been in acknowledged decadence. (1903 v. 12: 321-2)

The inconsistencies of the passage are easy to overlook: why would the Pre-Raphaelites need "to return to the early days" "before Raphael's time" in order to "draw what they see"? and how could they "surrender no advantage which the knowledge or inventions of the present time can afford to their art", "irrespective of any conventional rules of picture-making"? To "rescue" the Pre-Raphaelites from the 1850-51 attacks on the press (Ealand 1910: 55) and the "retrograde argument" sustained against them especially by Charles Dickens (1850), Ruskin recasts their archaism in terms of naturalism, that he himself favoured, for instance in the 1844 second edition of *Modern Painters* (e.g. see his comment that "Turner *is* like nature", 1903 v.

7: 52) and that was already in fashion since the late 1830s. In doing so, however, Ruskin displaced what we believe is the artistic problem of Pre-Raphaelite's practice and changed the course of the debate about their significance. Hunt raises the point many years later reflecting upon Rossetti with Ruskin's passage in mind:

> Despite differences, we both agreed that a man's work must be the reflex of a living image in his own mind, and not the icy double of the facts themselves. It will be seen that we were never realists. I think art would have ceased to have the slightest interest for any of us had the object been only to make a representation, elaborate or unelaborate, of a fact in nature. (Hunt 1905 v. 1: 150; see also v. 2: 362)

The Pre-Raphaelites were not, as Ruskin hoped, followers of Turner, who died later the same year of the letters. They were not trying to naturalise history (cf. Turner's *The Fighting Temeraire* from 1839 and *Snow Storm* from 1842, discussed in Rodner 1986) but rather to historicize nature, weaving both into an elaborate allegory of the present: "It is by virtue of a strange combination of nature and history that the allegorical mode of expression is born" (Benjamin 1998: 167) and that Millais' *Ophelia* aptly exemplifies.

The task of "allegorising the Pre-Raphaelites" rubs up against two strands in criticism: one follows Ruskin and emphases their naturalist style as anticipation of Realism (e.g. Prettejohn 2009; 2012), the other strand follows Hunt and emphasises their moral values and religious content as protraction of Romanticism (e.g Landow 1979/2015 and more recently, Grewe 2009). This may seem a rather sweeping simplification of the literature and a review would certainly be needed to support it but even so, the polarisation should not be dismissed as a classification of criticism (on the form/content divide, see Sonntag 1966: 12 ff.). The strands reflect a duality and ambiguity that belongs to the Pre-Raphaelites' practice and derives from the structure of their form of expression, allegory.

The history genre "far from being a merely ‘stylistic’ device, creates effects of reality and truth which are central to the different ways the world is understood . . . in painting, or in everyday talk. The semiotic frames within which genre is embedded implicate and specify layered ontological domains - implicit realities which genres form as a pre-given reference, together with the effects of authority and plausibility which are specific to the genre. Genre, like formal structures generally, works at a level of semiosis - that is, of meaning-making - which is deeper and more forceful than that of the explicit ‘content’ of a text." (Frow 2005: 19, adapted). The problem of this study is not determining how much (or how little) it departs from "conventional rules of picture-making" that was exaggerated but how those rules which and are better understood within international Academicism rather than provided it is correctly understood as we are about to explain. Second, naturalism is neither representation of nature

nor a a reference to is one of the remarkable distinctions between their painting and that of Van Eyck or Hemling," as Ruskin suggests in his second letter (1905 v. 12: 326), but has a communicative function as "truth effect" and as allegory, as we are going to see in the next section.

The Royal Academy and Pre-Raphaelites

Age 11, Millais became the youngest student ever to be admitted at the Royal Academy Schools in 1840 and in 1847, he completed the Life School winning the highest price open to students, the Gold Medal for History Painting awarded to him for *The Tribe of Benjamin Seizing the Daughters of Shiloh in the Vineyards* (1847; on the painting, see Rosenfeld 2019). Fifty years after it was first exhibited at the British Institution, the critic Marion H. Spielmann praised *The Tribe of Benjamin* for showing “a power of composition, a freedom of drawing, and a bigness of design—a capacity to use the human form in the 'grand manner'.... painted to prove the artist's knowledge in the rendering of flesh and the figure" (Spielmann 1898: 165). Despite the intervening changes in the artworld and the institution, the reference to Reynolds' grand style is not rhetorical but rather exemplary of how much it historical genre meant at the Schools.

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (PRB) to which we are mainly referring to with the term "Pre-Raphaelites" formed in 1848 and for Millais, begun fading while he was still finishing *Ophelia* until he and his wife Effie Gray finally moved to Scotland in 1856 (until 1861), waiting for the scandal of her annulled marriage with Ruskin (1855) to blow away. The PRB official group included five young artists (Millais was the youngest at 16 and Thomas Woolner the eldest at 23) at the beginning of their profession, Millais being the only one to have received a paid commission, the decoration of a private entrance hall in Leeds with a series of six allegorical lunettes ("The Four Ages of Man", "Music" and "Art", 1847-8, Leeds City Art Gallery). By 1853, the group had already disintegrated and Hunt, "the True Pre-Raphaelite" (Clark Amor 1995), was the only member to continue a PRB practice until the end of his career.

On the other hand, a second generation of Pre-Raphaelites assembled around the cycle of murals on the Arthurian legend, commissioned by Ruskin for the Oxford Union Debating Hall (1857-9): Dante Gabriel Rossetti, William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones, soon joined by Valentine Prinsep, John Hungerford Pollen, Arthur Hughes and John Rodham Spencer Stanhope. Through Morris, Pre-Raphaelitism enters the Arts and Crafts Movement, and through Burne-Jones, "the Last Pre-Raphaelite" (MacCarthy 2012), it fuses with Aestheticism.

There is no definite end to Pre-Raphaelitism, that continued in the United States and the Colonies until the 1920s, but in Britain, the First World War changed irreversibly the cultural conditions that had sustained the movement through the Victorian and Edwardian Age. At his death in 1917, John William Waterhouse, "the Modern Pre-Raphaelite" (Prettejohn et al. 2009), left the charcoal drawing "Study for 'Ophelia in the Churchyard'" (1915; Hobson 1980: 199 n. 365), a painting that if realised, would have completed his series on Ophelia's madness (1889, 1894, 1910) and may serve us here as an end point for our question: What is the relationship between the Pre-Raphaelites (1848-1853) and Pre-Raphaelitism (1848-1917)?

Marcia Pointon remarks that "at worst, the term 'movement' in Art History is simply a lazy way of avoiding serious consideration of individual artists or of historical events. . . . On the other hand, the art historian is bound to ask questions about why and how one person, one group of people, one event or one work of art provokes reactions which might be classed as artistic, political or social but which will, in all probability, be all three. Here, the art historian will be exploring a 'movement'. . . . At a theoretical level the question of identifying and naming may be the stimulus to enquiry." (Pointon 2013: 75-6) The term Pre-Raphaelitism, coined by Ruskin in 1851 to promote the Pre-Raphaelites (1903 v. 12), seems of the first kind.

The reappraisal and valorisation of Pre-Raphaelitism since the late 1970s was marked by the largest exhibition ever dedicated the movement (Tate, 7 March - 28 May 1984) that has become a cultural label, virtually coextensive with Victorian painting minus the baggage of Modernist criticism, plus a raised academic and political status (a press photograph shows Margaret Thatcher at the opening alongside Arthur Hughes's *April Love*, MacCarthy 2012). Art historians, on the other hand, have focussed on artistic biographies (e.g. our key references on Millais, Barlow 2005; Rosenfeld 2012) or themes reliably traceable across artworks (landscape, Staley 2001; drawing, Cruse 2011; or Ophelia, Rhodes 2008). Pre-Raphaelitism as identifier tends to be confined to general introductions (the structure of *The Cambridge Companion to the Pre-Raphaelites* is representative, Prettejohn 2012), either because "movement" is a category mainly used in teaching rather than research, or because "artistic, political or social" questions are no longer raised *together*. As Robert Slifkin argues in his essay "Abject Art History," "the practice of social art history, in the way that it seeks to situate artistic production and reception within broader historical contexts, can be understood as a methodological approach that ultimately reveals something that is categorically not art historical." (Grudin and Slifkin 2021: 7).

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, that in contemporary terms may be considered an art collective, and artists, that later recognised themselves in Pre-Raphaelitism, made a claim about

their practice that without the category of movement, in Pointon's second sense, would be difficult to understand. As the category of genre frames expectations schematizing the making and experiencing of the artwork, so that of movement frames actions assembling artistic practices and schematising artistic concerns with other social practices.

The title of Hunt's history of the movement *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood* indicates with the "and" a disjunction between the founding group and the movement that is not based on differences of style but of concerns. His and his wife Edith Waugh edited has the obvious intent of making him, rather than Rossetti as was then believed, the head of the movement. This has discredited the reliability of the source, we believe that the underlying insight it conveys is correct, namely that the Brotherhood is the double capture of two components external to one another within a conducive milieu: academic painting, centred on Hunt and Millais, and literature centred on Gabriel Rossetti and his family, not only his younger brother Michael, who was the "non artistic" member of the PRB, but also their youngest sister Christina, who took part in the PRB meetings despite not being aknowledged, and hanging over them all, their father Gabriele. The Royal Academy was the milieu that enabled the PRB to assemble in 1848 and to evolve into Pre-Raphaelite movement from the late 1850s. Around the genre of history painting, rediscovered in the late 1830s, hinged its complex power-knowledge network that supported the Pre-Raphaelites, contrary to a common narrative, and that in the remaining part of this section, we will briefly outline.

The Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, set up in 1835 "to inquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the Fine Arts, and of the Principles of Design among the people—especially among the manufacturing population of the country; and also, to inquire into the constitution of the Royal Academy, and the effects produced by it." (UK Parliament 1835: 555) reveal on one side the institutional and economic power of the Royal Academy, guaranteed by the Royal patronage and the profits from the Exhibition, and on the other, its attachment to artistic tradition and ways of teaching, that no longer met the demands of contemporary art and design (Sproll 1994). The creation of the Government School of Design instituted in 1837 in outcome, extended its institutional power (the artistic teachers at the school were academicians) and reinforced resistance. Testifying as expert witness before the 1863 Parliamentary Commission on the state of the Royal Academy, John Ruskin declared that "the present system of the Academy is to me so entirely nugatory, it produces so little effect in any way (what little effect it does produce being in my opinion mischievous), that it has never interested me" (UK Parliament 1863: 548).

Cliff Morgan presents the period between the two committee as "lost opportunities of reform" (1969) and raises the question "whether the excessive swing towards the social side was a result of failure to maintain standing and prestige on other counts." (Morgan 1969: 413) He places the swing with the presidency of Francis Grant (1866-78) who is elected president after Charles Eastlake's death, but in fact happens even before Eastlake's presidency, when Prince Albert appointed him Secretary of the Fine Arts Commission for the decoration of the new Houses of Parliament in 1841. The transformation from the closed and elitist institution of the 1830s into the fashionable Royal Academy of the 1850s at the centre of diverse power-knowledge networks, explains not only the paradox of its growing influence despite its continuing decline as teaching body (on cultural politics and the Royal Academy, Hook 2003), but captures how the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood grew so fast into Pre-Raphaelitism (key reference is Bruno Latour's *Reassembling the Social*, 2005; on Latour's Organisation Theory, Czarniawska 2014; 2017).

The first point of interaction between micro and macro actors was the network of the Royal Academy Schools that extended to other teaching institutions (such as the private schools Sass and Leigh, the Government School), associations (the Cyclographic Society that preceded the PRB), galleries (the National Gallery, Hampton Court, Dulwich), libraries and museums (the Royal Academy, the British Museum). Students completed their training at the Painting School with the realisation of a history painting in oil (on their organisation, see Morgan 1973). The Schools were a disciplinary system, both vertical and horizontal, that provided a formal body of knowledge and a hub for informal knowledge sharing (Taminiau, Smit, and De Lange 2007), especially across older and younger generations of artists. Hunt observes that "in the forties there was no systematic education to be obtained from the leaders of art; the best of them had had a hard struggle to keep their art and themselves alive during the days of poverty that followed the Napoleonic wars." (1905 v. 1: 46) and the Royal Academy was the place where such informal knowledge could still be shared with some regularity (an aspect often ignored but emphasised by Karl Mannheim in "The Problem of Generations" 1952). Conversely, the evident shortcomings of teaching at the Academy constituted a term of opposition for independent artistic research, such as The Clique (founded by Richard Dadd around 1837, the sketching club was active until 1843 and included Augustus Egg, Alfred Elmore, William Powell Frith, Henry Nelson O'Neil, John Phillip and Edward Matthew Ward) and that of Hunt and Millais, observable for instance in their use of local colour in Millais' *Cymon and Iphigenia* (1847-8) and Hunt's *Eve of St Agnes* (1848).

A second Royal Academy network centres around the Exhibition and connects semi-/professional artists, trained at the schools but also elsewhere (such as Ford Maddox Brown) with public, media and market. The submission regulations, the hanging committee, the exhibition spaces are some of the elements of a technology that disciplined visibility and public taste. The 1850-1 scandal, ignited by Rossetti's *The Girlhood of Mary Virgin* (1848-9, exhibited in Summer 1849 is the first picture to declare itself a "PreRaphaelite" work by carrying the initials of the movement as part of its signature) mostly concentrated around Millais' *The Carpenter's Shop* (1849-50) and is often mentioned as a proof of the revolutionary nature of the movement (for instance, Fiona MacCarthy's article "Why the pre-Raphaelites were the YBAs of their day," 2012). From a different perspective, it shows a crisis in the discipline of visibility, as public and artists moved from discourse mediating the experience of the artwork, to that of an engagement in discourse with the artwork, the former afforded by the neoclassical building by William Wilkins (the Royal Academy occupied the East wing 1837-1868, on the 83rd exhibition, May-August 1851, see Haupman 2018), the latter by the phantasmagoria of the Great Exhibition at Crystal Palace (1 May to 15 October 1851; on phantasmagoria in Benjamin's *Arcade Project, see* Cohen 1989; on interpellation, see Althusser 1972: 175). While the PRB scandal is almost entirely bracketed between two interventions in the press, Dickens' article "Old Lamps for New" (*Household Words* June 1850) and Ruskin's letters (*The Times* May 1851), the art dealer Henry Farrer had already agreed to buy the *Carpenter's Shop* before the Exhibition even opened. It was one of the first pictures to be bought by a dealer as a speculation, and Farrer seized the opportunity of the scandal to lower his offer to Millais from 350 Pounds to 150 (Bowness 1972).

A third network connected political and economic actors with an elite of Academicians, for instance the President, Martin Archer Shee (1830-50); Charles Lock Eastlake, controversial Keeper (Avery-Quash 2015) and then director of the National Gallery, Secretary of Royal Commission on the Fine Arts, and Shee's successor (1850-65). This system of privilege dates to the "Instrument of Foundation" with which on 10 December 1768, the Royal Academy was created by George III's personal will and costs were to be covered by the Privy Purse. By avoiding a charter and thanks to Reynold's social skills (for this aspect see Wendorf 1996: ch. 5), the personal relationship to the Sovereign as "Patron, Protector and Supporter" of the Royal Academy guaranteed independence to adapt to circumstances and withstand the pressure from the 1835-6 and 1863 Parliamentary Commissions to reform (the charter was rejected in 1860).

The Royal Academy privilege became instrumental to British cultural politics when the Royal Commission on the Fine Arts (1841-63) was set up, chaired by Prince Albert with

Eastlake as executive Secretary, to oversee the interior decoration of the new Houses of Parliament being rebuilt after the old Palace of Westminster was destroyed in a fire in 1834 (for a history of the interior decoration, see Boase 1954). The largest public art commission of its time served the goal of reinforcing the Crown and promoting Prince Albert's long-term project of forging a strategic alliance with the German Confederation against France (Orr 1978). Augustus Pugin and Charles Barry had won the architecture competition and the first stone of the Gothic Revivalist building was laid in 1840 (completed 1876). The decorations for its interior, depicting scenes from national history or literature (Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton) and allegories of chivalry virtues, were to be chosen by public competition amongst British painters and realised in fresco, a painting technique abandoned in Britain since the Middle Age (for good reasons, as will soon be realised). The model for their design and technique were the murals realised by Peter von Cornelius at the Glyptothek in Munich under the patronage of Ludwig I of Bavaria (1819-41; for a history of the murals, see Winter 2004). Pugin's British Neogothic architecture would be complemented by murals in the new Medievalist style spreading across Europe.

While the submissions exhibited at Westminster Hall (1843, 1844 and 1847) popularised the genre among the public (Willsdon 2000), history painting grew in Royal Academy (quantitative data would be needed, but a preliminary indication can be found in Roach 2018) and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood found its task. The significance of the Westminster decoration in the PRB formation is to date underresearched despite available evidence. For instance, Rossetti found the 1843 cartoon exhibition 'splendid ... the most interesting exhibition at which I have ever been' and 'proof that high art and high talent are not confined to the Continent" (Robertson 138); Millais contributed himself a carton ("The Widows' Mite," 1847); Hunt was worried that the Pre-Raphaelites might appear "Overbeckian in manner" (Hunt 1905 v. 1: 174) for which he blamed Ford Maddox Brown (221) who in 1843 had submitted "The Body of Harold brought before William the Conqueror" and "The Spirit of Justice," that seemed to the young Rossetti "all that ideal art should be" (Boase 1954: 333).

The task formulated by Eastlake in "The State and Prospects of the English School, Considered with Reference to the Promotion of Art in Connection with the Rebuilding of the Houses of Parliament," (1842, Eastlake 1848: 29-50) was nothing less than the renewal of British painting that Constable had already considered in decline in 1822 (quoted as epigraph in Hunt 1905 v. 1: 42). The mission around which the Pre-Raphaelite micro-network assembled and underlied their practice, was thus not primarily stylistic, as the critical discussion has been framed since Ruskin, but rather aesthetico-political in a sense and articulated within the history

genre that they used to reflect allegorically on contemporary life. However far from realism their paintings appear to be (on its "ambiguous relationship to the highly problematical concept of reality," cf. Nochlin 1971: 13 ff.), this conceptual shift is sufficient to positions the Pre-Raphaelites as a realist movement although few studies have gone far enough in this direction (notable is Marcia Werner's *Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth-Century Realism*, 2005 but again, her concerns remain stylistic).

Reporting for *The Spectator* on the *Exposition Universelle* of 1855, where several Pre-Raphaelite paintings were on view including *Ophelia*, William Michael Rossetti observed:

> Spite . . . of national differences and the hindrance of academic tradition and example, there appears a common and growing tendency in the entire aggregate of the schools. This tendency is distinctly towards Realism—as the thing, less easily defined than apprehended, is now called in France. It takes the special form, in France, of singular vigour and massive breadth; earnest observation and rapid seizing of natural effects in landscape; motion, power, and animal impulse, in man-life and brute-life; to which is added, in extreme instances, a preference of subjects ordinary even to insignificance, and an obvious avoidance of accepted rules of composition. In England, the Praeraphaelite [*sic*] *movement* need but be named. In Germany, the movement likewise so-called Praeraphaelite has taken a quite different direction; but here too some share in a similar influence . . . . (Rossetti, W.M. 1867: 98-9)

Clearly, W.M. Rossetti is not referring to Gustave Courbet's *Pavillon du Réalisme* defiantly placed just outside the Universal Exhibition, but to the paintings inside by Paul Delaroche, Ary Scheffer, Paul Vernet, and the old Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (101-2), the "official realism" of Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte (Boime 2007: 577, 841 n. 2). On one side, then, Delaroche's realist revision of the history genre in the 1830s, and on the other, the Quattrocentist archaism of the "Nazarenes," as was usually called the Brotherhood of St. Luke (*Lukasbund*) formed in 1809 at the Vienna Academy by Peter von Cornelius with Philipp Veit, Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Friedrich Wilhelm Schadow (followed by Johann Friedrich Overbeck, Franz Pforr, Friedrich Olivier and others). They group moved to Rome the following year and set up their studio in the abandoned convent of San Isidoro, that soon became a place of pilgrimage for artists on study travel from France, Germany and Britain, including Charles Eastlake, William Dyce, and Ford Maddox Brown (on the Nazarenes, see Boime 2004: 35-90; on Brown's Medievalism, Bury 2011).

On the one hand, the history painting genre provided an iconographic tradition both civil and religious that was unbroken since the Renaissance, a field in relation to the other genres of painting and to literature, a schematism for making and reading the picture, and an inherent historicism, mixing Romantic aesthetic with hermeneutic methodology, religious morality with political anti-Modernity. On the other hand, the Royal Academy power-knowledge networks to which Pre-Raphaelites were grafted, connected them to different kinds of knowledge

(formal/informal, old/new) and a variety of sources both historical and contemporary. At the same time, it provided amplification and integration between their personal networks and with networks that may be consider outside the immediate scope of art history (for instance, Chartism and Anglo-Catholicism). Although the strength of weak interpersonal ties, pioneered by Mark Granovetter (1973; 1983) and key to social media theory and analytics (Brashearsa and Quintane 2018), may be difficult to document and evaluate, the mapping of the Pre-Raphaelite social network may be necessary for an archaeology of artistic practice (for an example, see the study of the YBA field in Grenfell and Hardy 2007: 117-29).

Are the Pre-Raphaelites Modern?

It may seem that categories of history genre and academic movement have entirely resolved Pre-Raphaelite realism. However, rather than as a style, their realism can be found in the idealism of their practice, in the intimate connection between life and painting as moral activity and natural ritual (especially the case for Hunt and the early Millais), and in the purpose of painting, that is the moral education of the viewer achieved by the adoption of allegory not as an element within the painting but as its form of expression. While this will be the topic of the next section, we can formulate a main problem of our study: are the Pre-Raphaelites Modern?

The question rephrases a Modernist critique of the Pre-Raphaelites in the context of its latest re-evaluation, the international blockbuster exhibition "Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant Garde" (12 September 2012 – 13 January 2013, Tate Britain, London). The oxymoronic strapline was neither argued in the introduction to the catalogue (Prettejohn 2012), nor articulated in the exhibition curated by Tim Barringer, Jason Rosenfeld and Alison Smith, yet the praise for the exhibition was so unanimous that critics preferred to ignore the provocation or not take it too seriously. On the contrary, by failing to prove its case, the exhibition reveals the critical problem of the Pre-Raphaelites. Why are the Pre-Raphaelites relevant for artistic research today only in as much as they can be considered Avant-Garde? Is Manet the completion of a symbolic revolution begun at the end of the Classical Age in France, as Foucault, Bourdieu and others have argued? Are there "alternative temporal structures, alternative temporalizations of 'history', which articulate the relations between 'past', 'present' and 'future' in politically significantly different ways," as Peter Osborne argues (1995: 200)?

Gustave Courbet's *Burial at Ornans* and Millais' *The Carpenter's Shop* were both painted the same year (1849-50). When they were exhibited, Millais at the Exhibition and Courbet at

the Salon of 1851, both were subject to harsh criticism, but its violence and reasons were different. Eventually, around the same time, Courbet became Modern, whereas Millais became unfashionable. Osborne resolves the "structural categories of historical analysis" (200) into nominalism, as if Modernity were not an ongoing practice and the viewer looking at *The Carpenter's Shop* today needed an aesthetic re-education to see it otherwise, for instance as Avant-Garde.

The hyperobject allows to model Osborne's "alternative temporal structures" because temporality is only but one of its n-dimensions. Thus, Manet's symbolic revolution is not a point in time but a change of discourse within a cultural region of which this beholder is part, and on the other hand, whether there are regions to which Manet is irrelevant or in which Millais is a Modernist becomes a matter of empirical research and not of categorisation. By way of anticipation, we may observe how the symbolic revolution registers in the allegories of *The Carpenter's Shop* and *Burial at Ornans* semantically, by contrasting the nail and pincers as *Arma Christi* in Millais' medievalist allegory, to Courbet's "real allegory" (Fried 1992: 148 ff.), where the cross is first and foremost a liturgical object used at the funeral procession; pragmatically, by contrasting Millais' sentimental lure that radiates from the wounded hand of the child-Jesus, to black hole in the foreground that draws everything into it, the rotten skull and bones, the grave digger, the altar boy, the priest, the crucifix and eventually, the viewer.

Lacan's theory of the four discourses, will provide a means to integrate criticism into the hyperobject model that maps material-semiotic interactions between objects-actors, and to analyse pictures as subjects of discursive practices of painting and looking (for a critique, Bal and Bryson 1991: 195-202). *The Carpenter's Shop* addresses the viewer with knowledge, in the minuteness of details and cleverness of its biblical symbolism, the first proof of Millais' allegorical preaching fully accomplished in *Ophelia*, as we are about to see. On the contrary, *Burial at Ornans* confronts the viewer with the uncompromising gaze of the open grave and it is at this point that the real becomes allegorical with an ironic inversion (on the painting as a hidden deposition, Levine 1991) "and this is the essence of melancholy immersion: that its ultimate objects, in which it believes it can most fully secure for itself that which is vile, turn into allegories, and that these allegories fill out and deny the void in which they are represented, just as, ultimately, the intention does not faithfully rest in the contemplation of bones, but faithlessly leaps forward to the idea of resurrection." (Benjamin 1998: 232-3)

Allegory as mode of expression and interpretation

What are the sources of Pre-Raphaelite allegory?

The protagonist of Ludwig Tiek's historical novel *The Wanderings of Franz Sternbald* (1798) is a young painter in Nuremberg in 1520. He and his friend Sebastian, a student of Albrecht Dürer like himself, set out on a journey to study the masters in Italy and discuss art on their way:

> "All art is allegorical." said the painter. "What can man depict, individual and of itself, separated and forever divorced from the rest of the world, as we see in front of us the objects? Nor should art attempt it: we join together, we seek to graft general meaning onto particulars, and thus arises allegory. The word denotes nothing less than true Poesy that seeks the high and noble, and only in this way can it find it." (Tieck 1966: 257-8, my translation)
> ["Alle Kunst ist allegorisch," sagte der Maler. "Was kann der Mensch darstellen, einzig und für sich bestehend, abgesondert und ewig geschieden von der übrigen Welt, wie wir die Gegenstände vor uns sehn? Die Kunst soll es auch nicht: wir fügen zusammen, wir suchen dem einzelnen einen allgemeinen Sinn aufzuheften, und so entsteht die Allegorie. Das Wort bezeichnet nichts anders als die wahrhafte Poesie, die das Hohe und Edle sucht, und es nur auf diesem Wege finden kann."]

The novel was not available in English (only mentioned by Carlyle in the "biographical and critical notices" on Tiek in 1827, 1896: 262) and it is unlikely that the Pre-Raphaelites read it, but the passage shows clearly how Tiek imagined Medieval allegory (Renaissance was not word) and probably the Nazarenes, for whom the novel was the "elementary book" (Paulin 1988: 96). The old concept of allegory, that had been fading away from use since the end of the 17th century but never completely disappeared, was injected with the literary Romantic symbol, a "strictly theoretical construct, the purpose of which . . . was not to describe objects of perception but to condition the perception of objects. In the symbol, according to Johann Wolfgang Goethe's canonical formulation of the concept, the particular represents 'the universal, not as a dream or shadow, but as a living and momentary revelation of the inscrutable. Consequently, 'the idea remains eternally and infinitely active and inaccessible in the image, and even if expressed in all languages would still remain inexpressible. On the one hand the symbol was supposed to be the point of contact between the contingent and the absolute, the finite and the infinite, the sensuous and the supersensuous, the temporal and the eternal, the individual and the universal. On the other hand it was supposed to refer to nothing but itself, so that image and idea were inherently and inseparably connected in it. In short, it was supposed to be at once infinitely meaningful and incapable of being reduced to any particular meaning." (Halm 2007: 1-2; quotes are from Goethe's *Maxims and Reflections*, 1998: 106, n. 1112-3)

If it was generally accepted since the end of the 17th century that the Middle Age was "*the* age of allegory" (Brljak 2017), it may not seem surprising that the Pre-Raphaelites would adopt it as a characterising form of expression, instead they remained quite unique in their use of allegory when compared to the Nazarenes that preceded them or to contemporary Medievalisms in France and Britain. Thus, the question of where Pre-Raphaelite allegory comes from is important to understand how it is used in *Ophelia* and why it is so distinctive of their artistic practice, research, and programme.

George Landow's seminal study *William Holman Hunt and Typological Symbolism* (first published 1979) is among the first to rediscover the use of allegory among the Pre-Raphaelites, to which they refer to as "symbols" and Landow as "types". He "contends that Hunt's version of Pre-Raphaelitism concerned itself primarily with an elaborate system of painterly symbolism rather than with a photographic realism as has been usually supposed. Like Ruskin, Hunt believed that a symbolism based on scriptural typology – the method of finding anticipations of Christ in Hebrew history – could produce an ideal art that would solve the problems of Victorian painting. According to Hunt, this elaborate symbolism could simultaneously avoid the dangers of materialism inherent in a realistic style, the dead conventionalism of academic art, and the sentimentality of much contemporary painting." (2015: i)

The distinction between allegory and typology first gained relevance in Britain in the context of "higher criticism" when the historical-critical method in Biblical studies, pioneered by Friedrich Schleiermacher from 1800 to his death in 1834, begun circulating from the mid-1840s after Patrick Fairbairn's *The Typology of Scripture* (Edinburgh 1845, second volume, 1847). In the second volume of *Modern Painters* (1846), Ruskin uses "type" frequently but its meaning is abstract (cf. 76) or ambiguous (cf. 1903 v. 4: 94) particularly in his comment on Tintoretto's *Annunciation* (264-5) that Landow considers crucial for Hunt. Although the emphasis on typology at this early date is not warranted by evidence Landow is problematising, for the first time, the connection between naturalist depiction and figural meaning in Hunt's painting and to do so, he follows Auerbach's distinction between allegorical expression and figural, as typology is called in *Mimesis*. Whereas allegory disregards the literal meaning to privilege the spiritual meaning, that in turn does not depend on the validity of the literal event, in typology, "the figural structure preserves the historical event while interpreting it as revelation, and must preserve it, in order to interpret it" (Auerbach 1984: 68). Not only the Old Testament prefigures the New, but events in the New Testament are also figural, as shows Revelation, the last book of the New Testament, full of symbolism left unexplained and awaiting fulfilment. Referring back to our concept of allegory, it is apparent that the recovery

of the visible in typology is carried out from the point of view of the stateable. In other words, only what is typologically stateable is critically made visible in the paining, which excludes the very condition for artistic criticism, namely the difference and co-dependency of visibility and stateability.

Landow's use of typology has contributed to accentuate religious criticism of the Pre-Raphaelites at the expense of other strands, starting from the accusations of Tractarianism and Catholicism in 1849-51, to the focus on the religion "biblical painting was a major occupation of the circle and forms an important portion of its production during the Brotherhood years" as Herbert Sussman states in his *Fact into Figure: Typology in Carlyle, Ruskin, and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood* (1979) that continues Landow's study and has recently gained momentum in the context of the "Religious Turn" in English studies, for instance in Michaela Giebelhausen's *Painting the Bible. Representation and Belief in Mid-Victorian Britain,* "the first study to engage with the theory and practice of religious painting in nineteenth-century Britain" (2006: 1) and followed by Cordula Grewe's *Painting the Sacred in the Age of Romanticism (*2009). Since the beginning, the question of Modernity and that of religion in the criticism of the Pre-Raphaelites are inextricably bound together in an uncomfortable position (a discussion in Contemporary Art, Elkins). As we stated in the introduction, questions articulate problems the problem is precisely that relation to which

Religion is part of Victorian cultural life and of the political debate of the 1840s, but was also a genre in history painting that Medievalism could not avoid to confront. Millais reamained a religious person throughout his life, but Hunt was not a believer until 1849, Rossetti's relation with religion seems conventional and aesthetic, Hunt was a Christian Socialist and became agnostic. Their religious practices raises the question of how they are integrated in their artistic practice. The perspective of genre allows to frame the problem in its ambivalence and to show how deep the connection goes. The change of discourse between Millais' *The Carpenter's Shop* and Courbet's *Burial at Ornan* shows the fault line of modernity and marks the limits of a historical region to which this author belongs. In the same way *Burial at Ornan* shows that religion is not the obstacle as much as the baggage of of motifs to which Pre-Raphaelite religious paintings fell victim. For instance, Elizabeth Siddal, who modelled for Christ's hair in 'The Light of the World' 1851 was the first to notice how Hunt's most celebrated painting resembled cheap Catholic prints that circulated thanks to the Cardinal Weisman imports from Germany probably referring to an engraving after Philipp Veit (described in Atkins 1880: 114; cf. Veit 1840) Conversely, *Ophelia* can still be considered a modern religious painting because of Millais' radical rethinking of the genre that the outrage of *The Carpenter's Shop* had induced.

Rather than an imitation of Nazarene style, such as was the case with Eastlake and Dyce (Benedetti 1982), the Pre-Raphaelites were inspired to invent a Medievalist practice that explains not only the recognisable unity across the Pre-Raphaelites but also for their elusive identity as a movement. It involved a social and aesthetic ethos, a set of simple artistic principles and ideas, various schemes of composition and painting techniques, free imitation of Italian and Northern Renaissance examples, and the allegorical mode of expression. Better than typology, allegory accounts for the full range of pictorial tropes used by the Pre-Raphaelite (emblem, symbol, personification, enigma, irony, etc.) and across all genres of painting, not just religious, and further, it has the capacity of fusing expression and interpretation in the same mode, making allegory the most relevant component of Pre-Raphaelite practice for unearthing artistic criticism. Thus, the principal question is not iconographic, pinpoint sources and meanings of the Pre-Raphaelite allegories, but rather to understand how and why the movement came to regard allegory as central to their practice.

Comparing the first paintings created by the movement with those that immediately preceded them, the appearance of allegory, especially floral emblems, was abrupt and consistent as the following table suggests:

	Painted before PRB	**Painted after PRB**	**Example of floral emblem**
Millais	Cymon and Iphigenia (1848-51)	Isabella (1848-9)	Passionflower clambering in window
Hunt	Eve of St Agnes (1847/57)	Rienzi (1849)	Dandelion and groundsel in bottom right corner
Rossetti	n.a.	Girlhood of Mary Virgin (1848-9)	Madonna lily in vase
Brown	The First Translation of the Bible into English (1847-48/1859-60); Lear and Cordelia (1848/54)	William Shakespeare (1849)	Mirth flower in right hand

Though less noticeable than stylistic features allegory was a departure from academic practice as important as drawing, colour, or perspective, and almost unprecedented. We hypothesize that the reason for the programmatic adoption of allegory is to be found in Rossetti's practice of poetry and poetic translation. As early as 1845, Rossetti had begun translating, annotating and arranging nearly two hundred poems besides the *Vita Nuova* that in 1861 became *The Early Italian Poets from Ciullo d'Alcamo to Dante Alighieri (1100-1200-*

1300), the first English translation of 13th and 14th century Italian poets (on the translations, Gitter 1974). In the Preface Rossetti acknowledges his father's influence:

> In relinquishing this work . . . I feel, as it were, divided from my youth. The first associations I have are connected with my father's devoted studies, which, from his own point of view, have done so much towards the general investigation of Dante's writings. Thus, in those early days, all around me partook of the influence of the great Florentine; till, from viewing it as a natural element, I also, growing older, was drawn within the circle. I trust that from this the reader may place more confidence in a work not carelessly undertaken, though produced in the spare-time of other pursuits more closely followed. (Rossetti 1861: x)

and even allowing for Hunt's notorious bias against him, this passage is indicative of Rossetti's intellectual framework at that time:

> Dantesque shapes of imagery became Rossetti's alphabet of art, and in his designs, as in his poems, his mind expressed itself in a form independent of new life and joy in nature. This partiality had never been counterbalanced by rough experience of the battle of life; he spurned new fields of interest for the work of either poet or painter and disputed my contention that the aid of inexhaustible science should be used to convey new messages of hope to fresh broods of men. (Hunt 1905 v.1: 148-9)

The lack of studies in English on Gabriele Rossetti and the inaccessibility of his work is probably the reason for neglecting his major influence on Dante Gabriel and on Christina to a lesser extent. Gabriele Rossetti (1783-1854), was a civil servant who had supported Giocchino Murat crowned King of Naples by Napoleon in 1808 and executed 1815. He took part to the failed insurrection of 1820-1 against Ferdinando IV Bourbon and to escape the purges that followed, Gabriele Rossetti finds a passage on the HMS Rochfort to Malta, thanks to admiral Graham Moore (1821). In London (1824), he became professor of Italian at King's College (1831-1847), and part of an important network of intellectuals that included the retired diplomat and poet John Hookham Frere (Vassallo 2010), the geologist Charles Lyell, and Italian émigrés, such as Ugo Foscolo, Antonio Panizzi, and Gaetano Polidori, whose daughter Maria Francesca Lavinia he married (1826). Better known by his Italian contemporaries for Arcadian verses, librettos, patriotic and religious lyrics (cf. the collection edited by Giosué Carducci, Rossetti 1861), he considered the studies of Dante, written in Italian and published in London, to be his life work: *Comento analitico all'Inferno dantesco* (two volumes, 1826-27), *Sullo spirito antipapale* (1832; trans. into English 1834), *Mistero dell'Amor platonico* (five volumes, 1840) and *La Beatrice di Dante. Ragionamenti critici* (1842). His declining health and finances forced him to abandon publication of the two-volume manuscript *Commento analitico al Purgatorio di Dante Alighieri,* that William Michael gifted to the municipal library of Vasto on his visit to his father's town of birth (1893) and was published posthumus in 1966.

Underlying Gabriele Rossetti's interpretation of Dante are some deep-seated convictions. Not only did he see his own political exile in London foreshadowed in that of Dante,

perpetually banned from Florence after the “Black” Guelfs allied with Pope Boniface VIII succeeded in expelling the “Whites” in 1302, but he also traced the Reformation back to that same "antipapal spirit" that animated Dante (Rossetti 1832; 1834). Above all, Rossetti tried to use in his interpretation the knowledge he had acquired during his Masonic training in Naples and in the *Carboneria* (Sisti 2004). According to him, Dante dedicated the first sonnet of the *Vita Nuova* to "all the faithful of Love" to declare his allegiance to a secret association, the "Setta d'Amore", whose followers used a secret language understood only by its members. Persuaded that "in the century of Alighieri the genius of allegory was predominant" (1826 v. 1: 20), he proceeded with an initiatory interpretation of the *Divina Commedia*. By replacing "the figures with the figurative" and contextualizing them "to the exact knowledge of those authors on whom he nourished," it would be possible to read Dante's "slightest thoughts" and arrive "gradually from the genesis to the development" of the work, so that The Comedy would be "no longer an enigma" (1826 v. 1: 83) and reveal the ascending degrees of its Freemason knowledge.

The obsessive research that Gabriele Rossetti carried out for nearly thirty years was had infected the young Gabriel and passed to the Pre-Raphaelites when he launched the idea of the Brotherhood among the members of the Cyclographic Society, a sketching club he had started in January 1848 with Walter Deverell and Richard Burchett, both teachers at the Government School of Design, (Meacock and Chapman 2007: 36-7; Rossetti 2002 v. 1: 53-6; Millais 190o v. 1: 65) The club was active until September 1848, and counted fifteen members that included all the PRBs except William Michael Rossetti. Sketching clubs were common and "had a practical purpose rather than a radical or reforming one: they offered professional support and friendly advice or criticism from within the artist’s peer group, and helped in sharing the costs of hiring models, even providing models from within the group. They augmented rather than challenged the Royal Academy and its schools and asserted their differences from the prevailing orthodoxies in a variety of ways, often more startling than substantial, such as smoking pipes and drinking quantities of ale, growing their hair long and wearing unusual clothes" (Cruise 2011: 40) Nonetheless, the Cyclographic Society seemed more ambitious, as Gabriel Rossetti wrote in a letter to his brother: "The Cyclographic gets on fast. From discontent it has already reached conspiracy. There will soon be a blow-up somewhere" (Rossetti 2002 v. 1: 71).

In August 1848, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who had dropped out of the Academy, begun sharing a studio with Hunt, covering the expenses in exchange for informal tutoring, and with Hunt launched the PRB in September 1848. Deprived of its most talented members, the

Cyclographic immediately dissolved, but the Brotherhood was not another sketching club. Although the "List of Immortals" is the only official document (and heavily edited by Hunt), there are indications that the PRB had articles of association, minutes of its meetings taken by William Michael, and its mission as a secret society was taken seriously by all its members. Gabriele Rossetti's obsessive research over thirty years, had not only infected his son with Dante, as his change of name that same year indicates (from Gabriel Charles Dante into Dante Gabriel, see Matson 2010: 32), but had also provided him with extensive knowledge, a well-furnished library, and above all a model that combined Medievalism, an artistic mode of expression and interpretation, with social critique.

Gabriele Rossetti's Neoclassical and hermetic allegory harks back to the same tradition deployed by Félibien in his theory of genres. It is the remnant of Baroque allegory that sufficiently forgotten in the Academy, had acquire an antique patina perfectly suited to new Medievalism while, at the same time, providing an incredibly adaptive mode of expression and interpretation. Because "allegory makes use of the 'dumb show' to bring back the fading word, in order to make it accessible to the unimaginative visual faculty." (Benjamin 1998: 192), it gave the Pre-Raphaelites a way of transposing complicated meaning from religious and literary texts into historical paintings through naturalistic depiction of detail and gesture (contra Reynolds' Second Discourse, 1905: 72) and on the other hand, a way of story telling and commenting through allegory double register, the visible and the stateable we discussed earlier.

Further, the veiling of truth was exploited pragmatically to modulate the degree with which realism confronted the public from behind convention. Retaining its initiatic function, the Pre-Raphaelites used allegory to raise awareness on the "Condition of England Question" raised by Thomas Carlyle in "Chartism" (1839), a main feature common to the first PRB paintings: class struggle in Hunt's Rienzi, class inequality in gender relations in Millais' Isabella, the status of intellectual labour in Brown's Shakespeare, gender roles in Rossetti's Girlhood of Mary (on domesticity in Chartism, Clark 1992). In the context of the ongoing campaign against children's labour, sparked by the *Report of the Children's Employment Commission* (1842), *The Carpenter's Shop* raised its voice above the other Pre-Raphaelite paintings (Brown begun *Work* in 1852) and with more realism than the public was willing to accept from a religious painting.

Although Millais promptly switched to the literary subgenre and recalibrated the allegorical veil on the public's expectations, *Mariana* and *Ophelia* continued his social critique, as we are about to see. The same did Hunt with the cryptic *The Hireling Shepherd* (1851-2) and *Our English Coasts* (1852), whereas Brown became more critical with *Take your Son, Sir*

left unfinished for its topic (1851-95), *The Last of England* (1852-5) inspired by Woolner's emigration to Australia, and his allegorical masterpiece, *Work* (1852-64). On his part, Dante Gabriel Rossetti exhibited at the National Institution *Ecce Ancilla Domini* (1849-50), continuing the loose triptych on the life of the Virgin begun with *The Girlhood of Mary.* One critic declared that "we notice [the work] less for its merits than as an example of the perversion of talent which has recently been making too much way in our school of Art and wasting the energies of some of our most promising aspirants." (*Athenaeum* 1850: 424) Assailed by self-doubt, Rossetti vowed never to exhibit in public again (Hunt 1905, v. 1: 204, 2010) and abandoned social subjects entirely, the "fallen woman" in *Found* (1854–1855, 1859–1881) being the sole exception and left unfinished.

What story does Ophelia tell?

The catalogue of the eighty-fourth exhibition of the Royal Academy listed Millais' *Ophelia* with an excerpt from Gertrude's speech (*Ham.* 4.7.170-81):

> ' 'There on the pendant boughs her coronet weeds
> Clamb'ring to hang, an envious sliver broke;
> When down her weedy trophies and herself
> Fell in the weeping brook. Her clothes spread wide
> And mermaid like, awhile they bore her up;
> Which time she chanted snatches of old tunes,
> As one incapable of her own distress,
> Or like a creature native and indued
> Unto that element; but long it could not be,
> Till that her garments, heavy with their drink,
> Pull'd the poor wretch from her melodious lay
> To muddy death' ' -- Hamlet, act iv
> (Royal Academy 1852: 547, n. 557)

Texts were quoted frequently as it was an part of early Victorian viewing practice to move back and forth between text and image to evaluate the painting as a translation against its source. The critic of *The Spectator* begins his positive review stating that "Shakspere's description has been strictly followed" (1852: 519) However, at a closer look, some discrepancies are . Millais left out the part of the speech where Gertrude describes the scene (*Ham.* 4.7.164-9) and the Spectator concludes that "Ophelia is drifting slowly with the stream--the point where she fell being out of the picture; slowly the current carries the garland out of her hand, and bears onward the other flowers which she has let slip; and slowly the water which has covered her wrist and arms, is reaching her breast." This is also how Lawrence Olivier imagines the scene in his *Hamlet* (1949), but the willow that "grows askant the brook" (164) from which Ophelia fell is clearly depicted on the left of the painting. Further, the speech says

that Ophelia made garlands "Of crowflowers, nettles, daisies and long purples" (167) and Millais depicted them with botanical accuracy but added the plants in Ophelia's Mad Scene and others not mentioned in play. While the plants in the speech are consistent with a natural setting around the river Avon in mid-Summer (for this ecocritical approach, Bruckner 2008: 232), Millais' plants are cultivated or do not bloom simultaneously, as Alfred Tennyson noticed (Staley and Newall 2004: 34).

As soon as John Ruskin saw *Ophelia*, he raised the question of its realism in a letter to Millais (5 August 1852): "When you do paint nature why the mischief should you not paint pure nature and not the rascally wirefenced garden-rolled-nursery-maid's paradise." (James 1947: 176) It is commonly accepted that "most of the flowers in Ophelia are included either because they are mentioned in the play, or for their symbolic value. Millais saw these flowers growing wild by the river in Ewell. Because he painted the river scene over a period of five months, flowers that bloom at different times of the year appear next to each other." (Tate 2022) Admitting a variety of pictorial references does not answer Ruskin's matter of principle rather, it adds the difficulty of understanding why and how Millais decided to pick and mix references as categorically different as Shakespeare's text, iconography, and the landscape that Millais actually observed along the Hogsmill River near Old Malden (Southwest London, Salkeld 2010). The interpretive hypothesis we are about to outline attempts to resolve the issue of pictorial representation in *Ophelia* by offering a coherent reading of the painting as a naturalistic allegory, an expression we derive from David Carrier's "Naturalism and Allegory in Flemish Painting" (1987; replaces "concealed or disguised symbolism" Panofsky 1966: 141).

"The transformation of history into natural history" (Benjamin 1998: 120). The Pre-Raphaelites had from the beginning two distinctive features, the adoption of allegory as mode of expression and the depiction of nature and the body from life, the first deriving from literature the second from contemporary artistic practices. Here, a key actor hitherto unrecognised, may be Richard Redgrave, who held several positions the Government School of Design (later the Royal College of Art): botanical teacher (1847), headmaster (1848), art superintendent (1852), and inspector–general for art (1857) in which capacity he developed a national curriculum for art instruction (on his philosophy of art teaching, see Redgrave 1853). The integration of allegorical mode of expression into the naturalistic depiction nature may be attributed to the study of Northern Renaissance painters (Langley 1995), where the authority of Brown, who trained in Bruges, Ghent and Antwerp, and the trip of Rossetti and Hunt to Paris and Belgium (September-October 1849) played a decisive role. Naturalistic allegory is achieved by Millais with *Mariana* from 1851, where is evident the influence of Van Eyck's

Arnolfini Portrait, on display at the National Gallery since 1842 (Smith 2017). The fusion of allegory and nature, of artificial and natural forms central to Opehlia can be observed, for instance, in the two plane leaves (*Platanus × acerifolia*) that seem to detach from Mariana's needlework and serve her as model for representing emblematic flowers.

A painted sermon. The expression "painted sermon" was used by the critic of *The Art Union* (1845: 180) in his positive review of Redgrave's *The Governess* (1845) indicating a new way of looking at pictures emerging in the 1840s (moralising, rhetorical, popular). Millais says that paintings are sermons in his letter to Martha Combe (28 May 1851) but this has been his artistic programme since *The Carpenter's Shop*, if not earlier (cf. his entry for the Westminster competition, *The Widow's Mite* 1847), and he articulated it more clearly than the other PRBs. Painting had a religious and moral task, for which it required expanding historical painting beyond the Neoclassical unity of action. Already in *Isabella* (1848-9), Millais departs from linear narrative still evident the year before in the *Cymon,* to show multiple points of action, states of mind and overarching irony. The influence of William Hogarth's *Marriage à la Mode* (especially *The Toilet*, 1743) is evident (Barlow 2017: 10-4) but *Isabella* is more than a narrative container for multiple characterisations. It synthesizes different moments in Keats' "Isabella; or The Pot of Basil" without illustrating any episode in particular (the setting is prompted by lines 5-6: "They could not sit at meals but feel how well / It soothed each to be the other by"). Keats' text is already visible, "all at once put before the spectator without that trouble of realisation often lost in the effort of reading or listening" (Millais 1900 v.1: 105), as are the episodes of the Bible and lives of the Saints depicted in the frescoes by Giotto, Buffalmacco, Andrea and Bernardo Orcagna, Simone Memmi, Antonio Veneziano, Spinello Aretino, Benozzo Gozzoli, and engraved in *Pitture a Fresco del Campo Santo di Pisa* by Carlo Lasinio (1812). The book with 40 high-quality copper engravings was probably given to Millais during in stay in Oxford in the Summer 1848 by his early patron James Wyatt, "a remarkable man in many ways." (Millais 1900 v. 1: 35, n. 8; on Wyatt, Calloway 2015). Developing this synthetic approach to storytelling further, *Ophelia* supplements her "maimed rites" in the play (*Ham.* 5.1.208) with a Victorian funeral sermon typically organised in three parts: the plants on the far bank of the river, allegorize the chain of events leading to Ophelia's demise; the plants surrounding her body in the river allegorize her pregnant condition and her emotions during the suicide; the plants on the nearest bank allegorize Ophelia's forgiveness and resurrection.

Ophelia's chronotope. Mikhail Bakhtin comes closest to formulating some sort of a definition at the beginning of the essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel":

> We will give the name chronotope (literally, "time space") to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature. This term [space-time] is employed in mathematics and was introduced as part of Einstein's Theory of Relativity The special meaning it has in relativity theory is not important for our purposes; we are borrowing it for literary criticism almost as a metaphor (almost, but not entirely). What counts for us is the fact that it expresses the inseparability of space and time (time as the fourth dimension of space). We understand the chronotope as a formally constitutive category of literature; we will not deal with the chronotope in other areas of culture. In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. The intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope. (1981: 84)

We appropriate Bakhtin's chronotope from literary studies to describe how Millais indicates and spatialises time in the painting, weaving five temporalities together: narrative time, given by the events in Ophelia's sub-plot; pictorial time, organised on the three narrative planes of the picture; ecstatic time, Ophelia singing "broken tunes" between Jouissance and death, desperation and Salvation; calendar time, indicated by the cycle of the flowering seasons and the imperceptible flow of the river; historical time, synchronising the fictional past of Ophelia with the time present of the implied viewer. The viewer's (successful) encounter with the painting's complex chronotope gives rise to a new aesthetic experience that is, we claim, what Benjamin calls "dialectical image" (that Benjamin's allegory is experiential and dialectical is suggested by Wilkens 2006, anticipated by Cowan 1981 and Lindroos 1998, missed by Pensky 2006):

> It’s not that what is past casts its light on what is present, or what is present its light on the past; rather, image is that wherein what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation. In other words, image is dialectics at a standstill. For while the relation of the present to the past is a purely temporal, continuous one, the relation of what-has-been to the now is dialectical: is not progression but image, suddenly emergent. – Only dialectical images are genuine images (that is, not archaic); and the place where one encounters them is language. (Benjamin 2002: 462; “Awakening” N2a,3)

If the performative dimension of allegory is fulfilled in an encounter with the viewer, romantically completing the painting ("comes together in a flash", "forms a constellation"), the visible/stateable difference in painting's allegory ("archaic image") is translated into the viewer's own language ("place of encounter") as a dialectical image ("genuine image"). This image has nothing to do with representation of meaning, and yet is meaningful aesthetically, because it produces a "suddenly emergent" experience of interruption in the viewer's temporal progression ("the now"), and epistemically, because in "the now of knowability" truth is constituted: "Every present day is determined by the images that are synchronic with it: each "now" is the now of a particular recognizability. In it, truth is charged to the bursting point with time. (This point of explosion, and nothing else, is the death of the intention, which thus coincides with the birth of authentic historical time, the time of truth.)" (2002: 463, N3,1)

As Nathan Ross puts it, "Benjamin thinks of truth as an occurrence, a temporal event where the object undergoes a transformation because of a deep sense of immersion, a transformation where it does not adapt itself to the concepts that we use to understand it, but one where it changes these very concepts. In a socially critical context, truth results when sedimented layers of 'objective' lies get peeled away to reveal what Benjamin calls an intentionless state of being." (Ross 2021: 81; see the 1921-2) Thus *Ophelia's* chronotope is key to its allegorical mode of expression in relation to the viewer and to its task as "painted sermon". A letter written by John James Ruskin to Millais the day after encountering *Ophelia* at the Royal Academy private view (4 May 1852) resonates with Benjamin's dialectical image:

> I came home last night with only Ophelia in my mind and wrote to my son nearly as follows. Nothing can be truer to Shakespear than Mr. Millais' Ophelia and there is a refinement in the whole figure--in the floating and sustaining dress--such as I never saw before expressed on canvas. In her most lovely countenance there is an Innocence disturbed by Insanity and a sort of Enjoyment strangely blended with lineament of woe. There seems depicted, moreover, a growing wonder and fear on Ophelia just awakening to a sense of her situation. I should be surprised at the *Times* had I not observed that the public press cannot afford to be wrong. (James 1947: 176)

What is Ophelia's artistic criticism of Hamlet?

Allegory, as we suggested at the beginning of this chapter, is a trope or scheme for meaning making in which some content is presented as other. This is based on the ontological difference in allegory between stateable and visible not aligning with a sensory difference that allows meaning to be distributed in different ways within the picture. The classic definition from which we set out may give the impression that the allegorical relation between "something" (literal sense) and "other" (figural sense) is binary rather than triadic, as it includes its form of presentation or in our case, the picture. The way in which the elements are related to each other shows the structural change from Baroque allegory used by Gabriele Rossetti to interpret Dante to Pre-Raphaelite allegory: while the former is transitive and the literal sense is only a conveyor to the figural sense (cf. Goethe on allegory, 1998), the latter is intransitive and the picture mediates between the two senses (we follow Michael Cole's "basic mediational triangle in which subject and object are seen not only as "directly" connected but simultaneously as "indirectly" connected through a medium constituted of artifacts (culture)." 1994: 119). This is where artistic criticism is most salient because the gap within allegory makes it untranslatable into conventional forms of criticism.

Having proposed the allegorical scheme of the picture, we now need to present the senses that *Ophelia* mediates: the story of Ophelia as the early Victorians may have interpreted it from the play, and an external sense that is commonly identified in the literature as "the fallen

woman" (see for instance, Nochlin 1978; Auerbach 1980). Can it be that Millais' painting is on the contrary a critique to that topos? And conversely, is the painting contributing a new understanding of the play or at least, of the way in which early Victorians understood the character? It is not the question of substituting the fallen woman for another sense or to contextualise it but to represent the specificity of artistic criticism the ambiguity between the two senses and the interpreters, the painter interpreting the play the viewer interpreting the painting each interpreting the others, the multiple dimensions and directions, the production of new senses in time, etc. The methodology of the hyperobject is intended to address this problem of which we will present a map in the remaining part of this section.

If any piece of criticism can represent a collective reading of *Hamlet*, then this:

> Hamlet is a name; his speeches and sayings but the idle coinage of the poet's brain. What then, are they not real? They are as real as our own thoughts. Their reality is in the reader's mind. It is *we* who are Hamlet. This play has a prophetic truth, which is above that of history. (Hazlitt 1908: 84)

William Hazlitt is aware of it when he begins his *Characters of Shakespeare* (first published 1818) by emphasizing Alexander Pope: "His characters are so much nature herself, that it is a sort of injury to call them by so distant a name as copies of her." (1908: 1) in opposition to Samuel Johnson's critical distance: "It may be said of Shakespear, that 'those who are not for him are against him:' for indifference is here the height of injustice." (6). The measure of Hamlet and the play that is his, depends no longer verisimilitude and on the text but on the identification of the public: "we" means each one of us because "whatever happens to him we apply to ourselves, because he applies it so himself as a means of general reasoning" (85), "we" means the present of which Shakespeare is the prophet, "we" means English (Hazlitt 1908: 2) as opposed to Goethe's, Schlegel and Tiek's Shakespeare that Ferdinand Freilingrath will famously proclaim German (1844: 257, v. 1), and "we" means also the historical Saxons "who lived at the court of Horwendillus five hundred years before we were born, but all whose thoughts we seem to know as well as we do our own, because we have read them in Shakespear" (Hazlitt 1908: 84). Hazlitt puts Hamlet at the centre of the play, "not a character marked by strength of will or even of passion, but by refinement of thought and sentiment, . . . as little of the hero as a man could well be" (1908: 86), as he puts the reader at the centre of Shakespeare's experience (Han 2001).

"The text's the thing" (cf. *Ham.* 2.2.539). From mid 1820s, Shakespeare's plays and especially *Hamlet*, of which Henry Bunbury discovers the First Quarto in 1823 (for its significance, Lesser 2015), are subject to Biblical hermeneutics and enshrined in multi-volume annotated editions, excluding actors that, versed in the dominant genre of melodrama, were

considered unequal to the task of performing Shakespeare. William Charles Macready (1793–1873) was the first of the great Victorian actor-managers to make fidelity to Shakespeare a hallmark of his managerial career and to participate in the wider cult of Shakespeare worship: "I have only been the officiating priest at the shrine of our country's greatest genius (immense cheers); and, indeed, I can honestly take credit for little more than true devotion, zeal and good intention . . ." (Macready reported in The Examiner, July 28, 1839, in Zitter 2011: 14) During his management of Covent Garden and Drury Lane in the years before the deregulation of Shakespeare with the Theatres Regulation Act of 1843, Macready's textual restoration and historically informed staging elevated the social standing of the theatre and his cultural influence extends to beyond the stage. Daniel Maclise's celebrated painting *The Play Scene in 'Hamlet'* (1842) shows his "collaboration" with Macready's *Hamlet* at Covent Garden in 1839 (Clary 2007). *Lear and Cordelia* (1848-9, 1854) may have been inspired by Macready's restored *King Lear* that Brown saw in 1848 (Marylebone Theatre, 28 April 1848, Macready 1875: 573; on Brown's *Lear*, see Borowitz 1978), but Brown is closer to the "original" text (he depicts the expunged line from Q1 "Please you draw near; louder the music there." *Lear* 4.7.25) and Deverell's theatrical *Twelfth Night* (exhibited 1850) attempts move closer to Brown ("The Clown's Song" 2.4.50-66, featuring for the first time Elisabeth Siddal as Viola/Cesario). On the other hand, no longer reference performance both Millais's *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* (1849-50; see also the earlier version on board from 1849 in Liverpool) from *The Tempest* (1.2.388-96), and Hunt's *Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus* (1850-1) from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (5.4.63-70, 73-7 quoted in the frame spandrels, featuring again cross-dressed Siddal as Julia/Sebastian). The following year, Millais's *Ophelia* departed from fidelity to Shakespeare's text and historical accuracy of the setting, to add an allegorical dimension, signalled by subtle cues that break the naturalism of the painting, such as Siddal's medievalised figure, distorted perspective, inconsistencies in the natural setting, and Ophelia's out-fashioned but recognisably Victorian dress.

For Hazlitt and the early Victorian readers, Shakespeare was not allegorical (see also his contrast with Spenser's allegory, 1908: 258-9) or more emphatically, as Keats wrote in a letter to George and Georgiana Keats (14 February 1819), "Shakespeare led a life of Allegory; his works are the comments on it" (2002: 261) which was the meaning of Brown's "true" portrait of Shakespeare. Precisely because the text was not predetermined by allegory, its sense could be sought for in life itself and, "although the plays of Shakespeare had become a sacrosanct literary artefact, they remained infinitely malleable and excerptible for generations of actors professional and amateur, declaimers, schoolboys, self-help enthusiasts, preachers, tutors and

governesses and even working-class men in mechanics' institutes, who found Shakespeare a limitless artistic, social and moral resource." (Donohue 2008: 240) In particular, the plays remained open to allegoresis and transposition that in the literary painting mediates between the visible Shakespearean subject and a stateable external significance, producing the artistic criticism of Shakespeare's text.

The scandal surrounding the *The Carpenter's Shop* may have induced Millais to be more guarded in his use of allegory, hiking its traditional function of veiling the truth, but *Ophelia* also demonstrates how far Millais developed the allegorical mode of expression artistically, substituting the intrusive conventionality of Christian symbols for the naturalistic allegory. to the point of making the painting's figural meaning difficult to recognise, let alone decode. As the mediation operated by the painting is itself the product of mediation, the interpretation of allegory begins from the mediators at the margins, as did Aby Warburg in his interpretation of the Palazzo Schifanoia frescoes in Ferrara (paper presented at X Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte, Rome 1912, Warburg 1999; on Warburg's method, Ginzburg 1989). While the hyperobject multidimensional mesh of material-semiotic interactions will provide the theoretical framework and methodology to mediation, we will describe three regions of the mesh to which Millais' painting is connected.

Shakespeare's text. The excerpt from Gertrude's speech that accompanied *Ophelia in* the catalogue (Royal Academy 1852: 547, n. 557; also Millais 1900 v. 1: 115) is insufficient to determine which edition of *Hamlet* it was quoted from. However, the real question is how Millais approached Shakespeare's text, whether directly as pure *invenzione*, or already mediated by illustration, as we maintain. For his previous painting from Shakespeare, *Ferdinand lured by Ariel* (1849), Millais relied on Kenny Meadow's illustration of the scene from *The Tempest* between the invisible Ariel singing and Ferdinand (2.1, Shakespeare 1843 v. 1: 12) and the drawing makes the similarity even clearer (1848; unnoticed in Bennett 1984). He probably saw the illustration in the copy of *The Works of Shakspere* edited by Barry Cornwall that Gabriel Rossetti and his sister Maria Francesca bought when it was issued serially 1839-43 (he completed it in August 1844, Meacock and Chapman 2007: 20).

Images of Ophelia's death were not as common before Millais' painting as one may expect, and two stand out for their popularity (on Knight's and Cornwall's editions, Young 2009, 2010; on the illustrations, Sillars 2010: ch. 8): William Harvey's tail-piece to *Hamlet* in *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere* edited by Charles Knight (*Tragedies*, vol. 1 [1840]: 176; *Hamlet* was published 10 August 1839; for the dates of publication, Knowles 1987) and Kenny Meadows' tail-piece to *Hamlet*, Act IV in Cornwall's edition (1843 v. 2: 187).

Harvey reconstructs Ophelia's accident, closely following the text and Knight's interpretation (who quotes Anna Jameson, [1840]: 175): a basket of flowers floats next to a broken willow branch, and Ophelia held above water from the waist by her bellowing gown, is singing, holding her hair crowned by flowers while her bellowing gown holds Ophelia above water from the waist . Meadows only depicts the aftermath of the accident: Ophelia's garland and veil hang from a broken branch and her coronet of flowers floats above her body still visible under the surface.

Richard Redgrave's *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* (1842) was exhibited at the Royal Academy accompanied by the lines: "There is a willow grows ascaunt the brook, / That shews his hoar leaves in the glossy stream; / Therewith fantastic garland did she make / Of crow-flowers, nettles, daisies, and long purples." (1842: 7, n. 71). Narratively preceding Harvey's illustration, the painting depicts Ophelia seated on a willow trunk, as she pauses her weaving and looks sorrowful towards the sky. Despite the quote in the exhibition catalogue, the source-text is *Hamlet*'s "bad quarto" (Q1), published by Payne and Foss (1825) as "an accurate reprint from the only known copy of this Tragedy as originally written by Shakespeare, which he afterwards altered and enlarged":

> *Queene*. O my Lord, the yong *Ofelia*
> Having made a garland of sundry sortes of floures,
> Sitting upon a willow by a brooke,
> The envious sprig broke, into the brooke she fell,
> And for a while her clothes spread wide abroade,
> Bore the yong Lady up: and there she sate smiling,
> Even Mermaide like, twixt heaven and earth.
> Chaunting olde sundry tunes uncapable
> As it were of her distresse, but long it could not be,
> Till that her clothes, being heavy with their drinke,
> Dragg'd the sweete wretch to death.
> (Shakespeare 1992: 90)

Three differences from Gertrude's speech in the Knight's and Cornwall's editions are significant: it emphasises the variety of flowers used by Ophelia for her garland rather than naming specific plants; it describes Ophelia sitting to weave her garlands rather than her walk towards the willow, as in Knight's and Cornwall's reading of the folio (they read *Ham.* 4.7.168 "There, with fantastic garlands did she come," instead of "Therewith fantastic garlands did she make" which was and is prevalent). Exploiting these possibilities in the text, Redgrave focuses on Ophelia's silent prayer rather than madness (cf. Charles Le Brun's "Rapture" ["*La Contemplation*"] in *Heads Representing the Various Passions of the Soul*, London 1801 [Paris 1696]) and, borrowing from Ophelia's mad scene, expresses her state of mind using identifiable plants with symbolic meaning (Joanna Dean identified some thirty species, Casteras and

Parkinson 1988: 108). Although Redgrave's compositions are traceable in Deverell's *Twelfth Night* (cf. Redgrave's etching for the *Etching Club* "The Lover's Reverie" 1850, published 1857), Hunt's *Hireling Shepherd* (cf. Redgrave's etching "Or if the earlier season lead . . ." 1848, published 1850; also suggested in Casteras and Parkinson 1988: 26) and Millais' *Ophelia, t*he early connection between the Pre-Raphaelites and the network of artists teaching at the Government School of Design (Redgrave, Herbert, Dyce, a.o.) deserves further research (cf. Casteras and Parkinson 1988: 76).

Social problem literature. Redgrave's *Ophelia* became popular after 1857, when John Sheepshank donated it to the new Victoria and Albert Museum and circulated as engraving. However, Redgrave's best known pictures were *The Poor Teacher* (1843; another version is from 1845; was reworked in *The Governess*, 1844) and *The Sempstress* (the original version from 1844 is lost, the 1846 version is at Tate). When the painting was exhibited was accompanied in the catalogue by the lines from Thomas Hood's popular poem "The Song of the Shirt" (1843): "Oh! men with sisters dear / Oh! men with mothers and wives, / It is not linen you're wearing out, / But human creatures' lives." (Royal Academy 1844: 13, n. 227)

Immediately prior to his death in 1845, Thomas Hood wrote a series of poems in which he critiques society on its Christian values (Butterworth 2011): in "A Drop of Gin" he remarks: "But hold—we are neither Barebones nor Prynne [i.e. Puritans], / Who lash'd with such rage / The sins of the age; / Then, instead of making too much of din. / Let Anger be mute. / And sweet Mercy dilute. /With a drop of Pity, the Drop of Gin!" (*Punch*, 18 November 1843, Hood 1911: 623); in "The Song of the Shirt" the seamstress sings "It 's O! to be a slave / Along with the barbarous Turk, / Where woman has never a soul to save. / If this is Christian work!" (*Punch*, Christmas issue 1843, Hood 1911: 625); in "A Pauper's Christmas Carol" he comments ironically "Full of drink and full of meat, / On our Saviour's natal day. / Charity's perennial treat" (*Punch*, Christmas issue 1843; Hood 1911: 625); "The Lady's Dream" concludes the Lady's nightmare "Remorse was so extreme: / And yet, oh yet, that many a Dame / Would dream the Lady's Dream!" (*Hood's Magazine*, February 1844; Hood 1911: 641-2); in "The Workhouse Clock. An Allegory" he comments ironically: "Christian charity, hang your head!" (*Hood's Magazine*, April 1844; Hood 1911: 648-9); in "The Bridge of Sighs" he laments "Alas ! for the rarity / Of Christian charity / Under the sun!" (*Hood's Magazine*, May 1844, Hood 1911: 649-50); in "The Lay of the Labourer," the Labourer demands "To shun the workhouse walls; / Where savage laws begrudge / The pauper babe its breath, / And doom a wife to a widow's life. / Before her partner's death. // My only claim is this, / With labour stiff

and stark, / By lawful turn, my living to earn, / Between the light and dark" (*Hood's Magazine*, November 1844; Hood 1911: 651-2).

The political economic context of these poems is the Poor Law Amendment Act passed in 1834 that reformed and expanded the Workhouse system, the publication of the *Report of the Children's Employment Commission* in 1842 that drew public attention on child exploitation, the Anti-Corn Law League which emerged in 1836 and was most active between 1838 and 1848 particularly after the Irish Famine (1845-52), and the Chartist movement that following the failure of the 1832 Reform Act to extend the vote beyond those owning property, demanded universal manhood suffrage. In particular, the Seamstress is a victim of capitalism and the unrestrained operation of the market. In a November 1843 court case, it was claimed that a seamstress "had only three-halfpence for making a shirt" as was reported by *Northern Star* the weekly newspaper edited by the Chartist leader Fergus O'Connor (25 Nov. 1843: 7). Few months later, an inquest on the suicide of Eliza Kendall (19), heard that she was being paid "five farthings only ... for making up some [shirts]" and the coroner's jury had condemned the practice of paying "so low a rate of wages as to preclude the possibility of a subsistence" (*Northern Star*, 21 Aug. 1844: 6). In October 1843, the young widow and seamstress from Whitechapel, London that inspired Hood simply known as Mrs Biddell (Whitley 509), was prosecuted at a criminal court for pawning clothes she was sewing in order to feed her starving children. Henry Moses, the "slopseller" that brought her to court defended himself in a letter to the Times on the grounds that: "surrounded by a competitive market, I am compelled to sell as cheaply as my neighbours." Workhouses at this time were also involved in shirt making, and Moses depicts "the competition of workhouse against independent labourers" as the cause of "the diminished rate of wage" (*The Times*, 31 Oct. 1843: 3).

In order to support his friend and his magazine, Charles Dickens contributed "Threatening Letter to Thomas Hood, from an Ancient Gentleman by Favour of Charles Dickens" to the May issue of *Hood's Magazine* (1844). In the ironic piece Dickens refers to the case of Mary Furley, " who, though she was in full work (making shirts at three-halfpence a piece), had no pride in her country, but treasonably took in her head, in the distraction of having been robbed of her easy earnings, to attempt to drown herself and her young child." (1844: 409) The piece prompted Hood to write "The Bridge of Sighs" for the same issue and in turn, the influence of Hood's poem can be traced in Dickens' character of Margaret "Meg" Veck from *The Chimes: A Goblin Story of Some Bells that Rang an Old Year Out and a New Year In*, published by Chapman in December 1844 (for instance, cf. Dickens 2009: 211). Reviewing the novella for the January 1845 issue, one of the last things he wrote, Hood found *The Chimes*

less "happy" than *A Christmas Carol*, but praised the "wholesome lessons of charity and forbearance." (Whitley 1951: 390)

As epigraph to "The Bridge of Sighs" Hood quoted the conclusion of Gertrude's speech "Drown'd! drown'd!" (*Ham.* 4.7.182) linking contemporary cases of suicide and women exploitation in London to Ophelia. While the interpretation of Ophelia's "doubtful" death tended towards suicide and was, *thus*, left unrepresented (for instance, cf. the Malone-Boswell edition of 1821: 458-9, n. 6), the popular editions by Charles Knight and Barry Cornwall quoted a passage from Anna Jameson's *Characteristics of Women* (1832; that changed the perception of the character:

> Once at Murano, I saw a dove caught in a tempest; perhaps it was young, and either lacked strength of wing to reach its home, or the instinct which teaches to shun the brooding storm; but so it was—and I watched it, pitying, as it flitted, poor bird! hither and thither, with its silver pinions shining against the black thunder-cloud, till, after a few giddy whirls, it fell blinded, affrighted, and bewildered, into the turbid wave beneath, and was swallowed up for ever. It reminded me then of the fate of Ophelia; and now, when I think of her, I see again before me that poor dove, beating with weary wing, bewildered amid the storm. (Jameson 1832 v. 1: 188-9, quoted in Knight's "Supplementary Notice", Shakespeare 1838-43: 175; and in Cornwall's "Notes", Shakespeare 1843: 120)

Jameson concludes her essay with the exclamation "But there 's a heaven above us!" that Redgrave attempted to render in his *Ophelia* with a rather waxy expression of invocation. Commentators seemed unable to understand Redgrave's innovative interpretation of the character and fell back on stereotype. For instance, the *Athenaeum* only noticed her disordered clothing and strange "light in the eyes and a quivering of the lip" (4 May 1842: 410), and the *Art Union* that Ophelia "is pale--woebegone--and her restless, fevered eyes, bespeak a mind diseased" (1842: 121; even Alan Young does not recognise her expression, 2002: 331) and with this meaning, the wood engraving of Redgrave' *Ophelia* (first published in the *Art Journal* article on Redgrave, Dafforne 1859: 220) was inserted after Gertrude's speech in some later editions of Knight's *Pictorial Shakspere* (cf. Shakespeare 1867).

The Semptress pausing her needle work and raising her eyes to heaven has the same expression as Ophelia, mirroring the connection between Ophelia and the Unfortunate in Hood's poem:

> It is one of my most gratifying feeling that many of my best efforts in art have minded at calling attention to the struggles of the poor and the oppressed. In the "Reduced Gentleman's Daughter" [1840], "The Poor Teacher" [1843], "The Sempstress" [1844], "Fashion Slaves" [1846], and other works, I have had in view the helping them to right that suffer wrong at the hands of their fellow men. If this has been don feebly, it has atleast been don from the heart, and I trust when I shall have occasion to regret that I have debased the art I love, by making it subservient to any unworthy end." (1850: 49) Reviewing *The Governess* in 1845 the Art Union was had commented "despite the want of originality, the work cannot fail to prove universally attractive; the story is so touching; it is made so deeply impressive; it is so eloquent an appeal

on behalf of a class that demands our best sympathies; it is, in fact, a painted sermon--a large and valuable contribution to the cause of humanity (Art Union 1845: 180)

Methodology

In the Middle

> This really was a book without subject, without beginning or end, but not without middle. (Deleuze and Parnet 2007: x)

First, then, the middle. *Ophelia* (1851-2) is the title of an oil painting by John Everett Millais in the permanent collection of Tate Britain, routinely considered "one of the nation's most loved paintings" (Tate 2014) and "the best-known picture in all Victorian art" (Rosenfeld 2012: 71; Finch 2018). To most, however, it is a quaint Victorian picture, smaller and darker than one expects from its copious reproductions, oppressed by similar-looking paintings tightly hung on a vast greyish wall. Even its gilt-plate frame with semi-circular sight does not set it apart from its neighbours, despite Millais took care of designing it himself with an elaborate garland of daisies, passion flowers, jasmines, poppies, ivy, and forget-me-nots, to recapitulate the picture (contra Roberts 1985: 158). But this "is not its true frame" — Slavoj Žižek observes — "there is another, invisible, frame, implied by the structure of the painting, which frames our perception of the painting, and these two frames do not overlap — there is an invisible gap separating the two. The pivotal content of the painting is not rendered in its visible part, but is located in this dislocation of the two frames, in the gap that separates them." (2001: 5) This gap between affective presence and cultural significance, invisible yet felt when encountering the painting, set this research in motion.

From Millais' painting, backwards. Ophelia is the name of a fictional character in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1599-1601) whose off-stage death reported by Gertrude (*Ham.* 4.7.166-83) is the subject that Millais depicts, re-imagines, and criticises in his painting. And from Millais' painting, forwards. *Ophelia* is the title of a novel by Lisa Klein (2006) and its film adaptation directed by Claire McCarthy (2018) that rewrites the play from Ophelia's perspective with a twist. Daisy Ridley's drowning scene is the latest of a long series of cinematographic quotes of Millais's painting — Lawrence Olivier's *Hamlet* (1948), Alfred Hitchcock's *Vertigo* (1958), Lars von Trier's *Melancholia* (2011), only to name my personal favourites — the film middling reviews and modest box-office success may reveal more than its many faults (a.o. Reed 2019) and be a symptom of period drama (and Pre-Raphaelite painting) fatigue, of disinterest for Ophelia or even, God forbid, for Shakespeare, when too

many Shakespeares, old and new, contend for the public's stretched attention (Hulbert, Wetmore, and York 2006; Billington, Warchus, et al. 1998).

While it may be satisfying to fix beginning (1599-1601), middle (1851-2) and end (2018) in a timeline, these milestones are actually dynamic nodes, that change as they lead deeper into a large and complex network beyond any frame. From Shakespeare's play, back to its sources, collaborations, and contaminations, finally foregrounded in the *New Oxford Shakespeare* (2016). And then forward, to the scores of Ophelia's performances, parodies, and adaptations that began before the play was even printed. From Millais' painting, back to his Royal Academy training and cultural milieu of the early 1840s, to the collaborative intermedial practices of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (Millais, Hunt, D.G. and W.M. Rossetti, Collinson, Stephens, Woolner, with Brown and Collins 1848-53). And then forward to the Pre-Raphalite revival in criticism and the art market from the 1980s, and the raise of global Shakespeare from the 1990s.

The name "Ophelia" is polysemic and its references escape "mermaidlike" (*Ham.* 4.7.174) all attempts at framing them in conventional categories of art history and criticism, based on form or affect, context of production or reception (Fortier 2014): distributed over eight-hundred years since Saxo Grammaticus' *Danorum Regum Heroumque Historiae* introduces her as an anonymous "*excellentis forme foemina*" ("a very attractive woman" 2015: 184, 6.7; written c. 1220; first printed, Paris 1514; adapted into French by François de Belleforest as *Histoires tragiques*, Paris 1571), across all cultural regions from Hamlet's first international performances (1607 in Sierra Leone, see Taylor 2001; 1626 in Germany, see Seidler and Erne 2020) to the Globe recent production that toured 197 countries (Dromgoole 2017), and through all artistic media and study areas in the Humanities.

Whereas it may be possible to experience Millais' painting as an "event-encounter" (O'Sullivan 2005), for instance as a child, this is less likely to happen as one progresses through education and is integrated or subjectified by culture. For different reasons and by various means (Appadurai 1996), "Shakespeare" and "the Victorian Era" have been institutionalised, commodified, and globalised across cultural regions. Thus, any particular event-encounter with a Victorian painting of a Shakespearean subject, is already captured in a cultural apparatus that predetermines and enhances the experience. The invisible frame of the painting from which we begun, is not a frame at all, but the illusion sustaining the painting's dual nature as artefact and artwork, product, and commodity. The painting (artefact) is in the frame, the picture (artwork) is in the museum, the museum (apparatus) is in culture, so that each can be moved or translated without compromising the painting's aura. On the other hand, once the invisible frame has

dissolved, the liquid outside (Bauman 2000) floods the gap between the two frames, dissolving the physical frame and, eventually, the painting itself. This is how Ophelia became a hyperobject and henceforth, we will refer to her as such.

What Is a Cultural Hyperobject?

Simplifying and specialising a blend of assemblage theory (Deleuze and Guattari 1987; De Landa 2016; DeAssis 2018) and object-oriented ontology (Harman 2017), Timothy Morton applied the concept of hyperobject to "things that are massively distributed in time and space relative to humans" (2013: 1), "genuine nonhuman objects that are not simply the products of a human gaze" (199). Although Morton seems to exclude that hyperobjects can be cultural (cf. musical hyperobjects, 2013: 186-8), it is easy to see how cultural assemblages may become nonhuman by exceeding the scale and connectedness possible to cognitive experience in human lifetime. The five characteristics with which Morton defines an hyperobject are sufficient to account for the phenomenology of Ophelia we described at the beginning.

Viscosity, Nonlocality, and Temporal Undulation

Viscosity is Ophelia's new state after the solid visible inside of the painting and the liquid invisible outside of the frame merged together. The viewer is no longer in front of the painting, but rather stuck in the painting, "like . . . a wasp which sinks into the jam and drowns in it" (Morton 2013: 30-1). Ophelia has the uncanny "agency" (29) of the ghost (McGuire and McGuire 2014; Reisert 2003) haunting the cultural sphere and pulling down with her new objects and events, such as Jean-Martin Charcot's patients at La Salpêtrière (Paris) and Hugh Diamond's at the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum (Springfield) that were posed as Ophelia in medical photographs (Diamond 1852; cf. Didi-Huberman 2003; Rhodes 2008; Perni 2012), or the "Ophelia of the Seine" whose face "was cast in the morgue, because it was beautiful, because it smiled, smiled so deceptively, as though it knew" (Rilke in Saliot 2015: 129), or even Virginia Woolf's suicide in the River Ouse near her home in Rodmell, East Sussex that Stephen Daldry Opheliaised in the film *The Hours* (2002; Lee 2005; see also Silver 2014: 492).

Nonlocality is complementary to viscosity, as classic haunted house stories show: "Alas, how is't with you, / That you do bend your eye on vacancy, / And with th' incorporal air do hold discourse?" (*Ham.* 3.4.112-4) Local manifestations cannot realise Ophelia, that seems ubiquitous but dissolves as soon as one tries to grasp her. We will see later how a floating

signifier combines viscosity with nonlocality, whereas her, Paul Delaroche's *The Young Martyr* (1855) may demonstrate the viscosity-nonlocality mechanism in the hyperobject, the first metonymic, based on predication, contextuality, and contiguity, the other metaphoric, based on substitution and similarity (Jacobson 2009; on metaphor and metonymy in Lacan, Grigg 2008: Ch. 11).

First, Ophelia and the Young Martyr are initially separate: Delaroche, who painted the first version at the Hermitage following a severe illness in 1853, is unlikely to have seen Millais' painting before it was shown in Paris at the Universal Exhibition of 1855 (Bann 1997; see also Chapman 2007; the converse is probably less true but has not been investigated, cf. Hunt 1905 v.1: 187). Second, Ophelia "sticks" metonymically to the Martyr when Théophile Gautier, who had favorably reviewed Millais' painting at the Universal Exhibition (1856: 58-9), writes about the Young Martyr in Delaroche's obituary on his magazine *L'artiste*: "The Christian Ophelia shall be soon as popular as the Ophelia in Shakespeare" (1856: 319; however, he sounds less enthusiastic about Delaroche in 1874, "almost managing, in the Christian Martyr, to produce a real masterpiece after so many sham ones." 1901: 248)

Finally, Jules Laforgue had many opportunities of seeing Delaroche's painting acquired by the Louvre in 1895. Delaroche, who entered the history of photography for (allegedly) exclaming "From this day painting is dead!" is the first artist whose catalogue raisonné (Goddé 1858) was fully illustrated by photographs (Hannavy 2008: 407). The photographer Robert Jefferson Bingham shows together with other reproductions of contemporary paintings, Delaroche's Young Martyr (*Société française de photographie*, Grand Palais, Paris 1859) that specifically attracts the attention of critics Philippe Burty and Théophile Gautier for its photographic aesthetics (Burty 1859; Gautier 1858; on Bingham, see Boyer 2002). By the 1870s, "prints after Delaroche's dramatic and barren history paintings were ubiquitous" and all available from Goupil's catalogue (Renié 1999; 2006). Laforgue substitutes the Martyr for Ophelia in *Hamlet, or the Consequences of Filial Piety* (published in volume 1887). Returning at Elsinore after Ophelia's burial, Hamlet "leans out the window for a while to watch the golden full moon reflected on the calm sea where it wiggles a broken column of black velvet and liquid gold, magical and purposeless. — These reflections on the melancholy water … Thus did the saint and damned Ophelia float all night … Oh! I was not able to kill myself, deprive me of life! Ophelia! Ophelia! Forgive me! Don't cry like this!" (1921: 56-7, my translation).

Laforgue's look out of the window, since he "never ceased to think of himself as Hamlet" (Bailey 1963: 143) becomes a metaphor of the gaze in Millais' painting, whereas Ophelia's saintliness in Millais, Delaroche and Laforgue punctuates the return of viewer's repressed guilt

for her death. However, Lacan explains in an interview, it is not as if there were "a vague, dubious thing which is repressed; it is not a sort of need, or tendency, that could have been articulated (and is not articulated because it is repressed); it is a discourse that is *already articulated, already formulated in a language*. It is all there." (Lacan and Chapsal 1957, my translation) "What comes under the effect of repression returns, for repression and the return of the repressed are just the two sides of the same coin. The repressed is always there, expressed in a perfectly articulate manner in symptoms and a host of other phenomena." (Lacan 1993: 12)

Nonlocality and viscosity read through Lacan's repression and the return of the repressed across Millais, Delaroche, and Laforgue demonstrate that these works never were separate from each other but rather inhere in an hyperobject in which "locality is an abstraction" (Morton 2013: 47). Artworks become symptoms of a transindividual unconscious that, unlike hyperobject predecessors such as Fredric Jameson's "political unconscious" ([1981] 2002), Jonathan Culler's "literary unconscious" (1984) or Rosalind Krauss' "optical unconscious" (1994), is not all discursive or human (cf. Lacan's definition "The unconscious is that part of concrete discourse qua transindividual, which is not at the subject's disposal in re-establishing the continuity of his conscious discourse." 2006: 214; a critique of art as symptom is in Dean 2002).

Hopefully avoiding the pitfalls of the virgin victim trope (cf. Keifer 2001: 22), but already viscosity and nonlocality can account for Ophelia's vague, varied, inconsistent, excessive iconography (for an informal survey through a social network, see Giudici 2012-21), so similar to Aby Warburg's *Nympha Fiorentina* (for an image of the manuscript, Warburg 1986-1900; for an account of the *Nympha*, see Gombrich 1970) carrying the impulse of antiquity into Modernity (Didi-Huberman 2006). We are not surprised, then, to learn that Ophelia too is a *phantasma* (Agamben 2011), a ghost, an image, a fantasy, and a pagan Madonna: "Nymph, in thy orisons / Be all my sins remembered" (*Ham.* 3.1.88-9) Yet there are two significant differences. Ophelia is not a wave that propagates through memory (see the nymph in board 46 in Warburg Archive *s.d.*, and Cornell University Library 2013-6; for comments, see Johnson 2012), because the hyperobject is not a medium but the thing itself. Ophelia does not run towards us from the past but, as it were, back from the future:

> The Lacanian answer to the question 'From where does the repressed return?' is . . . , paradoxically, 'From the future.' Symptoms are meaningless traces, their meaning is not discovered, excavated from the hidden depth of the past, but constructed retroactively — the analysis produces the truth; that is, the signifying frame which gives the symptoms their symbolic place and meaning. As soon as we enter the symbolic order, the past is always present in the form of historical tradition and the meaning of these traces is not

given; it changes continually with the transformations of the signifier's network. Every historical rupture, every advent of a new master-signifier, changes retroactively the meaning of all tradition, restructures the narration of the past, makes it readable in another, new way. (Žižek 1989: 58)

Temporal undulation simply means that "every entity has its own time, both in a physical and in a deep ontological sense." (Morton 2003: 66) and as ghost stories show and as Hamlet and Derrida remarked, "time is out of joint" between our conventional clocks and the hyperobject internal clock (*Ham.* 2.5.186; Derrida 2006: 1). Inside the hyperobject, time does not flow in one direction only or at the same speed, and it can even stop or fold back on itself. In *Ophelia,* Millais represents this time by folding Shakespeare's narrative time, Ophelia's ecstatic moment, and the contemporary viewer's gaze within pictorial time producing a Now-time (*Jetztzeit* in Benjamin 2002: 473; Hamacher 2001). It is an image of time quite different from that underlying most Victorian narrative painting, such as Augustus Egg's *Past and Present* triptych (1858), or contemporary original-practices theatre (Weingust 2014), where the spectator for the price of the theatre ticket, can board a TARDIS (Time And Relative Dimensions In Space) and travel to the old-new Globe theatre at the very moment in which Shakespeare is staging his play (cf. the episode "The Shakespeare's Code" in *Doctor Who* third series, Palmer 2007). Instead, Millais places pictorial time inside the present as a "weak messianic power," if not as revolutionary moment ready to "explode the continuum of history" (Benjamin 2006 v. 4: 395).

Although it may be Millais' most original feature, temporality in his work has not received much attention (Paul Barlow may be the only one, for example in *Autumn Leaves,* 2005: 72-4). Whether discovered in Tintoretto (cf. on Tintoretto's time, see Vellodi 2014; 2019: ch. 5) via Ruskin's *Modern Painters II* ([1846] 1903-12 v. 4: 263-5), or in Delaroche, as we believe, Millais' manipulation of time in *Ophelia* is unintentionally Modernist and shows that "when past things survive, then it is not lived-out facts that survive, facts that could be recorded as positive objects of knowledge; rather what survives are the unactualized possibilities of that which is past. There is historical time only insofar as there is an excess of the unactualized, the unfinished, failed, thwarted, which leaps beyond its particular Now and demands from another Now its settlement, correction and fulfilment." (Hamacher 2001: 164) This other Now is the futural, as we are about to see.

Phaseness and Interobjectivity

Phaseness is the mathematical property of hyperobjects from which the previous phenomenological properties depend. Whereas ordinary objects can be entirely represented in

spacetime, hyperobjects require additional, hyper-dimensions. In the case of Ophelia, these may include the medium of presentation (theatre, painting, film, writing, etc.), the cultural region of reception, or elusive parameters, such as iconography, semantics, emotions, etc. The amount of data required, their irreducible complexity, heterogeneity, and fuzziness far exceed the capabilities of human or algorithmic criticism (Smithies 2017).

Far from rendering it useless, these insurmountable obstacles show that the hyperobject is an "operative concept . . . that is not essentially characterized by its objective or thematic definition, but by the intellectual operation that it allows for, and through which the thematic concepts are first fixed in their definition." (Nowotny 2006; Fink 1957; cf. "epistemic thing" in Rheinberger 1997; in artistic research, see Schwab 2013; 2018). Hyperobjects help recognise dis/continuities that may be difficult to trace in linear time or across multiple dimensions, as we did when tracing Millais's painting to Delaroche's Young Martyr via Laforgue's text.

Interobjectivity is the philosophical foundation of phasing and constitutes the hyperobjects ontological structure that Morton describes as a mesh, "relationships between criss-crossing strands of metal and gaps between the strands" (2003: 83). In the metaphor, the strands represent causal-semiotic interactions between the hyperobject components that are expressed mathematically by its *n*-dimensions. An object is more than the sum total of the interactions it expresses however, as these interactions are all that can be thought about the object, its other properties remain perfectly indeterminate, "a mystery" (87). Morton calls "strange strangeness" (211, n.3) the ontological withdrawnness of objects that corresponds to the gaps of the mesh. Always already "in front of" objects (86), the mesh highlights the epistemic costs of hyperobject theory. Its holey structure makes the hyperobject as a whole less knowable than its individual components, and conversely, each component cannot be detached, even in principle, from the strands of interaction through which it can be known. This fundamental paradox poses four challenges to the enquiry of cultural hyperobjects.

First, if components cannot be detached from their multidimensional mesh, then the hyperobject that enables an innovative problem-framing, forces interdisciplnarity upon enquiry (as a consequence of flat ontology, see Harman 2016; from a generalist perspective, see Graff 2015; Frodeman 2017; from a speculative realist perspective, see Bhaskar 2010; Bhaskar and Danemark and Price 2018). For instance, Millais' *Ophelia* and Holman Hunt's *The Hireling Shepherd* (1851) are enmeshed together and with the anthropic landscape along the Hogsmill River (Surrey), with middle-class anxieties growing in 1840s London about industrialisation, immigration, and environment (Lee 2014), with the construction of the London and

Southampton Rail (1832-1840), with early suburbanisation in the Surbiton area (French 2011; Jeevendrampillai 2019), etc.

Second, "intersubjectivity is really human interobjectivity with lines drawn around it to exclude nonhumans" (Morton 2003: 82). This means, however, that all interactions within the mesh are effectively causal-semiotic (88). Not only conventional categories of art history and criticism collapse, as we mentioned earlier, but their Kantian foundations (Newman 2008), namely the distinction between synthetic a priori and aesthetic judgements (Smith 2012), between consciousness and cognition, between law and freedom. A discussion would take us too far but three remarks are worth making to show what is gained in exchange.

Because there is no line separating the doing of the artist from the objective artwork and the semiotic interactions of the viewer/critic/buyer with the artwork, all interactions collectively constitute the artwork (cf. artworks as "physically embodied and culturally emergent entities" in Margolis 1974, 1977). Further, while it may be practical to distinguish different kinds of interactions for different purposes, for instance between the painter's brush stroke on the canvas and the bidder's click in an online auction, there is no ontological ground to do so. Finally, within hyperobject enquiry, not only have borders between art practices and academic disciplines become soft, but also that forgotten border persisting in the art discourse between the biographical and biological life of the producer and the material, factual and interpretative attributes of art products. No longer based on the transcendental subject and materialism (Harman 2011), unfashionable expression such as "artist's intentions," "authenticity," "originality," "public's taste" etc. may regain critical relevance for describing special areas in the mesh of interactions (high intensity, density, frequency), without intentional or affective fallacies arising (Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946; 1949).

Third, history becomes what Benjamin described as a "petrified, primordial landscape" (1998: 166), because in the hyperobject "appearance is the past, essence is the future" (Morton 2003: 91) and "the present is precisely nowhere to be found in the yawning Rift opening between the future and past" (92). An object in general is "a rift between what it is and how it appears" (18), a "fragile inconsistency" (196) that others have called difference (Deleuze 1994: 41). Difference manifests itself as the "strange strangeness" that, after what said earlier, can be explained as the object capacity to interact with itself (79), thus producing gaps of inconsistency and incompleteness in the interobjective mesh. At the same time, difference appears as "futurality" (67), meaning the hyperobject tendency to evolve towards a futural state (attractor) that lays "ontologically underneath its past" (91). This is its "origin" (Benjamin 2006: 395; 1998: 45) and "how the angel of history must look." (2006: 392)

Fourth, although we have shown that no ontological line separates art, criticism, and art history, this does not mean that their differences can simply be done away with as their different styles of thinking and modes of presentation constitute different knowledge-power interactions and discourses (against antidisciplinarity, see Bhaskar 2010; Bhaskar, Danemark and Price 2018; in defense of disciplines, see Osborne 2013; Jacobs 2014). Nonetheless, the temporal focus keeping their horizons of enquiry apart — he past-present of art history, the present-past of criticism, and the present-future of art — are less distinct horizons from the point of view of futurality than the same present continuing in different directions. Benjamin's angel of history knows well that all she sees in front of her is debris from the past, but also that the storm comes from Paradise from which she came and towards which she is blown away: "origin is the goal" (Benjamin 2006: 395). To art history, criticism and art, the angel assigns "futurality" as epistemo-critical task and ethico-political injunction, to construct the interrelations of the mesh aiming at its gaps, Morton's Rift that Benjamin calls the Now-time: "Here's fine revolution, and we had the trick to see't." (*Ham*. 5.1.85-6)

We said ealier that Millais' painting is a middle, a critical point that divides historical time in before and after, but this place in history cannot satisfy the angel who divides time between historical debris and the futural Paradise, from which the storm is blowing and towards which she is blown away. The angel is not a middle mark on a timeline but a Now-time that bursts it with its energy (for the Now-time as energy, see Lindroos 1998: 248; cf. Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 25). "Like every generation that preceded us, we have been endowed with a *weak* messianic power, a power on which the past has a claim" (Benjamin 2006: 309; Hamacher 2005; Loewy 2005; Morton 2021) and Millais' painting is a middle between the unrealised claims of Shakespeare's Ophelia and the weak messianic power of the Woman Question raising in the 1850s (Delap 2011).

Whereas the image of women in Pre-Raphaelite painting (Bullen 1998), the role of Pre-Raphaelite women artists (Marsh 2018; 2019), and the Pre-Raphaelite construction of masculinities (Sussman 2008; Yeates and Trowbridge 2017) gathered considerable literature, Millais' role has mostly been overlooked. That his marriage to Euphemia Grey marks the end of his artistic development is a common misconception, instead it demonstrates his and Euphemia's abilities to build as married couple a strong social position after the scandalous annulment of her marriage with John Ruskin (1848-54), their quick marriage the year after (1855-95) and their exile from London (1855-1861) that might have costed Millais his career. While inscribed within the ideology of separate spheres throughout his career Millais resisted the aesthetisation of the female body of the 1860s producing images of women that were

individual, intimate, and intense. The following are selected examples that trace a clear path to *Ophelia*.

Still formally a student of the Royal Academy, Millais entered the competition for decorating of the new Houses of Parliament with *The Widow's Mite* (1847) that illustrates a passage from the Gospels praising the widow's charity as well as lamenting social injustice of her economic condition (Wright 1982). Mary comforting child Jesus in *Christ in the House of His Parents* (1849-50) created an adverse reaction not only because of the medievalism and Tractarianism/Catholicism of the painting but especially because of the realistic representation of the Holy Family impersonated by living models and set in a London carpenter's shop (Millais 1900 v. 1: 78; Dickens 1850; Morris 1970), suggesting that Millais and Hunt's chartist sympathies may have gone further than his casual participation to the Kennigton Common Assembly in April 1848 (Hunt 1905 v.1: 101-2; on the onlookers as sympathisers, see Goodway 2002: 148-9; on women role in Chartism, see Schwartzkopf 1991; on Medievalism and Chartism, see Matthews and Sanders 2021). *Mariana* (1850-1) allegorises Tennyson's poem into an annunciation, highlighting seclusion and loneliness of women domestic work. *The Woodman's Daughter* (1850-1) presents the young heir's first sign of affection for the cottege girl as anticipation of her unwanted pregnancy, abandonment and suicide by drowning, and identifies the causes in the boy's sense of entitlement and in the girl's neglect by her overworked father (Polhemus 1994). The superstition that a bridesmaid would see a vision of her true love if she passed a piece of wedding cake through a ring nine times, is used by Millais in *The Bridesmaid* (1851) anticipating the mystic vision and woman's jouissance (Jacobi 2012) in *Ophelia* (1851-2).

A Hyperobject Called Ophelia

Becoming Ophelia

Subjectification

Millais' career is often defined by his brief role of founding member of Pre-Raphaelitism (1848-1855) and the commercial success and prestige he enjoyed during the forty years that followed, each side obscuring the artistic independence he maintained from both sides. *Ophelia* and *A Hugenot* (1851-2) painted at the same time, are the watershed between those two periods (a different kind of middle), as he abandons overt religious motifs, Medievalism, leaf-by-leaf technique and all-over detail that were stifling him artistically, slowing down his production, and alienating the public. *Ophelia* continues Millais' exploration of femininity and social issues in the safe genre of literary painting, and yet it is not as conventional as it may appear today. To begin with, this is the first representation of "Ophelia in the stream", as Millais for the first time refers to the painting, and the first depiction of a fully dressed woman in the water in British painting.

The history of a painting is different from the history of its idea (Gasché 1992) and *Ophelia*'s idea has two defining moments. The first moment is subjectification, the process in which from a theatrical role, Ophelia becomes woman through parallel and mutually supporting transpositions (Schwab 2018) the play becomes text, the text becomes image (Sillars 2006), the image becomes action (Lamb 2002). The process began with Sarah Siddons' Ophelia in her brother's *Hamlet* (Drury Lane, 1786) that emphased her "feminine sensibility" (Ortiz 2016), and reached a critical point with Harriet Smithson's Ophelia on the 11th September 1827, her opening night at the Odéon theatre in Paris as Ophelia next to Charles Kemble's Hamlet. (Raby 1982). Smithson's use pantomime and natural presentation crystallised a subject that extended beyond and beneath the play, and that reclaimed her own story.

Art historian Anna Jameson is a substantial source for the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (Ludley 1991-2) and author of the extremely popular *Shakespeare's Heroines* (1832; on Jameson and women rights, see Russell 1991), the first example of Shakespeare criticism written by a woman, for women about Shakespeare's female characters, placing them at the centre of the play, elevating characteristics that Jameson considers natural and exemplary for

contemporary women. Classified phrenologically (Tyler 2014: 293) among the "characters of passion and imagination," Smithson's Ophelia is canonised *femme fragile*

> "in whom all intellectual and moral energy is in a manner latent, if existing; in whom love is an unconscious impulse, an imagination lends the external charm and hue, not the internal power; in whom the feminine character appears resolved into its very elementary principle — as modesty, grace, tenderness. Without these a woman is no woman, but a thing which, luckily, wants a name yet; with these, though every other faculty were passive or deficient, she might still be herself. These are the inherent qualities with which God sent us in the world: these may be perverted by a bad education--they may be obscured by harsh and evil destinies — they may be overpowered by the development of some particular mental power, the predominance of some passion; but they are never wholly crushed out of the woman's soul, while it retains those faculties which render it responsible to its Creator. Shakespeare then has shown us that these elemental feminine qualities, modesty, grace, tenderness, when . . . thrown alone amid harsh and adverse destinies, and amid the trammels and corruptions of society, without energy to resist, or will to act, or strength to endure, the end must needs be desolation." (A. Jameson 1879: 153-4)

Hyperobject Ophelia allows to reconstruct a genealogy in a way that linear histories of representation cannot do by organising media separately and in linear chronologies (cf. Young 2002; Rhodes 2008). In the late 1820s Ophelia had become a romantic subject endowed with a story and a "feminine" psychology modelled on the Gothic novel trope of *femme fragile* (Thomalla 1972; Korte 1987), a very young and beautiful, obedient and sentimental, delicate and forlorn virgin victim. The *femme fragile* is Ophelia's main genealogy continuing uninterrupted to the present day. a larval subject "defined by the movement through which it is developed" as Deleuze writes in his study of Hume, *Empiricism and Subjectivity* (1991: 85). By the turn of the century, Ophelia had achieved the status of a classic motif, fusing the nymph mytheme (Leavitt 2010) of antiquity and the Renaissance with heroines of Gothic and Romantic literature, such as Wilkie Collins' *Woman in White* (London 1859). The apparatus of art academies, Shakespeare and popular literature, amplified by British international politics and imperialism, loosens Ophelia from signification and significance, guaranteeing reproduction by hypo-critical imitation. As a consequence of dissemination, new Ophelias appear in other cultural regions by translation and adaptation (for instance in Japan, see Sato 1987), and at the same time, Ophelia becomes a recognisable target of Modernist reactions against Romantic sentimentalism (for instance, contrast André Masson's *Ophelia*, 1937 with Millais'), and feminist critique of women representations.

The properties of viscosity, nonlocality and interobjectivity are sufficient to describe the spread and persistence of *femme fragile* Opehlias, as we hope to have shown, whereas notions of personal identity, such as Warburg's "survival," Benjamin's "afterlife" or Margolis' "personhood" are inadequate to represent high viariability among Ophelias, apparently kept together as a population and sustained in time by the stability of the cultural apparatus. On the other hand, Richard Dawkins' genetic identity based on "meme" (2016) does not account for

Ophelia's variations without evolution, nor for modernist and feminist Ophelias that follow a logic of "inversion" (Levi-Strauss 2020). Finally, George Kubler's notion of series (2008) cannot explain why Ophelias appear and disappear without amalgamating into an existing series or leading to an artistic invention (cf. for instance Ophelia's translation in Iran in Jalayer and Anushiravani 2017; Tafreshi 2019).

Problematisation

The more Ophelia was subjectified, the more her character required a development that the sketchy *femme fragile* was unable to support. The libidinal investment followed the public's demand for real characters and real actions not only among viewers, demonstrated by the tremendous success at the Royal Academy exhibition of *The Chelsea Pensioners reading the Waterloo Dispatch* by David Wilkie's (1822), who was a formative artist for the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (Hunt 1905 v. 1: 159), but especially among readers, demonstrated by the unprecedented popularity of Charles Dickens' first novel *The Pickwich Papers* (serialised 1836-7) that in only six weeks matched the sales of Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1st ed. 1814 sold 11,000 copies in six weeks, 2nd ed. 1829 sold 40,000 copies by 1836, see Altick 1957: 383). In the effort of escaping academic conventions, the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was turning not directly to nature, but to the naturalism of the Primitives (Early Renaissance Flemish, German and Italian painters) and to the close reading of poetic text, beginning with Keats, Patmore, Tennyson, and Shakespeare, through which nature was observed, Gertrude's speech being a case in point (for mimesis in *Hamlet*, see Fowler 2003).

Ophelia's feminine character had become insufficient to explain her "doubtful" death (*Ham.* 5.1.216), questioned in popular readings of text thanks to the multiplication of more accurate and affordable editions of the play (Murphy 2003) in which Ophelia's mad scenes could be read integrally and with annotations. Benjamin West's *Ophelia in front of the King and Queen* (1792), highly influential through the etching made for John Boydell's *Collection of Prints* (1803), shows that madness was the centre of the public's interest in Ophelia. West's image staged the reading in an more vivid theatrical performance, while conversely, images based on actors closed the gap, grafting the performance onto the text, such as the drawing and etching "Sarah Siddons as Ophelia" (*s.n.* after 1786).

Boydell's collection featured another *Ophelia* etched from the painting by Richard Westall (1795). Dressed in white muslin as in West's painting but with a melancholy expression lit by the moon, Ophelia is standing on the river bank. She is precariously stretching

forward, trying to hang a flower garland on a tree branch above the water, while holding on to another branch that is about to break. Free from theatrical performances conditioning the composition, Westall's image follows the text closely supplementing it with a convincing reconstruction dynamic of Ophelia's accident.

Looking at West and Westall's images together produces an equivalence of Ophelia's performance in the second mad scene and Gertrude's narration of her off-stage drowning. In chapter four, we will show in detail how Millais translates Gertrude's Voice in painting but for now, it suffices to say that Westall's dark image in as much as it gives to the public something to look, it produces a gaze that it can only briefly pacifiy. Further, the etchings make visible a causal link between the scenes of the play that could not be grasped in performance, as Gertrude's speech was not performed until the 1870 (Edwards 2016: 1570). Only when Ophelia acquired a self and a story from the text, was she truly capable of dying, and it is now from this "spot" that she is scrutinised by public's eye (Lacan 1997: 97).

Ophelia's story is reimagined with two major changes. Claudius' explanation that her madness "is the poison of deep grief. It springs all from her father's death" (*Ham.* 4.5.75-6) is deemed implausible and incompatible with the characterisation of Polonius, "Who was in life a foolish prating knave." (*Ham.* 2.2.213) Against the text (Neely 2018), the public explains Ophelia's madness entirely with Hamlet jilting her in the Nunnery scene (*Ham.* 3.1), which projects onto her Polonius' diagnosis of Hamlet:

> . . . he, repelled, a short tale to make,
> Fell into a sadness, then into a fast,
> Thence to a watch, thence into a weakness,
> Thence to lightness, and by this declension
> Into the madness wherein now he raves,
> And all we mourn for.
> (*Ham.* 2.2143-8)

As Westall had illustrated, the mad scenes establish in the play a plausible cause of death (Nosworthy 1964; Findlay 1994) that the Gravedigger and the Priest are the only one to doubt. However, once madness became lovesickness, Ophelia's accidental drowning is recast accordingly as romantic suicide, thematised by Delacroix in the three versions of the painting *Death of Ophelia* (1838; 1844; 1853) and in the lithograph (1843; for a history of the litographs, see Gervais 1984).

The publication of a new translation of *Hamlet* in prose that considerably revised that by Pierre Le Tourneur (1779), offered for the first time to the French public, an acceptable and accessible translation of Gertrude's speech. Petra Gröschel (1996, quoted in Gervais de Lafond 2012; also in Paes 2015) established that Delacroix based his composition on a drawing by

Achille Devéria dated between 1827 and 1830 that appears to be the first representation of Ophelia in the water, modelled and dressed as Harriet Smithson is depicted in that role by Achille Devéria and Louis Boulanger (1827) and as Delacroix saw her at the *Odéon*.

Delacroix's changes to Devéria's design are slight but completely transformed the meaning of the image. In Devéria, Ophelia lays completely dressed in the water, holding on vigorously to a tree branch with both hands and raising her eyes with an invocatory expression. In Delacroix, the bank and the strong current are more prominent, Ophelia floats in the river bare breasted, holding on to a tree branch with one hand and with the other pressing to her chest a willow garland, classic symbol of unrequited love. Whereas Devéria's drawing may still be legible as accident in sequence with Westall's etching, Delacroix presents Ophelia almost free of madness, at the end of her struggle against the current and her affliction. The pathos of the image is all concentrated in her left hand holding on to the branch for her life yet her sorrowful expression and resigned inaction indicate that she is about to release the grip and let herself be carried away towards the main river at the end of the dark wood.

Delacroix's *Death of Ophelia* was produced "no doubt quite independently" (2002: 338; a doubt in Paes 2015) from Anna Jameson's small illustration in *Shakespeares' Heroines* depicting the three garbed Fates under a crescent moon, looming over Ophelia's dead body washed ashore by the river. It lays on one side, the long dark hair are wet and spread wide, the theatrical dress of white muslin barely veils her breast. Above the image, Jameson's concluding passage resonates with Delacroix's image:

> the character of Ophelia bears a certain relation to that of the Greek Iphigenia, with the same strong distinction between the classical and the romantic conception of the portrait. Iphigenia led forth to sacrifice, with her unresisting tenderness, her mournful sweetness, her virgin innocence, is doomed to perish by that relentless power which has linked her destiny with crimes and contests, in which she has no part but as a sufferer; and even so poor Ophelia, 'divided from herself and her fair judgment,' appears here like a spotless victim offered up to the mysterious and inexorable Fates. "For it is the property of crime to extend its mischiefs over innocence, as it is of virtue to extend its blessings over many that deserve them not, while frequently the author of one or the other is not, as far as we can see, either punished or rewarded." (Goethe) But there's a heaven above us. (A. Jameson 1832: 208-9)

Was Jameson a source for Delacroix as we believe she was for Millais? It is plausible that Delacroix drawn by his fascination with Shakespeare and English theatre (on Delacroix's interest for Hamlet, see Gervais 1984; on his visit to London in 1825, see Raby 1982: 39), obtained Jameson's popular book either in English or in German (Leipzig 1834; on this translation, see Johns 2010) when preparing the first version of the *Death of Ophelia* (1838). The freedom from theatrical performance and established iconography that constrained Ophelia's other appearances in the Hamlet series (the closet, the mousetrap, the first mad scene)

leaves open the question as to why Delacroix departed from Guizot's translation further than Devèria, endowing Ophelia with acute anguish and full awareness:

> As she climbed to attach to the hanging twigs her garland of flowers, a cursed branch broke; then, she and her trophy of flowers fall into the sad stream; her clothes swell and spread out; they support her for a moment at the surface, like a water fairy; during this time she sang pieces of old ballads, without any feeling of her peril, or like a creature native of this element she inhabits. But this could not last long; her heavy and water-soaked clothes dragged the poor wretch away from her sweet songs, into mud and death. (Guizot 1821: 337, my translation)
>
> *[Comme elle grimpait pour attacher aux rameaux pendans sa guirlande de fleurs, une maudite branche se rompt; alors elle et son trophée de fleurs tombent dans le triste ruisseau; ses vêtemens s'enflent et s'étalent; ils la soutiennent un moment sur la surface, telle qu'une fée des eaux; pendant ce temps elle chantait des morceaux de vieilles ballades, sans avoir le sentiment de son péril, ou comme une créature native de cet élément qu'elle habite. Mais cela ne pouvait durer long-temps; ses vêtemens appesantis et trempés d'eau ont entraîné la pauvre malheureuse, de ses douces chansons, dans la vase et dans la mort.]*

Jameson's parallel, between Ophelia and Iphigenia about to be sacrificed to Diana by her father Agamennon (Goethe's rather than Euripides'), offers to Delacroix a classicist interpretation of the motif that opens up new dramatic possibility for painting that he tried to achieve over the years. One may be hasty to object, with Hume, that plausibility is not proof, and yet, could the hyperobject Ophelia not allow for more daring explorations of the plausible, that fascinating land between the proved and the imagined? Could there not be a treasure island of suppressed history waiting to be discovered among the perils of historical fiction?

The Court of Justice

Plausibility is precisely what Ophelia lacked as subject. Ophelia's *femme fragile* diagram (unrequited love causing madness causing suicide) or Delacroix's classicist heroine could not satisfy the readers and viewers of the 1840s, used to Dickens's realistic characterisations and to an increasing active participation of women in society. Once Ophelia is fully subjectified by her suicide, additional explanations for her behaviour are sought.

That Hamlet had seduced Ophelia vowing to marry her and then had gone back on his promise leaving her pregnant, is a suspicion that Shakespeare feeds with several allusions in the text (Hunt 2005) and started with early performances of *Hamlet* (Patrick 1953). While it circulated in France since Voltaire and in Germany since Goethe (Rosenberg 1992), the gossip did not catch in Britain. Not only was the topic considered too thorny for Shakespeare performance and criticism, suggestions of bawdry being excised from the acting text until the early 20th century (Glick 1969), but also Ophelia's pre-marital sex and illicit pregnancy were in clear contradiction with the *femme fragile*, as obedient daughter and sister, and virgin victim

sacrificed by Hamlet to his higher cause. For instance, here is Henry Irving's note to his Nunnery scene (Lyceum, London from 1874, with Ellen Terry as Ophelia in 1878):

> She is no puppet of a wooden tragedy, remember — no faint gauzy figure in the background of a stilted classic play. She is the idol of this young man's heart — a living, loving, pleading woman — fair, pure, and fascinating, with all the most thrilling memories of her lover's life trembling at heilightest breath. But he knows she is lost to him for ever. He knows, too, that he must appear to her, from the very contradictions of his case, a mere heartless trifler. (Irving 1877: 527)

In the mid-Victorian cult of "respectability" (Schoch 2004), *femme fragile* Ophelia was the only one admitted on stage. At the same time, the visibility of the stage produces an off-stage invisibility, or rather, it is that ob-scene jouissance that is real and sustains the social fantasy on the stage. Ellen Terry's nostalgia for the gas lighting at the Lyceum, the first theatre to install them in 1814 (Jackson 2004), reveals something of the audience desire:

> We [Terry and Irving] used gas footlights and gas limes there until we left the theatre for good in 1902. To this I attribute much of the beauty of our lighting. . . . Until electricity has been greatly improved and developed, it can never be to the stage what gas was. The thick softness of gaslight, with the lovely specks and motes in it, so like natural light, gave illusion to many a scene which is now revealed in all its naked trashiness by electricity." "the thick softness of gaslight, with the lovely specks and motes in it, so like natural light" which "gave illusion to many a scene which is now revealed in all its naked trashiness by electricity. (Terry 1908: 173)

The hysteric spectator, as we will see in the next chapter about Rossetti's painting *Lady Lilith* (1867), identifies with the fantasy on stage which explains why "the orthodox history of English theatre audiences from 1843 to 1910 is often presented as an evolutionary and triumphalist narrative." (Davis and Emeljanow 2004: 94) This narrative not only applies to the history of theatre audiences but also to the relation between theatre and the other media, especially the novel and narrative painting (Meisel 1983). The theatrical *femme fragile* Ophelia pushes other aspects off stage and towards other media each medium being interconnected with the other but with its own specificity. In the three examples that follow, literature and painting gain specificity by reflecting on the stage and the audience or by occupying blind spots of performance. The hyperobject phasing enables to trace the *femme fragile* across media and publics, but also the "return of the repressed" in that signifying chain, the *femme perdue* Ophelia.

The identity of the two Ophelias follows the literary model of the title character of Samuel Richardson's epistolary novel *Clarissa; or, The History of a Young Lady: Comprehending the Most Important Concerns of Private Life. And Particularly Shewing, the Distresses that May Attend the Misconduct Both of Parents and Children, In Relation to Marriage* (London 1748), in which the young and virtuous Clarissa Harlowe ends up falling victim to Robert Lovelace after he persuades her to run away with him and later rapes her. In a descending spiral of

misadventures, Clarissa falls ill and dies in the full consciousness of her virtue and trusting in a better life after death.

The 'real' of Clarissa — the point around which this elaborate two-thousand-page text pivots —is the rape; yet the rape goes wholly unrepresented, as the hole at the centre of the novel towards which this huge mass of writing is sucked only to sheer off again. Indeed, one ingenious commentator has doubted whether the rape ever happened at all. (Eagleton 1982: 61)

The "point", the spot around which Victorian *Hamlets* increasingly revolve is Ophelia's death. Her body desired, desiring, pregnant and dead that keeps returning throughout the play is the desire that the hysteric sacrifices to the Other in order to repress symbolic castration. In the play, as we shall see in the next chapter, the Ghost is the Other to the obsessive Hamlet, as Gertrude is to hysteric Ophelia. On the outside, however, the Other of the most perfect hysteric, the mid-Victorian public is the stage itself, not quite, as screen theory has it, as gaze but as a collective experience of watching and being watched that produces the "respectability" we started from. The paradigm for this is found in Daniel Maclise's *The Play Scene in Hamlet* (1842) based on William Charles Macready's production at Covent Garden in 1837-39 (Clary 2007). In this play within a play within a play, the theatricality of the scene, criticised by some contemporaries, serves to foreground what the painting is really about: the viewer looking at the reaction of the characters looking to one another's reactions to the even more theatrical *Murder of Gonzago*, which cavernous baroque stage is the spot in Maclise's picture.

Leaving for now a further discussion on the gaze, it is important to remind that what Eagleton calls "the real of Clarissa" that we paralleled to Ophelia's real, is not what Lacan calls the Real but the real within the symbolic register, as Hamlet's characters arranged at the sides of the centre of the visible that Maclise left invisible. "In its relation to desire, reality appears only as marginal" (Lacan 1993: 108) so that, conversely, what appears as marginal must be reality. This is the dialectic relation between the centre of visibility occupied by conventional theatre and the realism developing at its margin in literature and painting, and that between the theatrical *femme fragile* Ophelia and the *femme perdue* that began circulating in the 1840s, an Ophelia that had sinned and had fallen as Eve in *Paradise Lost*. We will give three examples of this dialectics.

In "Ophelia; the Rose of Elsinore" a prequel tale to *Hamlet* from the popular collection *The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines* (1st ed. London 1850-1; on the collection, see Gross 1972), Shakespeare's scholar Mary Cowden Clarke suggested Ophelia's pregnancy by association. Jutha "the only daughter of the peasant couple—a young girl of some fifteen or sixteen years of age, of the most winning appearance, gentle-mannered, sweet-tempered, and

extremely beautiful" (1854: 192), has become like an older sister to the much younger Ophelia, and after being seduced by Lord Eric, ends up drowning herself and her new-born (220).

In chapter thirty-one of *Great Expectations* (first serialised in *All the Year Round* 1860-1), Charles Dickens suggests that Ophelia is pregnant in Pip's comical account of Mr Wopsle's *Hamlet.* As in Harriet Smithson's interpretation of the first mad scene, Ophelia uses the veil of her costume to mimic her father's "hugger-mugger" burial (*Ham.* 4.5.84) to which "a sulky man who had been long cooling his impatient nose against an iron bar in the front row of the gallery, growled, "Now the baby's put to bed let's have supper!" Which, to say the least of it, was out of keeping." (Dickens 2008: 232). Wopsle's old-fashioned performance is probably based on Henry Thomas Betty's *Hamlet* at Covent Garden Theatre in 1844 (Clinton-Baddeley 1961) but of course, the comment from the audience is unverifiable.

The final example is Richard Redgraves's painting *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* (1842), etched to illustrate Gertrude's speech in Charles Knight's *Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere* (1842). The painting by the newly nominated Associate, hung near Macready's *The Play Scene in Hamlet* at the Royal Academy Exhibition and while *The Spectator* dismissed it bluntly as "a failure" (1842: 450), *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* became extremely popular thanks to the print and was sent to the 1855 Universal Exposition in Paris together with Millais' *Ophelia*. Its significance is evident in the composition of Arthur Hugh's *Ophelia* (1852; also noted in Young 331) and for Millais' *Ophelia* in the interpretation of the subject and use of flower symbolism. The reviewer of the Exhibition for *Art-Union* observed that "her restless, fevered eyes, bespeak a mind diseased." (1842: 120) At closer inspection, however, madness is precisely what Redgrave is trying to avoid, as recognised by *The Athenaeum* "The mournful sweetness of her countenance is disturbed by a light in her eyes and a quivering of the lip, which, more than her disordered attire, declare that Sorrow has done its worst work." (1842: 410) Ophelia's conventional expression is supplemented with a pictorial text written in the language of flowers that Redgrave, who in 1847 became botanical teacher at the new Government School of Design (later the Royal College of Art), depicts with botanical accuracy. The relevant details are the twisted grass ring on her left ring finger signifying Hamlet's broken vows, the oriental poppies in the bottom left corner signifying death. By depicting Ophelia seated on a felled willow trunk, Redgrave leaves no doubt as to her suicide intention.

The social critique of the painting becomes apparent when contrasted to *Cinderella About to Try on the Glass Slipper* (1842) the other painting that Redgrave entered at the Exhibition accompanied by the ironic quotation: "That minx, said the step-sister, to think of trying on the

slipper." Considered retrospectively from the perspective of later paintings such as *The Governess* (1844) based on his sister's experience, *The Seamstress* (1846) illustrating Thomas Hood's poem, and *The Outcast* (1851) on Hood's most famous poem "The Bridge of Sighs," *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* begins a series of paintings dramatizing hardship in the lives of lower middle-class women. While continuing Wilkie's realism of the 1820s, Redgrave was introducing the social novel into history painting, and "painter's etchings" (Fredericksen 2002) were providing the perfect mediation not only between literature and painting, but also between popular readerships of magazines and serialized novels, and upper middle class painting viewers, demonstrating the need for a "hyperobjective" perspective on inter-mediality.

The years of the *femme perdue* Ophelia are, we can only briefly remind, characterised by economic recession, the agricultural crisis following the repeal of the Corn Laws, the famine in Ireland and the Scottish Highliands that. The growing wealth inequality and the downward social mobility affected weaker economical strata of the middle class and displacing forced women and children into work or the workhouse.

A fallen woman could be an occasional or professional prostitute, or a woman who had had sex out of wedlock, either voluntary or by rape, which inevitably caused the fall, a reference to the biblical punishment of humanity because of Eve's first sin. The downward spiral that began with sex, continued with childbirth, abortion or infanticide, and led to loss of social position, ruin, drunkenness, disease, and early death, often by suicide. Shakespeare's sketchy story and rich mix of literary ingredients — female beauty and young age, lower (but not too low) social status and naivety, natural "feminine qualities" corrupted by a male social environment, (possible) illicit relation and pregnancy, abandonment followed by madness and suicide by drowning — configured Ophelia as the perfect floating signifier (Laclau 2018), no pun intended. The Ophelia hyperobject got stuck to the true stories of women attempting suicide or "found drowned" about which the press reported often sensationalised in the 1840s. Ophelia wasn't just an generic *femme fragile*, but a collective *femme perdue* functional to technologies of power around class and wealth, rural nostalgia and demonic industrialisation, urbanism and immigration, work conditions in factories and workhouses, exploitation and violence, diseases and alcoholism, poverty and prostitution, ideals of family and femininity, female and male sexuality, marriage and illegitimacy, abortion and infanticide, etc. (Swift 1987; Waters 1995).

This floating signifier has rightly been criticised (e.g. Nochlin 1978; Auerbach 1980) and the persistence of victim-blaming in cases of violence against women (Taylor 2020) shows that this criticism remains relevant. At the same time, *femme perdue* Ophelia is not only the

outcome of victim-blaming that starts in the play: If thou dost marry, I'll give thee this plague for thy dowry: be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny. (*Ham.* 3.1.134-6; on misogyny in Shakespeare, see Rackin 2016). Nor do we believe it is the main aspect of Ophelia's problematisation, certainly not in Millais' painting. The hyperobject allows to follow divergent strands of this cultural complex in order to study the variety of functions they perform under certain historical conditions.

The ambivalence of Ophelia allowed Redgrave and Millais to create, at the margin of the fantasmic *femme fragile*, a liminal space (Turner 1988; for performative epistemology in *Hamlet*, see Gorfain 1986) in which the artist brings forth the lack in desire by presenting the hysteric viewer with a semblant of lost abject, the *femme perdue* (on the art of transference, see Quinet 2018; on the liminal in relation to Other, see Morris 2020). This liminal experience functions not only at a subjective level, addressing the question of desire at the margin of the repressive fantasy of "respectability," but also at a social level, at the margin of ideologies of class, the "two cities" of rich and poor independent from one another (Disraeli 1845), and of gender, the "separate spheres" of domestic woman and public man (Vickery 1993). Finally, the problematisation of Ophelia bridged the gap between true stories reported and sensationalized in newspapers and illustrated magazines, and narrative painting that monumentalised the event in the artistic medium and reflected it within a genre that was at the centre of the national political debate surrounding the frescoes of the Houses of Parliament (1841-63, see Boase 1954), and of the Pre-Raphaelite artistic programme for an English School of history painting (see also the *Paragone* debate in Lippart 2019).

Not the first but the most notorious of these true stories was that of Mary Furley, a 36-year-old seamstress and single mother of two sons (36 and 22 months). In the night of the 25 March 1844, having all her money being lost or stolen, Furley attempted to drown herself and her younger, George, in the Regent's Canal near Mile End bridge. "She was heard several times to say that she and her children would meet a watery grave" (Burke 1845: 44, "watery grave" is a quote from Shakespeare's *Pericles* 2.1.10, often applied to Ophelia) rather than returning to the Bethnal Green workhouse, which Furley had left a few days earlier with George because of his health conditions (Old Bailey 1844). She was sentenced to death for the wilful murder of her child, but public and the press asked for leniency, most notably *The Times* : "No, the rich, the respectable, the comfortable members of society cannot imagine, cannot picture to themselves, a condition so deplorably miserable as to prompt a woman to infanticide. Let them be thankful that they cannot; but let them show their humility and their gratitude by judging lightly of a fellow creature." (29 April 1844, p. 4) The sentence was eventually commuted into

seven years transportation, on which *The Examiner* commented: “If such be the Royal clemency, what is the rigor?” (18 May 1844, p. 306; Anderson 1987; Conley 2020). Nothing is known of Mary Fuller after she arrived in Australia, or of her elder son who stayed in the workhouse.

Among Mary Fuller’s sympathisers, was Charles Dickens who references her suicide attempt in the novella *The Chimes* (the Christmas Book that followed *A Christmas Carrol* in 1844), and Thomas Hood was inspired to write his best-known poem “The Bridge of Sighs” (1844) that he epigraphed “Drown’d! Drown’d!” loosely quoting *Hamlet* (4.7.162-3). Plunged into John Keats’ circle, somewhat ironically, a few months after Keats's death, Hood had published a collection of Keatsian poems (1827) and some of Keats’ poems in his *Hood’s Magazine* (Whitley 1956). Probably because of Keats and through D.G. Rossetti, Millais became Hood’s admirer, illustrating “The Bridge of Sighs” in Gambart’s *Passages from the Poems of Thomas Hood* (1858) and presenting his thirteen-year-old daughter Mary with Moxon’s family edition of *The Poetical Works of Thomas Hood*, edited and introduced by W.M. Rossetti and illustrated by Gustave Doré (1872). In today’s perspective, “‘The Bridge of Sighs’ has a necrophilia-inflected image of a woman that men with money could ‘take to’, the poem a bit of piecework or self-selling, shifting attention from seamstress to hinted-at prostitute, which, if it works, will produce a capital amount of capital. To this end, Hood, freelance rhyming to make ends meet, gives his gentlemen investors an object for their sympathy, imagination, and cash. The clearest reason offered for her suicide is that ‘Near a whole city full, / Home she had none’ and, though one of ‘Eve’s family’, lacks family and more: ‘Had she a brother? / Or was there a dearer one / Still, and a nearer one / Yet, than all other?’” (Robinson 2019: 257)

Millais’s illustration leaves out most of Hood’s poem, focusing exclusively on the woman’s desolation in the night cityscape (Hood 1844: 416, stanzas 11-2). Against the silhouettes of Waterloo Bridge and St Paul’s in the far distance, the woman is standing on a mud bank. “In the bleak wind of March,” only her head and hand emerge from the decent hooded cape she wraps herself in, as she gazes “with amazement” into the “black flowing river” but still alive. Considered retrospectively, as hyperobjects allow, from Millais’ illustration to *Ophelia*, and then to Hood’s poem, one may recognise in Hood’s poem, an allusion to Laertes, Hamlet and Ophelia’ child: “Had she a brother? / Or was there a dearer one / Still, and a nearer one / Yet, than all other?” and in Millais’ painting, the Hood’s compassion and elevating finale: “Owning her weakness, / Her evil behaviour, / And leaving, with meekness, / Her sins to her Saviour!” However, it is apparent that Millais goes beyond Hood and Redgrave. As *The Times*

had covered Mary Fuller's trial for its readers, so Millais narrates Ophelia's story from the play and interpolates it with that of a true *femme perdue* story, presenting her psychology in a realistic and contemporary key, albeit shrouded in allegory. While Hood stereotyped Fuller alluding to Ophelia and appealing to a generic sense of pity in the reader, Millais summons the viewer to sit in a jury and decide in Ophelia's case. There is no sense of Delacroix's tragedy, instead he lays out the facts in front of the viewer and conjures for him or her (many women publicly supported Mary Fuller) an object of desire.

In the Introduction to *The History of Sexuality* Michel Foucault describes the logic of censorship:

> . . . One imagines a sort of logical sequence that characterizes censorship mechanisms: it links the inexistent, the illicit, and the inexpressible in such a way that each is at the same time the principle and the effect of the others: one must not talk about what is forbidden until it is annulled in reality; what is inexistent has no right to show itself, even in the order of speech where its inexistence is declared; and that which one must keep silent about is banished from reality as the thing that is tabooed above all else. The logic of power exerted on sex is the paradoxical logic of a law that might be expressed as an injunction of nonexistence, non-manifestation, and silence. (Foucault 1990 v. 2: 84)

Censorship explains why Mary Fuller's death sentence was converted to transportation, but she could not be pardoned, and why Millais' painting concludes Ophelia's problematisation, despite the number of Ophelia paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy was growing (see appendix in Rhodes 2017). The characteristics of the British artworld in the early and mid-Victorian Era (Bayer and Page 2011) made the logic of censorship inescapable for an artists. His practice was strongly regulated by self-censorship, first because the Royal Academy had trained him (the first woman was admitted at the Royal Academy Schools in 1860), and then because the art market for which he produced was directly or indirectly controlled by the Royal Academy. Attempts to evade this relatively closed and tight-knit economy of taste were rare, the late Turner seems the exception (Fisher 1996; Smiles 2020), and the Pre-Raphaelite scandal of 1849-52 demonstrates why. In this milieu, in the middle as it were, Millais' *Ophelia* "worked," producing a resistance to that logic: "Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power." (Foucault 1990 v. 1: 95).

He may not have been revolutionary or avant-garde, as some have claimed (Prettejohn 2009), but neither did Millais "sell out" in the 1860s, as William Morris accused him, building instead his artistic practice around his prodigious artistic skills and capacity to innovate in dialogue with other artists and writers, the publishing industry, institutions, buyers and the general public. After the 1849-50 crisis, Millais aimed decidedly at commercial success, but did not believe that "making money is art and working is art and good business is the best art."

(Warhol 1975: 90), as the history of his most famous painting in Victorian times demonstrates. *Bubbles* or *A Child's World* (1886) was painted as a portrait of his grandson with allegorical elements in the style of Seventeenth century Dutch bubble blowers; then bought by William Ingram to realise a large give-away colour print in the Christmas Edition of his *Illustrated London News* (1886); then sold with rights to Thomas J. Barratt of A. & F. Pears who adapted it into an extremely successful and influential "artist's advertisement" of his soap bar (1888/9; the advert is commented in Richards 1990); finally, today it came to represent Victorian sentimentalism, kitsch and art commodification, epitomising Millais' work precisely at a time when he was trying to get away from it (Barlow 2017).

The "separation of spheres" ideology was hegemonic, not exclusive to gender. The separation between the artist's private life and his or her public art, repressed artistic individuality and experimentation on which the Modernist ethics after Manet was founded. For Millais, private artistic values were, as other aspects in painting, open to negotiation with the public. In the dialectic tension between public and private sphere, Millais sided with the latter, displaying sense of opportunity, flexibility and mastery over his skills and medium. Artistic recognition and social status created pockets of "resistance" detectable, for instance, in his series of landscapes from *Chill October* (1870), or when he revisited his Pre-Raphaelitism in the *Portrait of John Newman* (1881) or revealed political sympathies in the "elegiac" *Portrait of Benjamin Disraeli* (1881; Jones 2012). Nonetheless, these aspects of resistance, if they may count as resistance at all, remain entirely subordinate to the art market and show Millais' progressive retreat from the margin towards the centre of visibility, from realism as "a truthful, objective and impartial representation of the real world, based on meticulous observation of contemporary life" (Nochlin 1971: 13), into the realistic re-presentation of fantasies (Roger Fry calls them "vulgar inanities" in 1951: 190).

The *femme perdue* Ophelia continues after Millais' painting but seldom as main subject, repressed under the *femme fragile* trope. An important painting based on Hood's "Bridge of Sighs" can shows this in its reception history. Frederic Watts had painted *Found Drowned* in 1849-50 but showed it first in 1862 at the Liverpool Academy and then again in 1881-2 at his own Grosvenor Gallery. Even thirty years on, critics still objected about its subject matter:

> Besides the imaginative conceptions which have reference more or less direct to great poems or great questions of human interest, there are two or three scenes of London life amongst the poorer classes, of great power. "Under a Dry Archway" is probably the most intense expression of that tragedy of hopeless pauperism, that Mr Fildes touched so dramatically in his great picture of the casuals. And the hand with which Mr Watts has treated his subject is as unaspiring as it is powerful; this is no "sentimental, picturesque wretchedness" (as George Elliot puts it), but simply a statement of how low a human being can sink, and how miserably she can die, in the greatest city of the world. . . . It has a singular effect, this silent problem

> that hangs upon the walls of the most aesthetic gallery in London, and is surrounded by portraits of beauties, and statesmen, and warriors, and divines. Bad policy, Mr. Watts, to confront these 'curled darlings' with so vital a question. You come too close home Sir to our consciences, to be agreeable. (The Spectator 1882: 15)

The reviewer refers collectively to a group of four paintings on social problems realised after Watts' return from a long residency in Italy (1843-7), *Song of the Shirt*, *Irish Famine*, *Under a Dry Arch*, and *Found Drowned* (1850; see Blunt 1875). The exploited sempstress from Hood's poem and Redgrave's painting (1846), the Great Irish Famine of 1845-9, homelessness and prostitution in London, are undifferentiated poor for the reviewer and Watts in the Raphaelite idealisation of his subjects, especially the young woman lying dead under Westminster Bridge peacefully illuminated by the moon, as in Delaroche's *Young Martyr* (1853; cf. Doré 1872). The review presents two contrasts that enable to situate the end of Ophelia's problematisation. First, Watts' self-censorship between 1850 and 1862 is based on the artist anticipating how the public would react to their subject matter, whereas the critic's comment in 1881 focuses on the suitability of the paintings as commodity in the context of the fashionable Grosvenor Gallery, at the centre of the Aesthetic Movement since it opened in 1877 (Denney 2000). Second, the critic compares Watts' paintings to George Fildes' *Applicants for Admission to the Casual Ward* (1874) situated between Watts first exhibition of *Found Drowned* in 1862 and the review. The paintings are quite different, and the comparison contrived but this makes the interrelation it produces of particular interest.

"Silent problem" mentioned in the review alludes to the text accompanying Fildes' painting in Royal Academy exhibition catalogue: "'Dumb wet, silent horrors'" Sphinxes set up against the dead wall, and none likely to be at the pains of solving them until the *general overthrow*." Charles Dickens. Extract from a letter in the third vol. of Foster's *Life of Dickens*" (Royal Academy 1874: 32, n. 504) a quote calculated both to cash in on publicity and add gravitas to the painting's message.

Fildes based the composition on the wood-engraving "Houseless and Hungry" he had published in the first issue of *The Graphic* (1869) that proved to be the turning-point of his career. The founder of *The Graphic* was William Luson Thomas, a wood-engraver who believed that artist had the power to influence public opinion on political issues. He later recalled: "The originality of the scheme consisted in establishing a weekly illustrated journal open to all artists, whatever their method, instead of confining my staff to draughtsmen on wood as had been hitherto the general custom… it was a bold idea to attempt a new journal at the price of sixpence a copy in the face of the most successful and firmly established paper in the world, costing then only fivepence." (Thomas 1888: 81; on his role in Social Realism, see

Korda 2015) The etching was noticed by Dickens who commissioned Fildes to illustrate *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* his unfinished novel published posthumously with a set of 12 illustrations by Fildes (1870). The painting was so successful that a railing was installed to control the public and opinion were polarised.

The change from "silent horror" in Fildes' catalogue entry to "silent problem" in Watt's review softens an expression that the reader of the review would have found negative and better applies to Watts' subjects that are too elevated and mediated by Raphaelite models to be horror inducing. The paintings belonged to the time in which they were painted, the same year as Millais' *The Carpenter's Shop* (1850) and the scandal that may have deterred Watts from exhibiting them, but they had already become unfashionable in 1874 and certainly in 1881. The writer and social reform activist James Hole delineates the growing economic and social inequality in his *Lectures on Social Science*:

> It will be one of the enigmas destined to puzzle posterity, that England, which undertook to clothe, conquer, and evangelize the world, should yet be baffled by its own paupers. They will attribute it to some monster delusion, and find confirmation in the fact, that infinitely more ingenuity was employed to discover how small a quantity of food the pauper's stomach would submit to without rebelling, than how to obtain a larger quantity for the said stomach. What to do with them, that is the question? . . . In the Poor Law, notwithstanding all its harshness, we trace the presence of that conservative element in society, whose aim is to prevent any disease reaching such a crisis as would be destructive of its own existence. If society did not so far deviate from laissez-faire-ism, as to support the life of him whom the latter would condemn to death, he would rebel against the verdict, and turn like the trodden worm upon that society which had thus unnaturally cast him out. Even as a measure of self-defence, society is compelled to keep the laborers whom it will not employ. The free advocates are in this sense quite as "impracticable" as many they dub with that name, i.e., their system is not, never was, and never will be carried out by society in its full and fair proportions. (Hole 1851: 38-9)

The new Poor Law (1834) that instituted the workhouse from which Mary Fuller tried to escape and in which people are queuing to enter in Fildes' painting, was a political compromise between the *laissez-faire* of liberal ideology and increasing state regulation needed after the economic crisis of the late 1830s (on the workhouse system, see Driver 2004). The bourgeois bafflement in front of "the paupers" was initially ascribed to ignorance in the mid-Victorian period and addressed with knowledge that took the form of official enquiries or reports, such as Henry Mayhew's seminal series on the *Morning Chronicle* "London Labour and the London Poor" (63 weekly instalments between December 1850 and February 1852; in 4 vols. 1861-2; for a publication history, see Schroeder 2019; Mayhew compared to Dickens, Humpherys 1975).

Painting reacted slowly and arrived when sociological knowledge had turned into spectacle. This is represented by the railing placed in front of Fildes' painting, the policeman controlling the public, and the public visiting the Royal Academy to watch what was happening

on the street. The real (a semblant of it, as we have seen), is no longer at the margin of the painting, veiled by allegory as was in Millais or by idealisation as in Watts. In the 1860s, a revolution installs the real at the centre of visibility and inverts the position of the subject in relation to its object of desire. The horror at the centre of visibility swallowed the whole painting that serves as the fantasmic support of the viewer's bourgeois life around it (a similar interpretation of the Victorian realist novel can be found in Jaffe 2016).

The collapse of the "two frames" from which this chapter began, of the real into the imaginary, is the condition by which social realism was admitted into Victorian painting which explains why poverty was depicted in all its details and variations, whereas its causes were generally omitted or kept vague. For instance, the elegant man lurking in the dark corner of Fildes' illustration has disappeared from the oil painting (1874), substituted by an unassuming old man confabulating with the policeman. Precisely *because* it is stripped bare of all "sentimental, picturesque wretchedness" — and isn't Ophelia a "poor wretch" (*Ham.* 4.7.180)? — the viewer can gaze upon the "silent horror" as a fantasy more real than the real. Its paternal function is to spoil the viewer's jouissance in real life, averting the anxiety of his (phallic) jouissance and keeping desire going. Lacan calls this a return to the father (*version vers le pére*), a *"pére-version,"* a perversion (in Lacan's Seminar 23 on Joyce, 2015: 11) and in this change of discursive structure, we identify the symptom of Modernism.

It is as if the original components of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, the fantastic and the naturalist that coexisted tensely side by side, finally collapsed. The Aesthetic Movement begins as a Pre-Raphaelite spin-off with the Oxford murals (1857-9) and is the artistic trend of the 1880s when the re-viewer warns: "Bad policy, Mr. Watts, to confront these 'curled darlings' with so vital a question. You come too close home Sir to our consciences, to be agreeable." Who are the "curled darlings"?

When Brabantio tries to arrest Othello accusing him of having bewitched his daughter Desdemona into marrying him. Material evidence of his accusation is that she was too innocent to leave paternal guardianship and he is a Moor:

> O thou foul thief, where hast thou stowed my daughter?
> Damned as thou art, thou hast enchanted her,
> For I'll refer me to all things of sense,
> If she in chains of magic were not bound,
> Whether a maid so tender, fair, and happy,
> So opposite to marriage that she shunned
> The wealthy curlèd darlings of our nation,
> Would ever have, t'incur a general mock,
> Run from her guardage to the sooty bosom
> Of such a thing as thou—to fear, not to delight.
> (*Oth.* 1.2.61-67; Shakespeare 2016: 2122)

As can be expected, the reference to the viewer's wealth is omitted but the implication goes further making is also that the viewer is an innocent woman that the father, the self-censored artist or the critic, must protect against the Real ("a thing"). If the Realist fantasy addressed the viewer in perversion, the Aestheticist fantasy addresses the viewer in hysteria, changing the male into a female viewer, and realist "fear" into aestheticist "delight."

The Grosvenor Gallery, co-founded by Caroline Blanche Elizabeth Fitzroy, Coutts Lindsay's wife and a Rothschild on mother's side, was purposely built in the rapidly expanding New Bond Street, and intended to appeal to an affluent public especially of women, as the illustrations on *The Graphic* (1877) and *The Illustrated London News* (1877) show. "Inside, the Gallery appeared like an aristocrat's picture gallery in a palace or country house, with green Genoan marble in the hall, Ionic pilasters and wide stairs with sculpture pedestals. A dining room below the main gallery was for banquets. Gilt capitals and a nave with gothic-like buttresses above blue bays with the phases of the moon in the main gallery completed the elegant decoration. Walls were divided by pilasters and covered with scarlet Lyons silk damask. Giles Waterford describes the entrance and stairway as creating "processional routes . . . the stimulation of a sense of occasion" for the viewer's arrival. In line with the aristocratic spaces, Lindsay had a billiards room and a smoking room for gentlemen, buffet bars and the restaurant for all viewers, an innovative circulating library in 1880 with an extensive collection of books and music, and electric lights installed in 1882. (Codell 2014)

These were the heydays of "the palace of art," before the Lindsays separated later in 1881 and debts began to accumulate until Coutts Lindsay sold it in 1890. Nonetheless, *The Spectator* reviewer is not referring to actual visiting the gallery but how he imagines them, or rather how the viewer is caught up in the new discourse of the Gallery, which is how Lacan formalises the discourse of the hysteric (Wajcman 2003). The "art for art's sake" had produced by the 1880s what Jacques-Alain Miller calls "suture [that] names the relation of the subject to the chain of its discourse" to the exclusion of the real (1977: 25-6; Lacan 1993: 118). It is no coincidence that Social Realism and the second Pre-Raphaelite wave began in parallel in the 1860s, nor that Watts' social problem paintings of 1850 remained unsold at the Grosvenor Gallery (and until his death) and he omitted them from his major retrospective at the new New Gallery (1896-7). The *Ophelia* he painted in 1864 and modelled by his 17-year-old wife Ellen Terry (on the couple, see Loshak 1963), is entirely disengaged from reality and de-problematised, leaning unkempt and emaciated on a mossy willow stub, while staring drowsily at the river below. The subject aligned to the Ophelia emerging in the 1860, has regressed to Romantic *femme fragile* but without the "sentimental, picturesque wretchedness" (the review misrepresents George

Eliot's critique of Pre-Raphaelitism misquoting from *Adam Bede* "picturesque sentimental wretchedness," 1859 v. 2 ch. 17: 8; Henry James quotes the passage when reviewing Eliot's novels and might have been the source, 1908 [1866]: 2).

After Ophelia: The Asylum and the Morgue

The "sentimental, picturesque wretchedness" has been substituted for realistic depiction of insanity. This is evinced, for instance, comparing Benjamin West's representation of Ophelia's performative madness (1792) with Watts' opiate-addict Ophelia (1864; this is put forward as a conjecture for which there is no evidence; on public response to opium addiction in Victorian England, see Harding 1988; Berridge 1999; on representation of women's addiction, see Kristina Aikens' PhD thesis "A Pharmacy of Her Own," 2008) or Joseph Severn's Ophelia (1860). The painting represents Ophelia sitting on the riverbank, the head resting on her right arm and the left hand on Hamlet's letter. She has a dreamy expression after composing the word "HAMLET" using columbine and foxglove sprigs. A description of the symptoms of erotomania may help to explain Ophelia's silly expression:

> Erotomania . . . is love felt for someone real or imagined or for an inanimate object, which is both pure, chaste and disinterested but also excessive and immoderate. In this mental disorder, the amorous ideas are fixed, dominant and often exclusive. As Esquirol has stated, the disease is only in the head for it is just a disorder of the imagination. The erotomaniac lives in a continuous state of exaltation and emotion, absorbed in the contemplation of his beloved, worshipping it, often in secret. He has no other worry or preoccupation and to dedicate himself fully to the object of his love he will leave home, forget his friends and abandon his job neglecting his own interests. He withdraws into solitude, writes a great deal expressing his emotions in poetry and prose and cries copiously . . . (Linas 1874: 170-1 quoted in Berrios and Kennedy 2002: 391; at present, Severn's link to medical literature is conjectural)

Pre-Raphaelite realism that Severn adopted in 1855 (Brown 2009: 273), allows him to represent Ophelia's erotomania not synthetically, mediated by artistic studies of human emotions, such as Charles Le Brun's Conference (Amsterdam and Paris 1698, London 1701) that Millais still used when he was a student at the Royal Academy (see for instance *The Tribe of Benjamin Seizing the Daughter of Shiloh*, for which Millais received the Gold Medal in his final year 1847; on the Pre-Raphaelite break away from physiognomy, see Hartley 2005), but rather analytically, through the symptomatology of a "disease" which, at the same time, hollows out Ophelia as subject. The new Ophelia of the 1860s is the result of subtracting from the femme fragile "the inherent qualities with which God sent us in the world: these may be perverted by a bad education — they may be obscured by harsh and evil destinies — they may be overpowered by the development of some particular mental power, the predominance of

some passion; but they are never wholly crushed out of the woman's soul, while it retains those faculties which render it responsible to its Creator.” (A. Jameson 1879: 154) Anna Jameson concludes that “without these a woman is no woman, but a thing which, luckily, wants a name yet.” (153) The Thing (Das Ding) that lays “beyond-of-the-signified” (Lacan 1997: 54) is the lost object unimaginable and real, endlessly desired in the Other as “the rem(a)inder of the lost hypothetical mother-child unity.” (Fink 1995: 94; Lacan 1997: 64).

Linear art history got us accustomed to join point events with lines of causality, making us forget that this is the exception in culture rather than the norm, for instance Alfred Gell calls for an anthopology of art “as the theoretical study of social relations in the vicinity of objects mediating social agency” (1998: 6, my italics). Whereas nonlocality prevents us from identifying the points and time undularity from tracing those lines, the hyperobject can better reveal nodes and areas of thick interaction. For hyperobject Ophelia, the most significant of these areas is around 1860 when Ophelia becomes her body in its twofold manifestation: the erotic insane, and the beautiful corpse. Examining the trajectory, we described so far from femme fragile Ophelia (1820-40), to femme perdue (1840-50) to body (1860-80), Millais' Ophelia is the “vanishing mediator” (Jameson 1973; Žižek 1991) necessary for the shift to take place from an idealised woman subject into a material female body. This is the reason why, at the beginning of the chapter, we claimed that the painting is a revolutionary middle “in history that one has to look at twice, as it were, in order to see that they really are precursors to the very thing that spells their end.” (Butler 2014: 264)

The Athenaeum reviewer of Ophelia at the Royal Academy exhibition observes that:

> There must be something strangely perverse in an imagination which sources Ophelia in a weedy ditch, and robs the drowning struggle of that love-lorn maiden of all pathos and beauty, while it studies every petal of the darnel and anemone floating on the eddy. (The Athenaeum 1852: 581)

He unwittingly recognises that Millais' detailed depiction of nature is a metaphoric substitution for Ophelia's “drowning struggle,” and prefigures its outcome “for this much is self-evident: the allergisation of the physis can only be carried through in all its vigour in respect of the corpse.” (Benjamin 1998: 217) On the other hand, the parted lips with which Millais represents Ophelia's singing are read as a symptom of her excessive sexual desire, her nymphomania (on the construction of the disease, see Groneman 1992; on the difference from erotomania, see Berrios and Kennedy 2002). This eroticised reading of Millais' Ophelia can be found in the ekphrastic sonnet “On a Picture” by aestheticist poet John Gray (in his first collection *Silverpoints*, 1893: 21):

Not pale, as one in sleep or holier death,
Nor illcontent the lady seems, nor loth
To lie in shadow of shrill river growth,
So steadfast are the river's arms beneath.

Pale petals follow her in very faith,
Unmixed with pleasure or regret, and both
Her maidly hands look up, in noble sloth
To take the blossoms of her scattered wreath.

No weakest ripple lives to kiss her throat,
Nor dies in meshes of untangled hair;
No movement stirs the floor of river moss.

Until some furtive glimmer gleam across
Voluptuous mouth, where even teeth are bare,
And gild the broidery of her petticoat...

The beginnings of Ophelia's new trajectories as insane and as corpse are well represented by two images in the vicinity of Millais' painting: Hugh Diamond's medical photograph of a woman patient at the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum (Springfield) posed as Ophelia (1852), and the *femme perdue* corpse in Watts' *Found Drowned* (1850) to which we shall return in the next section.

The Lunacy Act and the County Asylums Act (1845) regulated the administration of lunacy in Britain until 1890, the first gave to the "persons of unsound mind" the status of patient rather than social outcast, the second, allowed taxes to be collected and spent for the construction of reformed asylums, made asylum construction compulsory, disposed the transfer of pauper lunatics from workhouses and outdoor relief to public and private asylums, and introduced a national inspectorate, the Lunacy Commission, to oversee and police the new and existing establishments.

The impact of the new laws and their subsequent amendments was momentous, leading between 1844 and 1890 to a fourfold increase in the number of pauper lunatics in public asylums, which counted as 91 percent of all institutionalized mental patients by the end of the century. (Showalter 1985: 27). Elaine Showalter adds that "in 1845, a study by John Thurnam, medical superintendent of the York Retreat, had indicated that male asylum patients outnumbered women by about 30 percent. But within a few years after the passage of the Lunatics Act, the situation had changed. Gradually the percentages of women in Victorian asylums increased, and by the 1850s there were more women than men in public institutions. As the asylum population expanded throughout the century, the greater proportion of women remained constant. According to the census of 1871, there were 1,182 female lunatics for every 1,000 male lunatics, and 1,242 female pauper lunatics for every 1,000 male pauper lunatics. By 1872, out of 58,640 certified lunatics in England and Wales, 31,822 were women. There

were more female pauper lunatics in county and borough asylums, in licensed houses, in workhouses, and in single care. Men still made up the majority of middle- and upper-class patients in private asylums, but by the 1890s, the predominance of women had spread to include all classes of patients and all types of institutions; female paupers and female private patients were in the majority in licensed houses, registered hospitals, and the county asylums." (Showalter 1985: 52)

According to Showalter, from the end of the 18th century madness was feminised, becoming a technology of power for controlling the behaviour, sexuality and reproduction of women, especially poor. Three Romantic literary tropes represented and supported this change in culture:

> The victimized madwoman became almost a cult figure for the Romantics. . . . Yet this gentle female irrationality, so easily subjected to male reason, might also represent an unknowable and untamable sexual force. The troubling, ambiguous nature of female insanity was expressed and perpetuated by the three major Romantic images of the madwoman: the suicidal Ophelia, the sentimental Crazy Jane, and the violent Lucia. All three established female sexuality and feminine nature as the source of the female malady, but each also stood for a different interpretation of woman's madness and man's relation to it. Virtually all of these conventions can be traced to the figure of Shakespeare's Ophelia. (10)

We quoted at length from *The Female Malady* because it presents in a clear and convincing way a feminist position within the Foucauldian project of a history of madness and makes explicit the role that Ophelia plays in it. Both became the standard thesis in feminist social history and critical studies of Ophelia, but since the Nineties feminist histories of madness have been subject to strong revisionism. For instance, Joan Busfield questions Showalter's interpretation of the historical data and contends "that in nineteenth-century Britain madness was first and foremost a female condition" is "one-sided" and "an exemplar of a distinctive feminist genre: what I shall call the 'hidden from history' genre." (1994: 259)

Peter Bartlett explains the steady increase in patients as a failure in social policy, arguing that "the relationship between administration of lunacy and Poor Law was much closer than [previous] studies suggest. The asylum's legislative roots were in the old (i.e, pre-1834) Poor Law, and throughout the nineteenth century it remained an institution directed towards the poor. Far from being administratively separate from the nineteenth century Poor Law, both shared an administration at the local level. And far from the nineteenth-century asylum ousting Poor Law jurisdiction in insanity, large numbers of the insane remained on other forms of poor relief, usually residing in the workhouse, or living on outdoor relief. The picture which emerges is of various organs of the Poor Law, including the asylum, acting in tandem." (Bartlett 1999: 32)

Elaine Murphy studying the administration of insanity in East London goes further, minimises the phenomenon within the changing role of the state and the growth of nineteenth-century government administration and concluded that "The main changes in east London from 1800 to 1871 were trans-institutional shifts from pauper farms to asylums in the old poor-law period and from workhouses and private asylums to county and imbecile asylums in the New Poor-Law period. There is no suggestion in the guardians' minutes or parish and union doctors' letters that they thought the nature or rate of insanity was changing. Alienists and asylum inspectors puzzled their heads over the rising rate of lunacy through the nineteenth-century but the guardians did not." (2003: 347)

Madness is a broad and fuzzy category that combines extra-discursive with discursive dimensions which are not only gendered, but entangled with class, race, and religion inflected across medical and legal discourses, disciplinary technologies and ideology, representations in art and popular culture. As a medical specialism, psychiatry only began with the asylum and training was based on apprenticeship open to heterogeneous discourses, with empirical research emerging only in the 1870s and few means of curing: "Our asylums detain," wrote Montagu Lomax in *The Experiences of an Asylum Doctor* "but they certainly do not cure. Or if they cure, it is only by accident, so to speak, and in spite of the system, not as a result of it." (1921: 19) The "system" had outgrown the possibilities of science to support it, accumulating sufficient administrative and economic power to become an integral component of the disciplinary society of the 1850s.

As then, madness remains a complex and evaluative category today. Historiographic research on the "Great Confinement," as Foucault calls it in *Madness and Civilisation* (1988), inherits the Victorian criteria for diagnosis and statistics embedded in the archive, and combines them with contemporary conflicting ideologies about the role of the state in healthcare and welfare, the effects of capitalism on mental health, and the position of psychiatry within society. Edward Shorter identifies three main schools of thought: one "who doubt the very existence of psychiatric illness, believing it to be socially constructed," another who believes "that, while psychiatric illness is indeed very real and not necessarily an artifact of labelling, its incidence probably does not change very much over time," and a third that considers "psychiatric illness is real and that it can change in frequency depending on social circumstances that might affect mind and brain" (1997).

We share this last position with Shorter and will not try to explain away the prevalence of women in asylums, which peaked in England only in 1954. However, its causes appear more complex than Showalter presented (Busfield 1996: 232-7; Chesler 2005), and likewise,

although art is embedded in society without "special lines," as we argued earlier, the relation between artistic representations of women and gender within society at large is not a simple and direct mirroring as Showalter presents it. How could a tired motif as Ophelia fulfil a key ideological function of "expressing and perpetuating the feminisation of madness" in the rise of asylum confinement? The hyperobject, that we introduced as an operative concept to study long-duration high-complexity cultural assemblages such as Ophelia, may run the risk of becoming a grand narrative that absorbs differences in its viscosity, "that is, to pass off its absolute as the night in which, as one says, all cows are black" (Hegel 2018: 11-2 [*Phen*., Preface, §16]).

It should be clear by now that the hyperobject cannot be absolutized, neither as Schelling's presupposed identity nor as Hegel's self-realisation, simply because hyperobjects have no identity (Morton 2013: 197) and indeed, each object, except as a way of speaking, owing to the gaps in the mesh (ontological withdrawnness). The Classic virgin victim Ophelia, the Romantic *femme fragile,* the early Victorian *femme perdue*, and the mid-Victorian madwoman Ophelia ought not be understood as identities in a historic sequence, the usefulness of typology and periodisation notwithstanding, but rather as nodes in the hyperobject's mesh (cf. "territory" in Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 314-6), which may disappear (the fallen woman Ophelia in the 1850s), reappear (the virgin victim Ophelia sexualised in the 1860s), evolve (the *femme fragile* into the madwoman Ophelia) and coexist with other nodes at different intensities and dimensions (the madwoman and sexualised virgin). Likewise, narratives objects do not belong any particular narrative, rather like feet, they fit into many narratives for different purposes and are in excess of them all. An example of this is Hugh Welch Diamond's "Ophelia," an untitled and undated photograph of an unknown asylum patient at the Surrey Asylum (c. 1852-8). In the following, we will show how Diamond tried to fit that photograph into several narratives, and how because of its excess, it was made an example of female insanity and exploitative use of photography (Showalter 1985; Amirault 1993-4; Addonzio 1999; Rhodes 2008).

In "On the Application of Photography to the Physiognomic and Mental Phenomena of Insanity" read at the Royal Society and "in the course of the paper frequent reference is made to the series of photographic portraits of lunatic patients with which it was accompanied." (Diamond 1857: 117; unfortunately Pearl 2009 does not attempt a reconstruction) Diamond begins by listing advantages derived from the medium as "the silent but telling language of nature" which enables to "[a] denote a difference in the degree of mental suffering . . . [b] speaks for itself with the most marked precision . . . [c] indicates the exact point which has

been reached in the scale of unhappiness between the first sensation and its utmost height . . . [d] being shown from the life by the Photographer, arrest the attention of the thoughtful observer more powerfully than any laboured description . . . [e] secures with unerring accuracy the external phenomena of each passion, as the really certain indication of internal derangement, and [f] exhibits to the eye the well known sympathy which exists between the diseased brain and the organs and features of the body" (Diamond 2010: 2).

The main applications of photography are in the physiognomic symptomatology, nosology and diagnostics of mental diseases, to which Diamond adds four more. The first, is communication: "Photography, as is evident from the portraits which illustrate this paper, confirms and extends this description, and that to such a degree as warrants the conclusion that the permanent records thus furnished are at once the most concise and the most comprehensive." (3) The second, is therapeutic by way of positive reinforcement: "There is another point of view in which the value of portraits of the Insane is peculiarly marked. –viz. in the effect which they produce upon the patients themselves. I have had many opportunities of witnessing this effect. In very many cases they are examined with much pleasure and interest, but more particularly in those which mark the progress and cure of a severe attack of Mental Aberration." (3) The third is administrative: "The portraits of the insane are valuable to Superintendents of Asylums for reference in cases of readmission. It is well known that the portraits of those who are congregated in prisons for punishment have often time been of much value in recapturing some who have escaped, or improving with little expense, and with certainty a previous conviction and similarly the portraits of the Insane who are received into Asylums for protection, give to the eye so clear a representation of their case that on their re-admission after temporary absence and cure. I have found the previous portrait of more value in calling to my mind the case and treatment, than any verbal description I may have placed on record." (7) The fourth is documentary: "In conclusion I may observe that Photography gives permanence to these remarkable cases, which are types of classes, and makes them observable not only now but for ever, and it presents also a perfect and faithful record. Free altogether from the painful caricaturing which so disfigures almost all the published portraits of the Insane as to render them nearly valueless either for purposes of art or of science." (8)

Diamond was "the right person in the right place" (Burrows and Schumacher 1979: 11). He worked with Alexander Morrison who pioneered in Britain the use of drawing for medical illustration in *The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases* (1838) and was visiting physician of the Surrey Asylum until 1857 while Diamond was Resident Medical Superintendent of the Female Department (1848-58). This explains why most of his models are pauper female patients of the

asylum, although among his more than 70 known photographs, there are several portraits of male patients under the care of Charles Snape, the other superintendent in the Male Department of the Surrey Asylum. He is the one who introduced photography and Talbot's calotype process to Frederick Scott Archer, who was a patient of his general practice in London, leading to Archer's invention of the far quicker, cheaper, and sharper wet collodion process, which he announced in March 1851 and Diamond immediately adopted (on Archer's discovery, see Hannavy 2008). However, he was not just a keen and proficient amateur photographer, but also a technical innovator, credited with the invention of cardboard-mounted *carte de visite*, and an excellent communicator, publishing twelve accessible papers on photographic technique and applications, acting as consultant to photography enthusiasts with a semi-regular column on photography, and promoting photography as founding member of the Photographic Society (1853). Although he did not contribute to clinical research, Diamond became known as "the father of psychiatric photography" (Gilman 1976: 5) through a series of public lectures, as the one summarised above, and thanks to John Conolly's *The Physiognomy of Insanity*, a series of eight articles on the *Medical Times* that comment on Diamond's photographs, reproduced in seven lithographs (1858; republished abridged in *The Asylum Journal of Mental Science*, 1860).

Conolly, who was the first to abolish restraints in a public asylum at Hanwell in 1839 and Diamond's a mentor, did not include the "Ophelia" photograph for comment or publication, nor is Ophelia is ever mentioned. In the article on "Suicidal Melancholia" Conolly begins introducing the literary tropes:

> The emulative melancholy of the scholar, the fantastical melancholy of the musician , the melancholy of the politic courtier, the *nice* melancholy of the lady even the lover's melancholy, of all these compounded are not fictions of the great dramatist [*viz.* Shakespeare], but realities which offer their companionship at the age when the passions and the intellect begin to be active. (Conolly 1858: 56)

Conolly's series was advertised in *The Athenaeum* (1858: 91) to non-specialist readers of the *Medical Times and Gazette. A Journal of Medical Science, Literature, Criticism and News,* whose founder and first editor was the same John Charles Bucknill who diagnosed Ophelia's "erotomania" in *The Psychology of Shakespeare* (1859: 123; also in *The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*, 1860 and *The Mad Folk of Shakespeare,* 1867), which he wrote "in the leisure hours of a busy life" as non-restraint medical superintendent at Devon County Asylum (1844-62).

The reference to Bucknill explains the opening of Conolly's second article we quoted above, but he continues drawing a clear line between literary representations madness and the

reality of public asylums for the pauper, describing the well-documented vicious-circle between poverty and mental illness (for an overview, see Ridley et al. 2020) in his characteristic style, lucid yet compassionate and free of moralism:

> It is evidently not the portrait of an educated or refined person, but a woman of the poorer ranks of life, ---- from which ranks our large crowded county asylums are filled [. . .] And the worst of them, too impatient of this lot [. . .] deviate from the walks of industry [. . .] It is easy to moralize on these things, and virtuously to condemn; but God alone can judge such matters Justly. If a man would try to do so, he must realise to himself an almost unfurnished home, and hungry children, and rent to pay [. . .] He must fancy the state of his mind under the privation of all indulgences and all amusements, and in the utter absence of all comfortable recreation for mind or body. Who is there, more happily placed, who can estimate or even imagine the physiological results of all this combination of misery and privation? (Conolly 1858: 57)

Literary references would have been out of place with Conolly but in general, the medical literature of the time does not seem to share Bucknill's passion for Shakespeare, against what Showalter maintains. It also seems plausible that Bucknill may have been occasioned Diamond's Ophelia, although this is hard to prove since the photograph cannot be dated precisely (between Diamond's adoption of the wet collodion process in 1852 and his resignation from the Surrey asylum in 1858). What appears certain, however, is that the photograph in not significant because it is typical of medical illustration, but because of its originality, as a few observations will show.

Diamond's Ophelia has a direct antecedent in an earlier calotype *Miss Kemp as Ophelia* (1843-7) by the photographic partners David Octavius Hill and Robert Adamson in which the model, seated with head lowered and turned in three-quarters, is characterised as Ophelia by a flower crown and a black shawl, still used in theatrical performances of *Hamlet*. Not only did Diamond know Hill and Adamson's work (Dahlberg 2015), but in his portraits, adopts the same half-figure framing of the subject and sparse use of props.

The sitter in Diamond's "Ophelia" is also portrayed in another photograph (published as Table 14 and 15 in Burrows and Schumacher 1979). There she is seated nearly in profile, head in three quarters turned towards the camera but looking away from it, as if "distracted." Considered together, the two images together are similar to the pair "Religious Melancholia and Convalescence" and, as Diamond explained in his paper, "denote a difference in the degree of mental suffering," illustrating a deterioration in the sitter's condition. Sharona Pearl argues that "physiognomic photography . . . , in the hands and through the eyes of Diamond, increase[d] the rhetorical power of physiognomy by extending it to clothing, hair, and other metonymical markers of states of mind." (2009: 290) This extension, Diamond claims, was also applied in his moral therapy to reinforce a positive self-image in the patient, and in communication, to "confirm and extend" the diagnosis integrating it with metonymic and, in

this case, metaphoric markers. Diamond is not simply posing his patient as Ophelia as a literary reference, as Hill and Adamson, but is demonstrating his diagnosis using Ophelia as representative of the "erotomaniac" type.

By postulating a causal relation between the mind and the body, the pseudo-science of physiognomy provided the main empirical support to psychiatry (see Gilman 1996) and a direct genealogy may be traced from the early studies of Philippe Pinelle (1745-1826) through Jean-Étienne Dominique Esquirol (1772-1840), to Alexander Morrison (1779-1866) and from him, to William Alexander Francis Browne (1805–1885) and John Conolly (1794-1866), Morrison and Conolly being the mentors of the younger Hugh Welch Diamond (1809-1886). However, although he "is typically remembered as the 'father of psychiatric photography,' this parochial label and the pathos of these well-known images have occluded our contemporary view of Diamond, who was regarded by his peers as one of the leaders of British photography." (Dahlberg 2015: 3, punctuation modified)

Physiognomy was a bridge between medical science and art going back at least to the Renaissance (for instance, in Leonardo, see Britton 2002), but it is Charles Le Brun's illustrated *Méthode pour apprendre à dessiner les passions* (Paris 1698) that bound physiognomy and training in art academies across Europe until the late 1840s. The tables in Morrison's *The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases* (1838, 2nd ed. 1843) are evidence of the conventions used by the artists he hired to draw the expressions illustrated (Beveridge 2018 pt. 1; 2018 pt. 2) and it is to them that Diamond is referring to with "the painful caricaturing which so disfigures almost all the published portraits of the Insane as to render them nearly valueless either for purposes of art or of science." After Archer's invention, Diamond could substitute the "caricaturing" of physiognomic conventions in academic drawing, for the "unerring accuracy" of photography, implicitly admitting a convergence of concerns between art and science.

Three distinct and conflicting narratives seem to coexist in Diamond's arguments. First, the Romantic myth of a hieroglyphic language that does not require human interpretation and is thus capable of expressing a primordial truth (Pfannkuchen 2021), what Walter Benjamin calls "the language of things" (1996 v. 1: 65). This narrative accounts for Diamond's faith in in the power of photography to magnify or even reveal phenomena invisible to the human eye, such as "the well-known sympathy which exists between the diseased brain and the organs and features of the body" or even occult, as soon as the superposition of negatives made it possible (on supernatural photography, see Wojcik 2009; on superposition and photography's capacity to lie, see Natale 2012).

Second, the positivist narrative of transparency, objectivity and truthfulness of the photographic medium, that can realise "the great myth of a pure Gaze that would be pure Language: a speaking eye," as Foucault calls it in *The Birth of the Clinic* (2003: 114). On one hand, photography is just an instrument in the hands of the psychiatrist for diagnosis, administration and documentation, on the other it substitutes the psychiatrist's semiology and communication, constituting the diagnosis itself with its "unerring exactitude" and communicating it "more powerfully than any laboured description."

Third, photography participates in the narrative of art striving for Beauty in which artistry and artistic labour are entirely sublated. At the limit, the ideal picture becomes acheiropoieton, an image "not made by human hand," such as the "true image" of Jesus' face miraculously printed on Veronica's veil during the passion (Morgan 2012: ch. 3). In the Introduction to *The Pencil of Nature* (1844), William Henry Fox Talbot places photography at this limiting point

The little work now presented to the Public is the first attempt to publish a series of plates or pictures wholly executed by the new art of Photogenic Drawing, without any aid whatever from the artist's pencil. The term "Photography" is now so well known that an explanation of it is perhaps superfluous; yet, as some persons may still be unacquainted with the art, even by name, its discovery being still of very recent date, a few words may be looked for of general explanation. It may suffice, then, to say, that the plates of this work have been obtained by the mere action of Light upon sensitive paper. They have been formed or depicted by optical and chemical means alone, and without the aid of anyone acquainted with the art of drawing. It is needless, therefore, to say that they differ in all respects, and as widely us possible, in their origin, from plates of the ordinary kind, which owe their existence to the united skill of the Artist and the Engraver. They are impressed by Nature's hand; and what they want as yet of delicacy and finish of execution arises chiefly from our want of sufficient knowledge of her laws. When we have learnt more, by experience, respecting the formation of such pictures, they will doubtless be brought much nearer to perfection; and though we may not be able to conjecture with any certainty what rank they may hereafter attain to as pictorial productions, they will surely find their own sphere of utility, both for completeness of detail and correctness of perspective. (Talbot 2016: 13)

The scientific truth of diagnosis in the first narrative and the artistic beauty of the picture in the third narrative, are made to coincide by "magic" (Flusser 2000: 16) in the technical image of the second narrative. This ambivalence is apparent in Diamond's list of entries to photographic exhibitions between 1852-59 (Taylor 2002). They include portraits, views, and copies of prints, still-lives, and documentary photographs of archaeological remains and

antiquarian finds. The photographs of patients were exhibited alongside the others under different titles: "Types of Insanity" (1852), "Phases of the Insane" (1854), "Melancholy" (1855), "Portraits of the Insane (1856), "Studies of Insane Persons" (1857), "Portraits of Insane Women" (1857), "Illustrations of Mental Disease" (1859). It is apparent that Diamond did not distinguish between artistic portraiture and medical illustration, and between contexts of presentation, seemingly oblivious of the fact that he might "caricature" his subjects. At the same time, his portraits of insane persons are not formally different from individual portraits taken by him or his contemporaries except for clothing and expression but acritically adopted narratives of photography and conventions of academic portraiture (see for instance, the *Untitled* 1852-5 in the MoMA collection).

Allan Sekula sees at play an ambivalence between the "honorific" and "repressive" function of photographic portraiture "within a new hierarchy of taste. Honorific conventions were thus able to proliferate downward. At the same time, photographic portraiture began to perform a role no painted portrait could have performed in the same thorough and rigorous fashion. This role derived, not from any honorific portrait tradition, but from the imperatives of medical and anatomical illustration. Thus, photography came to establish and delimit the terrain of the *other*, to define both the *generalized look*—the typology—and the contingent instance of deviance and social pathology." (1986: 6-7) But can this ambivalence not be rather that, while Diamond presented his photographs as medical illustration they were, in fact, portraits? And further, may this ambivalence ascribed to Diamond not be our own in front of a gaze staring back from photography's brief age of innocence?

Diamond's look on insane persons can perhaps be found in Théodore Géricault's five extant Portraits of the Insane (see for instance the one in Lyon, *Portrait of a Woman Suffering from Obsessive Envy, also known as The Hyena of the Salpêtrière* 1819-22; see Snell 2016) and a few years after Conolly's articles, Adrien Alban Tournachon's seventy-four photographs that illustrate Duchenne's *Mécanisme de la Physionomie* (1862) medical photography had become an independent genre. Rather than for othering, as Sekula claims, Diamond used the portraits pragmatically, to subjectify the insane persons and mediate between inside and outside of the asylum, part moral treatment for the patient, part promotion of his non-restrains policy amongst the public. In this perspective, "Ophelia" too becomes part of Diamond's communication strategy in which Ophelia figures precisely as the trope it had become.

Rather than positing an identity that each succeeding age tailors to fit its fantasy of Woman, as Showalter seems to suggest (1994), Ophelia after Millais is better understood as a

floating signifier, which for Lacan is the master signifier (S1) that represents a subject for all other signifiers

> [B]ecause signifiers refer only to other signifiers, this produces a seemingly endless chain of references . . . [T]his seemingly infinite sequence of referral can be fixed or anchored only through the intervention of a . . . 'nodal point' . . . which 'quilts' them, stops their sliding and fixes their meanings . . . this nodal point . . . in the series of signifiers is the "master-signifier"—a signifier that, although essentially no different from any other signifier, is situated in such a way that it masters the entire sequence of referral by providing a kind of final . . . guarantee of meaning. It is able to do this . . . not because it possesses some special significance . . . but simply because it is able to halt the process of referral by the empty gesture of referring only to itself. This "reflective" signifier is nothing more than a kind of cul-de-sac in the chain of equivalences . . . 'beneath' the alleged unity of the field of meaning, there is only a . . . self-referential, performative gesture. (Butler 2014: 190–1)

In Lacan's "Seminar on the 'Purloined Letter'" (2006), the content of the Letter (S1) is never known, and its value depends upon the relation between the characters of Poe's story and their relation to it: the King that must not know of it, the Queen from whom it is stolen, the Minister who steals it, the Police who searches for it, or Dupin who finds it and returns it. Although "everything radiates out from and is organized around this signifier . . . the point of convergence that enables everything that happens in this discourse to be situated" (Lacan 1993: 268), the meaning of the Letter that circulates, or floats, does not depend on a signified content, but only from whom the signifier is attached to and from its context.

We can now explain how Ophelia functions as floating signifier within the Discourse of the Master, the basic structure in Lacan's theory of the four discourses that we will be using later (cf. Fink 2004: 11-6; Vighi 2019: 178-82). The discourse is organised on two levels:

S1 —> S2
— —
$ // a

The overt line of the statement presents the "relation of impossibility" between the master signifier (S1) and the big Other (S2). S1 is the signifier "the signifier of power, the sceptre, and also owing to which virility can be assumed." (Lacan 2017: 258) that represents the subject ($) "before all the signifiers that together make up unconscious knowledge, the system of the Other as language, culture, and the Law." (Braustein 2003: 111). The unconscious occupies the lower part of the discourse, separated from the statement by a bar. If the truth of the subject of speech ($) is "the driving force in the discursive machine" (Wajcman 2003: 80), its product is a real surplus (a) that is both jouissance of the Other and cause of the subject's desire as it is appropriated by S1. Subject and object-cause of desire are only connected via the statement ($ —> S1 —> S2 —> a —> S1) and their absolute disjunction ($ // a) that Lacan "relation of impotence." This formula expresses Lacan's "there is no such thing as a sexual relationship"

(Lacan 2007: 116) that is equivalent on one hand, to the phallus as signifier of lack (*phi*), as noted by Genevieve Morel (Ragland 2004), and to the formula of fantasy ($ <> a), as noted by Žižek (2004).

The discourse of the master enables to articulate hyperobject Ophelia on two levels, the public discourse summarised by Showalter's thesis that Ophelia represents the feminisation of madness, and below, the "political uncoscious" that supports it (Jameson 2002). We will enter in the details in the next chapter but an anticipation will main points

The line of the statement is mapped onto the first relation:

S1 —> S2

Woman —> Ophelia

This shows that Ophelia determined by the master signifier "Woman" (the floating signifier proper) that refers to Lacan's formula of sexuation expressed by "there is no such thing as Woman." To distinguish this fantasy from real individual women, Woman is capitalised to indicate that is a universal, and barred to indicate that is not real, unlike individual women (Lacan 1999: 72-3; we will only capitalise for typographic expediency). The other term of the relation is a "treasure trove of signifiers, . . . a synchronic and countable collection in which none of the elements is sustained except through its opposition to each of the others." (Lacan 2006: 682) Thus, Ophelia is reduced to a collection of generic features connected together in the Romantic interpretation of Shakespeare's character, and Woman to one of the names-of-the-father, as Žižek argues:

> The usual way of misreading Lacan's formulas of sexuaton is to reduce the difference of the masculine and the feminine side to the two formulas that define the masculine position, as if masculine is the universal phallic functon and feminine the excepton, the excess, the surplus that eludes the grasp of the phallic functon. Such a reading completely misses Lacan's point, which is that this very positon of the Woman as excepton — say, in the guise of the Lady in courtly love — is a masculine fantasy par excellence. As the exemplary case of the exception constitutve of the phallic functon, one usually mentons the fantasmatc, obscene figure of the primordial father-jouisseur who was not encumbered by any prohibition and was as such able fully to enjoy all women. Does, however, the figure of the Lady in courtly love not fully fit these determinations of the primordial father? Is she not also a capricious Master who wants it all, i.e., who, herself not bound by any Law, charges her knight-servant with arbitrary and outrageous ordeals? In this precise sense, Woman is one of the names-of-the-father. The crucial details not to be missed here are the use of plural and the lack of capital letters: not Name-of-the-Father, but one of the names-of-the-father, one of the nominations of the excess called primordial father . . . in both cases, the role of this fantasmatc agency is to fill out the vicious cycle of the symbolic order, the void of its origins: what the notion of Woman (or of the primordial father) provides is the mythical starting point of unbridled fullness whose "primordial repression" constitutes the symbolic order. (Žižek 1995: 24)

The relation of impossibility S1 —> S2 characterises Ophelia's action in the play as subjected to power, of Polonius/Laertes, Hamlet and especially, as we will see in the next chapter, of Queen Gertrude, whose unrestrained jouissance for sex and power sets off the tragedy. Applied to the Victorian cultural field, Woman is the mythical Phallic Mother, "more

dangerous than the Primitive Father" (Kristeva 1980; Gallop 1982). The product (a) is a fall out of the symbolic as are the categories we used to describe significant representations of Ophelia emerging in certain periods: the tragic victim (Early Modern to late XVII century), the *femme fragile* (late XVII century to 1830s), the *femme perdue* (1830 to early 1850s), the madwoman (late 1850s to WW1) and, as we shall outline in the next section, the corpse (1870s to WW1).

The relation of impotence $ // a reveals not only the fundamental fantasy of Ophelia as subject in the play (being the Queen/having the Phallus), but also that of the Victorian reader/viewer, the real Ophelia, for whom the lost object has different forms: positively, it is a signifier of the Other's jouissance, such as the gaze in Millais' *Ophelia*, negatively, it is an abject as in Watts' *Found Drowned*, or a phobic object such as Ophelia's face of insanity in Diamond's photograph. This ambiguity corresponds to the double function of fantasy on the side of the subject ($) as constitutive of desire, and on the side of the object (a), defence against castration anxiety. Insanity is the utter collapse of the master signifier (Name-of-the-Father) and the symbolic order, but as signifier, the phobic object makes a traumatic situation thinkable and liveable, introducing in the fantasy a symbolic dimension that props up in the subject the paternal metaphor insufficiently established (Fink 1997: 163-4), and in society, discourses of domination.

Victorian Era is not uniform enough a category to allow for useful generalisations, the 1840s and early 50s share more in common with the late 18th century than with the 1880s and 90s. Likewise, the "repression hypothesis" that Foucault critiqued in *The History of Sexuality* (1990: 10 ff.) has been abandoned (Garton 2004), but it may be useful to rethink Victorianism as a transitional form of domination from disconnected disciplinary enclosures in the early and mid-Victorian Era (the workhouse, the asylum, the home, the brothel, etc.) to disciplinary systems progressively integrating with each other from the 1850s (the workhouse and the asylum, the home and the brothel, etc.) to the imperial state of the end of the century. In this context, the "repression hypothesis" may be revisited. Repression does not cover up conflicts under the appearance of respectability, nor is it simply a displacement, rather it is regulated by the algorithm of the master discourse vertically and horizontally: the asylum becomes more of a home, so that more persons can be confined in it.

Our interpretation that madwoman Ophelia has less to do with female insanity, than with male and female anxiety about discipline and social order, is supported by the series of "lunacy panic" that occupied the British press particularly in 1858-9 and 1876-7 (McCandless 1978). The theme of "wrongful confinement" is at the centre of Wilkie Collins' best-selling novel *The*

Woman in White (serialised in Dickens' *All the Year Round*, 26 November 1859 – 25 August 1860; in three volumes, 1860). In Chapter 3, Walter Hartright goes to Hampstead Cottage to bid goodbye to his mother and sister, before leaving London to take up his new position as private art teacher. Late that night, while he is walking back home through Hampstead Heath, he meets for the first time the mysterious "Woman in White," Anne Catherick. Hartright promises her not to interfere with her plans and helps her to get on a cab towards London. Soon afterwards, two men on a carriage stop near Hartright and ask a policeman on his round to stop Anne Catherick if he sees her, explaining she had escaped from a nearby asylum.

Charles Dickens considered the scene to be the most dramatic description he could recall in literature (H. Dickens 1934: 54), and Millais claimed to have witnessed the episode that inspired Wilkie Collins while he was walking home late at night with him and his brother Charles (Millais 1900 v. 1: 278-81; on the reliability of the story, see Collins 2006: 14-6). The "sound of the wheels [growing] fainter in the distance" and "the sound of rapidly approaching wheels close behind [him]" conjoin the two parts in which the scene is articulated. The first part begins with the departure from his mother/sister and the encounter with the Woman in White, which endings show they are equivalent: "My mother and sister had spoken so many last words, and had begged me to wait another five minutes so many times . . ." (62) and "I entreated her to let me see her set down safely at her destination." (69) A break of "ten minutes, or more" follows in which Hartright reflects on the encounter:

> At one moment, I found myself doubting the reality of my own adventure; at another, I was perplexed and distressed by an uneasy sense of having done wrong, which yet left me confusedly ignorant of how I could have done right. (Collins 2006: 70)

The second part begins with the conversation overheard by Hartright, between the private asylum director and his assistant on the carriage and the policeman, followed in Chapter 4, by Hartright's thoughts while he walks back to his lodging at Clement's Inn, Temple:

> 'She has escaped from my Asylum.' I cannot say with truth that the terrible inference which those words suggested flashed upon me like a new revelation. Some of the strange questions put to me by the woman in white, after my ill-considered promise to leave her free to act as she pleased, had suggested the conclusion, either that she was naturally flighty and unsettled, or that some recent shock of terror had disturbed the balance of her faculties. But the idea of absolute insanity which we all associate with the very name of an Asylum, had, I can honestly declare, never occurred to me, in connexion with her. I had seen nothing, in her language or her actions, to justify it at the time; and, even with the new light thrown on her by the words which the stranger had addressed to the policeman, I could see nothing to justify it now. What had I done? Assisted the victim of the most horrible of all false imprisonments to escape; or cast loose on the wide world of London an unfortunate creature whose actions it was my duty, and every man's duty, mercifully to control? I turned sick at heart when the question occurred to me, and when I felt self-reproachfully that it was asked too late. (Collins 2006: 70)

The episode that ends the next morning, when Hartright begins his journey towards Limmeridge House, Cumberland and his "new life," functions as the primal scene of the novel and will serve us to outline a the discourse of the reader, complementary to that of the master.

Hartright, the subject of the entire scene ($), occupies a different position in each part: inside the chance encounter dominated by the Gaze ("in the middle of the broad, bright high-road"), and outside the overheard conversation dominated by Voice ("on the dark side of the road, in the thick shadow of some garden trees"). Even in the first part, however, he is not the agent first his mother and sister don't let him leave ("My mother and sister had spoken so many last words, and had begged me to wait another five minutes so many times, that it was nearly midnight when the servant locked the garden-gate behind me"), and it is the Woman in White who stops him ("in one moment, every drop of blood in my body was brought to a stop by the touch of a hand laid lightly and suddenly on my shoulder from behind me") and later, snatches from him a promise. A signifying chain connects his mother/sister to the Woman in White and to Laura Fairlie, Hartright's future wife of whom Anne Catherick is look-alike and half-sister. The glowing appearance of the Woman in White is the "point of light" that lures the subject (Lacan 1993: 95) is dialectically opposed to the shadow in the conversation scene, the "spot" in the scene that Hartright is (97). In the arresting gesture of his mother/sister and the Woman in White ("begged me to wait" and "brought my blood to a stop") the gaze appears that "not only terminates the movement, it freezes it" (cf. Lacan 1993: 117). This relation between the Woman in White and Hartright can be written as: a —> $.

In the second part, Hartright does not see the asylum director but only hears his Voice asking the policeman to "stop her and send her" back to the asylum (S1). Hartright misrecognises himself in the policeman as the addressee of the command retroversly (Lacan 2006: 684): "My hand was on the cab door. She caught it in hers, kissed it, and pushed it away. The cab drove off at the same moment—I started into the road, with some vague idea of stopping it again, I hardly knew why—hesitated from dread of frightening and distressing her—called, at last, but not loudly enough to attract the driver's attention." Even the policeman's reply to the director "What has she done?" the question that Hartright later asks himself ("What had I done?"), and the director's answer to the policeman ("She has escaped from my Asylum"), repeated by Hartright, becomes his own knowledge (S2). The policeman can thus be identified with Hartright ($) and the relation written as: $ —> S1 —> S2 —> $.

The two relations combine in the Discourse of the Hysteric, derived from a clockwise rotation of terms from the Discourse of the Master:

$ —> S1

—   —

a   //   S2

In the place of agent, we find the divided subject "Walter Hartright, teacher of drawing, aged twenty-eight years" (50) unmarried and unsuccessful. He begins his own story tracing that of his father

> Events which I have yet to relate, make it necessary to mention in this place that my father had been dead some years at the period of which I am now writing; and that my sister Sarah, and I, were the sole survivors of a family of five children. My father was a drawing-master before me. His exertions had made him highly successful in his profession; and his affectionate anxiety to provide for the future of those who were dependent on his labours, had impelled him, from the time of his marriage, to devote to the insuring of his life a much larger portion of his income than most men consider it necessary to set aside for that purpose. Thanks to his admirable prudence and self-denial, my mother and sister were left, after his death, as independent of the world as they had been during his lifetime. I succeeded to his connexion and had every reason to feel grateful for the prospect that awaited me at my starting in life. (Collins 2006: 51)

His father is neither the Primordial Father ("his admirable prudence and self-denial"), nor is he the symbolic father that establishes the Name-of-the-Father. Instead he sacrifices his jouissance ("a much larger portion of his income than most men consider it necessary to set aside for that purpose") for that of his wife and children, leaving Hartright in his shadow rather than placing him at his father's place ("I succeeded to his connexion, and had every reason to feel grateful for the prospect that awaited me at my starting in life"). The paternal metaphor is not sufficiently instated to allow Hartright to accept symbolic castration, leaving him defenceless against his mother/sister's desire and in denial of his own. "From a Lacanian point of view, the oedipal solution consists in setting up an Other, who guarantees a certain feminine identity and thus allows the possibility of a sexual rapport. The recurrent problem for the hysterical subject is that this Other who guarantees can never do so enough: the series starts with the father, but it does not take long for the subject to realize that every father fails; at that point, the endless chain of big Others is started. Usually, the oedipal series is carried over into religion or ideology, where the hysterical subject continues to look for an undivided big Other who will function as a guarantee. Hence, from a structural point of view, the hysterical subject is essentially a *believer*. He or she needs an Other to believe in, in order to put an end to doubting." (Verhaege 2000: 136)

This hysteric's wanting-to-believe in a real big Other to escape the truth of castration is at the core of Hamlet's questions to figures of the big Other and their successive fall starting from his father's Ghost that he immediately after mistrusts ("The spirit that I have seen / May be a de'il, and the de'il hath power / T'assume a pleasing shape." *Ham.* 3.2533-5), Ophelia, who was othered in the closet scene ("Are you honest?"), the King ("What do you call the play?

/ *The Mousetrap*" *Ham.* 3.3), his mother, a figure of Phallic Mother ("You go not till I set you up a glass / Where you may see the inmost part of you." *Ham.* 3.3), until he finally reaches the dimension of the death drive beyond the big Other and confronts the Voice that ties together language and the body (Dolar 2006: 72):

> What warlike noise is this? . . .
> Oh, I die, Horatio.
> The potent poison quite o'ercrows my spirit.
> I cannot live to hear the news from England,
> But I do prophesy th'election lights
> On Fortinbras. He has my dying voice.
> So tell him, with th'occurrents more and less
> Which have solicited. The rest is silence.
> Oh, oh, oh, oh!
> *[He] dies.* (*Ham.* 5.2.358-64)

We cannot elaborate further on the correspondences between *Hamlet* and Collins' novel, but is the Woman in White, from which the novel gets its title, not "As a 'ghaist' should be" (124)? She is a figure of the big Other from whom the hysteric Hartight seeks knowledge about himself ("I tried again to lift the veil that hung between this woman and me"), a Phallic Mother, at once mother and sister, damsel in distress and mysterious seductress, monster ("the idea of absolute insanity which we all associate with the very name of an Asylum").

Her presence confronts Hartright with the dilemma: "[Had I] assisted the victim of the most horrible of all false imprisonments to escape . . . or cast loose on the wide world of London an unfortunate creature whose actions it was my duty, and every man's duty, mercifully to control?" This question about the the Woman in White translates the hysteric question "Am I a man or a woman?" (Fink 1997: 122) that is about about Hartright himself. If the Woman in White is a victim of unlawful confinement, as Hartright suspects, then she is a woman subject to the Name of the Father (asylum), and he, in as much as object of her desire, is a man. If the Woman in White is instead a lunatic, as the asylum director says, then she is not a woman ("unfortunate creature") and he is not a man but a woman, in as much as he is the maternal (imaginary) phallus. The dager of the veil being lifted on Hartright's own castration fills him with anxiety, "perplexed and distressed" after the encounter and "sick at heart" after the conversation he overhears. Only at the end of the scene, his anxiety is relieved ("It was a relief when the hour came to lock my door") when Hartright addresses a new big Other, Limmeridge House. Truth about one's desire cannot be the product of discourse (S2 —> $), and Hartright together with the reader, will need to go through the novel to traverse the fundamental fantasy of the Woman in White, eventually discovering the secret of Anne Catherick and Laura Fairlie. Only then, will he traverse the fundamental fantasy (both answers to the dilemma are wrong

because the hysteric question is wrong) and the Law (Name-of-the-Father) restore the identity to Anne Catherick, the inheritance to Laura Fairlie, and sanction Hart/right's and Fair/lie's marriage.

Comparing the discourse of the hysteric with that of the master, the algorithms show that the agent in the former is the addressee in the latter (S1). Both discourses are supported below the bar by fantasies, in which the product of discourse is assumed as truth. The fantasy of the master ($ // a) is that of the subject in perversion a <> $, "who determines himself as object, in his encounter with the division of subjectivity" (Lacan 1993: 185). Failing to establish the paternal metaphor, the subject disavows castration by identifying in masochism, with the object of the Other's desire that is the (non-existent) Other of the big Other, or in sadism, with the Other's jouissance that caused the (non-existent) big Other to exist. The fantasy of the hysteric (a // S2), is a will to knowledge, eliciting from the Other a solution to the riddle of his desire and pacify his (castration) anxiety by exchanging knowledge for truth. Here too, the discourse shows its complementarity to the discourse of the master, when the hysterics imagine to know their own desire, "they simply dream of being perverts, which is quite natural, for how else could they attain their partner?" (Lacan 1998b: 80; also 2006: 699; on the hysteric-pervert couple, see Apollon et al. 2002).

The discourse of the master characterises disciplinary ideologies, such as Victorianism, as can be traced in Hartright's sketch of his father (the relation between laissez-faire state and Victorianism is examined in Mandler 2006; see also Hewitt 2000), and dovetails with the discourse of the hysteric in the primal scene. The identification of the reader with the main characters Hartright and Fairlie, is framed in a metanarrative that became a frequent device in Victorian fiction after Collins introducing polyphony between parts of the serialised novel, and adding a "reality effect" to the narrative (Barthes 1986). The "Preamble" of the *Woman in White* constructs the novel as a court room in which the fictional reader is the judge and the characters are the fictional narrator or witnesses:

> This is the story of what a Woman's patience can endure, and of what a Man's resolution can achieve. If the machinery of the Law could be depended on to fathom every case of suspicion, and to conduct every process of inquiry, with moderate assistance only from the lubricating influences of oil of gold, the events which fill these pages might have claimed their share of the public attention in a Court of Justice. But the Law is still, in certain inevitable cases, the pre-engaged servant of the long purse; and the story is left to be told, for the first time, in this place. As the Judge might once have heard it, so the Reader shall hear it now. No circumstance of importance, from the beginning to the end of the disclosure, shall be related on hearsay evidence. When the writer of these introductory lines (Walter Hartright, by name) happens to be more closely connected than others with the incidents to be recorded, he will describe them in his own person. When his experience fails, he will retire from the position of narrator; and his task will be continued, from the point at which he has left it off, by other persons who can speak to the circumstances under notice from their own knowledge, just as clearly and positively as he has spoken before them. Thus,

> the story here presented will be told by more than one pen, as the story of an offence against the laws is told in Court by more than one witness—with the same object, in both cases, to present the truth always in its most direct and most intelligible aspect; and to trace the course of one complete series of events, by making the persons who have been most closely connected with them, at each successive stage, relate their own experience, word for word. (Collins 2006: 50)

The relation of the reader to the novel is no different than Hartright's to other characters. The reader is the agent that questions ("makes the persons . . . relate their own experience") and the characters "speak to the circumstances under notice from their own knowledge" producing a surplus jouissance ("the story") that the reader is presumed to take as "the truth always in its most direct and most intelligible aspect." The "implied author" (Schmid 2009) disappears in the structure of novel and the impersonal voice of the Preamble, as the Author's Preface to the first edition seems to confirm:

> An experiment is attempted in this novel, which has not (so far as I know) been hitherto tried in fiction. The story of the book is told throughout by the characters of the book. They are all placed in different positions along the chain of events; and they all take the chain up in turn, and carry it on to the end. . . . It has forced me to keep the story constantly moving forward; and it has afforded my characters a new opportunity of expressing themselves, through the medium of the written contributions which they are supposed to make to the progress of the narrative. (Collins 2006: 618)

However, a closer reading of the opening passage shows otherwise. Collins does not reconstruct a fictional Court Room ("If the machinery of the Law could be depended . . . ") but an ideal one, in which the literary "experiment" is more truthful than "the machinery of the Law" and the reader is not susceptible, unlike the judge, to "the lubricating influences of oil of gold." The "model reader," the model of potential reader foreseen in the text (Eco 1979: 7-11), is the same reader who might have read Collins' serialized novel next to the newspapers and magazines reports of a true case of "wrongful confinement" such as the one on which *The Woman in White* is loosely based, the Baronet, Member of Parliament and best-selling novelist Edward Bulwer-Lytton's committal of his wife and author Rosina Wheeler to a private mental asylum in 1858 (on Wheeler's wrongful confinement, see Blain 1990). The implied author disappears less in the objectivity of Collins' experiment than in the anonymity of the public, and the novel has more the self-evidence of common opinion than the truthfulness of a court room.

The main characters, Walter Hartright and Laura Farlie, the model reader, and the implied author of *The Woman in White* are aligned subjects in the discourse of the hysteric. in front of the Big Other. The master signifier of Victorianist ideology is the Public itself that the hysteric commands from his position as agent, while entirely surrendering to what he empowers to answer: "Tell me! Answer me! Whatever you say I am!" (Wajcman 2003). Below the bar, the contiguity of the realist fantasy in the novel and the sensational news in the press the

misrecognition of knowledge for truth (S2 —> $ for a —> $) operates the "suture . . . of the subject to the chain of its discourse" (Miller 1977: 24; commented in Hewitson 2013). Is the "monstrousity" of the Victorian novel (David 2001: 2-5) not that of the Phallic Mother encountered in Collins' primal scene? Is Victorianism not under the sign of the Phallic Mother "who gathers us all into orality and anality, into the pleasure of fusion and rejection, with a few limited variations possible" (Kristeva 1980: 191)?

Where does this interpretation of the discourse leave Ophelia? In the Classic reading of Shakespeare's play, the discourse of the master in the revenge tragedy produces the oedipal lost object that Hamlet sacrifices to the Name of the Father and is subjectified as Romantic *femme fragile* Ophelia, as in Delacroix (1843). In the problematisation that follows, the social bond is mapped onto the play's discourse producing the identification of Ophelia with a *femme perdue* banished by the Court of Justice from society and eventually forgiven on the verge of death by the Name of the Father, as Millais' painting enacts it (1851-2). In this section, we argued that Ophelia did not typify madness as female but is better understood as a figure of Phallic Mother, its other side. The ghost of the asylum haunts society, at a time when it becomes a home (Diamond 1852-8) and its boundaries with society become permeable (Collins 1860), a synecdoche of society, conditioned by growing biopower and Victorianist ideology.

Towards the end of the century, Victorianism will morph into an aggressive ideology of empire, and Ophelia into *Thing*, "the desire for the mother [that] cannot be satisfied because it is the end, the terminal point, the abolition of the whole world of demand, which is the one that at its deepest level structures man's unconscious. It is to the extent that the function of the pleasure principle is to make man always search for what he has to find again, but which he never will attain, that one reaches the essence, namely, that sphere or relationship which is known as the law of the prohibition of incest." (Lacan 1997: 67) Ophelia's body is what is left of the Phallic Mother: a melancholy signifier of Nature's fullness, like in Ruskin's *Proserpine* (1875-86); an aesthetic object, like the death mask of the *Inconnue de la Seine* (late 1880s; on Edgar Allan Poe's "the death of a beautiful woman is, unquestionably, the most poetical topic in the world," see Bronfen 1992: 59 ff.); a necrophilic motif, as in Gabriel Cornelius von Max's *The Anatomist* (1867; on necrOphelia, see Romanska 2005a and 2005b); the body of Jack the Ripper's victims reported in the press (1888-91).

As abject at the other end of the Phallic Mother (Kristeva 1982) Ophelia concludes her Victorian parable, and it is as body that Ophelia returns from the Modernist oblivion, talking meat hanging from a butcher's hook in Heiner Mueller's *Hamletmachine* (written and published 1977; industrial meat hooks were used to suspend Ophelia in Steve Barker's 1992

production at the University of California, Irvine; on the Artaudian body in the play, see Kalb 1998). The horror of the body is politically mobilised in a revolt against discourse:

> I am Ophelia. She who the river could not hold. The woman on the gallows. The woman with the slashed arteries. The woman with the overdose ON THE LIPS SNOW. The woman with the head in the gas-oven. Yesterday I stopped killing myself. I am alone with my breasts my thighs my lap. I rip apart the instruments of my imprisonment the Stool the Table the Bed. I destroy the battlefield that was my Home. I tear the doors off their hinges to let the wind and the cry of the World inside. I smash the Window. With my bleeding hands I tear the photographs of the men who I loved and who used me on the Bed on the Table on the Chair on the Floor. I set fire to my prison. I throw my clothes into the fire. I dig the clock which was my heart out of my breast. I go onto the street, clothed in my blood. (Mueller 1995: 89)

On closer inspection, Mueller is re-presenting Ophelia as Shakespeare does in the play before the first mad scene, when a Gentleman describes how her voice "speaks" split from the body that "winks and nods and gestures" (*Ham.* 4.5.4-13) This, Lacan says, is "the real . . . the mystery of the speaking body, the mystery of the unconscious." (1999: 131; on Mueller and the real, see Buch 2010). The real of Ophelia irrupts unannounced and unrestrained into King and Queen's room and speaks to them directly though unintelligibly. Speech becomes song and music, as the stage direction in the Bad Quarto (Q1) indicates: "Enter Ofelia playing on a Lute, and her hair down, singing." (on the use of lute music, see Deanne 2014), song becomes "snatches of old lauds" (*Ham.* 4.7.175) and eventually, the Voice: "But long it could not be / Till that her garments, heavy with their drink, / Pulled the poor wretch from her melodious lay / To muddy death." (*Ham.* 4.7.179-81) After the individual Voice that ties individual speech to the body is undone, to the Voice of the Other can reclaim corpse and continue its story differently, as in the speeches at Ophelia's burial (on Ophelia's dead body in the play, see Rutter 2001) or at the end of the play:

> Take up the bodies. Such a sight as this
> Becomes the field, but here shows much amiss.
> Go bid the soldiers shoot.
> *Exeunt, [bearing the bodies, to the sound of drums and cannon]*
> (*Ham.* 5.2.385-7; Shakespeare 2016: 2099)

The separation of the body from the Voice, is a distinctive motif of Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* (1949). Crouched at the feet of an arched doorway, Ophelia delivers her final lines to herself filmed in medium shot and walks slowly out of the room accompanied by tense music. She exits the frame and only then does the camera begin to track her walk across the empty gallery to a dark room and an arched window that cross-fades with a low angle shot of the river from among willow branches. Gertrude's disembodied voice is superimposed on melancholy music, then the camera pans on Ophelia floating in the river. The voice interrupts, Ophelia sings regressively and floats out of the frame followed by flowers, the voice resumes when she

is out of frame, then the camera pans to the where it started and shows the river. Olivier weaves together the voice (incidental music, Gertrude's voice-over, Ophelia's regressed singing) and the gaze (the delayed camera tracking and the off-screen/on-screen action) as Millais does in *Ophelia*, by transposing the voice into allegory and gesture, and the gaze into "hypnotic hyper-realism" (Smith 2013) and cinematic perspective, as we shall see in chapter four.

We can follow Ophelia's body sliding away from *The Hamletmachine* into Berthold Brecht's poem "Ballad of the Drowned Girl" (1919/20) set to music by Kurt Weil (*The Berlin Requiem* 1928) and performed by David Bowie (1982):

> When she had drowned and begun her drifting down
> Out of the streams into the greater rivers
> The opal of the sky shone with a wondrous sheen
> As though it must appease this corpse of hers.
> (Brecht 2019: s.p.)

The ballad superposes Ophelia's body onto that of the Spartacist leader Rosa Luxemburg, murdered in January 1919 by the GSKD (*Garde Kavellerie Schutzen Division*) and thrown in the Landwehr canal in Berlin (Gietinger 2019). The water carries her body further to Arthur Rimbaud's "Ophélie" (dated 15 May 1870, sent to the poet Théodore de Banville in a letter dated May 24, published in the collection *Le Réliquiare* in 1891) and to Delaroche's "Christian Ophelia" (Delaroche 1855; Gautier 1856: 319), in either of which Jules Laforgue may have found it (Rimbaud 2008: 29-30; on Rimbaud's poem, see Minogue 1989, that comments on Millais but ignores Delaroche; on the connection between Brecht and Rimbaud, see Nägele 2002; on Rimbaud's influence on Laforgue, see Bertrand 2019):

> And the Poet says that by starlight you came
> To pick the flowers you loved so much, at night,
> And he saw, wound in her veils like a dream,
> like some great lily, pale Ophelia float.
> (Rimbaud 2008: 30, vv. 32-6)

However, the similarity of Rimbaud's and Delaroche's Ophelia ought not hide their difference. At the end of the century, Rimbaud reunites Ophelia's body "Glimmering on the water, a phantom fair" (v. 6) with the Voice of the Phallic Mother:

> For a breath that moved your long heavy hair
> Brought strange sounds to your wandering thoughts;
> Your heart heard Nature singing everywhere,
> In the sighs of trees and the whispering of night.
> For the voice of the seas, endless and immense,
> Breaks your young breast, too human and too sweet;
> (vv. 15-20)

Delaroche, on the contrary, had reinscribed her body in the Name of the Father, as Watts had done in *Found Drowned* and Millais in *Ophelia*. The grave of this Ophelia can be found in Kensal Green Cemetery, where a bas-relief by Matthew Noble presented her as a figure of Christ (1854; on Thomas Hood's monument, see Illustrated London News 1854; the model of Noble's sculpture may be Raphael's *Baglioni Deposition* 1507).

In the next chapter, a discussion of *Lady Lilith* (1868) bu Dante Gabriel Rossetti will attempt to describe this phase transition, analysing Rossetti's fantasy of Phallic Mother and showing how a new "discourse of the pervert" presents in the painting a new relation between painting, painter and public. Rossetti's response to the criticism he raised by altering *Lady Lilith* may offer an anticipation: "I have often said that to be an artist is just the same thing as being a whore, as far as dependence on the whims and fancies of individuals is concerned." (letter to Ford Madox Brown, 30 May 1873, Rossetti 1965-7 v. 3: 1175) No longer questioning the master signifier in the new discourse of generalised perversion, the painter personifies "the whore as story-teller" (Carter 1979: 81) who provides, like the four prostitutes in de Sade's *The Hundred and Twenty Days at Sodom*, the fantasies that fill the void of the big Other. Where reject and abject Ophelia was, the painter has become.

A Dangerous Method

To conclude with the three nodes from which we begun, it may seem that some kind of equivalence or symmetry between McCarthy's film, Millais' painting and Shakespere's play *Ophelia* was suggested. Quite the contrary, the Now, that may be better understood as an intuition of the hyperobject's futurality, "singular" (Williams 2011: 3) and of indefinite duration, is delimited and unrepeatable, and although McCarthy's *Ophelia* displays several novel interactions, the film remains derivative from Millais' and Shakespeare's distant Nows. While interactions keep adding strands to the mesh as we write, the hyperobject may have reached a stable equilibrium in which new interactions cease to produce phase transitions or a revolutionary moment. Ophelia confirms that cultural hyperobjects are not lost because they disappears but because, when strands of interaction have covered up enough gaps in their mesh, they become too present.

The periodisation of Ophelia corresponds to the historical ebbs and flows of gender biopower (cf. Repo 2015): from a "material girl" at the end of the Elizabethan Era, as we interpret Shakespeare's character, to pathetic *femme fragile*, from cathartic *femme perdue* to

the mid-Victorian ghost of insanity, from *fin de siécle* corpse to the Modernist interruption (Richardson and Willis 2002; Duncan 2016), and from postfeminist heroine in the Eighties to the neo-Victorian trope in which Ophelia is fading, as young publics seek contemporary characters and figures of women's self-empowerment.

On one side, the Now (futurality) is the hyperobject temporality produced by interobjectivity exceeding human experience, on the other side, the New (originality) is created by the gaps that are left in between the strands of interaction. This situation confronts methodology with Plato's paradox of inquiry (*Meno* 80d-e): if you know what you are looking for, then inquiry is unnecessary, and if you don't, then it is impossible (Fine 2014). Jacques Derrida, a central reference for Morton, identifies as "saturation of context" and "the undecidable" (Derrida 1988: 3, 116) and offers an answer that however, cannot be ours (cf. Gaschè 1988: 163-76). "We know what we are but know not what we may be." (*Ham.* 4.5.43-4) she says while we drown in Ophelia as a wasp in the jam jar.

Across the play, Shakespeare constructs a meta-argument against philosophical suicide. If suicide were rational, then the fear of the unknown after death would prevent it (Hamlet), if fear cannot prevent it, then it is caused by madness and cannot be rational (Ophelia), therefore, the only philosophical suicide possible is its possibility in life (Horatio). But what is the life that remains between fear of death and pain of living? Compare Hamlet's first monologue: "But that the dread of something after death / . . . puzzles the will / And makes us rather bear those ills we have / Than fly to others we know not of." (*Ham.* 3.1.77-81) with Hamlet's speech to stop Horatio's stoic suicide: "Things standing thus unknown, shall I leave behind me! If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart / Absent thee from felicity awhhile / And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain / To tell my story" (*Ham.* 5.2.329-33). The hysteric fantasy that exchanges knowledge for for truth condemns Hamlet to a meaningless death and Horatio to a sad "survival" (Agamben 2000: 8-9), whereas Ophelia, "divided from herself and her fair judgement," (*Ham.* 4.5.85) breaks the spell of knowledge on the subject (S2 —> $) and in the flash of the Now, finds the truth of her desire (a —> $), a "will to power" (Gildersleeve 2016) that traverses the fundamental fantasy, as Hamlet could not.

Ophelia's madness in the play is not just the malady the other characters and the audience expect, but a prophetic and poetic frenzy, a Platonic furor (cf. Borris 2017), that intensifies her riddles, songs and actions. One needs only contrast Polonius' aside on Hamlet: "Though this be madness yet there is method in't" (*Ham.* 2.2.202-3) with Horatio's description of Ophelia's behaviour:

She speaks much of her father, says she hears
There's tricks i'th' world, and hems and beats her heart,
Spurns enviously at straws, speaks things in doubt
That carry but half sense. Her speech is nothing,
Yet the unshaped use of it doth move
The hearers to collection; they yawn at it,
And botch the words up fit to their own thoughts,
Which, as her winks and nods and gestures yield them,
Indeed would make one think there might be thought,
Though nothing sure, yet much unhappily.
(*Ham.* 4.5.4-13)

Whether these are symptoms of hysteria, or rather illness was invented to fit them (Showalter 1985; Neely 1991) matters little for a methodology of the hyperobject. Ophelia's enthusiasm or hysteria is an intensity irrupting in the assemblage of Elsinore, energising the characters' interrelations and precipitating events towards the final duel. As Ghirlandaio's nymph impassions Aby Warburg (Gombrich 1983; Ghirlandaio 1485-90) or Dora's transference displaces Freud (Cixous 1986; Hutfless 2018), Ophelia's hysteria offers a method, because there is no method in it. Unlike schizophrenia (Deleuze and Guattari 1983; Woods 2011), hysteria is in discourse or rather, it is a discourse (Lacan 2007). The agent ($) is excluded from truth (a) and knowledge is produced by the other (S1) as surplus-jouissance (S2). Her question is embodied rather than articulated and performed rather than spoken, in which the response is less an answer as an irritatation and a reaction. The reader may have recognised Horatio's words: "her speech is nothing, yet the unshaped use of it doth move the hearers to collection" and recalled that Ophelia's corpse causes Hamlet to face Laertes and speak his knowledge: "This is I, Hamlet the Dane." (*Ham.* 5.1.246-7).

This "dangerous method," as David Cronenberg's film seems to suggest (2011), counters the saturation of the hyperobject described earlier (for different perspectives on methodological hysteria in art and humanities, see Braun 2021). Hystericisation, that for Lacan is the beginning of the psychoanalytic treatment (Quinet 2018) and a revolutionary moment (Starr 2001; Gildersleeve 2016), energises the strands of the hyperobject mesh, stretching them and putting them to the test. At the same time, hystericisation reconfigures the mesh also by de-energising it, breaking strands that widen gaps or open up new ones (against aesthetic accelerationism, see Shaviro 2014; on accelerationism in Deleuze and Guattari, see Hui and Morelle 2017). The following chapters present three experiments in which hystericisation is applied to different regions of hyperobject Ophelia.

Coda

"Ophelia" is Ireland's most searched word of 2017 (Google 2017). It was the name of the worst storm to affect the country in 50 years, the easternmost major Atlantic hurricane on record, and the tenth Atlantic hurricane in ten weeks, matching a 124 year old record (Astor 2017). It began 1-5 October from a broad low-pressure area along a stationary cold front west of the Azores. Located within a favourable environment, the storm steadily strengthened over the next days, getting its name on 9 October and becoming a hurricane on 11 October. After becoming a Category 2 hurricane and fluctuating in intensity for a day, Ophelia intensified into a Category 3 hurricane on 14 October south of the Azores and began accelerating north-east towards Ireland, weakening over progressively colder waters. Completing an extra-tropical transition in the early hours of 16 October, the storm reached the south-west coast of Ireland in the morning, moved through Ireland, Northern Ireland and Scotland, heavily affecting Wales and the West of England. Ophelia then crossed the North Sea and struck western Norway early on 17 October, before weakening during the evening and finally dissipating the next day. On 17 October, *The Irish Times* editorial clearly stated the correlation between "extreme weather events" like Ophelia and "global warming" (anticipated in Haarsma et al. 2013; confirmed in Collins et al. 2019; Knutson et al. 2021), calling on the Irish government for action to cut "greenhouse gas emissions" (The Irish Times 2017).

A connection between the cultural hyperobject Ophelia and the climate crisis, on which Morton developed his theory, may seem preposterous here. This was established by means of a naming convention by the World Meteorological Organization that maintains and updates six lists of 21 names, used to name in strict rotation the Atlantic hurricanes of each season, and re-cycled every sixth year (2021). For instance, "Ophelia," number 15 on the list, had already been the name of two major hurricanes in 2005 and 2011, and will be available for use in 2023. We readily admit it was intended as a provocation and yet the connection was made and now, *it is there*, signifier and signified are retroactively "knotted together" (Lacan 1993: 268). The hyperobject viscosity is the condition of possibility for which a strand of interaction, a string of writing, connects Ophelia and the climate crisis. On the other hand, this strand is nothing but a piece of writing if nothing comes of it (futurity). One can neither tell whether something was possible until it is done, nor what was done until it produces something.

A Sermon in Painting

Shortly before his artist retreat with Holman Hunt in Surbiton Hill and Worcester Park Farm (near Ewell, Surrey), Millais described to Mrs Combe his plans for a new painting on "the Days that were Before the Flood" (1905 v. 1: 103). He had already begun working at an ambitious biblical painting (see the preparatory drawing at the British Museum "The Eve of the Deluge," c. 1849-50), inspired by the financial and critical success of John Linnell's *The Eve of the Deluge* (1848), when in February, Millais abandoned that plan and begun instead *The Return of the Dove to the Ark* (1851, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) that he entered at the Royal Academy exhibition. Millais had already sold the painting to Mr Combe (March 1850) when John Ruskin saw *The Return of the Dove to the Ark* at the exhibition and asked to buy it. Ruskin's interest for the painting and his support for the Pre-Raphaelite movement, may have briefly revived Millais' original idea that he described to Mrs Combe in a letter dated 28 May 1851 in which he declared:

> One great encouragement to me is the certainty of its having this one advantage over a sermon, that it will be all at once put before the spectator without that trouble of realisation often lost in the effort of reading or listening. (Millais 1900 v.1: 105)

Following the vehement criticism that hit *Christ in the House of His Parents (The Carpenter's Shop)* (1849-50, Tate), exhibited at the Royal Academy together with *The Return of the Dove*, Millais never returned to that project, moving away from recognisable religious subjects and intricate group scenes, towards simple compositions with few figures capable of synthesising a whole story in small gestures and measured expressions. However, the comparison between painting and sermon goes beyond the context of the letter, offering a rare first-hand account of Millais' problematics during his Pre-Rahaelite period, at least until *The Blind Girl* (1853-6). Rather than a more or less faithful transposition of a literary source, as he had done before with Boccaccio's tales in *Cymon and Iphigenia* (1847-8) and *Isabella* (1849), Millais aims at articulating an interpretation of the text and deliver a moral message to the public. As sermons are analytic ("trouble of realisation") and diachronic ("the effort of reading or listening"), painting has the "advantage" of being synthetic and synchronic, and thus, is more suitable for "turning the minds of men to good reflections and so heightening the profession as one of unworldly usefulness to mankind." (103)

By the early 1860s, Millais has once more changed his position on painting as visual sermon, as the sentimentality of *My First Sermon* (1862) and its sequel *My Second Sermon* (1864) makes apparent. The Archbishop of Canterbury Charles Longley, who had been enthusiastic about the earlier painting, commented on *My Second Sermon* in his speech at the Academy banquet of 1865:

> I would say for myself that I always desire to derive profit as well as pleasure from my visits to these rooms. On the present occasion I have learnt a very wholesome lesson, which may be usefully studied, not by myself alone, but by those of my right reverend brethren also who surround me. I see a little lady there (pointing to Mr. Millais' picture of a child asleep in church, entitled My Second Sermon), who, though all unconscious whom she has been addressing, and the homily she has been reading to us during the last three hours, has in truth, by the eloquence of her silent slumber, given us a warning of the evil of lengthy sermons and drowsy discourses. Sorry indeed should I be to disturb that sweet and peaceful slumber, but I beg that when she does awake she may be informed who they are who have pointed the moral of her story, have drawn the true inference from the change that has passed over her since she has heard her "first sermon," and have resolved to profit by the lecture she has thus delivered to them. (Millais 1900 v.1: 379)

In November 1861, Millais moved in his new home at the centre of "Albertopolis" (Millais House, 7 Cromwell Place, South Kensington) with Effie and his three daughters (Effie Gray, Mary Hunt, and Alice Sophia Caroline "Carrie," born the following April), and this portrait of seven years old Effie Gray in "sweet and peaceful slumber" during a sermon at All Saints Church (Kingston upon Thames), may be an ironic comment on his former artist statement that "paintings are sermons" now that he had become the fashionable and successful painter he had always desired and into which he was moulded. *Ophelia* too is a sermon not only because this idea underlies its composition, but also because of its narrative connection with the sermon missing from Ophelia's "maimed funeral rites" in the play (*Ham.* 5.1.219) through Thomas Hood's elegiac poem "The Bridge of Sighs" (1844).

Maimed Funeral Rites

The cause of death and the appropriate form of burial are central issues in Ophelia's subplot, as individuals who committed suicide were culpable of *felo de se* (felony against oneself), which resulted in seizure or forfeiture of their property to the Crown and exclusion from burial in consecrated ground: "Is she to be buried in Christian burial, / when she wilfully seeks her own salvation?" (*Ham.* 5.1.1-2). Gertrude described to Laertes her death as accidental ("an envious sliver broke" *Ham.* 5.1.173) and Ophelia "As one incapable of her own distress," (*Ham.* 4.9.178) and the coroner must have simply confirmed Gertrude's indirect testimony, finding that she was *non compos mentis* ("of unsound mind") and irresponsible of her actions ("The crowner hath sat on her and finds it / Christian burial." *Ham.* 5.1.3-5). However, the

second gravedigger doubts the impartiality of the inquest ("Will you ha' the truth an't? If this had not been / a gentlewoman, she should have been buried out o' / Christian burial." *Ham.* 5.1.23-5) and argues it was a suicide ("It must be *se offendendo*, it cannot be else." *Ham.* 5.1.9). The priest too seems unconvinced:

> Her obsequies have been as far enlarg'd
> As we have warranty. Her death was doubtful;
> And but that great command o'ersways the order,
> She should in ground unsanctified been lodg'd
> Till the last trumpet: for charitable prayers
> Shards, flints, and pebbles should be thrown on her.
> Yet here she is allow'd her virgin crants,
> Her maiden strewments, and the bringing home
> Of bell and burial. (*Ham,* 5.1.224-32)

The passage describes an ancient custom still prevalent in parts of England during Shakespeare's time, for which suicides were buried at cross-roads with a stake driven through the body to mark the spot and passers-by threw stones at it to prevent the soul from wandering. Although the law overruled ecclesiastical authority, the priest was entitled to abridge the burial service so far as to satisfy only the minimal legal requirement, the burial in consecrated ground. In Ophelia's case, further elements of the funeral service were maintained, a compromise that fails to satisfy Laertes as it does not clear his sister's name of suspicion ("Lay her i'th' earth, / And from her fair and unpolluted flesh / May violets spring. I tell thee, churlish priest, / A minist'ring angel shall my sister be / When thou liest howling." *Ham.* 5.1.235-9) Thus, Ophelia's funeral, Anglican (Guernesy 1885: 6) with an "echo of Catholic liturgy" (Groves 2007: 3), is called "obsequies" from which are excluded the "requiem and such rest."

The 1560s and 1570s controversy, whether the sermon should be considered Catholic and thus excluded from Protestant funerals, was forgotten, and in the late Elizabethan period, English funerals typically included a sermon. The few sermons published in this period consisted of two parts, "teaching the people some good learning, and also saying well of the departed" (Puttenham 1869: 63). For instance, Charles Fitz-Geffry speaking at the funeral of Lady Philippa Rous in 1620, said that "'To give the dead their due prayse is both for the glory of God, and for the benefit of the living. God is thereby glorified, for hee who prayseth the Saints of God, prayseth God in his Saints, because their prayse is his. The living likewise are hereby profited; for hearing others praysed for their goodnesse, they are incited to be good that they may attayne unto the like prayse.' Of the two elements, it was the benefit to the living that was most often stressed and set these sermons apart from popish (or even pagan) eulogies." (Carlson 2000: 572).

The element of praise to God is entirely missing from *Hamlet*, whereas example is partly substituted for Laertes' and Gertrude's speeches before Ophelia's interment (Holleran 1989: 75). The subversion of the rite is complete when Laertes curses Hamlet and jumps in Ophelia's grave ("Hold off the earth awhile, / Till I have caught her once more in mine arms." *Ham.* 5.1.247-8) provoking Hamlet to confront him. The dispute on the funeral ritual culminates in the desecration of Ophelia's body, when a fight ensues between Hamlet and Laertes in her grave where, according to some interpretations, Ophelia has already been laid to rest. The priest's empty ritualism, and Laertes and Hamlet's inappropriate behaviour allow Shakespeare to represent how the church and its moral authority decay following the crisis of sovereignty.

This aspect becomes relevant when interpreting Millais' *Ophelia* in the light of its companion, Hunt's *The Hireling Shepherd*, and is consistent with the allegorical commentary that Hunt wrote on his own picture in a letter to J. E. Phythian when the painting was purchased by the Manchester City Art Gallery in 1897:

> Shakespeare's song [*King Lear* 3.6 quoted in the Royal Academy catalogue] represents a Shepherd who is neglecting his real duty of guarding the sheep: instead of using his voice in truthfully performing his duty, he is using his "minikin mouth" in some idle way. He was a type thus of other muddle headed pastors who instead of performing their services to their flock — which is in constant peril — discuss vain questions of no value to any human soul. My fool has found a death's head moth, and this fills his little mind with forebodings of evil and he takes it to an equally sage counsellor for her opinion. She scorns his anxiety from ignorance rather than profundity, but only the more distracts his faithfulness: while she feeds her lamb with sour apples his sheep have burst bounds and got into the corn. It is not merely that the wheat will be spoilt, but in eating it the sheep are doomed to destruction from becoming what farmers call "blown." (Macmillan 1972: 188)

"The Bridge of Sighs" presents the "maimed funeral rites" performed by a party of boatmen for an unnamed woman found drowned, as illustrated by Gustave Doré in *The Favourite Poems of Thomas Hood* (Moxon 1872). Crossroads burials ended with the increasing understanding of mental illness and depression, particularly after the suicide of Lord Castlereagh in 1822 and an Act of Parliament passed the following year, allowed suicides private burial in a churchyard, but only at night and without a Christian service. The opening of the poem makes clear that both the Unfortunate and Ophelia, to whom the epigraph refers, committed suicide:

> One more Unfortunate,
> Weary of breath,
> Rashly importunate,
> Gone to her death!

The following stanza directly addresses the men recovering her body from the river:

Take her up tenderly,
Lift her with care;
Fashion'd so slenderly
Young, and so fair!

Her dead body is the passive subject of the poem both as abject ("Loving, not loathing. // Touch her not scornfully;"), and object of male desire, transparent to the gaze ("Make no deep scrutiny"), accessible to the look ("Look at her garments / Clinging like cerements;"), pliant to the touch ("take her up", "lift her," "touch her", "wipe those poor lips", "loop up her tresses," "smooth and compose [her limbs], "her eyes, close them," "Cross her hands humbly . . . Over her breast!"). Millais' *Ophelia* draws from the poem the eroticism of the woman's wet body and clothing, making *Ophelia* one of the first British paintings to depict a woman dressed in wet contemporary clothes. Although contemporary reviewers pretended not to notice it, this striking and innovative feature is one of the main factors appealing to the public today, as one can gather from the many re-enactments of Millais' painting (an online collection is available in Giudici 2021) and the popularity of the story of how in January 1852, Elizabeth Siddal posed in a bathtub full of water kept warm. by tea-lights. As may be expected, the dramatization of the sitting in the second episode of the BBC mini-series *Desperate Romantics* (Gay 2009) accentuates Siddal's virginal appeal (Amy Manson) and the sexual tension it provoked between Fred Walters, a composite character that here plays the part of Walter Deverell (Sam Crane), and Dante Gabriel Rossetti (Aidan Turner), while Millais (Samuel Barnett) is presented as a precocious genius completely absorbed in drawing the "Head study" now in Birmingham Museum (1852), while omitting the presence of Millais' mother who supervised the sessions.

The Unforunate of Hood's poem and Ophelia is less an individual than the representative of a social type, the inexperienced young girl barely responsible of her actions:

Mad from life's history,
Glad to death's mystery,
Swift to be hurl'd—
Anywhere, anywhere
Out of the world!

The stanza reflects the change of attitude towards suicide separating Elizabethan Ophelia, declared mad ("as one incapable of her own distress") in order for her suicide not be a crime, and the Victorian Unfortunate, whose suicide itself proved that she was "mad." The "secularisation of suicide" had already begun in England after the Revolution (MacDonald 1986) but still far from complete in early and mid-Victorian period, explaining why Hood avoids all references to a religious funeral for the Unfortunate. An example of the ambivalent

religious attitude towards suicide is given in 1853 by "a minister who preached a funeral sermon for his own wife following her suicide. He argued against the view 'that a child of God will never be suffered to commit suicide when in a state of insanity' by describing not only the evidence for her authentic Christian experience before she became ill, but also the dying professions she made before the poison she had drunk took full effect." (Wolffe 2012: 346)

Nor is the Unfortunate's madness in the poem the same medical and legal insanity of the 1860s, but rather a moral consequence of the Unfortunate's loss of social status and economic hardship caused by the Dissolute Man, a social type that to "One of Eve's family" personifies the biblical Serpent in the City. He is the origin of the Unfortunate's demise and, in contrast to his cowardice, she gains agency and moral responsibility for a moment impossible in time:

> In she plunged boldly—
> No matter how coldly
> The rough river ran—
> Over the brink of it,
> Picture it—think of it,
> Dissolute Man!
> Lave in it, drink of it,
> Then, if you can!

In the very act of suicide that destroys her, the Unfortunate is subjectified, and taking upon herself the mythical blame for the Dissolute Man and with her sacrifice, she frees the City of its guilt, a parody of Euripides' Iphigenia, whose sacrifice permits the safe passage of her father's ships to Troy. As we saw earlier, Anna Jameson had connected Ophelia to Iphigenia (1832) incidentally to emphasise her innocence and the dramatic necessity of her death, whereas Hood constitutes the Unfortunate's suicide as a cathartic ritual "in which the sacred and the social come together in a process of establishing and generating significance" (Neumann 1998: 103) and death restores her innocence, "All that remains of her / Now is pure womanly."

At the margin of this fantasy, Hood allocates "real" blame on the Unfortunate's family who did not support her:

> Sisterly, brotherly,
> Fatherly, motherly
> Feelings had changed:
> Love, by harsh evidence,
> Thrown from its eminence;

and rather thinly, on the City's wealth ("Near a whole city full, / Home she had none.") Although Christian references remain sparse and generic, lack of charity ("Alas! for the rarity

/ Of Christian charity / Under the sun!") and loss of faith ("Even God's providence / Seeming estranged."), the poem closes with an appeal to God's forgiveness:

> Perishing gloomily,
> Spurr'd by contumely,
> Cold inhumanity,
> Burning insanity,
> Into her rest.—
> Cross her hands humbly
> As if praying dumbly,
> Over her breast!
>
> Owning her weakness,
> Her evil behaviour,
> And leaving, with meekness,
> Her sins to her Saviour!

The last stanzas sum up the scapegoating logic of the poem (for the fallen woman as scapegoat, see Auerbach 1980). The Unfortunate and by implication, Ophelia are finally condemned ("her evil behaviour", "her sins"), despite circumstances and "burning insanity", so that the community is redeemed through the mediation of its sacrificial victim. Whereas Hood only invokes the Saviour as guarantor of the restored social order (Girard 1989: 112 ff.), Millais reformulates the social problem, that the Unfortunate's sexual transgression and suicide poses to Hood's reader, as a collective and religious problem of Ophelia's salvation. The question of Ophelia's sins ("Is she to be buried in Christian burial, / when she wilfully seeks her own salvation?" *Ham.* 5.1.1-2), of her forgiveness ("And leaving, with meekness, / Her sins to her Saviour!") and religious authority ("churlish priest" *Ham.* 5.1.239) are in the foreground of Millais' painting in the allegorical dramatization of her story.

While George Landow's seminal study on *William Holman Hunt and Typological Symbolism* (1979/2015) showed the religious sources of Hunt's allegorical mode of representation and more recently, several studies investigated the deep connections of first wave Pre-Raphaelites with religion (Giebelhausen 2005), Millais role is limited to some early religious drawings and paintings that culminated in *The Carpenter's Shop* (1849-50), after which he would have abandoned religious subjects owing to the bad reviews he received. This interpretation, however, does not consider quasi-religious subjects that appear throughout his production such as, among others: *Mariana* (1851), *A Huguenot* (1851-2), *The Blind Girl* (1854-6), *The Vale of Rest* (1858-9), *Joan of Arc* (1865), *The Martyr of Solway* (1871), or *The Parables of Our Lord* (1864), a masterpiece of wood etching he realized in collaboration with the Dalziel Brothers. Identifying *Ophelia* as a religious painting without a religious subject, may explain why Millais succeeded where so many painters of Ophelia have failed.

On the one hand, the religious subtext balances a critical interpretation of Shakespeare's text with the artistic imperative of autonomy, but on the other, it places *Ophelia* in an awkward position with regard to Modernity (Barlow 2000; Smith and Barringer 2012). This is, somehow, the opposite problem that Thierry De Duve raises for Edouard Manet's *Dead Christ and the Angels* (1864): *Ophelia* might be considered Modern had it not been a religious painting. James Elkins may be right to conclude *On the Strange Place of Religion in Contemporary Art*, recognising that "it is impossible to talk sensibly about religion and at the same time address art in an informed and intelligent manner: but it is also irresponsible not to keep trying." (2004: 116)

A Huguenot

A Huguenot on St. Bartholomew's Day refusing to shield himself from danger by wearing a Roman Catholic badge hints at an artistic transformation in Millais, precipitated by the adverse reactions to *The Carpenter's Shop*. Paul Barlow identifies a group of his paintings that include besides *Ophelia* and *The Huguenot*, *The Proscribed Royalist, 1651* (1852-3), *The Order of Release, 1746* (1852-3), *The Black Brunswicker* (1860) and a few others. They are characterised by an "Anglicized" Pre-Raphaelite style and are "concerned with the same problem, the tension between emotional intimacy and physical constraint. In each case the lovers aspire to possess one another, but their intimacies are disturbed and threatened by their situation" (Barlow 2005: 39; cf. a similar insight is already in Millais 1900 v.1: 148). Susan Casteras places *The Huguenot* within the theme of the "courtship barrier," two lovers meeting at a style, a gate, or a wall, and highlights Millais' unconventional treatment (Casteras 1985). Holman Hunt says that Millais presented *The Huguenot* at the 82nd Royal Academy exhibition as a "make-weight second picture, relying on the *Ophelia* for the advancement of his reputation" (Hunt 1903 v.1: 283) and Jo Briggs observes that his remark "may also have affected scholarly interest in the work" (2012). Biggs places *A Huguenot* correctly in the context of the Papal Aggression Controversy (1850-2), ensued after Pope Pius IX decided to re-establish the Catholic hierarchy in England after nearly three centuries (on the topic, see Ralls 1974), but does not expand on the painting's strategic function in Millais' career.

In the Summer-Autumn 1851, at the peak of Hunt and Millais' artistic collaboration on the *Ophelia / The Hireling Shepherd* diptych, and as Hunt was beginning the most significant painting of his career, *The Light of the World* (1851-6), *A Huguenot* marks Millais' distancing

from Hunt's controlling influence, and the repositioning of religion within his artistic practice. Not only our interpretation explains Hunt's diminutive account of the painting, in light of the barely concealed partiality that he and his wife show towards other members of the Pre-Raphaelite movement, but is also consistent with Millais' own accounts of its significance in a letter to Martha Combe (22 November 1851, see below) while he was painting it, and to Frederic Stephens, when looking back at it from the top of his career:

> It was at this epoch that The Huguenot which he had not seen for more than thirty years, was brought to London in order to be exhibited again [in the Millais retrospective at the Grosvenor Gallery that opened 1 January 1886]. The case it travelled in was opened in my presence, and while Millais was in the gallery; so I called him to look at his masterpiece. He came, and having the panel released from the frame he took it in his hands, and studied the surface of the picture with the keenest interest and most searching attention. Nothing could exceed the force of this regard. He called upon me to notice some characteristics of the handling, and reminded me of various technical details in it which, as I had often seen him at work upon the panel in the Gower Street studio during 1853 [sc. 1852], were still present in my memory. He laughed with pleasure when, recognising certain trial touches with a sable brush made upon the white margin of the panel (which the frame originally concealed), he told me a ludicrous story connected with Miss Ryan, the model who sat to him. It was with evident pride and many happy memories that, putting the picture back again into its frame, he said: 'Really, I did not paint so badly in those days, old man !' He was especially delighted because the panel, having been in the country since it left the Academy of 1853, was then (1883) [sc. 1886] perfectly unchanged in all respects. 'I used,' he said, 'such a colour for this, and such for that. It was risky, perhaps; but there, you see, it's all right now.' I never saw him more deeply moved anent his own work than on this occasion. (Millais 1900 v.2: 195-6)

Michaela Giebelhausen summarises "the Pre-Raphaelites' response to the vitriolic criticism of 1850 and 1851: reticent, cautious and clever." (2006: 27) However, Millais did more than this in *The Huguenot.* The painting's full title accentuates the masculine integrity of "refusing to shield himself from danger" against the sentimentality of the woman tying her lover's arm with a white scarf that also qualifies her as Catholic (see letter to Mrs Combe from 6 March 1852, Millais 1900 v.1: 160), a detail that seem to have escaped many of the viewers. Unlike the *Carpenter's Shop*, that was exhibited without a title and was accompanied by an obscure biblical quote (Zechariah 13: 6), the catalogue note for *The Huguenot* quotes and credits Anne Marsh-Caldwell's *The Protestant Reformation in France or, History of the Hugonots*, leaving no ambiguity as to the picture's subject matter and message: "When the clock of the *Palais de Justice* shall sound upon the great bell at day-break, then each good Catholic must bind a strip of white linen round his arm, and place a fair white cross in his cap." (Marsh-Caldwell 1847 v.2: 352, quoted in Royal Academy 1852: 24; on Millais' mother sourcing the reference, see Hunt 1905 v.1: 293) It was with this order that Henry I, Duc of Guise state-sanctioned the unprecedented St Bartholomew's Day Massacre (24 August 1572) that from Paris spread to a dozen provincial cities in the following weeks, leaving 4,000 to 6,000 French Protestants murdered (Holt 1995: 94) and causing a first wave of Protestant emigration (First Refuge) mainly towards Geneva, the United Provinces and England.

The change in Millais becomes clear contrasting the sympathetic tone towards Catholicism in a letter to Mr Combe (16 December 1850):

> I think I shall adopt the motto '*In Coelo quies*,' and go over to Cardinal Wiseman, as all the metropolitan High Church clergymen are sending in their resignations. Tomorrow (Sunday) Collins and myself are going to dine with a University man whose brother has just seceded, and afterwards to hear the Cardinal's second discourse. My brother went last Sunday, but could not hear a word, as it was so crowded he could not get near enough. The Cardinal preaches in his mitre and full vestments, so there will be a great display of pomp as well as knowledge… And now, my dear Mr. Combe, I must end this 'heavy blow' letter with most affectionate remembrances and earnest assurances to Mrs. Pat that I do not mean to turn Roman Catholic just yet. (Millais 1900 v.1: 93)

with a letter to Martha Combe "Mrs Pat" (22 November 1851) written towards the end of Millais' retreat at Worcester Farm, in which he describes his plan for *The Huguenot* having nearly completed the background wall:

> My brother was with us today, and told me that Dr. Hesse of Leyton College, understood that I was a Roman Catholic (having been told so), and that my picture of "The Return of the Dove to the Ark" was emblematical of the return of all of us to that religion—a very convenient construction to put upon it! I have no doubt that likewise they will turn the subject I am at present about to their advantage. It is a scene supposed to take place (as doubtless it did) on the eve of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. I shall have two lovers in the act of parting, the woman a Papist and the man a Protestant. The badge worn to distinguish the former from the latter was a white scarf on the left arm. Many were base enough to escape murder by wearing it. The girl will be endeavouring to tie the handkerchief round the man's arm, so to save him; but he, holding his faith above his greatest worldly love, will be softly preventing her. I am in high spirits about the subject, as it is entirely my own, and I think contains the highest moral. (Millais 1900 v.1: 135-6)

It may be a risk, of course, to project the artist's biography onto his work, yet the unusually complicated gestation of the figures demonstrated by the sketches, the readings and conversations that Millais was having at the time around the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (see his diary entry of 19 November 1851, Millais 1900 v.1: 133), and the special place Millais gave to *A Huguenot* as his first truly personal invention, lend credit to this conjecture. The same letter to Mr Combe suggests the other horn of Millais' moral dilemma:

> You will perhaps wonder what these ailments can be. I will enumerate them. First, a certainty of passing an unusually turbulent life (which I do not like); secondly, the inevitable enemies I shall create if fully successful; thirdly, the knowledge of the immense application required to complete my works for the coming exhibition, which I feel inadequate to perform. (Millais v.1: 93)

The passage is probably still alluding to the effects of public hostility against the Pre-Raphaelites and Millais that carried on from the *Carpenter's Shop* to the paintings he had exhibited at the Royal Academy earlier that year, *Mariana, The Woodman's Daughter* and *The Return of the Dove to the Ark*. In hindsight, Millais' preoccupations for his career seem exaggerated, the Papal Aggression Controversy had dissolved as soon as the Great Exhibition was inaugurated (1 May 1851; cf. Ralls 1974), Ruskin had turned public opinion defending the

Pre-Raphaelites with two letters to *The Times* (13 May, 30 May) and the pamphlet *Pre-Raphaelitism* (published 13 August), and Millais had already sold all three paintings.

For the 1852 exhibition as well, Millais had three paintings in plan: a single female character as main painting, a couple as secondary, and for the first time, a portrait. Impressed by Millais' interpretation of his poem "The Woodman's Daughter" (1844), Coventry Patmore commissioned him a portrait of his wife Emily Augusta that was ready in October. *Mrs Coventry Patmore* (1851) depicts Emily Augusta Patmore half-length, sitting on a chair in a black dress with a white lace collar and a red velvet tie, holding a nosegay. The composition, similar to *The Bridesmaid* (1851) and to *The Return of the Dove* for its black background, revisits Northern European Renaissance portraiture but Emily Patmore's direct look towards the viewer proved too innovative and unflattering for her husband who "hated it . . . beyond speech" (Payne 2010: 30). In the other two paintings, the exhibition plan highlights Millais' artistic changes from 1851 even more clearly. Responding to the main points of criticism, he changed Gothicism into even greater Naturalism, removed or concealed the "Romanist and Tractarian tendencies" that Ruskin had criticised in *Mariana*, and switched the bland social critique of *The Woodman's Daughter* (Pohlemus 1994) for the manly and Protestant message in *A Huguenot*.

It seems then unlikely that Millais, choosing the subject for *A Huguenot*, should have drifted along from Hunt's idea of a Yorkist and Lancastrian star-crossed couple, to another of Cavalier and Puritan, eventually settling for Huguenot and Catholic simply because he remembered Giacomo Meyerbeer's opera *Les Huguenots* (Hunt 1905 v.1: 289-90). His son contradicts Hunt's version adding that "some time after Millais' decision he and Hunt went to the opera to study the pose and costumes of the figures" (Millais 1900 v.1: 141) although the 1851 season would have been over by that time, and *Gli Ugonotti* opened too late the following season to be of use for the painting. If Millais's choice of subject and source was deliberate, why did the painting need separating from the opera? One reason may lays with the modernity of Meyerbeer's historical grand opera:

> There can be no doubt that, at an ideological level, Meyerbeer voiced in *Les Huguenots* a fervent attack on religious fanaticism and inhuman intolerance. It is no less true that thanks to the techniques of montage and collage he discovered a musico-dramatic style to express on the operatic stage the modern historical conception that events are not the work of heroes but result rather from socio-economic forces. Neither aspect was completely understood during Meyerbeer's lifetime; perhaps only after the twentieth century, with its global catastrophes, can we see just how radical Meyerbeer is. For his own part, he was well aware of the modernity of his techniques and the implications of his theatre. During the first Paris run of *Les Huguenots* he wondered whether the public would appreciate the modern aspect. 'The part of Marcel is better than any of the music – Robert included – that I have written in my whole life. I don't know whether he will be understood. At first he probably won't be, I fear.' (Brzoska 2003: 206)

Over a decade since it was premièred (Paris Opéra, 29 February 1836), the English public still knew *Les Huguenots* sung in Italian and heavily abridged (for a critical review, see for instance, Athenaeum 1851: 933). The Royal Italian Opera at Covent Garden, after hosting productions by German (1842) and French ensembles (1845), produced *Gli Ugonotti* sung in Italian (20 July 1848, with Jeanne-Anaïs Castellan, Pauline Garcia-Viardot, Mario di Candida, Ignazio Marini. The French libretto by Eugène Scribe with Émile Deschamps in the Italian translation by Manfredo Maggioni and English translation by Thomas Grieve, was first published by T. Brettel, London 1848, with several reprints, see Meyerbeer 1851). The opera was performed five times per season on average and dominated for twenty years (1848-68) by soprano Giulia Grisi (as Valentine, daughter of the Count de St. Bris) and tenor Giovanni Matteo "Mario" de Candia (as Raoul de Nangis).

It is quite possible that Millais attended a performance of the opera recently before sketching *A Huguenot.* In his *Musical Memoirs,* William Spark describes the 1851 production (première 22 April, extra night 15 May, with Mario as Raoul, Grisi as Valentine, Castellan, Bertrandi/Angri, Tagliafico, Formes, Tamburini, Ferrari, Rommi, Mei, Soldi): "I confess to have experienced some of the happiest most musically sensational hours of life listening to Meyerbeer's operas *Les Huguenots* and *Robert le Diable*, at Covent Garden theatre, with Grisi and Mario as the principal artistes" (1909: 50) adding: "never can I forget their singing and acting in the *Huguenots*; it was as near perfection as any artistic performance can be. Everything seemed so natural, and yet so finished and refined; their grace and ease of manner were only equalled by their lovely voices and their delightful singing" (193-4).

More generally, not only had paintings based on theatre performances gone out of fashion as drama declined in 1830s, but a new hierarchy of art forms was emerging, that the double mise en abyme in Daniel Maclise's *The Play Scene in 'Hamlet'* (1842) demonstrates. Whereas theatre looked at painting to create images that move (for a survey of theatre in Victorian visual culture, see Newey 2009), and painting looked at literature to create pictures that tell stories, all three were competing with each other to represent "truthfully" Nature and History to the viewer. Besides, there was no getting past the fact that *Les Huguenots* was a French opera on a French subject. Millais's painting was a calculated appeal to the same anti-Catholic sentiments that had fuelled in part the criticism against him, and also to the raising preoccupations in Britain for Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte's authoritarian regime, about to escalate in a new invasion scare when the president of the Second Republic staged a coup d'etat (2 December 1851) and a plebiscite granted him the title of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French (2 December 1852; on his influence in Britain, see Parry 2001). This political line was

continued by Hunt the following year with *Our English Coasts, 1852* (1852, exhibited 1853) that he explained "might be taken as a satire on the reported defenceless state of the country against foreign invasion" (Stephens 1860: 23).

The subtle mixture of crowd-pleasing themes in *A Huguenot* was key to its success, progressing from the relatively low sale price to art dealer Thomas White (£250 that is about £20,000 today, Millais 1900 v.1: 147), to the public acclaim at the Royal Academy exhibition, the non-member price of the Liverpool Academy in 1852, and the high number of sales of the print, published by Thomas White in London and by Ernest Gambart in London, Paris and New York (1857). In a letter to his wife Millais comments (8 May 1856):

> Nothing could have been more adverse than the criticism on 'The Huguenot,' yet the engraving is now selling more rapidly than any other of recent times. I have great faith in the mass of the public, although one hears now and then such grossly ignorant remarks. . . . It is just the same with music and literature. (Millais 1900 v.1: 303)

Millais' ideal viewer was no longer the educated patron, such as Combe or Farrar, but "the mass of the public" to which *A Huguenot* delivered what it wanted. The reviewer of *The Spectator* proclaimed that "One such picture — and there are three such here — tells us more of what Pre-Raphalitism *is* than all the arguments of four years." (The Spectator 1852: 452) and in the catalogue of Millais' retrospective at the Grosvenor Gallery, *The Athaeneum* art editor and former Pre-Raphaelite brethren Frederic Stephens recognised this painting was a breakthrough:

> When "A Huguenot" was exhibited at the Royal Academy crowds stood before it all day long, men lingered there for hours, and went away but to return. It had clothed the old feelings of men in a new garment, and its pathos found almost universal acceptance. This was the picture which brought Millais to the height of his reputation. Nevertheless, even "A Huguenot" did not silence all challengers; there were critics who said that the man's arm could not reach so far round the lady's neck, and there were others, knowing little of the south, who carped at the presence of the nasturtiums in August. It was, on the whole, however, admitted that the artist had at last conquered his public and must thenceforth educate them. (Stephens 1886: 17)

For this very reason, Millais' friend John Linnell "thought he had fallen off somewhat, and on one occasion, when they met, he exclaimed, 'Ah, Mr. Millais, you have left your first love you have left your first love!'" (Story 1892 v.1: 26). The lovers' conflict in *A Huguenot* thus appears, if not a genuine dramatization, a fitting metaphor for Millais' personal conflict between private belief and public image, artistic integrity and professional success, which he resolved by idealising a practical compromise into a melodramatic fantasy of self-sacrifice.

A Huguenot is not an illustration of a specific scene of the opera (Parris 1984: 99) but rather a supplement that on one hand, interpolates and expands its narrative, and on the other, explicates and criticises its meaning. Its relationship to the source text, can also be discerned

in *Ophelia* and was developed by Millais since his student painting *Pizarro Seizing the Inca of Peru* (1846), that interpolates an invented scene in a recent production of Richard Brinsley Sheridan's last play *Pizarro* (Princess Theatre, Oxford Street 15 May 1846) even featuring one of the actors as model (Rosenfeld 2012). Two separate duets in Meyerbeer's opera merge in *A Huguenot*: the "Grand Duet" between the Huguenot Raoul and the Catholic Valentine in the fourth act (4.6 in the French original, 3.5 in the Italian version) and in the last act, their dialogue in the cemetery before the Trio with Marcel, Raoul's servant and spiritual father (5.4 /4.3).

In the fourth act duo, Raoul, who is hiding behind a tapestry to meet Valentine for the last time, overhears the monks blessing the arms of Catholic conspirators, commanded by the Count of St. Bris, Governor of the Louvre and Valentine's father. As soon as he is left alone, Raoul prepares to leave the palace through a window to warn his co-religionists, when Valentine enters the room through a side door, warning him in turn of the danger:

Val. Oh, heaven! where are you going?
Raoul, answer me.
Rao. I go to save my friend,
A crime to frustrate.
I go to risk my life, to fight,
And to prevent the plan
Of such inhuman traitors.
Val. My father is amongst them, and my husband,
Whom it is my duty to respect.
Will you draw your sword against their lives?
Rao. Their treason I shall punish.
Val. They obey the will of heaven.
Rao. They obey the will of heaven!
This is the law you worship ;
A law that, among brothers,
Breathes war and destruction.
Val. Ah, do not say such words.
It is for the mercy of heaven
That now I come to save thee.
And for your future happiness,
Do not go out.
Rao. I must.
Val. You rush to your destruction!
Rao. To linger here is treason
To friendship, duty, and honour.
Danger presses.
I can no longer stay. -Ah ! let me go!
Val. You hasten to your death!
For pity's sake, remain!
Rao. Alas!
Val. You are my only hope.
Would you see me die before your eyes ?
Have pity upon my misery!
Ah ! listen to my prayers!
Stay, oh, stay, and I shall save your life.
Rao. Ah, let me go from hence.
Honour calls! duty commands.
Rao. runs towards the door, but is

followed by Val., who stops him.
Val. Ah, no! across this threshold
Thy steps shall not adventure!
I firmly cling to thee!
Rao. To hear thee is a crime.
Val. And am I not guilty too?
Rao. Heaven!
Val. Still, I listen to thee.
Yes, at this dreadful hour
Of thee alone I think,
Upon the verge of death.
Ah! stay, Raoul; grant me this consolation.
Have pity upon my fate !
If thou should'st die,alas! I must die also.
Stay, oh, stay! -I love thee!
(Meyerbeer 1851: 89, 91)

Their dialogue articulates the main text of *A Huguenot.* Moving quickly from the public sphere ("treason", "the will of heaven") to personal and gendered values. Valentine's fidelity and protection on one side, Raoul's duty and honour on the other, are incommensurable and the scene concludes with Valentine swoon and Raoul escape through the window to join the other Huguenots. The Parting was the most popular scene of the opera, and the drawing of this scene with Grisi and Mario made by Queen Victoria (8 May 1852) demonstrates its popularity. Camille Roqueplan's *Valentine et Raoul* (1836?) was "the iconic metonym for the opera and its message" (Letellier 2014: 172), but "Notice sur Les Huguenots" in *Les beautés de l'Opéra* also enjoyed wide circulation and contained ten line-etchings based on the theatrical performance in Paris, including the Parting scene (Gautier et al. 1845: 24), had

The moral contradiction and love triangle between Raoul, Valentine and her husband, is resolved in the scene near the end of the fifth act, that outlines the subtext of Millais' painting. Marcel has brought a group of Huguenots inside a church to protect them from the massacre raging throughout Paris, and in the adjacent cemetery, Raoul finds the injured Marcel. The two are ready to die with the other Huguenots inside the church, when Valentine arrives to inform Raoul that the Queen is ready to spare his life if he abjures his faith and that her husband was killed defending the Huguenots:

Val. Non, tu ne mourras point!... et le ciel qui m'inspire
Conduit mes pas!... Je viens te sauver.
Rao. Ce peut-il?
Val. Cette écharpe à ton bras… nous pouvons sans péril
Parvenir jusqu'au Louvre, et là dans sa clémence
La reine épargnera tes jours, si tu veux, toi…
Rao. Et que m'ordonne-t-on ?
Val. D'embrasser ma croyance.
(Meyerbeer 1909: 165)

Marcel's admonition ("*Ne vois-tu pas la main du Seigneur qui t'arrête?*") shakes up Raoul who chooses to stay with him until the end ("*Non, près de lui je reste pour mourir!*"). Valentine immediately abjures the Catholic faith ("*Tu maudissais mon culte, et j'adopte le tien!*") and asks Marcel to celebrate her marriage with Raoul before God (Trio: "*Savez-vous qu'en joignant vos mains*"). This "moment of farewell and funeral wedding" ("*Le moment des adieux et des noces funèbres*", Meyerbeer 1909: 167)) is the subject of *A Huguenot* subtext and the refrain that connects it to *Ophelia*.

After murdering the Huguenots inside the church, Catholic soldiers find Raoul, Valentine and Marcel in the cemetery, and carry them away, having refused to wear the Lorraine double cross and the white scarf. In the Finale, Raoul, Marcel and Valentine are shot by a company of arquebusiers commanded by Valentine's father, under the horrified gaze of Margaret of Valois, the notorious *Reine Margot*, wife of king Henry IV. Scribe's stage notes of the scene are very precise in the French libretto:

> A few murderers, who appear at the entrance of the crossroads on the right, call their companions and break the gate; they rush on the stage towards Raoul, Marcel, and Valentine, who, holding hands, advance slowly, offering their chests to the blows of the assassins. Astonished, they first withdraw a few steps, and then they return, surrounding them and presenting to each the cross of Lorraine and the white scarf. (Meyerbeer 1909: 169-70, my translation)
>
> [*Quelques meurtriers, qui paraissent à l'entrée du carrefour à droite, appellent leurs compagnons et brisent la grille; ils s'élancent sur le théâtre, se précipitent vers Raoul, Marcel et Valentine, qui, se tenant par la main, t'avancent lentement en offrant leur poitrine aux coups des assassins. Ceux-ci, étonnés, reculent d'abord quelques pat, puis ils reviennes les entourent, et leur présentant à chacun la croix de Lorraine et l'écharpe blanche.*]

The same Achille Deveria, on whose illustration Delacroix based his "Death of Ophelia" (1842), illustrated the cemetery scene in an etching (1836), that Millais may have seen on the front cover of the French libretto. His earliest preparatory drawings show Raoul and Valentine with other figures, in the "First Idea" (Millais 1905 v.1: 130) there is a monk on the left of the couple and a figure leaning forward on another figure laying in foreground, whereas the Second Idea (131) and Third Idea (137) show the couple standing and embracing, surrounded by a monk and soldiers, with a "white scarf" and a "Lorraine Cross" visible. The Fourth Idea (137) shows only the couple with the white scarf, after a monk standing on the right of the male figure was erased, and "Fifth and Final composition" (138) shows them facing each other in inverted positions, finally rearranged in the Birmingham Museum drawing (1852).

The progression of drawings is particularly insightful. First, the subject evolves from crude oppositions between spheres and gendered values into an intimate dialogue between the lovers made of subtle gestures and dynamic tensions. Second, if we are correct in inferring that

Raoul and Valentine's scene at the cemetery is the main reference for the scene depicted, this implies that Millais had already decided the composition before he begun the background wall (first recorded in his diary 20 October 1851, Millais 1900 v.1: 127). This contradicts Hunt's account but is consistent with Millais' usual way of working methodically from detailed preparatory drawings and very few pentimenti on canvas. Third, the scarves and the Lorraine cross presented by the Catholic soldiers to Raoul, Valentine and Marcel, which are visible in Millais' Third Idea, are not included in the Italian/English version of the libretto for the Royal Italian Opera production (they are only mentioned during the blessing of the swords in 3.4: "A questa bianca benda, / A questa doppia croce / Sian distinti gli eletti." translated as "By this white scarf, / And by this holy cross, / We shall be recognised." Meyerbeer 1851: 84/85). This detail may indicate that Millais consulted the French libretto by Eugène Scrive, and also support his son's statement that he had not seen *Les Huguenots* in performance until later.

Through the lens of the opera, other pictorial elements of *A Huguenot* become legible: the ring on the woman's right finger is consistent with Scrive's libretto, where Valentine had married Nevers the morning of the massacre. At the cemetery, having learned from Marcel that her husband died rescuing him from the Catholics ("*Oui, Nevers, ennemi généreux, /M'arrachant aux bourreaux dont j'étais la victime, / A succombé lui-même, assassiné par eux!*"), Valentine converts to Calvinism and marries Raoul, so that her ring in the shape of Hercules knot anticipates their wedding ("*Ingrat!... tu veux en vain que nos nœuds soient rompus*"). Owing to Pre-Raphaelite flattening of depth, the woman's lips appear to approach the Huguenot's gold medallion. This allusion to the Catholic/Tractarian sacrament of Eucharist (on sacraments in the Oxford Movement, see Herring 2016) is consistent with Valentine's imminent death and enriches the religious subtext of the painting, not least because it presents the perfect complement to the theme of repentance in *Ophelia.* Finally, the opera allows to interpret the iconography of the plants depicted in *A Huguenot* and place them in the context of the allegorical language common to *Ophelia* and Hunt's *The Hireling Shepherd.*

The setting of *A Huguenot* expands the scene into the allegorical register and, as in *Ophelia,* explains why Millais depicted plants that are not found in bloom together in late August, a detail that some contemporary critics considered an inaccuracy in both paintings. The four main plants of the painting have a precise iconographic meaning and are arranged in a cross centred on the couple. On the ground at left of the woman, a plant of Canterbury-bells (*Campanula Medium*, flowers May-June) symbolises her "warning and constancy" (Lehner and Lehner 2003: 114), alluding to the Grand Duet (3.5) when the tolling bell signals the

beginning of the massacre and Valentine tries to protect Raoul preventing him from joining his co-religionists ("Thou can'st with coldness see / My constancy and my love?).

Diametrically opposite, at the right of the Huguenot, the garden nasturtium (*Tropaeolum majus*, flowers June-October) symbolises the contrasting force of abjure. Iconographic sources about this plant obfuscate its meaning in the painting. "Patriotism" became prevalent in Victorian floriography (for instance, Reid 1847: 21) and is generally taken to express a positive virtue of Raoul (Briggs 2012). On the contrary, Millais is using the nasturtium idiosynchratically, to represent Roul's gesture of repelling the monk that he had sketched in the "Forth Idea" and then erased (1900 v.1: 137). All figures except the couple disappear in the fifth sketch (1900 v.1: 138; original "'A Huguenot.' Sketch of a Woman placing Chain and Cross round her Lover's Neck" in Birmingham), and in the final drawing ("'A Huguenot.' Compositional Study" also in Birmingham) a garden nasturtium appears in the same position. The substitution is explained by the French common name of the plant, *Grande Capucine*, that derives from a certain analogy of shape between the flower and the hood of Capuchin friars (Brown Friars).

At the feet of the couple, the red French rose turned towards the ground (*Rosa gallica* var. *officinalis,* flowers mid-summer) signifies their crushed hopes of a love relationship and is also prominent in the foreground of *Ophelia*. Finally, Millais uses the large ivy clambering the wall above the lover's heads not only to characterise the setting as a graveyard, but also because of the double meaning of the ivy encountered in Victorian funeral monuments, "wedded love" (Lehner and Lehner 2003: 119) and "eternal life". After the Catholic soldiers kill the Huguenots praying inside the church, Valentine converts to Calvinism and Marcel to celebrates her marriage with Raoul, aware of their fate ("Ah, yes, we know that soon / In heaven we shall be united."). With the same meaning of "funeral wedding" ("*noces funèbres*" Meyerbeer 1909: 167), Millais uses the ivy wreath motif on the frame he designed for *Ophelia* (it is English ivy, *Hedera helix,* in *A Huguenot* and Irish ivy, *Hedera Hibernica,* in *Ophelia*).

The small dome-shaped yellowish-green umbels of the ivy put a time stamp on Millais' accurate depiction of the mature plant at the bottom of Worchester Farm garden (Millais 1900 v.1: 127) and introduces an inconsistency between the painting's chronological time, indicated by the blooming ivy (September to November), and its narrative time, set in the morning of St Bartholomew's Day (24 August 1572, note that the cemetery scene in the opera occurs at night). As in *Ophelia*, Millais creates a multiple temporality that opens *A Huguenot* to a complex reading beyond the master narrative of the scene it presents. The Canterbury bell on the left, the nasturtium on the right, the cut rose on the ground and the ivy clambering on the

wall above the couple, form a cross with opposite symbolic values: domestic protection v. religious intolerance, romantic love v. eternal life. The quadrature intensifies the lovers' gestures and suspends them in an ecstatic moment that is neither chronological nor narrative.

This special relativity, as it were, that also characterises *Ophelia* as well other paintings by Millais, was not lost on George Eliot. After seeing Meyerbeer's opera (Royal Italian Opera, 1 May 1852, see Gray 1984: 6), she was deeply moved by *A Huguenot,* that was the only painting at the Royal Academy she seemed to notice: "Has Mr Bray described to you Millais' picture of 'the Huguenot Knight'? The face of the woman is never to be forgotten–I wish you could see it" (to Cara Bray, 27 May 1852, 1985: 97), and that she still remembered years later (to Sarah Hennell, 30 April 1864, 1985: 294).

The Black Brunswicker

Probably due to their production and reception history, the connection of *A Huguenot* with *Ophelia* is stronger than generally recognised. *A Huguenot* was Millais' favourite and an instant success, whereas *Ophelia* was closer to Hunt's ideas and became popular with the public only after Millais' breakthrough, with the exhibitions in Paris (*Exposition Universelle* 1855) and South Kensigton (1873) and especially, thanks to the circulation of the mezzotint by James Stephenson (1866; see Warner 2009), first published by Henry Graves who first bought the painting, but then distributed internationally by Ernest Gambart, who bought the painting from Graves (he owned *Ophelia* 1864-72). The allegorical language and the organisation on multiple temporalities are similar features of *A Huguenot* and *Ophelia*, but on the narrative level, is the Huguenot not facing the same dilemma as the Victorian Hamlet, who must choose between his love for Ophelia and his duty towards his father and the Crown which eventually prevails? (see for instance the commentary on the Nunnery Scene in Strachey 1848: 63; see also the ambivalence of the scene in Irving and Terry's performance, commented in Dawson 1997: 63) And is the Catholic woman not commending herself to God as she share the Huguenot's choice by not letting go of the white scarf she tied to his arm, echoing the Hercules knot of her ring and the ivy on the wall.

The node connecting *A Huguenot* to Meyerbeer's *Les Huguenots* and to *Ophelia*, is completed by an even stronger connection to Millais' *The Black Brunswicker* (1860) in which he deliberately revisits and expands his composition of a standing couple torn apart by history and contrary values:

> My subject appears to me, too, most fortunate, and Russell [William Howard Russell, *The Times* correspondent] thinks it first-rate. It is connected with the Brunswick Cavalry at Waterloo. 'Brunswickers' they were called, and were composed of the best gentlemen in Germany. They wore a black uniform with – death's head and cross-bones, and gave and received no quarter. They were nearly annihilated, but performed prodigies of valour. It is with respect to their having worn crape on their arms in token of mourning that I require some information ; and as it will be a perfect pendant to *The Huguenot*, I intend making the sweetheart of a young soldier sewing- it round his arm, and vainly supplicating him to keep from the bugle-call to arms. I have it all in my mind's eye, and fed confident that it will be a prodigious success. The costume and incident are so powerful that I am astonished it has never bee n touched upon before. Russell was quite struck with it, and he is the best man for knowing the public taste. Nothing could be kinder than his interest; and he is to set about getting all the information that is required. (Millais 1900 v.1: 352-3)

The scandal of Effie's separation from Ruskin (1854), their marriage (1855) and Scottish exile (1855-7), added economic pressure to Millais' artistic transformation, already under way since *A Huguenot*. He reacted in 1859 rebooting his career with a "commercial Pre-Raphaelite picture" (Barlow 2005: 55) that explicitly self-referenced the painting that had resolved the Pre-Raphaelite crisis. At the same time, *The Black Brunswicker* is not a "pendant" of *A Huguenot* because they have similar compositions, but rather because Millais uses similarity to express their contraposition in meaning. This aspect is apparent as soon as one compares the woman's look affix on the Huguenot's eyes, with the downcast look of the woman in *The Black Brunswicker*:

> The Black Runswicker, however, regards the lady with a look of sad determination, an pain that she should not value, as he does, the call of duty, — and standing upright, with her head nigh to his breast, would press himself away, regardless of her entreaties. The lady, whose face is towards us half-fretfully resists and standing between him and the door — so that to escape he must needs push her aside–bends down her countenance, bearing signs of pique at his heedlessness. (Athenaeum 1860: 620)

The pet in question is a dachshund, a breed that became popular in England after Queen Victoria and Prince Albert imported their first pair from Germany in 1840, "Waldman" and "Waldina" (see Prince Albert and Queen Victoria's drawings of Waldman and his portrait by Edwin Landseer 1841). The Queen is reported to have said that "nothing will turn a man's home into a castle more quickly and effectively than a Dachshund" and Millais uses the pet to allegorise the woman's wish, associating the dachshund's black coat with the Brunswicker's uniform and its crimson collar matching the bows tied around her sleeves of her white satin ball dress. Millais imagines the scene at the "Duchess of Richmond's Ball" hosted in Brussels for British and their Prussian allies gathering their forces against Napoleon, who had regained power. Late in the evening, the Duke of Wellington arrives at the ball with the news that Napoleon is marching towards Brussels, and the guests must immediately prepare to meet the French in battle at Quatre Bras, only thirty kilometres South of the city (16 June 1815. See Millais 1900 v.1: 356).

By the summer of 1859, the British were in another invasion scare. Napoleon III had accused Britain of complicity in Felice Orsini's assassination attempt on the Emperor and Empress (14 January 1858), and had entered the Second Italian War of Independence against Austrian Empire (29 April – 11 July 1859). Heeding to public pressure, the Parliament authorized the formation of volunteer rifle corps to be called out "in case of actual invasion, or of appearance of an enemy in force on the coast, or in case of rebellion arising in either of these emergencies" and the artist Edward Sterling launched the idea of the "Artists Rifles" with his fellow students at Carey's School of Art (Charlotte Street, Bloomsbury). Millais, Hunt and Rossetti, among others, became founding members of the 38th Middlesex (Artists') Rifle Volunteers regiment, formed a few months later (28 February 1860) under the command of the painter Henry Wyndham Phillips (Cunningham 1975).

The framed engraving by Antonio Gibert (1809) after Jacques-Louis David's famous paintings *Napoleon Crossing the Alps* (1801, first version), placed in *The Black Brunswicker* top left corner is an allusion to the battle awaiting the Black Brunswicker, and to Napoleon III's recent campaign in Italy against Austria. Although such a subject seems unlikely in the setting he imagined, as a critic noticed, the accurate representation of Gibert's print and the contrast it produces within the gilded frame and emerald-green wallpaper that surround it, raise this fragment to the degree of allegory. Millais' picture within a picture is a Baroque paragone of painting and engraving, not only because it represents in painting an engraving of another painting, but also because it is a mise-en-abyme of *The Black Brunswicker* itself, when the detail is Millais' painting is compared to that in Thomas Atkinson's etching (1864), that Millais had already agreed with Gambart when he sold him the painting "for one thousand guineas" (about £62,085.66 in 2017, Millais 1900 v.1: 354).

The counter position to *The Huguenot* is not only established by the figures but also by their setting. The wallpaper is analogue to the cemetery wall with its damask pattern that echoes the clambering ivy, and its emerald-green colour. Closely related of Scheele's green invented by the Swedish chemist Carl Wilhelm Scheele in 1775, emerald green is another extremely toxic arsenic and verdigris compound pigment, created in 1814 by the German industrialist Wilhelm Sattler. It became an instant favourite with designers and manufacturers thanks to its easy low-cost production, and its versatility for creating enduring yellows, vivid greens, and brilliant blues. The arsenic-laced pigment was widely used in the intricate patterns and bright colours increasingly in vogue in Victorian homes, not only in wallpaper, but also in carpets, curtains, tapestry, upholstery, toys, dresses, etc. By 1858, a manufacturer could venture an estimate that as many as 100 million square miles of arsenic-coloured paper were to be found

on the walls of British homes, and Alfred Taylor, called as a witness before the 1858 parliamentary committee considering "a bill to regulate the keeping and sale of poisons" (British Medical Journal 1859: 173), observed that wallpaper now "furnishes arsenic to the million" (Whorton 2010; Hawksley 2016).

It was only in 1857, that the Birmingham medical doctor William Hinds published his long observations on the toxicity of wallpapers produced with volatile arsenic compounds, and as late as 1885, William Morris refused to believe that his wallpapers were toxic (letter to Thomas Wardle, 3 October):

> I cannot imagine it possible that the amount of lead which might be in a paper could give people lead poisoning. Still there should not be lead in them: especially, by the way, in the red one: I can understand Chromate of lead being in the green ones but surely in very small quantities. As to the arsenic scare a greater folly it is hardly possible to imagine: the doctors were bitten as people were bitten by the witch fever. I will see Warner next week to try to get to the bottom of the matter. My belief about it all is that doctors find their patients ailing don't know what's the matter with them, and in despair put it down to the wall papers when they probably ought to put it down to the water closet, which I believe to be the source of all illness. (1984: 463)

Following Hinds' publication, reports of arsenic poisoning begun to circulate in the press, where Millais would have picked up the news, as a regular reader of *The Times* and always up to date on the latest innovations in colour thanks to Hunt, who started using emerald green at least since *Our English Coasts* (1853, see Hackney 1982: 57; the green in *Ophelia* is a mixture of Prussian blue and chrome yellow, see Ball 2003: 163). It is no coincidence that wallpaper in *The Black Brunswicker* should be painted with the specific green that George Field calls in his *Chromatography* "*true* Brunswick Green" (1835: 130; first found in Mulready from 1842, Townsend 1996: 184).

The "pendant to *The Huguenot*" goes beyond a reworking the same idea (contra Prettejohn 2012) but revising his former position about religion and women. The English lady, modelled by Charles Dickens' daughter, the artist Kate Perugini (on the sitting, see Hawksley 2018), is very different from the passionate and sensual Catholic woman of *The Huguenot* admired by Eliot. The unidentifiable English woman of *The Black Brunswicker* does not support her lover's lofty ideals and sense of duty and holding the doorknob with her right hand she stands on his way and gently pushes him back. Meanwhile, the Brunswicker in black uniform is ready to leave and with his right hand, is pulling the door gently towards him, wrapping his other arm around his hat, decorated with the skull and crossbones badge of his volunteer regiment is a reminder of the Black Brunswickers' death oath to revenge Charles William Ferdinand, the Duke of Brunswick who died fighting Napoleon in the battle of Jena (1806), and possibly Millais' allusion to the volunteers movement against Napoleon III.

Death in *The Black Brunswicker* does not unite the lovers but drives them instead further apart. Their contrasting gestures are accentuated by their expressions, on which the reviewer of *The Spectator* elaborates with confidence:

> As we read the picture, the young hussar, bound by the fatal oath of his regiment, expresses not anger at being opposed, but that pang of regret that hovers always round our most cherished moments of happiness; -- till this time, he only fancied that she loved him; now, the truth breaks upon him at the instant of parting for ever. The fair girl has been surprised into a silent, but not less forcible and touching sign of her love – instinctively she has seized the handle of the door, and at the same moment meets him as he presses foreword – she leans upon his breast and hangs her head, ashamed in her natural modesty to find her secret confessed. That we are able to perceive all this romantic story and much more in the vista of their acquaintance at Brussels, denotes the noble purpose of the painter and his great faculty of execution. (Spectator 1860: 456)

This typical mid-Victorian review, bent on telling the painting's story and judging artist on its "execution", offers a plausible reconstruction of Millais' scene, that retraces Raoul and Valentine's Grand Duet in Meyerbeer's *The Huguenots ("Ô ciel! où courez-vous?"* 6.4 / " Oh, heaven! where are you going?" 5.3). Things look quite different, however, beneath the superficial melodrama. The anxiety-ridden lovers of *The Black Brunswicker* are trapped in a claustrophobic room, each inside its own gendered and incommensurable sphere, one of duty and honour for the Brunswicker, the other of domesticity and sentiment for the "fair girl". The outcome of the silly tug of war she engages with the Brunswicker is clearly anticipated: Napoleon's horse rears up as the First Consul incites his troops up the Great St Bernard Pass, whereas the dachshund stands on its back paws, mimicking her gesture. Even love, in which the couple of *The Huguenot* transcended their situation, has become an obstacle to the Brunswicker's action and a shame for the woman's modesty.

The whole picture is scattered with *memento mori.* The Huguenot's purple coat (the liturgical colour of Lent) now lays at the Brunswicker's feet, fully dressed in black (the liturgical colour at funerals). The gold medal, to which the Catholic woman was approaching her lips as if receiving a host, is skull and crossbones, a death wish for the Brunswicker and forebode for the English lady. The graveyard wall that protected the couple from the massacre outside, has become a poisonous wallpaper "that has "crinkled" away from the wall" (Spielman 1898: 81). The engraving showing the heroic fantasy of the young officer (is it hers too?), the badge of his death wish, the dachshund slain in perspective by the sabre, and a genuine Lacanian spot, the other half of the Brunswicker's left hand hidden behind the door.

In face of Napoleon's III renewed threat of invasion, Millais may have wanted to draw attention to the dangers of military unpreparedness, that the recent parliamentary inquest into the conduct of Crimean War had exposed (1856). Maybe the painting was a reminder of the

spirit of Waterloo, as the Anglo-German alliance against France was deteriorating, or a way of showing support for the political project that Prince Albert promoted until his death (1861), and underlies Daniel Maclise's monumental mural for the House of Lords, *The Meeting of Wellington and Blücher after the Battle of Waterloo* (cartoon 1858-9, exhibited in the Royal Gallery at the Palace of Westminster in 1859; mural 1861, begun January 1860 and completed in Winter 1861; on the decline of Anglo-German relations from 1860, see Kennedy 1980). Or else, the painting is Millais' new fantasy about himself as heroic Brunswicker rather than Huguenot martyr.

Changing Discourse

At the peak of domesticity (Tosh 1998) and in the midst of a marriage crisis, if one gives credit to the rumours (Cooper 2010), Millais seems to embrace the ideology of separate spheres he had previously critiqued. For instance, St Anne mother of John the Baptist and Mary mother of Jesus are both at work with Joseph and his apprentice in *The Carpenter's Shop*, and *The Huguenot* presented a love relationship based on intimacy, shared values and mutual care, that George Sand described as "an evangel of religion and love" (referring to Meyerbeer's opera, Letellier 2014: 46; see also her letter to Meyerbeer from September 1836, in Sand 1847: 304 ff.).

Millais' religious beliefs, informed by the Oxford Movement and Christian Chartism, infused by Medievalism, practised and preached in painting, came to a clash with the public. The adverse reactions to *The Carpenter's Shop* that more clearly embodied his believes, led Millais' practice to a bifurcation:

Ophelia (1851-2) … *The Blind Girl* (1856)
The Carpenter's Shop (1850) -<
A Huguenot (1851) … *The Black Brunswicker* (1860)

The lineage following *Ophelia* is characterised by a strong moral subtext that concealed allegorically under an apparent master narrative, determines the meaning of the painting as a whole. The lineage following *A Huguenot* is characterised by a weak subtext that, if at all present, is subdued and buried by the master narrative that determines the overall moral message of the painting. Although the two lineages are not as clear cut as our our reconstruction may suggest, and the *Ophelia* line only accounts for a minority of Millais' works, they allow nonetheless to recognise a polarity and alternation in the artist's position with respect to the

implied viewer. This provides a critical insight into Millais' career, understanding his artistic practice together with his commercial success, as a careful mix of narrative text and allegorical subtext, carefully calibrated on the public response Millais kept monitored at academy exhibitions, in the press and increasingly, through sales.

Millais did not break from Pre-Raphaelitism, simply because this was not a Modernist movement based on ideas against the common sense of its public, but on beliefs (artistic, religious, moral, political) negotiated within the public sphere. Something had got to give in order to maintain the communicative dimension of his practice, and Millais sacrificed the painting-sermon principle with observable consequences. On one hand, the ontological statute of painting was compromised by exchanging absolute truth of religion for relative truthfulness to "Nature." On the other, Millais brought the allegorical register he had developed with Hunt and Rossetti, back within the limits of the visual trope, when it failed to fulfil the moral function the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood had initially hoped, that is the performative moment defining Romantic irony as "the permanent parabasis of the allegory of tropes" (De Man 1996: 179).

The resignation from critique and irony is apparent when comparing the two lineages. Beneath the *femme fragile* Ophelia received from late Romantic interpretations of the character, Millais presents to the discerning viewer a new Ophelia, a repentant and redeemed f*emme perdue,* veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols. This double operation of concealing and revealing, allows the artist to retain some of his former role as preacher and administer moral truth to the public with greater caution. Millais almost gives up this ironic distance in *A Huguenot*, aligning himself with the response he elicits from the viewer and subordinating the allegorical subtext to the master narrative. While the woman's love and the man's duty are allegorically transfigured into faith and martyrdom, Millais hesitates to articulate in painting the critique of sectarian intolerance that Meyerbeer had achieved in his opera. Millais transformation from a preacher without a public to an artist in tune with the public is described by a change in the Lacanian discourse prevalent in the picture that is, the way in which artist and public socially interact through the medium: from the discourse of the university (S2 —> a) in *The Carpenter's Shop* and to a lesser extent, in *Ophelia*, to the discourse of the hysteric in *A Huguenot* ($ —> S1).

In as much as Victorian narrative painting is "story-telling" (Thomas 2000: 9) with a hybrid nature the picture presents itself to the viewer as a chimeric monster, as the Sphinx threatening Oedipus with its riddle: "Tell me! who am I?" Thus, the artist's speech act to the implied viewer is first, a command to the Other to speak and then, a question of interpretation. The intended viewer will provide an answer (S1 / S2): "You are …" sealing a contract with the

artist, acknowledging the artist for his artistic knowledge in exchange for a recognition of its power. Its currency is meaning that the artist "executes" in painting and the viewer "reads" in the picture. The circuit is closed when the viewer's answer returns to the artist in form of a surplus of meaning and jouissance (S2 —> $). Because of the asymmetry between text and image on the one hand, and between knowledge and power on the other, the message that the artist receives back from the place of the Other is not identical to his message to the viewer (see the "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'" in Lacan 2006). The riddle always exceeds the viewer's capacity for interpretation and the surplus meaning that the artist receives back not only as text (a statement, a review, a criticism, etc.) but especially as social status, professional and institutional prestige and money, will increase the artist's symbolic debt towards the public that "made" him.

When the hysteric artist exposes the insufficiency of the answer offered by the Other whatever the answer to its riddle, he (or she, in as much as the artist mentioned here is only a placeholder for the implied author of the painting) makes visible the lack in the public that the artist seeks to occupy with the riddle. Identified with the Other's lack, the hysteric can fantasize of becoming the Other's desire in three moves. First, the artist presenting his chimeric picture, uncovers the lack in Other; second, the artist offers himself entirely to plug up that hole in the Other; finally, the artist reproaches the public's for failing to understand the picture, but only in so far as the Other is reduced to another that failed.

The artist's final move is by no means ironic in De Man's sense, but farcical, because the artist does not deny the castration of the Other (the Other does not exist) as much as represses his own, all the more becoming the imaginary phallus in the Other's fantasy and increasing his symbolic debt to the public. By taking away his desire and replacing it with a fantasy, the artist avoids dealing with the anxiety of castration at the centre of artistic production, that John Keats, a main source of the Pre-Raphaelites, calls "negative capability" reporyting a discussion with the writer and critic Charles Wentworth Dilke in a letter to his brothers (December 1807):

> . . . several things dovetailed in my mind, & at once it struck me, what quality went to form a Man of Achievement especially in Literature & which Shakespeare possessed so enormously – I mean *Negative Capability*, that is when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason – Coleridge, for instance, would let go by a fine isolated verisimilitude caught from the Penetralium of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half knowledge. (Keats 1958 v.1: 193-4)

There is, behind the sacrificial offering of the artist who wants to be "all for the Other," the wish to find the absolute viewer, to whom all the meaning he put in the painting for him

would be understandable. This con-fusion is represented in Lacan's formula of hysteric fantasy in Seminar 17 on Transference (Lacan 2015: 250):

$a / (- \varphi) <> A$

"Desire for the Other" is elaborated in the algorithm of the hysteric discourse as the relation of impotence below the bar (a // S2). Here, the viewer's jouissance as meaning about painting produced in discourse, is substituted by the artist for truth about his own desire. On one side, the artist identifies with the picture, as for instance Millais did with the Catholic girl in *A Huguenot* or Ophelia, and on the other, he identifies the public with that primordial Father posited by Freud in *Totem and Taboo*, that, complete but always already dead, the artist sustains beyond all contradictions with his allegories "in its baroqueness and its superfluousness" (Lacan 2007: 101), a love fantasy for the perfect Master.

Allegory, that was integral to enunciation in *Ophelia* and in *A Huguenot*, to a lesser extent, is demoted to an "artistic device" (De Man 1996: 169) in *The Black Brunswicker*, when the public shows no appetite for Millais' programme of artistic and moral reform. Here, it merely functions to support the master narrative and the artist's fantasy, propping up the lack of artistic truth beneath the story-telling and especially, allowing the artist to slip away as object of desire (Lacan 2006: 698), the masquerade in which the hysteric consists (Riviére 1991). That is why, although death allegories are frequent throughout Millais' production from his early *Isabella* (1849) to *The Vale of Rest* (1858-9) and *The Black Brunswicker* (1860) and even in the late landscapes, such as *Flowing to the River* (1871) up until *Dew-Drenched Furze* (1889–90), the exuberance of variations is less important than the function of the allegories within the composition, either ironical or more often, repetitive and conventional. Benjamin's dictum that "truth is the death of intention" underlays its opposition to allegory:

> Truth does not enter into relationships, particularly intentional ones. The object of knowledge, determined as it is by the intention inherent in the concept, is not the truth. Truth is an intentionless state of being, made up of ideas. The proper approach to it is not therefore one of intention and knowledge, but rather a total immersion and absorption in it. Truth is the death of intention. This, indeed, is just what could be meant by the story of the veiled image of Sais, the unveiling of which was fatal for whomsoever thought thereby to learn the truth. It is not some enigmatic cruelty in actual meaning which brings this about, but the very nature of truth, in the face of which even the purest fire of the spirit of inquiry is quenched. The mode of being in the world of appearances is quite different from the being of truth, which is something ideal. The structure of truth, then, demands a mode of being which in its lack of intentionality resembles the simple existence of things, but which is superior in its permanence. Truth is not an intent which realizes itself in empirical reality; it is the power which determines the essence of this empirical reality. (Benjamin 1998: 35-6)

Allegory, as "artistic device", is both intentional and conventional (Benjamin 1998: 175) and thus, belongs to the discursive knowledge that veils truth. On the other hand, Millais' ironic use of allegory, constructs the allegorical subtext that confronts the viewer who identifies with

the painting's master narrative and may subvert it. It is Romantic irony rather than the allegoric mode per se, which the Pre-Raphaelites believed to have brought back from the early Renaissance, that qualified a minor lineage of Millais' production as sermons. In the "melancholy immersion" of his paintings, Millais constructs an allegory of salvation:

> In God's world the allegorist awakens. 'Yea, when the Highest come; to reap the harvest from the graveyard, / then I, a death's head, will be an angel's countenance.' This solves the riddle of the most fragmented, the most defunct, the most dispersed. Allegory, of course, thereby loses everything that was most peculiar to it: the secret, privileged knowledge, the arbitrary rule in the realm of dead objects, the supposed infinity of a world without hope. All this vanishes with this *one* about-turn, in which the immersion of allegory has to clear away the final phantasmagoria of the objective and, left entirely to its own devices, re-discovers itself, not playfully in the earthly world of things, but seriously under the eyes of heaven. And this is the essence of melancholy immersion: that its ultimate objects, in which it believes it can most fully secure for itself that which is vile, turn into allegories, and that these allegories fill out and deny the void in which they are represented, just as, ultimately, the intention does not faithfully rest in the contemplation of bones, but faithlessly leaps forward to the idea of resurrection. (Benjamin 1998: 232-3)

Through it paintings such as Ophelia open to artistic truth, that is the truth about the painting's own desire, not as knowledge produced by speech, but the "power" that causes it:

> What happens then, when we want to repress a truth? The whole history of tyranny is there to give the answer: It is expressed elsewhere, in another register, in a ciphered, clandestine language. Well, this is exactly what is produced with consciousness. Truth, the repressed, will persist, though transposed to another language, the neurotic language. Except that we are no longer capable of saying at that moment who is the subject speaking; but, that "it" speaks, that it continues to speak. It happens that it is entirely decipherable in the manner that we are decipherable, which means, not without difficulty, it's a lost writing. Truth has not been annihilated, it has not fallen into an abyss. It is still there, given, present, but turned into unconscious. The subject who has repressed truth is not the master anymore, he is not at the center of his discourse; things continue to function alone and discourse continues to articulate itself, but "outside the subject." And this place, this "outside the subject," is exactly what we call the unconscious. You can clearly see that what we have lost is not the truth; it is the key to the new language in which it is expressed from then on. (Lacan 1957)

Millais' progressive disengagement from Pre-Raphaelitism and the change of discourse, is less a betrayal than a process of artistic maturation in search of his voice, freer from the textual overdetermination programmatic to the movement. This artistic achievement is exemplified by Millais' diploma work at the Royal Academy, *A Souvenir of Velazquez* (1868). The quotation of Diego Velasquez's *Portrait of the Infanta Margarita* (1653) he rediscovered during his recent visit to the Louvre (1865), the economy of means close to that of Whistler (Prettejohn 2009), and the conscious use of a conventional allegory, take on the significance of a declaration of independence from that institutional context. As industrial capitalism reshaped the English art market from the 1850s (Beyer and Page 2011), "poetry and painting supplemented the pulpit if they did not actually replace it" (Altick 1973: 272). Millais' artistic maturation across economic crises and through commercial success, reinforced one another, without this necessarily confirming Willaim Morris' remark that Millais had become "a genius

bought and sold and thrown away" (reviewing *An Idyll of 1747* at the Royal Academy, 1884: 81). Millais' desire was fully formed before 1850, as this passing remark shows:

> Millais, she [Mrs Combe] added, one day said to Mr. Combe, "People had better buy my pictures now, when I am working for fame, than a few years later, when I shall be married and working for a wife and children. (Millais 1900 v.1: 89)

The discourse of the university and that of the hysteric share the same goal of power (S1) the former in its fundamental fantasy (S1 // $), the other in its speech act ($ —> S1) so that the double lineage from *Ophelia* and *A Huguenot* combines the two discourses along the vertical axis of the discourse of capitalism, which Lacan discovered by hybridizing the other four ($ —> S1 —> S2 —> a).

Rather than desire, the discourse of capitalism is constructed to emulate the drive, as Marx had realised (Tomšič 2015). It starts with the subject addressing power in the place of truth and closes the circuit with desire in the place of surplus jouissance returning to the subject and consuming it at every new iteration of the algorithm (Vanheule 2016). It should come as no surprise that the fundamental fantasy of the discourse (S1 // a) is the very recovery of truth through discourse, that initially inspired the Pre-Raphaelite movement. Because the subject ($) is split between signification and desire, the capitalist fantasy promises to make the subject whole again (un-castrated) by supplying to the master signifier (S1) its product as the lost object (a). The double substitution of the subject ($) for its signifier (S1 … S2), and of the object cause of desire (lack) for an object of jouissance (commodity), constitutes fantasy as hegemonic ideology (modified from Glynos 2001). It is this "truth" to which Millais' allegories ultimately refer, rather than salvation as he may have wished. The skull and crossbones in *The Black Brunswicker* and the other memento mori, is where the sermon of the preacher meets the vanity of the artist in the commodity of the painting, and correspond to the skull, pre-Raphaelite and proto-Capitalist, in Holbein's *Ambassadors.* These allegories all show "something that is simply the subject as annihilated — annihilated in the form that is, strictly speaking, the imaged embodiment of the *minus-phi* of castration, which for us, centres the whole organization of the desires through the framework of the fundamental drives." (Lacan 1993: 88-9).

While recognising in Millais the "allegorical genius" that Benjamin recognised in Baudelaire (Benjamin 2006: 40), the theorem stated by Scottish capitalist Samuel Laing that "Art flourishes in inverse proportion to Capitalism" (Porter 1991a: 265) raises important questions about the relationship between capitalism and art in Victorian Britain (on the debate, see Porter 1991a; 1991b; Wohl 1991; Schmiechen 1991) and there are sufficient examples of

"rank escapism" (Porter 1991a: 254) produced under the conditions of an expanding and inflationary art market to reduce Millais to this. Lacan's discourse of capitalism affords instead a different interpretation of Millais' work where the religious enthusiasm and anti-academism of the Pre-Raphaelite years morphed into faith in the civilising and moralising power of Capital and Empire. Protected by an ideological bubble that suspended Laing's theorem for the artist and the public, Millais could, with some caution and considerable freedom, the three sides of the capitalist discourse, the "Business Artist" to borrow Warhol's expression (1977), the preacher and the hysteric artist.

Appendix. Fee (A Meta-Fiction)

> . . . I have remembrances of yours
> That I have longed long to redeliver.
> (*Ham.* 3.1.92-3)

> For the signifier is a unique unit of being which, by its very nature, is the symbol of but an absence. This is why we cannot say of the purloined letter that, like other objects, it must be *or* not be somewhere but rather that, unlike them, it will be *and* will not be where it is wherever it goes. (Lacan 2006: 17)

> "Who is the nymph; where does she come from?" Jolles asked Warburg in their 1900 Florence exchange regarding the female figure in movement painted by Ghirlandaio in the Tornabuoni chapel. Warburg's response sounds peremptory, at least superficially: . . . The nymph is the image of the image. (Agamben, 2011: 72, 79)

Story of a Letter

> I believe that we cannot know what philosophy is until we have dealt with these questions: about the fiancée, about the friend, about what a friend is. —Gilles Deleuze[1]

Hamlet was 31 when he took his own life.[2] A small crowd attended his funeral at St Giles although, after he had left hospital, he was living privately in the large house in Denmark Hill where he grew up, caring for his disabled mother. His generosity, honesty and edgy wit had kept his old friends and gained him some new ones of which I pride myself on being the closest. We met frequently to discuss art, literature, and politics. He came for dinner to my house several times, and my wife and children joined me at his birthday party. And here is the irony: I was his psychiatrist at the hospital, and I was the one who discharged him and drove him home, remaining his psychotherapist and guardian until his tragic end.[3]

As the London press duly reported on Hamlet's mental illness, sparing no detail it could find or fabricating one, when unable to find any, these details are already known to the public. Hamlet had spent a few weeks in prison for assault, the seriousness of which was greatly exaggerated in the news. In the psychiatric assessment, he was diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia[4] and sent to compulsory psychiatric treatment at the hospital where I was

---

[1] From "F as in Fidelity" in the film interview *Gilles Deleuze from A to Z*, Boutang 2011.

[2] Deduced from *Ham.* 5.123-4.

[3] Hamlet's mental health is compatible with guardianship order under the Mental Health Act 1983, see Department of Health and Social Care 2015: 342-348

[4] "Schizophrenia Paranoid Type" in DSM-4 (American Psychiatric Association. 1994: 287). Schizophrenia subtypes are removed and the 'schizophrenia spectrum' is introduced from DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association. 2013: 87 ff.) For Hamlet's diagnosis, see Theodore Lidz's *Hamlet's enemy: Madness and myth in Hamlet* (1975).

inpatient consultant psychiatrist. His father's death followed shortly after by his mother's remarriage, of which he strongly disapproved, had a devastating effect on Hamlet's mental health, yet he showed no clinical symptom during the treatment and within a few months, he was assessed, and transferred in my guardianship.[5]

The dramatic events that occurred during Hamlet's hospitalisation, were important factors in that decision. Hamlet's stepfather and mother were returning home from a party late one night. He was drunk driving and speeding and crashed into a car arriving in the opposite direction. He and the other driver were instantly killed, while Hamlet's mother was brought to the hospital in critical conditions. She lost the use of her legs and when she was discharged, Hamlet asked to move back in with her. He was a deeply transformed person,[6] assisting his mother in her daily needs and scrupulously keeping his appointments. He begun a strict diet to fight the weight gain induced by hospital medication, and having been a fencing Olympic,[7] he was keen to get back in training.[8] He was also planning to resume the PhD at Wittenberg he had interrupted when his father died, when Hamlet's mother suddenly died from stroke. When sorrows come, they don't arrive one at a time, but in armies[9] and her death was too much for Hamlet to bear. Only few weeks after her funeral, Hamlet took his own life with cold determination.

He remembered his confinement at the hospital as his "prison" and used to call me a "merciful pirate"[10] with affection and some understandable bitterness. For his last year, I was his psychotherapist, his guardian and his friend. Most of the time, these roles stood comfortably side by side, sometimes they conflicted and more often than not, they helped each other. The rapid progress after Hamlet returned home, gave mutual impulse to our friendship. After, the sense of guilt and self-doubt I was feeling for Hamlet's death, fed on my grief and tore my professional practice apart.

For the first time, Hamlet had missed his appointment and was not returning my calls, so I decided to pay him a visit before going home that evening. I begun to worry only when he did not open the door and let myself in, using the key he had given me "just in case". I found him lying in his mother's bed many hours too late, a half bottle of Evian and several empty

[5] An allusion to an alternative Closet Scene (*Ham.* 3.4) that in the play resulted in Hamlet's accidental killing of Polonius and exile to England.

[6] Mary Floyd-Wilson argues that the pirates kidnapping completely transformed Hamlet (2009).

[7] An allusion to a curiosity of the 2016 Summer Olympics in Rio de Janeiro, where "Denmark's only Olympic fencer … is a Brit" (James 2016).

[8] Hamlet tells Horatio that he is fit in *Ham.* 5.2.184-6.

[9] A paraphrase of *Ham.* 4.5.77-8.

[10] *Ham.* 4.6.17.

tubes of his mother's painkillers and sleeping pills, neatly arranged on the night table. He did not leave a note but there was no doubt in the coroner's mind about what had happened. Only I could not believe what had just happened, that I did not see it coming, that I could not prevent it. All I needed to do was check on him that morning, as soon as he did not answer the phone.

His lawyer informed me that Hamlet had made a will and had appointed me his executor. He left me his precious desk and chair, his papers and library. The remaining of his estate, he left "unconditionally" to his former fiancée, Ophelia.[11] Hamlet's mother had been very fond of Ophelia[12] and after Hamlet broke up with her, the two had kept in touch. From one of Ophelia's letters to her, I learned that she had married one of her tutors and had moved to the Virgin Islands[13]. I sent her a letter explaining what had happened and a copy of Hamlet's last will. In her reply, Ophelia gently and firmly refused to accept her inheritance, asking me to send her only her own letters to Hamlet and the few personal objects that she had given him during their short but intense engagement.

Thus, Hamlet's estate ended up to a cousin of his living in Norway,[14] who sold the house to a developer and auctioned its entire contents after I removed what Hamlet had left me. I placed Hamlet's writing desk[15] in my practice in front of the rear window, where it used to stand in Hamlet's study. It is a Victorian mahogany desk with a low back and a hinged writing slope flanked by two drawers. The slope and top are inset with three red leather panels, and the frieze beneath is fitted with three shallow drawers. Two banks of three drawers raised on pedestals leave just enough leg room when I sit on the comfortable cane seat of the armchair.[16]

The deep bottom drawers of the desk contained twenty-seven A4 black notebooks, that Hamlet minutely inscribed every other line in pencil. Some bold corrections and highlights are made in red and blue pencil, otherwise Hamlet's frequent revisions and additions are written with a finer pencil, squeezed between the lines in a micrographic hard to read handwriting. I tried to persuade him to use a personal computer and went as far as to procure him a laptop for his thirtieth. He reported that staring at the screen made him sick and soon became convinced

[11] "It is naturally my will that my former fiancée . . . should inherit unconditionally what little I leave behind. If she herself refuses to accept it, it is offered to her on the condition that she act as trustee for its distribution to the poor. What I wish to express is that for me an engagement was and is just as binding as a marriage, and that therefore my estate is to revert to her in exactly the same manner as if I had been married to her." (Garff 2017: 91). The parallel between Ophelia and Kirkegaard's fiancée Regine Olsen, that is alluded here and in Deleuze's epigraph, is not developed in this letter.

[12] Cf. *Ham.* 5.11.211-13.

[13] Regine Olsen's life followed her husband Frederik Schlegel when he was appointed governor of the Danish West Indies (Garff 2017: 51-2).

[14] Cf. *Ham.* 5.2.334-5.

[15] A detail from Kierkegaard's *Either Or. Part I.* (1987: 25-8).

[16] The description is based on Dickens' desk (Agency 2015).

that the computer was spying on him.[17] He preferred his pencil, submissive and always ready everywhere, scratching and coiling on the paper, cautious and sceptic as his thoughts. I found the laptop stored in one of the drawers, a couple of usernames and passwords scribbled on a yellow post-it stuck to the cover and nothing inside worth mentioning.

The notebooks are stacked in chronological order and the entries usually undated, span from before Hamlet's PhD in Wittenberg until his mother's death. Sections are of irregular length, separated by double space, and of varied and discontinuous content: journal entries, notes of lectures, reading notes and comments, annotated references, drafts of essays and letters. After Hamlet returned home, I recommended him to write letters to someone he cared about to deal with his grief, closure, and anger. These therapeutic letters covering the last four notebooks, Hamlet addressed to Ophelia, weaving together personal, sentimental, erotic, and critical writing. In one of them (15 May 2014), Hamlet tells her he wants to resume his PhD at Wittenberg the coming year and change the title of his thesis in "something like *The Artist as Critic*". A few pages after this letter, he observes that "J[ohn] E[verett] M[illais]'s Ophelia is the most popular British painting yet did not deserve the attention of a monograph or at least an article" He declared that his thesis will "address this regrettable gap in art criticism" and dedicated it "to my late father and to her."[18]

When I completed my duties as Hamlet's executor, I was feeling so spent and disconnected from my patients that my work as psychiatrist and psychotherapist had become impossible. I am thankful to my psychiatrist supervisor for urging me to take a break from my practice and make good use of my leave to write. Thus, I approached Hamlet's *Doktorvater* at the University of Halle-Wittenberg, proposing that I would submit on Hamlet's behalf a thesis based on his notebooks, and asking him to recommend Hamlet for a posthumous doctoral degree. I am thankful to Professor Philip Melanchthon, who always held Hamlet's "noble mind"[19] in esteem and nourished great expectations for his academic future, for receiving my proposal with enthusiasm and making Hamlet's thesis submission possible. The thesis was built upon Hamlet's unsent letters to Ophelia, starting from the first, dated 9 May 2014, in which the idea of a work on Millais' *Ophelia* first emerges. We publish here the full text of this letter for the first time, divided in sections and supplemented by notes and references extracted from Hamlet's notebooks.

---

[17] Cf. *Ham.* 2.2.160-4; 3.4.1-5. The detail is based on Tan, Shea and Kopala 1997: 143.

[18] Garff 2017: 223.

[19] *Ham.* 3.1.144.

In all, the thesis remains conjectural at best, and my interventions have been considerable. Although I kept to the principle of least action, it might easily be objected that the theoretical and in this context, most necessary work consists precisely of the writing which Hamlet could not have done himself, raising issues about the authorship of his thesis. Yet, I refused to separate my voice from that of my friend in any way, not to detract any value from Hamlet's work and, by doing so, from my own. I might defend that choice by reminding that our textual weaving approaches Shakespeare's "artisanal authorship," finally acknowledged in the *New Oxford Shakespeare*;[20] or that our non-collaboration is reminiscent of that author-editor relationship that created David Foster Wallace's posthumous masterpiece *The Pale King*;[21] or even that, from a philosophical point of view, our undifferentiation in the text puts into practice Hamlet's substitution of assemblage for authorship, which he did not allow the past to pass. To me personally, however, the questions Gilles Deleuze raises "about the fiancée, about the friend, about what a friend is." find their answer in the severality that Hamlet himself was.

The first reader of the thesis was my psychiatrist supervisor, to whom I am grateful, once more, for her careful comments, corrections and suggestions that ensued. Ophelia was the second reader explaining the how and why of the project and asked whether she had any objection to divulge what of her relationship with Hamlet she could recognise in the text. I also took that opportunity to inform her that Hamlet had left her one last thing. In a private sale at Christie's, closed the week before he died, he had bought back at considerable loss, his "mother's painting" mentioned in the letter. Although Hamlet had arranged to have the painting delivered to me, it was apparent he meant it as a special gift to Ophelia. While she encouraged me to make use of Hamlet's papers as I deemed proper, I did not expect that Ophelia would reject the painting, saying that she "could not bear to look at it, and never had." She always felt it was "depressing and stuffy" and had "an eerie hold on Hamlet" but now, she was also "mad at Hamlet for using a trick to press that . . . painting on her,"[22] and quoted "Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind."[23] She concluded that it would probably be best if I kept the painting as her personal gift to me.

---

[20] "The artisan is not a Kantian free intelligence: the artisan is a cyborg in the sense developed by Donna Harraway in "Cyborg Manifesto". A shifting assemblage of humans, tools, and raw materials inhabiting a specific environment, the artisan can survive only by manufacturing artificial objects desired by others." (Taylor 2017: 23).

[21] On 12 September 2008, David Foster Wallace hung himself in his house in Claremont, CA at age 46. The material of his third novel was composed and published three years later by his friend and editor Michael Pietsch, see "Editor's Note" in David Foster Wallace's *The Pale King. An Unfinished Novel.* (2011: 6-15).

[22] *Ham.* 1.3.14-6.

[23] *Ham.* 3.1.101.

As I write this preface, Hamlet's and Ophelia's painting, a Victorian copy of Millais' *Ophelia* at Tate Britain, hangs in my psychiatric practice by the window above Hamlet's desk. I wonder what words Hamlet might have used to introduce his letter, whether he would have disapproved of its publication or would have anything to say about what I wrote here on his behalf, about his story, her story, and mine. Nothing at all, I presume.[24]

To Ophelia (9 May 2014)

Denmark Hill,[25] 9 May 2014

Dear Fee,

thank you for the fantastic[26] flowers you sent on mother's birthday. She was delighted, especially because they came from you,[27] and I am sure she would have written in person, had she been able. She made a good recovery, but still cannot hold a pen or do many things unassisted. She probably never will, as the doctors had to admit at the end of her convalescence. When I realised that she would need constant care, I could not bring myself to return to my PhD in Wittenberg.[28] I simply had to stay.

---

[24] Cf. *Ham.* 5.2.337.

[25] Denmark Hill is a road in Camberwell (SE5), between the London Boroughs of Southwark and Lambeth. It derives its name from a hunting residence of Prince George of Denmark and Norway, Duke of Cumberland (1653 – 1708) and consort to Queen Anne (1683). Imagined to be located at 163 Denmark Hill, the location of Hamlet's house was not only chosen for its obvious reference to the play, but also its pychogeographical reference to John Millais. On the grounds of what is Cross Court in the Denmark Hill housing estate (opened 1954), stood until 1947 the Bessemer Grange and Ruskin Manor Hotel, a complex that combined the estates once owned by Henry Bessemer and John Ruskin. The art critic lived in the large, detached house with garden for nearly thirty years (1843-1872) (Weinreb e Hibbert 1995: 230) and wrote the letters to The Times and the pamphlet Pre-Raphaelitism that projected the Pre-Raphaelites into notoriety after the RA show of 1851 (Ruskin 2012). It is this house that John Millais frequents and grows a passion for Euphemia Grey, Ruskin's wife whom he marries in 1855, the year after the scandalous dissolution of their marriage (Moyle 2009: 74-5).

[26] Shakespeare's Ophelia is decorating a willow with 'fantastic garlands' (Hamlet 4.7.166) when she falls in the river below. The shift between the adjective in the play, where it means 'elaborate' (Shakespeare 2006: 407, n166), and its common informal use here, meaning 'extraordinarily good or attractive' (Oxford Dictionary of English 2015) points towards the time difference.

[27] Gertrude comments explicitly on Ophelia's relation to her son at the funeral, 'I hoped thou shouldst have been my Hamlet's wife' (*Ham.* 5.1.233) distancing herself from Ophelia's father and brother, who considered their relation inappropriate.

[28] Shakespeare's Hamlet is also a student at the University of Wittenberg, founded in 1502 by Frederick the Wise, Duke of Saxony and made famous throughout the Reformed world by Martin Luther, who held the chair of Theology in Wittenberg from 1512 to his death in 1546. Although the play does not specify when Hamlet returned to the Danish court, it is plausible that he left his studies in Wittenberg to attend his father's funeral, a few weeks before the sighting of the Ghost with which the play begins. His plans to return to Wittenberg would confirm this assumption (*Ham.* 1.1.113, 119) and so would the summoning to court of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, probably Hamlet's fellow students at Wittenberg (2.2). On the other hand, Hamlet's first meeting with Horatio, who arrived from Wittenberg for the same reason, fits awkwardly with this interpretation (Bradley 1905: 403-6). Revenging his father prevents Hamlet from ever returning to Wittenberg.

Mother's Painting

This was her first birthday after the accident [1][29] and the first we spent together since my father died. I suggested going to the theatre, as we used to do before she got remarried. I bought us two tickets for *Henry IV*, but when we arrived at the Donmar, I found out that it was not Shakespeare we were about see. [2] In this other *Henry IV* by Pirandello, Henry is a rich Italian aristocrat of the early 1900s. During the costume horse ride, he had minutely prepared, Henry takes a fall and when he regains consciousness, believes to be the character he was masquerading, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV. His sister locks him up in a secluded villa, perfectly furnished as a medieval palace, so that he can continue to act out his madness, humoured by an old butler and four actors paid to keep up the fiction by impersonating the emperor's privy counsellors. The play is set twenty years after Henry's accident, when his nephew Carlo Di Nolli visits the villa with a psychiatrist in a final attempt of cure. They are accompanied by Matilda, Henry's ex-girlfriend, Tito Belcredi, Matilda's partner and Henry's one-time romantic rival, and Frida, Matilda and Tito's nineteen-year-old daughter and Carlo's betrothed.

Henry has lost touch with reality because of the trauma [3] and the psychiatrist plans to hot-wire his memory. He stages staging a little play in the play (in the play) with Matilda, Tito and Frida, who is identical to her mother at the time of Henry's relation with her. As you could expect, things do not end well. Henry admits he had already recovered his memory eight years before and accuses Tito of having caused his accident to take Matilda away from him. He then blames Frida for having a part in the mousetrap and assaults her. When Tito tries to stop him, Henry gets hold of a sword and sleighs him. Tito is carried away and dies shortly after, while Henry conveniently reassumes his feigned madness 'now and forever'. [4]

There and then, I felt quite embarrassed, but Mother didn't seem to mind seeing a different and shorter play which we both enjoyed in the end. One scene in particular stayed with me until later that evening. The stage is dominated by two portraits of Henry and Matilda in costume, somehow painted during the historical pageant. One of the privy counsellors remarks how they work as mirrors "reflecting back a world which comes to life in them". [5] When everything is set up for the re-enactment, Matilda sees with envy in the painting her daughter Frida young and beautiful as she was then, and Henry sees with anger the character that imprisons him. Their double stares at them and for a moment, they feel the uncanny

[29] A double system of footnotes marked by superscript numerals, and endnotes marked by numerals in square brackets, is required to distinguish academic from fictional metatext. A similar usage is found in David Foster Wallace's novel *Infinite Jest* (e.g., 2006: 983, n.5).

presence of the real and its unbearable anxiety. It reminded me of Mother's painting hanging above the fireplace in the front room: you said it was 'yours' as soon as you saw it.[30] When I moved back, I had it quietly auctioned. I could no longer bare you staring at me every time I entered the room, but that evening I longed for your silent indictment and regretted it was gone. You know well 'How deeper than all longing is regret!' [6] and resolved to go and see it again.

Water and Oil

The following morning after breakfast, I took the 185 bus on the opposite side of the road and got off at Pimlico. I walked towards Tate's new entrance and as I crossed the road, Thomas Brock's monument of John Millais emerged from behind the foliage of a plane tree. [1] It had been long since my last visit and I can still remember that before the Centennial Development Millais stood at the left of the main entrance, facing the river, both projecting the museum into the city and protecting it from the city, as a new acropolis. Now in the middle of the sidewalk between a Belisha beacon and a bicycle rack, Millais got something of a posh lollipop man, holding his oversized palette in three-piece suit and waiting for pedestrians to arrive from Pimlico station. The monument disappears quickly as I turn the corner on Attenbury Street, leaving the impression that some awkward compromise had to be struck between Millais' Victorian values [2] and commercial success, Romantic fictions of the artist, Tate's legacy and national heritage, private investments, and shiny New Museology.

The sweet smell of mid-morning cappuccinos expanding through the Manton foyer, lures me to a cluttered coffee area, where I can savour the anticipation of Mother's painting carried in 'curatorial triumph' before going up to main floor. As I mounted, David Tremlett's mural started to vibrate, as if the entire collection was about to tumble down that lifeless gorge. The intense sensation of colour wrested of painting made me even more uneasy finding the 'national collection of British art' branded with a corporate logo and a tagline. 'BP Walk through British Art' captures in a single phrase the capitalist gaze, corporate yet national, active yet cultural, penetrating art and instilling meaning and function — the high-reliefs languishing above Millbank entrance, are they not reminding the visitor that art is invariably passive and female?

An open vestibule prepares the art-goer to the galleries. First, Thomas Brock's bronze bust of Henry Tate displayed next to the blurb, [3] validates the sponsor by associating it with Tate's foundation myth. Then, on the other side of the entrance, the timeline 'Collecting British

[30] Mother's Painting is based on a fine Victorian copy after Millais' *Ophelia*, sold at Christie's 3 September 2008 for £10,000 (Live Auction 5402, Victorian and Traditionalist Pictures, Lot 169).

Art' justifies the corporate branding, constructing a genealogy from Early Modern private collectors. Following the golden line of the infographics, I find a small photo of Mother's painting in the left corner to mark the year of Henry Tate's bequest. You must be thinking I am being squeamish about the privatisation of culture, but I can assure you that I wouldn't have paid much attention to it, had it not been for that old argument we had. Remember?

We were lounging away the Sunday morning in the front-room, when you passed me an Italian Vogue, that Mother must have brought back from her last travel. It was open on a fashion editorial by Steven Meisel. Crude oil seemed dripping from the top of the page onto an innocent title 'Water and Oil', printed in knockout on a double spread photograph of Kristen McMenamy. [4] The colours are subdued and cold, she is laying on a rocky shore in feather gilet and high heels while a black oil streak gushes from her arm. In the following pages, she wears one leather glove with feather rim, as if it was the puppet of a bird dripping oil from its beak; she gasps for breath in an black astrakhan overcoat; she lays on her stomach in a black dress with a long fishnet skirt spread wide as a mermaid's tail; in a close-up, she stares blankly with her face and ash-blond hair completely covered in oil; she reclines on a jagged rock with her legs dangling in the oily water; she lays in a black silk dress enveloped in smoke; in a black and white double page she holds her throat while coughing out sea water; she lays in recovery position on an oil patch; she looks zombie-like while a jet of water washes the oil from her D&G dress; she lays on her side next to a pier, she embraces a rock with her eyes are shut.

Reports and images of the burning rig, emergency teams, gashing oil, polluted coast, agonising birds, rotting fish, distraught fishermen, activists, police, technicians, spokesmen, politicians had long faded from the top news, but the BP oil spill had been too terrible to disappear from memory, not to become a major motion picture. We argued for a while, but whether those photos were exploiting the sublime of disaster, or allegorizing the incommensurable catastrophe, remained perfectly undecidable. Bourgeois melancholy submerged us gradually, while contemplating Mother's painting above the mantelpiece: 'Till that her garments, heavy with their drink, / Pull'd the poor wretch from her melodious lay / To muddy death.' you quoted.[31]

Queen Elizabeth I

Be as it may, I left these thoughts behind and walked through the doorway: '1540' warns a brass inlay on the floor. What a sad image of time! but inside, my mood was lifted entirely,

[31] *Ham.* 4.3.182.

no doors or barriers distracting the eye, natural light emanating softly and evenly from the ceiling, the light grey of the walls parsing the paintings, lower hanging height and discreet labels affording a casual encounter. For the first time, I notice a full-length life-size portrait of Elizabeth I, [1] splendidly standing in three-quarters at the centre of burnished gold, sumptuous reds, and a swath of emerald. She wears a French gown in russet velvet, with matching forepart, slashed sleeves and a red rose surrounded by oak leaves on the left shoulder. The shoulder rolls and the arched neckline of the bodice frame an embroidered linen partlet with a pink-starched neck ruff. Her blond curly hair gathered in a caul, are crowned by a golden diadem with green sprigs of mirth, sacred to Venus. A long necklace with roses of garnets, sapphires, and pearls, finishes in a large pendant fastened to her bodice and a long pearl girdle falls along her gown twisted and knotted, finishing in a rectangular pendant surmounted by an armillary.

The white foundation exalts the delicate pink of her lips and cheeks, and the piercing look in her dark eyes, still sunken after the smallpox the year before. Her arms are slightly raised, almost anxious: her left hand touches the side of the gown, showing her slender ring finger and delicately holding a pair of gloves, bridal gift; her right rests on a throne finial as if it were a regal orb, with her thumb and index holding a red carnation and closed together in a subtle gesture of union. Occupied only by a large golden pillow, the golden throne is empty and merges with the background of golden brocatelle, decorated with the Royal Arms above the throne and stylised wreaths, one of them encircling Elisabeth’s head.

Luxuriant leaves, flowers in bloom and ripe fruits, laden with conflicting symbols of sovereignty and marriage, virginity, and fertility, fill up a space between the edge of the hanging and the edge of the picture, as wide as Elizabeth’s shoulders. This is no door to an enclosed garden, though. The disposition of the stems, leaves, and fruits on top of each other, the stand in the bottom right corner and a vertical bar behind the leaves along left side, do not attempt to disguise the artificial floral arrangement mounted on a trellis inside a shallow closet.

The closet frame painted in red, marks the inviolable border with the throne room. A withered fig-leaf, symbol of the Fall, scarcely touches the inside of the border, and a leg of the stand with a lion’s paw, symbol of her character, is kept from crossing it. Beyond the red line, a recent restoration of the painting revealed a painted-over area. The Turkish carpet on which Elizabeth is standing, finishes in line with the tapestry, while the golden underlay is shown to continue beyond the picture edge. The brocade has been pulled away from the closet frame up to the carpet line revealing on the floorboard, that has been uncovered, covered and recovered, a small scrap of paper caught under the closet frame. The carpet, the underlay and the cartellino repeat the room, the hanging and the floral arrangement. Only this time, the screen behind the

screen behind the screen is empty: nothing was ever written on that paper and a later inscription painted across the floorboard, has been erased and remains illegible.

In the representational space of the picture, three spaces must meet which do not belong to the same order: the room on both sides of the picture and the cartellino with the missing writings belong to the Real by metonymy; the Symbolic includes the hanging, the throne, the carpet and also the picture as a whole; of the symbols in the closet and Elizabeth's allusive look are of the order of the Imaginary. However, where they meet cannot be anything within the picture and its order, it is the very way in which the orders are precariously knotted together, the object-cause of the picture's desire that cannot be depicted. This is why Elizabeth must hide the spot with her gown and by doing so, she takes up its semblance.

Where is she looking? — I wonder. In an official portrait 'alluding to her status as a prospective bride', as the display caption states, I should have expected Elizabeth to look towards the viewer and potential groom. Instead, she is looking straight in front of her, as if the visitor announced by the symbols in the picture, had arrived. He just entered the throne room and is walking towards her. He sees Elizabeth next to the empty throne, her political body, but he cannot see the closet behind, her natural body that marries and gives birth. The visitor and Elizabeth cannot see the closet, and neither is looking at us, viewers and subjects, as if we were not there. Instead, we are there and we can see Elizabeth between the throne and the closet, and finally, the visitor. As he stand on her right, she says to him: 'Here is my hand, / My dear lover Englande / I am thine both with mind and heart, / For ever to endure, / Thou maiest be sure, / Until death us do part.' [2]

Lacan retells us the tale of a contest between two painters. One paints a bunch of grapes on the wall that attract some birds inside trying to peck them off the wall. The other paints a curtain making the first painter to exclaim: 'Now lift the curtain and show us what you painted!' These are the two positions between which the viewer of the Hampden Portrait oscillate. On the one side it is a mirror, not unlike the portraits in Pirandello's Henry, that reflects the demands of the viewer's desire (the cabinet), on the other side it is a curtain that by frustrating the eye's identification with that phantasy, suggests a real object of desire beyond the painting (the guest). When I looked at the time and walked into the 1650 room, it became apparent to me that the painters had rigged their contest to ensnare me in her fascination!

Susanna and the Elders

There again, as if a century had not passed, 'Susanna and the Elders' [1] play 'eye and gaze'. Remarkably similar to the Countess of Kildare on the same wall, or Lely's merry beauties of Windsor, Susanna wears a décolletage-bearing white linen dress, swathed in black silk. She appears to be perched on an allegorical fountain, while two men stand next to her on the right side of the picture. The older of the two in the background, holds a corner of Susanna's dress above her shoulder, peering into her doe eyes. The other man in foreground staring at her cherry-red lips, stretches his left hand to grab her arm. With her left hand, Susanna is holding her dress gathered over her bosom and with her right, she gestures that she is about to escape but at the same time, she turned her head back towards the man in foreground and is looking at him in the eyes.

A storm is about to break but all is still, all movements are frozen. The stone putto spouts water from his winkie and blows vigorously in his flute, but all is quiet and nobody speaks, contrast of movement and diegetic sound. Unlike other representations of the motif that the painter knew or might have known, Lely does not even insist on Susanna's body: her bath, curvy nakedness, frightened reaction, expression of shame, knowing wink at the men inside and outside the picture (I know that they are watching me and that you know that I know, and I know that you are watching me too and that they don't know, and we all know how wrong it is to watch and to be watched.) Nor does Lely tell the story of two nameless perverts (partial drives sadism and scopophilia) instead, he stages symbolic violence in a field of visibility and reveals the whole scopic regime, which Susanna and you, dearest Fee, must know well by now.

The precision and restraint of the composition together with the theatrical gestures and expressions of the characters construct the ambiguity of what the painting exactly depicts. It might be showing Susanna immediately after she is blackmailed by the two men, when her flight response yields to the realisation that running away cannot save her: either she surrenders to their sexual demands, or they will accuse her of adultery and have her sentenced to death. Alternatively, it might be showing the two men preventing Susanna from running away, after she was surprised with her lover who managed to escape. What else could a beautiful young woman be doing alone at dusk in a hidden corner of a park?

Of course, this is not how the story ends and the remainder too feeds into the picture. Both Susanna and the two men call for help. The next day at the trial, the assembly sides with her powerful accusers, but as Susanna is led to her execution, young prophet Daniel intervenes to her rescue. Exposed by his cross-examination, the two men are convicted of perjury and sentenced to death, while Susanna is acquitted and released. But the whole action of this written

and painted drama, revolves around the absence of eyewitnesses, who is watching from the blind spot that engulfs the entire picture? He makes sure nobody is around and without making a noise, removes the painting from the wall revealing a large hole in the masonry with a small hole inside. He fits his face in the large hole and a beam of light pricks his eye. “She is taking off her skirt, her …” “Move! it’s my turn now!” but she has already gone. I lift my eye and while I carefully replace the painting on the whole, he turns towards the door. “What is it? Did anybody see us?” He did not answer and rushed towards his Mother. Nobody saw us, [2] Who is watching from where I stand? And who is watching me? Indeed, Tate was built on Bentham’s Panopticon! [3]

Pamela Writing

The fourth wall is impenetrable in the 1730 room, as if I had never existed, as in the group of four small paintings by Joseph Highmore illustrating Samuel Richardson’s epistolary novel *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* [1] in which Highmore’s daughter Susanna features as Richardson’s controversial protagonist, Pamela Andrews. In the first of the twelve paintings closely following the novel, “Mr B. finds Pamela writing” a letter to tell her parents that the kind Lady B, whom she has been waiting for the past three years, died of her illness. Especially recommended by Lady B’s in her last words to her son, Mr B hires Pamela as his linen maid allowing her to provide her parents some financial support. Expressing all her gratitude towards Mr B for the Mourning money and the extra four guineas she received, Pamela describes how she intends to send her parents the four gold coins through the footman, wrapped in paper and sealed in one of Lady B’s pill boxes.

The incident depicted by Highmore occurs after Pamela finishes her letter, as she immediately reports in a post-script. She is sitting at a tea table at the centre of what used to be Lady B’s dressing room, wearing a black and white maid outfit and a bonnet gathering her dark hair. On the table in front of her lay two sheets of blotting paper and a white writing box, the mirror image of the one Highmore painted on Samuel Richardson’s desk a few years later [2] Holding the quilt mid-air over her bosom and with her left hand turning over the sheet of paper she is writing, Pamela raises her dark doe-eyes.

On her right side, Mr B flings the door open towards me and steps into the room with his right foot. Still holding the door handle with his right, he stretches out the other arm towards Pamela in a demanding gesture. Pamela raises her eyes and strikes Mr B at the heart, while his line-of-sight travels through Pamela’s quill to her letter on the table and misses because, if he

were to look past it, he would have seen his own face reflected in the dark mirror tilted towards him. On the toiletry table next to it, Highmore places another margin note to Richardson's text, Lady B's pill box red as a beating heart on a folded sheet of white paper are ready to receive Pamela's gold. Further along the wall in the right corner, a bookcase shows leather-bound tomes spreading wide its glass doors, one door frontal against the rear wall giving no reflection and the other pointing sideways towards me hinting with the room door to my pyramid of vision. Pamela takes a book from the second shelf but changes her mind and leaves it on the Georgian chair in the left corner to write her letter at the table. The illustrated copy of John Cleland's Fanny Hill leans against the back of the chair, presenting the back cover with its black slit-shaped ornament to the fold in Mr B's justacorps bulging from his crotch.

A landscape with a scene hangs above the mantlepiece, as once did Mother's painting in our front room. Pamela's head in front of its bottom right corner interrupts the frame and her eye enters the picture which illustrates rather conventionally the parable of the Good Samaritan. The motif popular in Dutch painting may well refer allegorically to Lady B's charitable spirit and 'underline the traditional values of the heroine', as the display caption states, or ironically to the 'friendship' that Mr B bestows on Pamela. I suspect that there is more to it than this, that it is a mise en abyme of the scene happening in front of it or better, its reflection inscribing the subject itself in the field of objects. [3]

The picture in the picture is very different from the Good Samaritan that Highmore painted the following year but is close enough to a small pencil study he did which is also at Tate. However, the composition has been rearranged, making now discernible the correspondence with whole picture. The warm sunset light that enters the dressing room from a window behind me is the same illuminating the Good Samaritan (see the shadow of the horse and the lighting on the two main figures). On the left side, the Samaritan's horse has turned its head to look at the scene, as I am doing too, keeping my eyes straight at the centre of the picture, where the horse has its front left knee. On the other side of the picture in the picture, the good Samaritan attends the victim that lays unconscious on the ground, as Mr B stands next to Pamela sitting at the table. In the background, a Catholic priest in profile exits the picture on the right with his front already out of frame, complementing Mr B in profile who enters the main picture on the left with his back still behind the door. Further in background, a woman is about to disappear behind two ominous-looking tree stubs, as she walks away from the scene towards a distant city. Here is all of Pamela's primal scene as she imagines it: the woman walking away as the natural mother who left her to the care of Lady B; the Catholic priest as Lady B herself who dies and once more, leaves her to the care of Mr B; the Samaritan as Mr B

who will rescue her and beyond him, in the shadow of Pamela's anxieties, her father desire ready to jump over the picture frame.

'Who have you been writing to, Pamela?" asks Mr B surprising Pamela at the table. Without fright or shame, [4] as Lely's Susanna, she languidly turns over her letter to the side, trying hard not to hide it from him and thinking to herself 'What does he want of me?' Pamela's quill writes what Mr B wants to read, while the black shadow of the table-stand creeps up her white apron and seeps through the paper as an ink blotch. The passage to the act interrupts the circuit of the gaze in the seventh painting of the series, when Mr B attempts to rape Pamela and she faints. At this obscene and excessive event, Mr B recoils in shame (Pamela doesn't have it) and redeems himself, following which Pamela accepts to surrender her writings and becomes author.

Three Ladies

I need not say to you, dear Ophelia, that a letter always reaches its destination, eventually. The content does not really matter, as much as to whom it is addressed, and how it circulates. It may even be the long and sinuous festoon of flowers in Joshua Reynolds' 'Three Ladies' that hangs opposite the entrance of the small 1760 room. [1] The 'Irish Graces' are portrayed in the grand manner while enacting a private rite to the god of marriage in their father's estate. The youngest sister Barbara, who will marry the following year [2], kneels on the left side of the picture wearing a loose pseudo-classical dress, dip-dyed in venetian red. Her right is about to pick a rose from the basket at her feet and with her left she is holding up the festoon for the eldest sister, kneeling on a stool wrapped in a Turkish carpet. The elder Elizabeth, wearing another fancy dress in Reynolds' bitumen brown [3] and sandals, points towards the basket, maybe asking for a rose, and holds up with her left the festoon for her newlywed sister Anne. She is depicted past the term in a fancy white dress, holding the festoon with both hands raised above her head as if about to wreath the term. Instead, something above Elizabeth's head seems to have caught her eye.

To protect the intimacy of the sister's sacrifice, a Titian red backcloth has been tied to the largest of the three birches in background and flutters in the summer breeze behind the disquieting term. Hymen waits to be crowned with a flaming torch resting in his right arm. Possibly hiding the identity of George Townsend who commissioned the painting for his fiancée Elisabeth, a deep shadow blurs the face of the young god except for one eye shining through and looking straight at me. While Anne is lost in contemplation, the wind blows her

muslin belt dangerously near the fire that burns on the stone altar at her left. [4] One of the ram heads decorating its corners, seems to pour its evil look in a silver ewer below that on its smooth and polished surface reflects my face, as a black stain in a convex mirror.

Lady Macbeth

A noise in the 1810 room calls my attention. It is pitch dark, but two figures seem to emanate an eerie electric glow [1] A woman draws a curtain on the right and whooshes across the room, hovering as a ghost with her long white dress and veil. She is tall with dark curly hair, large deep eyes and a strong profile. [2] Holding her finger against the lips as if in doubt, she stares towards the man in cuirass and tights who is entering the room through the narrow door in front of her. Dishevelled and pale as a living dead, he is holding two daggers with stretched arms. Rather, it is the daggers that are pulling him forward, as if animated by the blood dripping off their tips. When her fierce eyes meet his horror, Macbeth cries: ‘I have done the deed!’ According to their plan, Lady Macbeth has drugged the king’s grooms (*Mac*. 2.2.1) so that while they sleep, Macbeth can kill Duncan and then frame them (*Mac*. 2.3.95-7). Instead, Macbeth besides himself with horror, takes the daggers with him. In the hall downstairs, he faces Lady Macbeth who urges him to stick to the plan (*Mac*. 2.2.51-3). As the murder replays in Macbeth’s mind and he refuses to go back to the crime scene at which Lady Macbeth intimates: ‘Infirm of purpose! Give me the daggers.’ (*Mac*. 2.2.55-6)

Although perspective, lighting, setting, costumes suggest a theatrical performance, Fuseli reinvents the scene that David Garrick and Hannah Pritchard performed at Drury Lane, changing their costumes, faces and possibly gestures. [3] There is no description of Macbeth raising the daggers towards Lady Macbeth, his distorted face resembles Fuseli’s self-portraits, and his costume isn’t Garrick’s red military coat, but a gentleman’s day outfit. A fold in Macbeth's long waistcoat mimics a fear erection pointed towards Lady Macbeth’s hoop petticoat, frenzied with desire. Standing in profile as one of the Weird Sisters, [4] Lady Macbeth’s gesture silences and commands her husband, forcing him into submission. In the shadow projected by her hand on the wall behind, I recognise the silhouette of a hound ready to attack a stag or a wild boar, as in a hunting scene by Frans Snyders or the *Horse Attacked by a Lion* in the other room. [5]

The story time moved forward in the pen and ink drawing that Fuseli made in Rome a few years later. In the foreground on the left side of the sketchbook page, Macbeth now wears a Roman cuirass and stockings, and is twisted in a theatrical gesture of aversion [6], while Lady

Macbeth walks towards the door on the right. Ecstatic with evil, she waves her white tunic and the daggers, dancing as the maenad with castanets on the Borghese Vase [7].

Something of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth returns from the previous drawings, but this painting is entirely new. The story time has moved backwards to the very beginning of the scene, when the two meet again immediately after Duncan's murder. They hear noises but the hall, the stage and the picture are in total darkness until a lightning reveals them to each other and creates this gothic image: ‘My husband!’ In that obscurity, there isn't enough light to discern the details and colours of their bodies, nor enough time to analyse the flux of their passions. We can only see that they are no longer human and feel, as Thomas de Quincey once observed, the sublime terror of Fuseli’s Hell. [8]

Flatford Mill

A growl reminded me that lunchtime had passed, and I grew impatient to cut my visit short. I was heading straight to room 1850, when a strange sensation took me by surprise. It came from a patch of green in Constable, [1] a compound of three large ash trees, their deep shadow on the verdant Stour bank and a sunny meadow behind. There and then, it felt like mother’s painting, when I entered the front room in the early morning and a bright strip of sunshine made it shine like an emerald. If I think about it, though, Millais and Constable’s greens, seemingly so close, couldn’t be further apart. [2] Constable simply invented the colour green and, as every true invention deserves, it has its myth of origin, the experiment in which he uses a violin to demonstrate that grass is green. [3]

One has only to look back in the other room to realise that before him nature was only brown. Look at Brooke Boothby’s portrait, for instance. [4] In a bright summer day at Ashbourne Hall, Boothby lays down next to a stream to think. He contrives a pose of spontaneity leaning against the trunk of a large beech, with the right finger supporting his cogitation and with the left hand, carelessly folding Rousseau’s *Dialogues* against the ground. [5] Each plant is accurately drawn and recognisable to the discerning eye, [6] but still the undergrowth is painted in a uniform greenish brown and the trees are suspended in Reynolds’ perennial autumn. If one of Gainsborough’s landscapes hung next to *Flatford Mill*, [7] Constable’s invention would be apparent, each plant recognisable through sharper details [8] and specific greens [9] intensified by naturalistic chiaroscuro. [10]

Constable tried out pigments as soon as they became available on the market, but with caution, and his friendship with George Field should not be underestimated, but that came later.

[11] The green in my favourite Gainsborough, *Mr and Mrs Andrews*, [12] is the same as in *Wivenhoe Park*, my favourite Constable (the delicacy of the cows' rose snouts and udders in the sunshine … the tiny figure at the window looking at the viewer from the mansion … the subtle convexity of the pictorial space …). [13] The invention of green cannot lay in new technology (a pigment) or knowledge (optical colour mixing) but in a new sensation that appears in the history of the eye, the same sensation that appalled the Royal Academicians [14] and excited Eugene Delacroix when he first saw his paintings in Paris. [15]

It is often repeated that Delacroix was so inspired by Constable at the 1824 Salon, that he took down the *Massacre at Chios* to retouch it [16] and during his trip to England the following year, Constable would have revealed to him that 'the superiority of the green he uses for his meadows derives from the fact that it is composed of a multitude of different greens'. [17] An episode that fits different stories, Delacroix seeks support for a crucial painting that had launched his career and stirred controversy at the Salon of 1824, [18] Leslie sees in Constable's success in France a lesser substitute of the success he would have deserved at home, [19] Paul Signac draws a genealogy of optical colour mixing from Constable through Delacroix to the post-impressionists, [20] Herbert draws another from Constable to Cézanne to Picasso [21] stories of a new sensations. [22]

In a lecture at the Royal Institution, Constable said that paintings are experiments, quite a statement for an artist at a scientific institution, [23] and one that the next generation of painters sought to disprove claiming that they are sermons. On the other hand, that meaning is already implicit in a painting by Wright of Derby [24] depicting an experiment performed at candlelight in a dark salon under a full moon. [25] The candle is placed on the central round table but hidden to the viewer and together with the other objects writes the story of the demonstration: the Magdeburg hemispheres, [26] the bottle half full of water with a straw and a cork, [27] the lungs floating in the jar in front of the candle [28] and a totemic air pump [29] and a cockatoo in its glass receiver, where the drama culminates. [30] The bird flatters the wings in pain and terror, as the air is pumped out of the bell, and she is about to asphyxiate. [31] We are standing in front of the table, watching with the rest of the public: the little girl and her elder sister frightened for their pet bird while their father preaches about the necessity of it all, the self-absorbed lovers, the boy fascinated by the bird's pain, the philosopher mediating on death, the dedicated scientist measuring how long the bird can last, the young servant holding the birdcage, unsure whether it will be needed again. [32]

With the same frenzied look as Colin Clive's in *Frankenstein*, [33] the demonstrator gestures his question to us, while he lays his left hand on the valve at the top of the bell, ready

to let the air in and spare the bird, only just in time. His look meets ours on the other side of the canvas, [34] connecting scientific experiment with moral painting, the public with the viewer, the performance with the picture, the bird's pain indefinitely repeatable with its agony infinitely suspended. [35] However, representational spaces remain distinct as are the demonstrator's question whether the bird will revive once the air is left in again, and the painter's question whether it is right to make an animal suffer. By converting the object of the experiment into a moral subject, [36] Wright presents a new *paragone* not between painting in relation to other arts as in the Renaissance, but in relation to science and philosophy. To some extent, painting matches science in showing empirical phenomena (the Royal Society's motto was 'Take nobody's word for it') but at the same time it exceeds it by showing psychological phenomena and social interaction. Moral is one of painting's fields of enquiry as in philosophy, but where the latter seeks to (verbally) explain 'the secret springs and principles, by which the human mind is actuated in its operations' [37], painting can (visually) induce passions, such as sympathy for the little girl and her pet cockatoo. In this sense, *An Experiment* not only depicts a scientific experiment, but also performs a psychological experiment on the viewer.

In his last years, Wright went on painting picturesque views around Arkwright's cotton mills [38] and the scope of *An Experiment*, the paragone, seems forgotten. Constable's landscapes might not be as picturesque as they appear at first sight, [39] yet it is not at all obvious why they should be experiments. A hint might come from another lecture at the Royal Institution when Constable seems to connect in a single process, the understanding of the landscape by the painter and the affect of the picture on the viewer. [40] Here, the relation between the experienced landscape and the painted figure is not mimetic, in the same way as Wright's bird in the air pump does not resemble the vacuum it demonstrates, nor are painter and viewer connected through the common form of perspective, but immediately relate to each other in painting. [41] Constable once wrote that 'painting is but another word for feeling', and feeling, or sensation as I would rather say, becomes the matter of the experiment, as air was in Wright's picture, following the schema of a proportion 'landscape : sensation ~ sensation : picture.' [42] The truthfulness of the picture to the landscape is not determined optically, but experientially through sensation. Constable corresponds to Wright's air pump, rather than to its demonstrator and his experiment consists in finding the pictorial analogon [43] of his experienced landscape. Such analogon is the green in *Flatford Mill* that strikes thought with the force of sensation. [44]

Whereas Baudelaire's correspondences are derivative of the *flâneur's* equations, Constable's equivalents are measured by experiment and his science of painting [45] is born

out of work, however romanticised. For the first time in this walk through British art I see man and children at work in *Flatford Mill*.[32] In the foreground, a boy mounted on a horse holds it while another pulls the rope out of the water. It has been disconnected from a barge so that it can be poled under Flatford Bridge by two men aboard. Another one with two boats men is waiting to pass under the bridge, while a man is closing the lock behind it. A third barge is at the distance, still loading sacks of flour from the mill to transport them the few miles downstream to Mistley from where they are probably shipped to London. Two boys examine their catch on the bank and a mower crosses the meadow with his sickle.

The entire landscape is shaped by human hand, not only the bridge, the lock and the water mill, but also the canal with its reinforced and raised bank, the tow path and its drainage completely cleared of weeds, the cut back ash trees, the meadow enclosed by hedges of dog rose as in mother's painting, the hay neatly stacked in the sunshine, the cows grazing in the distance behind a dry wall and scratched in the dirt in front of the bridge, 'John Constable 1816'.

His oversized signature is inscribed in the picture rather than on the painting, in the Renaissance tradition of the cartellino as in Elisabeth's portrait. Only it remains unique in Constable, doubting the transparency of the canvas and marking the special significance of this painting. Constable's mother Ann had died the year before and his father Golding that May, [46] mill and transport business to his brother Abram [47] and enough to John to marry Maria Bicknell the coming October. [48] He knew that would be his last summer in the house in East

---

[32] John Linnell, *Kensington Gravel Pits* (1811-2). Oil on canvas, 711 x 1067 mm, Tate (http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/linnell-kensington-gravel-pits-n05776) hangs in the same room but outside the itinerary described in the text. So far, Hamlet's visit of Tate Britain appears to coincide with the BP walk through British art, yet it is important to distinguish their temporality. Reinterpreting Stoic philosophy (Sellars 2007), Deleuze distinguishes two aspects of time:

> […] time must be grasped twice, in two complementary though mutually exclusive fashions. First, it must be grasped entirely as the living present in bodies which act and are acted upon. Second, it must be grasped entirely as an entity infinitely divisible into past and future […]. Only the present exists in time and gathers together or absorbs the past and future. But only the past and future inhere in time and divide each present infinitely. These are not three successive dimensions, but two simultaneous readings of time. (Deleuze 1990: 5)

The first 'reading of time', 'Chronos', is the actual time of the viewer experienced by Hamlet and as it exists only as present it cannot be represented in a narrative. On the other hand, 'Aion' is the pure virtuality of History that exceeds its actualization, because 'all history does is translate a coexistence of becomings into a succession' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 430) and all possible representations, historiography. The BP walk is a kind of spatialized historiography that in Deleuze's terms can be called a 'striated space' instituted by the museum (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 474-5; temporal as much as spatial, Bogue 2007b: 127-8; a 'geohistory,' Protevi 2009: 92).

Bergholt where he grew up, before the newlywed couple moves to London [48] and the property is sold. [50]

Before you say anything, I mean no direct cause that links these events to the painting or a simple intention that translates his state of mind into a picture. Nevertheless, events that thicken around the painting,[33] stories that entangle with it[34] are already there and I just write them.[35] You can see them for yourself in the picture. The horizon is just above the grazing cows in the far distance and the point of sight is on the tip of the boy's fishing rod. The perpendicular to the horizon from the point of sight goes through the eye of the horse in the foreground and meets the ground at the beginning of the bridge, just beneath the inscription. [51] The distance between the point of sight and the standing point, corresponds to a conventional height of the painter and viewer of the picture, [52] but here it also creates a semiotic relation between two zones of indeterminacy. [53] The first zone is that of mastery on the landscape where around the standing point, Constable's hand that signs the painting becomes the invisible hand that inscribed the landscape. The second zone is that of vision where, around the point of sight, Constable's eye becomes the eye of the viewer.

In the painting, Flatford 'reappears, not as it was or as it could be, but in a splendour which was never lived, like a pure past which finally reveals its double irreducibility to the two presents which it telescopes together: the present that it was, but also the present present which it could be. […] It is *within* Forgetting, as though immemorial, that [Flatford] reappears in the form of a past which was never present: the in-itself of [Flatford].'[36] The relation between the

---

[33] The term is a reference to Bakhtin's concept of 'chronotope': "We will give the name chronotope (literally, "time space") to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature. This term 'space-time' is employed in mathematics, and was introduced as part of Einstein's Theory of Relativity. The special meaning it has in relativity theory is not important for our purposes; we are borrowing it for literary criticism almost as a metaphor (almost, but not entirely). What counts for us is the fact that it expresses the inseparability of space and time (time as fourth dimension of space). We understand the chronotope as a formally constitutive category of literature; we will not deal with the chronotope in other areas of culture. In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope." (Bakhtin 1981: 84)

[34] Benjamin appropriates 'superimposition' from Heisenberg (Fenves 2011: 282-3 n25): At street corners, before house fronts and shopfronts, in proximity to particular doorways, particular stretches of cobblestone, particular entrances to the catacombs, particular cafés and cabarets, he experiences an uncanny thickening and layering of phenomena, an effect of superimposition, in which remembered events or habitations show through the present time and place, which have suddenly become transparent, just as in film an image may bleed through one or more simultaneously perceptible, interarticulated images in multiple exposure. It is a dreamlike effect, with the moving imagery characteristically yielding, in the flâneur's case, a "felt knowledge" that is not yet conceptual.' (Eiland 2006: 121-2, my emphasis).

[35] The passage introduces for the first time the difference between events, that are points in space and time, such as the painting, and stories, that are lines of possible interaction between events in the hyperobject.

[36] The passage develops Bakhtin's chronotope introduced earlier and further suggests that Constable's 'autobiographical landscapes' (Bermingham 1985: 135) show a split between the observing painter of the sketches

two zones of indeterminacy, mastery and vision, produces the space of the image that is, if I am not mistaken, allegorical.[37] Three figures stand out in the landscape for scale and detail. The boy on the horse resembles the model of Constable's early religious paintings, his elder brother Golding and the boy with dark hair behind him could be his younger brother Abram. [54] Golding dropped his hat and whip on the ground and looks back towards Abram, passing on the family business that he inherited after his father's death but was unable to manage. John who is the second in the line of inheritance, is standing on a barge and just disconnected the rope that tied him to Golding. While Abram is pulling the rope out of the water taking upon himself the tie of responsibility, John poles the barge away towards London.

The bargemen, the towers, the lock operator, the mower remain without a face, even the boys in foreground are turned away from us. They are present and invisible in the landscape as the painter is in the painting, they make the landscape to which they belong as Constable paints the landscape that belongs to him and thus, knows best. Of course, the metaphor in the painting and the painter's denial, or false consciousness if you prefer, cannot conceal the reality of labour and unemployment in Suffolk, the riots punctuating the summer of 1816, the year without summer, the steady decline of Flatford Mill caused by the corn laws. Still, for all its fantasy, Constable creates here a new and precarious relation to nature produced through his artistic practice. He integrates his apprentice as a miller, hours of drafting and painting from nature, with formal academic training and naturalist observation. painters different from the idle picturesque that erases its traces [55] or natural science, opposite to the sublime that destroys or paralyses. It is an artistic practice that

Flatford Mill is also the last painting that Constable to great extent en plaine aire Constable's first large landscape towards the six-footers began 1821. After that he worked mainly in his London studio from sketches as a necessity of production, but also the fold in the visible where invention unfolded.

There is an underlying project, I believe, to create a monument of Flatford, not of the landscape but of its sensation, to reconfigure time itself as in Combray. The Green flickers in the illustrated books of the Pre-Raphaelites and dominates Millais's painting of that period, "God Almighty has given us green, and you may depend upon it it's a fine color" he would

---

and narrating painter of *Flatford Mill* and the large landscapes. Constable's position is thus ironic and equivalent in this respect, to Proust's narrator revealed at the end of *Combray* (Reid 2003: 8). In Deleuze's passage from *Difference and Repetition* (1994: 85) Proust's Combray has been substituted by Constable's Flatford. Deleuze will develop this process of Bergsonian forgetting as 'fabulation' (Bogue 2007) which Simon O'Sullivan further develops as 'fictioning', the production of untimely images (O'Sullivan 2016). Fabulation and fictioning will be applied later to *Ophelia*.

[37] It will be easier to explain allegory in Millais after recognising it in Constable (and Turner first).

have said. [56] His friend Holman Hunt did not approve of his green [57] nor did Ruskin. Constable was not in fashion and never was, but accompanied Millais all along, from the early landscapes at Hampstead, five minutes' walk from Constable's house to his last PRB painting [58] with Constable's double rainbow, to the late landscapes in Scotland. How could green turn so sour?

Maybe it is the pigment. Emerald green already shines in the small palette that Millais is holding in his self-portrait at age eighteen. [59] He is working on a small oil sketch placed on the easel in front of him, the board is low and distorted to let us see a landscape. Yet Millais is looking towards us, sitting uncomfortably on a green leather armchair in front of a Titian red background, as if copying from an old master in the RA studio. [60] The same shade of green takes over *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* and *The Woodman's Daughter*, [61] with a radiation so powerful that only a sarcophagus might contain it. [62] Or maybe it was you, becoming green,[38] flowers, water, nothing… my heart was rushing and my head spinning, "I need to sit down". I wish there were a voluptuous Victorian sofa as the one seducing the viewers of the Hay Wain, instead I had to stagger in an adjacent room, half-darkened and solitary, to find a minimalist bench.[39]

The Woman in White

I laid there completely exhausted for who knows how long, with my eyes shut and my legs dangling off the edge, until the pins and needles made me sit up. I imagined that Stendhal

[38] When Ophelia must admit Hamlet's involvement with her, Polonius accuses her of being gullible: "Affection? Puh! You speak like a green girl, / Unsifted in such perilous circumstance. / Do you believe his tenders as you call them?" (*Ham.* 1.3.101-3)

[39] Constable's *The Hay Wain* (1821) is on view in room 34 of the National Gallery. The room is one of the eight rooms designed by E.M Barry (1874-6) that were refurbished in 1984-6 and fitted with re-creations of the original leather settees (Taunton. 1987). The change in the type of furniture reflects a change in the way in which the museum constructs the embodied gaze and viewing time of the look. The contrast between contemporary perambulation and Victorian contemplation continues the theme of "BP walk through British art." The room used for temporary displays, showed "BP Highlights: Works on paper 1840-1910" and the lights are subdued for conservation reasons.

Syndrome overwhelmed me,[40] rather than the consequence of forgetting my Zyprexa.[41] Gradually in front of me, appeared the portrait of a woman in yellow, [1] one of the hundreds Rossetti made of Fanny Comfort [*sic*][42] during their on and off relation and friendship—how? you might ask. One year later, the sparkles had already gone, yet she stayed with him for years, caring for him as his health deteriorated. Unfit for the role of angelic woman that Rossetti reserved for his wife [2] or that of the ultimate femme fatale he soon begun to pursue, [3] Fanny was no "destroyer of men", [4] or an illiterate Cockney prostitute, for what matters. [5] Put aside and painted over by her lover, [6] overlooked by critics, abandoned by family and friends, she ended her days in an asylum and buried in an unnamed grave as Ophelia's prosaic double.[43]

---

[40] Graziella Magherini refers a series of anxious, somatic and psychotic symptoms affecting tourists who visit Florence as 'Stendhal Syndrome' (Magherini 1989). The name derives from the French writer' report of a panic attack he suffered during his visit to Florence in the Santa Croce Basilica (22 January 1817): "Coming out of Santa Croce, I had heart palpitations, that in Berlin are called 'nerves'; the life in me was exhausted, I walked in fear of falling. I set on a bench in Santa Croce square, read with delight these lines by Foscolo that I kept in my wallet: I did not see their faults: I just needed to hear the voice of a friend sharing my emotion . . . ." (Stendhal 1919: 325, my translation).

Our episode at Tate is modelled on Stendhal's report and consistent with the symptoms that Magherini describes in the first and mildest type of Stendhal Syndrome: panic crisis and somatized anxiety, with heart palpitations, difficulty breathing, pain in the chest, the feeling of being on the verge of fainting and consequently, a vague sense of unreality. These conditions lead to a sudden need to feel 'at home', to return to their own land, to speak their own language. (Magherini 1989: 98 ff.). The slight ironic tone reflects a caricature of Stendhal Syndrome in the New York Times (Inturrisi 1988).

[41] Zyprexa is the brand name of olanzapine, an atypical antipsychotic used in the symptomatic treatment of schizophrenia and bipolar disorders (European Medicine Agency 2017).

[42] The pun on Fanny Cornforth's name is ironic on Rossetti's relation.

[43] Cornforth is listed in 1901 as a lodger at 9 Kilmarsh Road, Hammersmith where she lived with some financial support from her sister-in-law, Rosa Villiers née Schott. As Cornforth had developed dementia, Villers put her in a workhouse near Chichester (1905) and later (1907) was admitted to the West Sussex County Lunatic Asylum, now Graylingwell Hospital. She died there of pneumonia in 1909 age 74 and was buried in the district cemetery, in an unmarked common grave paid for by the asylum. Her progression from lodging to workhouse to asylum is exemplifies a trend of asylums expanding in the late nineteenth century due to economic reasons:

> . . . John Joseph Henley, the general inspector of the Local Government Board, informed a Select Committee of the House of Commons that in his inspectors' experience, "there is a disposition among all classes now not to bear with the troubles that may arise in their own houses. If a person is troublesome from senile dementia, dirty in his habits, they will not bear it now. Persons are more easily removed to an asylum than they were a few years ago." Workhouse authorities, too, according to the medical inspector of the London workhouses, routinely used asylums to "relieve their wards of many old people who are suffering from nothing else than the natural failing of old age" as well as to rid themselves of troublesome people in general. (Scull 1989: 246)

Cornforth's late years sadly connects her to Ophelia's 'maimed rites' (*Hamlet* 5.1.186) and the gravediggers' comments on her death:

> *Other.* Will you ha' the truth on't? If this had not been a gentlewoman,
> she should have been buried out o' Christian burial.
> *Clown*. Why, there thou sayst - and the more pity that great folk
> should have countenance in this world to drown or hang themselves
> more than their even-Christen. . . . (*Ham.* 5.1.20-4)

The implication is that if Ophelia had not been an aristocrat, the coroner would have declared her death a suicide and thus, she would have been buried outside the cemetery without a funeral or a grave. This detail evokes

An invisible hand hung the *Woman in White* [7] next to the *Woman in Yellow* as if under a spell.[44] Anne Catherick on the doorstep of her inferno is about to emerge into the starry night

---

the image of a double Ophelia one of which a story is told, and another which has been forgotten to serve the narrative. This dark Ophelia completes and gives significance to the semiotic square of her character we presented before in relation to Lady Macbeth, and responds to Elaine Showalter's appeal:

> Why has she been such a potent and obsessive figure in our cultural mythology? Insofar as Hamlet names Ophelia as "woman" and "frailty," substituting an ideological view of femininity for a personal one, is she indeed representative of Woman, and does her madness stand for the oppression of women in society as well as in tragedy? Furthermore, since Laertes calls Ophelia a "document in madness," does she represent the textual archetype of woman as madness or madness as woman? And finally, how should feminist criticism represent Ophelia in its own discourse? What is our responsibility towards her as character and as woman? (Showalter 1985: 77-94, 78-9)

To a certain degree, the same trope appears in Pre-Raphaelite literature about Elisabeth Siddal and Fanny Cornforth. Notwithstanding the importance they both had in Rossetti's life and work, Siddal's story has often been told especially under the sign Ophelia, while Cornforth's is marginalised, contrasted with her along stereotypical oppositions (wife / mistress, artist / illiterate, melancholy / material, delicate / fat). Thus, the unspoken "dark" Ophelia in all its supplementary logic is triangulated with Fanny Cornforth, Rossetti's overlooked companion and model of Woman in Yellow, and Elisabeth Siddal, Rossetti's muse and model of Millais' Ophelia. Rita Cameron constructs portrays Siddal as jealous of Cornforth in her historical novel, but it is unsure whether she even knew of her existence (Cameron 2015: 323 ff.)

Rossetti made several drawings using Elisabeth Siddal as model for Ophelia. Except for *First Madness of Ophelia.* 1864, Oldham Gallery, Rossetti focusses on the closet scene (*Hamlet* 3.1), showing Ophelia frightened by Hamlet's, hiding her face; *Hamlet and Ophelia - Compositional Sketch.* 1854*,* Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery; *Hamlet and Ophelia.* 1853-4. British Museum, London. In the later drawings, the scene is less one of madness than of seduction with Ophelia increasingly in control: *Hamlet and Ophelia, illustration to William Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', Act III, Sc i.* 1858, British Museum, London; *Hamlet and Ophelia - Compositional Study.* 1865, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery. Rossetti's hand kissing might refer to Edmund Kean's addition to the Nunnery scene where "after his departing abruptly out of sight of his audience, used to come on the stage again and approach slowly the amazed Ophelia still remaining in the centre, take her hand gently, and, after gazing steadily and earnestly in her face for a few seconds, and with a marked expression of tenderness in his own countenance, appeared to be choked in his efforts to say something, smothered her hand with passionate kisses, and rushed wildly and finally from her presence (Hackett 1863: 49). In *Hamlet and Ophelia.* 1866, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, Ophelia maintains Siddal's face contour but acquires Cornforth's distinctive blond and curly hair.

[44] The proximity of the two paintings on the wall is interpreted as a connection between their subjects. Is the relation between the paintings more than proximity? On what ground can a series of more or less accidental relations between artworks be constructed into narrative and research? A passage from Freud's Uncanny (1919) might offer the starting point for an answer:

> If we take another class of things, it is easy to see that there, too, it is only this factor of involuntary repetition which surrounds what would otherwise be innocent enough with an uncanny atmosphere, and forces upon us the idea of something fateful and inescapable when otherwise we should have spoken only of 'chance'. For instance, we naturally attach no importance to the event when we hand in an overcoat and get a cloakroom ticket with the number, let us say, 62; or when we find that our cabin on a ship bears that number. But the impression is altered if two such events, each in itself indifferent, happen one, or at all events one which contains the same figures. We do feel this to be uncanny. And unless a man is utterly hardened and proof against the lure of superstition, he will be tempted to ascribe a secret meaning to this obstinate recurrence of a number; he will take it, perhaps, as an indication of the span of life allotted to him. (Freud 1955 v.17: 236-7).

Between pure chance and 'something fateful and inescapable,' the invisible hand as we called it here, Freud places the realm of fiction richer in possibilities for uncanny experiences than real life and also distinct. "What is fiction in reality? This is a question which haunts the accesses to the Freudian text, but without entering them." (Cixous 1976: 546). The reality of fiction does away with personal psychology and concealed agencies in three ways.

and already turns back? [7] That Summer night, John Millais, Wilkie Collins and his brother met Fanny's chance twin and ghost on Hampstead Heath. [8] Collin's novel is full of liminal places (the park, the declining mansion, the asylum, the cemetery) where one can encounter ghost and doubles and the museum is another such place. [9] Isn't this all I am here for, to follow my ghost, find my Carlotta Valdes? [10] Instead, I felt unable to transmit that thought to my legs and kept sitting on that bench, blandly distracted by the naked sculpture in front of me. [11] She appears to be sleeping in an awkward recovery position the soles and bottom facing towards me, one arm minus one finger stretched the other bent under her head. Her size and anatomical implausibility clouded the male gaze, still I stood up to look at the other side. The girl must indeed have been fast asleep, as what I thought was a mattress, is apparently water, waves billowing around her legs, wet hair loosening, bad dreams perturbing her expression and Ophelia's flowers whirling in her lap. [18]

. . . *Nymph, in thy orisons. Be all my sins remembered* . . . [19] You asked me to help you with a photograph you had in mind.[45] That same evening, I drove you to the cemetery and

---

First, there is the authorial hand constructing the main character's psychological profile consistent with symptoms of paranoid schizophrenia. For a historical overview, see "Paranoia" in Shorter 2005: 206-11. This narrative was also adopted in *Hamlet*. 2011. Directed by Ian Rickson. With Michael Sheen as Hamlet, Vinette Robinson as Ophelia. Second, there is the curatorial hand of Penelope Curtis, the controversial Tate Britain director between 2010-2015 that oversaw Tate's 2013 rehang (Ellis-Petersen 2015). Far from being "a neutral search tool" as Curtis called it, the rehang is rather "a wolf in sheep's skin" that hides curatorial decisions behind a matter-of-fact chronology. (Wullschlager 2013). Third and foremost, there is the machinic unconscious that grounds schizoanalysis and our research methodology.

Contrasted to Freud's unconscious, the machinic unconscious present three characteristics that are relevant here: it is both outside and inside the ego, rather than only inside as Freud's unconscious; it is facing forward towards possibilities rather than backwards towards past events; it is creative of new assemblages rather than reproductive, it is situated (embodied and embedded) rather than general (cf. Guattari 2010: 194-98).

[45] The text fictionalises the making of Francesca Woodman's photograph *Untitled (Boulder Colorado)*, 1976, in which she is laying naked in the current of a canal among the roots of a large tree with a 19th century graveyard in the background. The photograph, made while she was living in Providence to attend the Rhode Island School of Design (1975-78), continues a series Woodman realised previously in the same location (see *Boulder Colorado (Graveyard),* 1972-75, in Keller 2013: 172). The shot is taken on a 35mm camera appears to be taken with a flash at dusk by an assistant low on the opposite bank if not standing in the water.

The text suggests that that the person behind the camera is the author of the letter and the subject of the photograph its addressee. Despite Woodman's claim that she would use herself as model as a matter of convenience because she is always available (Rankin 1998: 35), most of her photographs are autofictions that require an assistant, involve other sitters or both. The fiction is based on the speculation that the photograph might have been taken by Benjamin P. Moore who was Woodman's fellow student at RISD and boyfriend at the time (for Moore's portrait see *Italy, May 1977 - August 1978*. 1977–8). The couple began dating in 1975 and were together for approximately five years. Her classmate and close friend Sloan Rankin has said that Moore was her 'first caring love' (*The Woodmans*, dir. by Scott Willis, 2010). Moore's relationship with her and his involvement in her work remains so far unexplored.

The unspecified location of the photograph is the Columbia Lodge Cemetery that extends south of Pleasant Street between Eighth and Ninth Street in Boulder, Colorado, US. It is crossed West to East by the Anderson's Ditch and still retains some of the old trees after the historical Masonic cemetery, established 1867 and left in disrepair for decades, was restored in the 1990s (for history and map of the graveyard Colombia Cemetary 2021: https://bouldercolorado.gov/locations/columbia-cemetery).

The reference to Woodman's photograph is relevant here for a number of reasons. In Millais' *Ophelia*, features prominently an uprooted crack willow (*Salix fragilis*, so called because its brittle branches). The painting

transforms the tree from which Ophelia falls according to Gertrude's description (4.7.166) into a fallen tree signifying the mourning for her father's death, for instance in Richard Redgrave's *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands*, 1842, Victoria and Albert, London). Looking back and re-evaluating the painting in 1859, the critic for the *Art Journal*, with a fresh perspective and a name for the style employed by Redgrave, observes that 'the figure is an admirable embodiment of the poet's character, and the landscape is painted with a finish and attention to detail which, in our day, would be called 'Pre-Raffaelism'.' (Rhodes 2008: 85). *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* was engraved for Charles Knight's *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere. Tragedies, Vol. I.* ([1839–42?]. Engraved by Butterworth and Heath, London: Virtue & Co., London, ill. 23) while the painting was bought by Millais' collector John Sheepshank until he gifted it to the V&A in 1857. We would argue that Redgrave is Millais' counter-reference for his *Ophelia*. The events depicted in two paintings are symmetric in relation to Ophelia's action of falling or jumping in the water, left suspended as it is in Shakespeare's text.

Woodman's photograph does not reference Millais or Ophelia directly, although in Delacroix' lithograph and paintings, one might consider the way in which Ophelia holds on to the broken branch while the current drags her half-naked body towards the background.

The point of view in Woodman's photograph is the same relative to its subject which constructs the male gaze in relation to Ophelia's off-stage death in Shakespeare, Millais' scopophilic desire and Woodman's man behind the camera. The quote in the text "You cannot see me from where I look at myself" indicates Woodman's resistance (Sollers 1998: 10).

Woodman's *Untitled* concludes the themes introduced by Walker's *Woman in White* that Woodman knew well as fervent reader of Victorian literature:

The graveyard in the context of the other liminal spaces featuring in Woodman's work, such as the artist's studio and other decommissioned industrial building, a decaying Victorian house, doors, mirrors. See Margaret Sundell 1996; Riches 2004.

The ghost of her body glowing in the dark graveyard in the context of her use of soft focus, motion blur and double exposure. In her diary she writes: "Am I in the picture? Am I getting in or out of it? I could be a ghost, an animal or a dead body, not just this girl standing on the corner…?" The ghost in her body of work is evoked by her suicide at the age of 22 in 1981, as Carol Armstrong observes in 'Francesca Woodman : a ghost in the house of the "woman artist." (2006).

The double constituted by Woodman as subject, performer and image, "now that Woodman is dead, anybody is free to fantasize about her ("her"), unencumbered by the annoying intrusion of her actual existence as separate from the work itself." (Reines 2013). See also Woodman's shadowgraph, *Providence, Rhode Island, 1976*, 1976.

Untitled also concludes the themes introduced by Pomeroy's *The Nymph of Loch Awe*. Woodman's hair flowing in the water are analogue to those of the nymph of Loch Awe. They are the opposite of the fetish, empowering as Fanny Cornforth's golden hair in the *Woman in Yellow* (for an analysis of hair in Rossetti, see Gitter, Elisabeth G. 1984. "The Power of Women's Hair in the Victorian Imagination", *PMLA* 99 (5, October), 936-54) or enchanting, as Madeleine's twirl in *Vertigo*. The hair shows their dissipation in 'the land of dead nymphs', as Gaston Bachelard correctly interprets it as symptom of what he identifies as the "Ophelia Complex" that underlies our research:

> In vain Ophelia's remains are buried in the earth. She is truly, as Mallarmé says, 'an Ophelia who is never drowned . . . a jewel intact despite disaster.' For centuries, she will appear to dreamers and to poets floating on her brook with her flowers and her tresses spread out on the water. She will provide the pretext for one of the clearest of poetic synecdoches. She will be floating tresses, tresses loosened by the floods. In order thoroughly to understand the role of creative detail in reverie, let us for the moment retain nothing but the image of floating tresses. We shall see that it brings to life by itself a whole symbol of the psychology of the waters, that it almost suffices in itself to explain the whole Ophelia complex. (Bachelard, Gaston. 1983. *Water and Dreams. An Essay on the Imagination of Matter.* Translated by Edith R. Farrell. Dallas: The Pegasus Foundation, 83)

Half of Woodman's body is under water, the right leg is stretched the left bent under the surface, while she leans on a root stump with her right arm bent. Her limbs seem to continue the roots of the large tree in Columbia Cemetery exposed by the current. Becoming tree is a motif that recurs in her work but Woodman's series of *Untitled, MacDowell Colony, Peterborough, New Hampshire,* 1980. More precisely references the myth of Daphne. Her wrists are wrapped in birch bark and the camera superposes her stretched arms in foreground to the birch trunks in the near background, creating an effect of interpenetration. The connection between the river and the tree is made clear once one recalls that the nymph Daphne sworn to Artemis and chastity, asked her father, the river god Peneus, to transform her into a tree not to succumb to Apollo's desire (for an analysis, Tutter 2011). The strong connection between Ophelia and the tree in Shakespeare's text (Gertrude's speech begins "There is a

parked off Pleasant Street, near the gap in the railing you knew. You gave me the camera and instructed me to wait on the other side of the ditch facing the big tree. You appeared suddenly from behind the tree and quietly entered the water, twisting your legs and arms around its roots and letting your hair flow with the current, while I flash and click. You are white as a ghost, quivering with cold and before I even finish the film, you said you have enough, climb up the roots and quietly disappear behind the tree. I waited in the car and drove you home without a word, while you kept drying your hair. Passing you the camera on the back seat, I asked you whether you minded I was there. "You cannot see me from where I look at myself" was all you said before shutting the door.[46] Oh-feel-ya.[47]

The Lady of Shalott

"Get out, get some fresh air!" I thought your portrait would be in the next room and looked for it where I last saw it, on the right wall towards the corner beneath *The Lady of Shalott. . . . floated down to Camelot: / And as the boat-head wound along / The willowy hills and fields among, / They heard her singing her last song* . . . . [1] "They must have moved her" and walked towards the end of the room searching the walls … *Ta-tum ta-tum / Ta-tum ta-tum ta-tum ta-tum* ... There's milady's lovely boat, [2] and Millais' ghost on the other side, gazing at Ophelia's ghost floating down the stream, [3] and dreary Mariana in the corner. [4] I make my way back down the gallery and beckon nervously to an attendant in the other room.[48] He

---

willow . . . ") remains in the background in the iconology and tends to loosen further during the second half of the 19th century, notwithstanding exceptions such as Arthur Rackham's illustration "To this brook Ophelia came" (1909). This tendency follows the demotion of Ophelia's grief compared to sentimental or sexual components. Millais being the painting that most clearly associates Ophelia's father with the willow, is also responsible for committing her to the water. The shift from Ophelia standing or sitting on the tree to laying or sinking in the water becomes apparent comparing Millais' *Ophelia* with the other by Arthur Hughes at the 1852 Royal Academy exhibition (1852, Manchester City Art Gallery. Hughes's composition references directly Redgrave's *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands* but the tree trunk on which the fairy-like Ophelia is sitting is far less prominent. On the right of the dark swamp in which she throws her flowers, a group of birches completes the Nordic setting of the scene.

[46] Francesca Woodman's quote is in Philippe Sollers "The Sorceress" (1998: 10). Woodman seems to adapt Lacan's expression in "The Line and the Light", Seminar 11: "From the outset, we see, in the dialectic of the eye and the gaze, that there is no coincidence, but, on the contrary, a lure. When, in love, I solicit a look, what is profoundly unsatisfying and always missing is that—*You never look at me from the place from which I see you*." (Lacan 1978: 102-3). Woodman spent a few years in therapy, but it remains so far unclear how much she knew about psychoanalysis, a research that would be at odds with the spontaneous artist image carefully constructed after her death.

[47] The allusion is to the opening of Nabokov's *Lolita*: "Lolita, light of my life, fire of my loins. My sin, my soul. Lo-lee-ta: the tip of the tongue taking a trip of three steps down the palate to tap, at three, on the teeth. Lo. Lee. Ta." (Nabokov 1991: 128) The importance of Shakespeare in Nabokov has often been discussed (Schuman 2014) and Ophelia features appear in *Bend Sinister* (1947), *Pnin* (1957), *Pale Fire* (1962), *Ada, or Ardor: A Family Chronicle* (1969) and we would like to argue, in *Lolita* (1955). However, stringing together the Nymph of Loch Awe, Francesca Woodman, Lolita and Ophelia, cannot be done without introducing some critical problems, importantly the age of the characters.

[48] The scene is modelled on Scotties's visit to the museum in Hitchcock's *Vertigo*:

comes to where I am standing. "Where is she?" I ask rather agitated. He turns his head to the painting of a woman fallen on the floor. [5] "The one that was here before" At my reaction he realises "Oh, that's *Ophelia*. It is on a world tour with an exhibition. You'll find it in the catalogue. I thank him as he hands me the small catalogue *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde*. I turn back looking in the room "What nonsense!"[49]

INT. GALLERY - (AFTERNOON) - SEMI-CLOSEUP
Scottie turns and makes his way carefully back down the gallery.
INT. GALLERY - (AFTERNOON) - SEMI-LONG SHOT.
THE CAMERA is now back in its original position, beyond the columns of the entrance to the room. We see Scottie coming down toward the CAMERA. As he comes to us in CLOSER SHOT, we see him beckon to somebody off screen.
INT. GALLERY - (AFTERNOON) - MEDIUM SHOT
A male attendant is coming over towards the CAMERA. He goes out of the picture.
INT. GALLERY - (AFTERNOON) - MEDIUM SHOT
He comes to where Scottie awaits him. Scottie asks in a low voice:
SCOTTIE (Nodding in the direction of the gallery) Who is the woman in the portrait?
The Attendant turns his head.
SCOTTIE The one where the lady is sitting.
ATTENDANT Oh, that's Carlotta, sir.
(At Scottie's reaction) You'll find it in the catalogue: "Portrait of Carlotta."
Scottie nods his thanks as the attendant hands him a catalogue. Scottie then turns back and looks into the room.
The CAMERA MOVES IN past him, so that once more we are left alone with Madeleine seated, still looking at the portrait. (Coppel and Taylor 1957).

[49] The exhibition is exhibition is *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde* The travelling exhibition had the following schedule: Tate Britain, London 12 September 2012 - 13 January 2013; National Gallery of Art, Washington 17 February – 19 May 2013; The State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow, 10 June - 30 September 2013; Mori Arts Center Gallery, Tokyo, 25 January - 6 April 2014; Palazzo Chiabrese, Turin 19 April - 13 July 2014; *Ophelia* returns at Tate Britain, 7 August.

Ophelia was installed on the left wall of the 1840 room, beneath Charles Allston Collins *May, in the Regent's Park* (1851), between Millais' *Mariana* on the left and Arthur Hughes' *The Eve of St Agnes* (1856) on the right. On the top left corner, is *Thoughts of the Past* (c.1859) by John Roddam Spencer-Stanhope and on the top right corner, *Aurelia (Fazio's Mistress)* (1863–1873) by Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The new position of *Ophelia* appears less satisfactory than the previous repeating the same conditions for which it did not sell when first exhibited at the Royal Academy: the wall is too big and densely hung for a relatively small and detailed painting, the diffuse bright lighting is unsuitable for its dark tones of green, the constellation of its neighbouring paintings is confusing. For a photograph of the rehanging, 2014; for a general view of the wall, Founta 2014.

The doors of the room are heavy as a pair of wings caught in the storm[50] and the sight of the Duveen Galleries is tremendous[51] with ruins sprawling from one end to the other[52] and debris reaching up to the ceiling: a pipeline section on a gantry crane, bales of coloured canvas, broken stretchers, a freight un/loaded, anchors neither weighed nor dropped, crashed containers, a packaged column, a ghost ship, the Millbank entrance, the revolving door and the lousy Thames.[53] A perfect allegory for my visit, Millais' *Ophelia*, Mother's painting, all gone,

---

[50] The reference is to Walter Benjamin's thesis IX in "On the Concept of History":

> My wing is ready for flight,
> *I would like to turn back.*
> If I stayed everliving time,
> I'd still have little luck.
> -Gerhard Scholem, 'Greetings from the Angelus'
>
> There is a picture by Klee called *Angelus Novus*. It shows an angel who seems about to move away from something he stares at. His eyes are wide, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how the angel of history must look. His face is turned toward the past. Where a chain of events appears before *us, he* sees one single catastrophe, which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it at his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise and has got caught in his wings; it is so strong that the angel can no longer close them. This storm drives him irresistibly into the future, to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows toward the sky. What we call progress is *this* storm. (Benjamin 2006: 392)

[51] The adjective is from Adrian Searle's 'Phyllida Barlow at Tate Britain review: 'In every way tremendous'' (2014).

[52] The reference is also to the exhibition *Ruin Lust,* Tate Britain 4 March – 18 May 2014.

[53] The description refers to the Tate Britain Commission 2014, 31 March – 19 October 2014, for which Phyllida Barlow realised *untitled: dock* 2014, an installation consisting of seven separate sculptures 'loosely inspired by the view from Tate Britain's Millbank entrance.' (Sooke 2014). Although Barlow acknowledges the reference to the river and a reflection on the Tate collection which is also a formal requirement of the Tate commission, we are rubbing against the grain of Barlow's installation attributing a descriptive function that she rejects on many occasions, for instance in her lectures, at University College London (Barlow 2014a); Tate Britain (2014b); Slade School of Fine Art, London (2014c).

Barlow's installation follows the Duveen Galleries that are orthogonal to the Thames and its subtitle 'dock 2014' appears to be a reference to the London Docks, that were finally closed in 1981. The inclusion of the river within the museum creates a new space, in the same way as the date of the work incorporated in the subtitle in contrast with its historical reference, creates a new temporality. The deliberate coincidence of the Tate exhibition *Ruin Lust* with the opening of Barlow's installation, serves to amplify these references (for an overview, Pilger 2014). Barlow and *Ruin Lust* received an undeservingly bad review by Waldemar Januszczak:

> Although the riverside position of Tate Britain gives Dock a specific geographic history to evoke, there is no sense of a poetic connection with the past, no emotional evocation of London's ruined waterside or any atmosphere of entropy. The huge battle of dock effects remains strictly instructional, like a humongous episode of Blue Peter in which the different impact of weights and balances in space is being illustrated with some old loo rolls and a box of toothpicks borrowed from a giant. And that's the trouble with all this: it's so damn art school. These are the drab, grubby, effortful, paint-splattered art-class aesthetics of the 1970s. I didn't like them the first time round. . . . And right now, you can see the same daft impulses ruining Ruin Lust, a pointless collection of different pictures of ruins made over the past 300 years by different artists in different media. No real thematic coherence. No proper sense of development. And a totally silly guiding idea that ruins are "objects of desire", and that their frequent appearances in art amount to a display of lust. Try telling that to the monk whose monastery was torched or the soldiers whose bunkers were bombed. This is exhibition thinking so thoughtless and awful, it makes the drop of 10% appear fortunate. Curtis has to go. She really does. (Januszczak 2014)

and I don't even know wheatear you are receiving my letters to which you never reply. Do you read them? does your mother forward them to you?[54] what else remains? why write? why not, I still need to tell you whom I met on my way home.

Yours forever, my dearest, or at least as long as this machine goes.[55]

H.

Januszczak's critique of Barlow's installation hinges on its symbolic failure to "evoke a specific geographic history" and its contrived form of presentation. On the contrary, we would argue, these are precisely the artistic qualities that constitutes the allegorical relation of the Docks and the Museum in *untitled: dock 2014*. Walter Benjamin recognises allegory as a kind of experience (Cowan 1981: 110), that of the "impermanence of things" and the wish it was not so (Benjamin 1998: 223-4). The "antinomies of the allegorical" specify its paradoxical structure: "Any person, any object, any relationship can mean absolutely anything else." (175); "the profane world is both elevated and devalued." (175); "allegory is both: convention and expression; and both are inherently contradictory." "The conflict between theological and artistic intentions" (177). If the romantic symbol attempts to transcend the signifying relation to become universal, allegory on the contrary by presenting its artificiality, obscurity and fragmentarity attempts to erase it: allegory "means precisely the non-existence of what it presents" (233). The non-existent that *untitled: dock 2014* presents are the hustle and bustle of industrial production in the Docks and of artistic creation in the studio, metonymically signified by the various materials that Barlow incorporates in the work. At the same time, the architectural scale confers to the installation the ambiguous status of ruin—are not all allegories ambiguous? (177)—of which Benjamin precisely defines the relation to allegory:

> The allegorical physiognomy of the nature-history, which is put on stage in the Trauerspiel, is present in reality in the form of the ruin. In the ruin history has physically merged into the setting. And in this guise history does not assume the form of the process of an eternal life so much as that of irresistible decay. Allegory thereby declares itself to be beyond beauty. Allegories are, in the realm of thoughts, what ruins are in the realm of things. (177-8)

The installation becomes the theatrical setting of the viewer's mourning that interrupts historical time and the progress underlying the "BP walk through British Art", and its end point, again ambiguous, is the angel of history: "Yea, when the Highest comes to bring the harvest from the graveyard, so will I, a death's-head, become an angel's countenance." (215)

[54] In the play, Ophelia never speaks about her mother, Laertes mentions "the chaste unsmirchèd brow / Of my true mother." (*Ham.* 4.5.120-1).

[55] A paraphrase of Hamlet's salutaion in his letter to Ophelia: "Thine evermore, most dear lady, whilst this machine is to him, Hamlet." (*Ham.* 2.2.121-2)

Editor's Notes

[1] Gertrude was involved in a car accident[1]

---

[1] Shakespeare's Gertrude dies after she accidentally drinks the poisoned wine from the goblet that Claudius prepares for Hamlet (5.2.294-6) and later Hamlet makes him drink (5.2.310). The text does not give enough details to identify the poison, but it must be different from the 'cursed hebenon' that Claudius poured in the ear of King Hamlet while he was sleeping in the garden (1.5.62), 'most likely' a distillate obtained from henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger L.*) a plant containing atropine, scopolamine and hyoscyamine (Thomas and Faircloth 2014: 177-8; for effects of tropane alkaloid poisoning see Chang, et al. 1999). If one accepts that Claudius uses a pearl to poison Hamlet's wine (5.2.264), the way of administering the poison is different (Tabor 1970: 94).

Based on their similarities, it seems likely that Gertrude, Laertes, Claudius and Hamlet dye of the same poison that Laertes uses to poison the tip of his sword (4.7.144-5). Edward Tabor identifies it with poison derived from aconite but also suggests it could be one of the newly reported 'South American arrow poisons' (Tabor 1970: 89). Curare is mentioned the first time in Pietro Martire d'Anghiera's *De rebus oceanicis et Orbe nouo decades tres*, decade II, book II (Sneader 2005: 99-100; Caldwell 2014), first published in Latin (Alcalá de Henares, 1516), followed by several expanded editions, and translated into English by Richard Eden (London, 1553), was secretary to Queen Elizabeth's chief advisor, William Cecil.

They took away the ship's boat, and broke it in manner to chips: so fiercely assailing our men with their venomous arrows, that they slew of them forty-seven before they could cover themselves with their targets. For that poison is of such force, that albeit the wounds were not great, yet they died thereof immediately. For they yet knew no remedy against this kind of poison, as they after learned of the inhabitants of *Hispaniola*. For this Land brings forth a herb which quenches and mortifies the violent poison of the herb wherewith their arrows are infected, so that it be ministered in time. (Eden 1885: 113, spelling modernised)

Following his exploration of Guyana and eastern Venezuela, Walter Raleigh published *The Discovery of the Large, Rich and Beautiful Empire of Guiana* (London 1596) which provides another and more detailed account of 'urari':

> The […] Aroras […] have the most strong poison on their arrows […]. There was nothing whereof I was more curious than to find out the true remedies of these poisoned arrows. For besides the mortality of the wound they make, the party shot endures the most insufferable torment in the world, and abides a most ugly and lamentable death, sometimes dying stark mad, sometimes their bowels breaking out of their bellies; which are presently discoloured as black as pitch, and so unsavoury as no man can endure to cure or to attend them. And it is more strange to know that in all this time there was never Spaniard, either by gift or torment, that could attain to the true knowledge of the cure, although they have martyred and put to invented torture I know not how many of them. But every one of these Indians know it not, no, not one among thousands, but their soothsayers and priests, who do conceal it, and only teach it but from the father to the son. […] But this is a general rule for all men that shall hereafter travel the Indies where poisoned arrows are used, that they must abstain from drink. For if they take any liquor into their body, as they shall be marvellously provoked thereunto by drought, I say, if they drink before the wound be dressed, or soon upon it, there is no way with them but present death. (Raleigh 1848: 70-1, spelling modernised)

Curare appears to fit better than aconite in the dramaturgy of the duel scene in terms of dosage, administration, rapidity and lethality. On the other hand, there is no direct evidence linking contemporary accounts of the poison to Shakespeare's text and this identification remains speculative.

Whether Laertes and Claudius used curare, does not concern primarily the correct interpretation of the text (does curare fit in what we already know about Shakespeare's Hamlet?), nor does it necessarily require a conditional answer until, if ever, historical research proves it a fact. Rather, the question belongs here to a different mode of thinking, that of possibility and art (Bogue 2007). Already Aristotle assigned to poetry the representation of the possible and the necessary, while history represents 'what has happened' (*Poetics* 9.2-4 / Aristotle 1996: 16). Through Bergson, Gilles Deleuze explains the distinction of the possible and the real that underlies Aristotle:

> The possible has no reality (although it may have an actuality); […] On the other hand, or from another point of view, the possible is that which is "realized" (or is not realized). Now the process of realization is subject to two essential rules, one of resemblance and another of limitation. For the real is supposed to be in the image of the possible that it realizes. (It simply has existence or reality added to it, which is translated by saying that, from the point of view of the concept, there is no difference between the possible and the

[2] Hamlet places the performance on the evening of Wednesday, 7 May 2014, but Luigi Pirandello's *Henry IV* was on at the Donmar Warehouse, London 29 April – 26 June 2004 (Pirandello and Stoppard 2004).[2]

[3] 'Well, it's classic. Fall from horse—hits head—brain damage—temporary obsession made permanent, fixed, causing a disturbance of the balance of the mind . . . up to insanity itself.' (Pirandello and Stoppard 2004: 40-1). The psychiatrist's diagnose is presented as a caricature (Biow 1989), in line with his character description and his (partial) failure. However, it seems to refer to Pierre Janet's 'fixed ideas': "Nearly all these ideas, and probably all if we knew better the illness, have their origin in some memory of the previous life. They are not conceived, invented at the time in which they are formulated when they are but repetitions." (Janet 1915: 25, my translation) Even the course of Henry's illness follows Janet who recognised that a strong emotional shock is a causal factor in the formation of rigid thought complexes (Heim and Bühler 2006), a direction continued (Moskowitz 2006) by the inventor of schizophrenia, Eugen Bleuler: "As psychological process, the illness starts often, or possibly always, gradually; it remains latent until an acute crisis evidences primary symptoms or a physical shock causes stronger secondary manifestations." (Bleuler 1911: 374, my translation)

Bleuler's distinction supports Henry's behaviour after his 'recovery' eight years before. However, no evidence connects Pirandello's text to Janet and Bleuer, or Pirandello to psychoanalysis (David 1990: 370-

---

real.) And, every possible is not realized, realization involves a limitation by which some possibles are supposed to be repulsed or thwarted, while others "pass" into the real. (Deleuze 1988: 96-7)

Deleuze avoids the problems of the possible as image of the present minus its reality, such as determinism ('tomorrow's sea-battle' in *De Interpretatione* 9.5 / Aristotle 1963: 51) and indetermination ('the possible fat man in the doorway' Quine 1948: 23-4). More importantly, he invents "the possible as aesthetic category" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 177) and gives to the Early Romantic theory of art as medium of reflection (Menninghaus 2005) a new meaning in his transcendental empiricism. On the side of the virtual, art has the aesthetical task of 'making visible' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 181-2) by embodying 'blocs of sensation' (164). On the side of the actual, art has the noetic and ethical task of making possible again, of deterritorialising (Deleuze and Guattari: 1987: 508) and the political task of calling forth 'a people to come' (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 218).

Here, Hamlet's poison is a 'minor detail' that deterritorialises the major Shakespeare's text (Deleuze and Guattari 1986: 16), producing new possibilities in the context of postcolonial criticism, beyond the locus classicus of *The Tempest* (Zabus 2002). In particular, reading Shakespeare and Raleigh's texts in parallel highlights the binary opposition that classifies curare. As treacherous commodity for Laertes (4.7.139) or exotic weapon for the Spanish, the geography and technology of curare are erased. At the same time, its characteristics highlight the moral depravity of its user and the enormity of the crime against sovranity (Bellamy 2016).

[2] The references are based on reviews (Wolf 2004; Billington 2004; Spencer 2004) and on Tom Stoppard's version of Pirandello's text (Pirandello and Stoppard 2005). The confusion between Shakespeare and Pirandello is suggested in a review by Philip Fisher 'Before anyone gets confused, this Henry IV only has one part, lasts a mere 100 minutes, including an interval, and is not by Shakespeare.' (Fisher 2004) On the other hand, time confusions are central to Pirandello's play: the confusion between Henry's fictional present and the chronological present of the other characters, Bertold's confusion between Henry IV, King of France (1553 – 1610), and Henry IV, Holy Roman Emperor (1050 –1106), Pirandello's present (2014: 197; premiere Teatro Manzoni, Milano 24 February 1922) and Stoppard's (Donmar Warehouse, London 29 April 2004).

The play was written for Ruggero Ruggeri celebrated for his Hamlet (1915) and later for Eleuterio Ridolfi's film *Amleto* (1917), remarkable for an early transposition into film of Millais' *Ophelia* interpreted by Helena Makowska (Cartmell 2008: 177; Buchanan 2009: 141-189). However, the analogy between Pirandello's *Henry IV* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet* goes deeper (Dente 2005). For instance, both are revenge plays, Hamlet seeks revenge on Claudius who murdered King Hamlet and Henry on Tito who caused his accident; Hamlet and Henry are confined in a palace and to carry out their plan, simulate madness that might also be real; the plot is sustained by two (Oedipal) triangles (Hamlet-Gertrude-Claudius as Henry-Matilda-Tito) and two female doubles (Ophelia : Gertrude :: Frida : Matilda); a play in the play reveals the truth, a sword duel precipitates the plot and the protagonists fall victim of their own revenge.

2). On the other hand, Antonietta Portulano was diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia, or 'delirio paranoide' as it is reported in her clinical records (Ladi 1996), and following violent psychotic episodes, was finally committed to 'Villa Giuseppina', a new psychiatric clinic outside Rome in 1910 where Portulano remained in the for forty years, until her death in 1959. Although Pirandello had an intense relation with star actress Marta Abba from 1925 to 1936, he kept visiting his wife until his death in 1936. The significance of Pirandello's experience with schizophrenia is not only central to his biography (Pirandello 1995) but also to his artistic research. In particular, Henry IV Pirandello seems to anticipate later studies on schizophrenia by Eugéne Minkowski (Bentley 1985: 65), Bleuer's assistant.

The passage in the letter refers specifically to Minkowski's definition of schizophrenia as 'a loss of vital contact with reality to be the fundamental disorder in schizophrenia' (1970: 276). This loss often appears as a "hypertrophy of static factors," expressed in the following way by one of Minkowski's patients who might have well been Henry himself:

Everything around me is immobile. Things appear isolated, each one in itself, without suggesting anything. Certain things which ought to evoke memory, evoke an immense number of thoughts, present a picture, remain isolated. They are more under-stood than experienced. They are like pantomimes, pantomimes which play around me but into which I do not enter; I remain outside. I have my judgment, but my instinct for life is missing. I am not able to put enough energy into my actions any more. I am no longer able to change from a relaxed state to a tense state of mind [passer des cordes douces aux cordes tendues]. However, it isn't natural to remain always in the same state [pourtant on n'est pas fait pour vivre sur le meme theme]. I have lost contact with all kinds of things. The idea of the value or the difficulty of things has disappeared. There no longer is a current between them and me; I can't let myself go any more. There is an absolute fixity around me. I have even less mobility for the future than I have for the present and the past. There is a kind of routine in me which does not allow me to envisage the future. The creative power in me is abolished. I see the future as a repetition of the past. (Minkowski 1970, 276–7)

The following passage summarizes how Minkowski grounds Bleuler's definition of schizophrenia on Henri Bergson's concept of *élan vital* and redefines Emil Kraepelin's separation of affective disorders (manic-depressive insanity) from schizophrenic psychosis (early-onset dementia) as the opposition of infinite duration in melancholia, and unlimited spatialisation in schizophrenia (Stenghellini 2005: 47, n7):

Bergson contrasted two principles in life: intelligence and intuition, the dead and the living, the immobile and the flowing, being and becoming, space and lived time, these are the various aspects under which this fundamental opposition appears. These two principles, however, form a harmonious whole. Incapable alone of assuring the individual's existence, each complements the other by limiting its own field of action in a natural and appropriate way. Intelligence unites with intuition to pursue a common end; becoming unfolds in being without clashing with it; and being bears the contact with becoming without being reduced to ashes. But does all this apply to pathology? Here it may well be that morbid factors freely attack the two principles of which we have spoken, in which case we would have two large classes of mental disorders: the one characterized by a deficiency of intuition and of lived time and by a progressive hypertrophy of the intelligence and spatial factors, the other by a state of affairs diametrically opposed to the first. (Minkowski 1970: 272).[3]

[3] Admittedly, Minkowski's model of schizophrenia is superseded since the 1980. On the other hand, it was not introduced here to provide here a diagnostic tool for psychoanalysing a fictional character, but to enable a critical distinction between Pirandello's Henry and Shakespeare's Hamlet based on a temporal structure abstracted from the text, rather than psychological features interpolated from the plot. Both temporal structures show that 'time is out of joint' (*Hamlet* 1.5.189) but where Henry's time dramatises the structure of schizophrenia, Hamlet dramatizes that of melancholia. There will be other opportunities to return on Hamlet's melancholia in greater detail but here it is worth adding a few remarks relating to Minkowski's model. While Shakespeare's contemporaries considered Hamlet a melancholic if they were acquainted with Timothy Bright's *A Treatise of*

[4] In the letter inviting Ruggero Ruggeri and his company to premiere his new play (21 September 1921), Pirandello summarises the plot of I: 'C'è forse un mezzo per guarire quel demente: ridargli con un trucco violento "la sensazione della distanza del tempo." He is quoting a line spoken by Tito Belcredi in the Second Act, transalted as "To suggest the distance in time." (Pirandello 2014: 273) or "For the full effect of twenty years between." (Pirandello and Stoppard 2005: 72). Both translations unfortunately cover what seems a reference to Bergson's cone of memory drawn twice in 'Matter and Memory' (Paris, 1896).

On P the "plane of my actual representation of the universe", stands the inverted cone "SAB," that represents 'the totality of the recollections accumulated in my memory' (Bergson 1988: 152). At the base AB, there are 'the recollections accumulated in my memory' and at the summit of the cone S on the plane P there is the image of my body concentrated into the present perception. While AB remains 'motionless', S moves 'unceasingly' forward on the plane P. In the second figure of the cone of memory (162), an indefinite number of 'repetitions of our psychical life', different regions of the past ordered according to their distance or nearness to the present S. However, the distance is not metric as in a chronology, but represents a gradient between two different kinds of memory, pure memory in AB and the sensory-motor mechanisms in S, that at any given present is cut perpendicularly to the cone axis to produce a memory-image (172) A'B', A''B'', … :

Melancholie, London 1586 (Wilson 1963: 309-320), Ophelia's behaviour might have already been considered hysteric according to Edward Jorden's *A briefe discourse of a disease called the Suffocation of the Mother*, London 1603 (Camden 1948). 'Until Freud it was believed that hysteria was the consequence of the lack of conception and motherhood. Bleuler grouped hysteria with schizophrenia (Micale 1995: 173), and Minkowski's model followed his classification so that Ophelia has the same temporal structure as Henry, indefinite spatialisation.

Minkowsi's model of schizophrenia is quoted by Deleuze and Guattari as a source for their concept of schizophrenia (Deleuze 2006: 23). The importance of Hamlet for Deleuze's philosophy of time is evident in Difference and Repetition in relation to duration

> What does this mean: the empty form of time or third synthesis? The Northern Prince says 'time is out of joint'. Can it be that the Northern philosopher says the same thing: that he should be Hamletian because he is Oedipal? The joint, cardo, is what ensures the subordination of time to those properly cardinal points through which pass the periodic movements which it measures (time, number of the movement, for the soul as much as for the world). By contrast, time out of joint means demented time or time outside the curve which gave it a god, liberated from its overly simple circular figure, freed from the events which made up its content, its relation to movement overturned; in short, time presenting itself as an empty and pure form. Time itself unfolds (that is, apparently ceases to be a circle) instead of things unfolding within it (following the overly simple circular figure). It ceases to be cardinal and becomes ordinal, a pure order of time. (Deleuze 1994: 88)

Hamlet is often discussed in this context (Lorraine 2003; Somers-Hal 2011; Williams 2011; Grosz 2012), raising the question of where Ophelia would figure in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy had she been mentioned. Finally, and precisely because of the temporal structure that opposes her to Hamlet, she was chosen as the muse of this doctoral research, an experiment in artistic research for its epistolary part, and schyzoanalytic criticism for its scholarly apparatus:

> Schizoanalysis disturbs the division of labour separating author, critic and theorist, insisting on their differences in regime but not on their difference in nature. Schizoanalytic criticism – if we can speak of such a thing – exhorts us towards a traversal of these generic and disciplinary classifications, making possible perhaps new kinds of hybrid discourse. It would thus be inappropriate to describe the pieces collected in this volume as schizoanalysis applied to literature. Schizoanalysis is itself a practice, but one that operates alongside other practices in order to help us better understand – and in some cases to challenge and transform – the relations between theory and practice in any given field. (Buchanan et al. 2015: 4)

Is it not by the constancy of this agreement, by the precision with which these two complementary memories insert themselves each into the other, that we recognize a “well-balanced” mind, that is to say, in fact, a man nicely adapted to life? The characteristic of the man of action is the promptitude with which he summons to the help of a given situation all the memories which have reference to it; yet it is also the insurmountable barrier which encounters, when they present themselves on the threshold of his consciousness, memories that are useless or indifferent. To live only in the present, to respond to a stimulus by the immediate reaction which prolongs it, is the mark of the lower animals: the man who proceeds in this way is a man of impulse. But he who lives in the past for the mere pleasure of living there, and in whom recollections emerge into the light of consciousness without any advantage for the present situation, is hardly better fitted for action: here we have no man of impulse, but a dreamer. Between these two extremes lives the happy disposition of memory docile enough to follow with precision all the outlines of the present situation, but energetic enough to resist all other appeal. Good sense, or practical sense, is probably nothing but this. (153)

Although the influence of Bergson is generally recognised (Orsini 2009: 140-3), no evidence supports that Pirandello knew of the cone of memory specifically. Henry’s present (S) has completely telescoped into pure memory (AB) producing the fictional memory-image of his portrait. Confronted with the paradox that Frida is now what Matilda was in the painting, and Matilda is now what he has become, Henry’s cone of memory suddenly opens and he feels the distance of time that overwhelms him with anger.

The ‘violent trick’ staged by the doctor might lead to Pierre Janet’s hypnotherapy described in his *Psychological Healing. A Historical and Clinical Study* (1919) “Hypnotism may be defined as the momentary transformation of the mental state of an individual, artificially induced by a second person, and sufficing to bring about dissociations of personal memory’ (Janet 1925: 291). Both hypnosis and the violent trick aim at inducing, in Bergson’s model, the dissociation of memory-images superposed on the same plane of intersection. Similarities can also be found with more recent Narrative Exposure Therapies used in post-traumatic stress disorders (Schauer, Neuner and Elbert 2011), but more importantly, Pirandello’s ‘reliving therapy’ finds its antcedents in literature (Binion 2011: 3) and particulary in The Mousetrap (*Hamlet* 3.2).

The connection between a psychological therapy and a theatrical representation is relevant here within Oedipus’ genealogy from Sophocles to Aristotle and to Freud. Deleuze outlines the ‘symptomatological method’ (Smith 2012: 193), that he and Félix Guattari will later develop into schizoanalysis (*L’Anti-Oedipe,* Paris 1972), in the essay ‘Coldness and Cruelty’ (‘Le Froid et le Cruel’ in *Présentation de Sacher-Masoch*, Paris 1967) that attempted to reframe critically Leopold von Sacher Masoch’s novella *Venus in Furs* (*Venus im Pelz*, Wien 1870) and clinically Richard von Krafft Ebing’s sadomasochist perversion (*Neue Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der Psychopathia sexualis*, Stuttgart 1890) :

The critical (in the literary sense) and the clinical (in the medical sense) may be destined to enter into a new relationship of mutual learning. Symptomatology is always a question of art; the clinical specificities of sadism and masochism are not separable from the literary values peculiar to Sade and Masoch. In place of a dialectic which all too readily perceives the link between opposites, we should aim for a critical and clinical appraisal able to reveal the truly differential mechanisms as well as the artistic originalities. (Deleuze and Sacher-Masoch 1989: 14)

Strikingly missing is the purpose of this symptomatology once the clinical progression from symptoms to diagnosis to therapy is interrupted, and what is the purpose of criticism once Deleuze admits that ‘it is a question of seeing what use it has in the extra-textual practice that prolongs the text.’ (Deleuze in Schrift 1995: 63). The purpose of schizoanalysis lies with the spectator as this passage from Lacan’s Seminar VII ‘The Ethics of Psychoanalysis’ explains about classic tragedy:

> Catharsis has the sense of purification of desire. Purification cannot be accomplished, as is clear if one simply reads Aristotle’s sentence, unless one has at least established the crossing of its limits that we call fear and pity. It is because the tragic epos doesn’t leave the spectator in ignorance as to where the pole of desire is and shows that the access to desire necessitates crossing not only all fear but all pity, because the voice of the hero trembles before nothing, and especially not before the good of the other, because all this is experienced in the temporal unfolding of the story, that the subject learns a little more about the deepest level of himself than he knew before. For anyone who goes to the *Theatre-Français* or the Theatre of Athens, it will last as long as it lasts. But if, in the end, Aristotle’s formulations mean anything, it is that. One knows what it costs to go forward in a given direction, and if one doesn’t go that way, one knows why. One can even sense that if, in one’s accounts with one’s desire, one isn’t exactly in the clear, it is because one couldn’t do any better, for that’s not a path one can take without paying a price. The spectator has his eyes opened to the fact that even for him who goes to the end of his desire, all is not a bed of roses. But he also has his eyes opened – and this is essential – to the value of prudence which stands in opposition to that, to the wholly relative value of beneficial reasons, attachments or pathological interests, as Mr. Kant says, that might keep him on that risky path. (Lacan 1997: 323)

In his return to Freud, Lacan reconnects psychoanalysis to Aristotle’s cathartic function of the hero’s journey, but with a Nietzschean correction: the *fin* of psychoanalysis, its purpose and end, is ‘purification of desire’ not ‘from desire’, when Henry and Hamlet’s eyes are finally wide shut.

[5] The mask and the mirror are a recurring motive in Pirandello (Leube 1966: 160-1).

[6] The quote is from the Aestheticist sonnet “Ebbtide at Sundown” in *Wild Honey from Various Thyme* by Michel Field “How larger is remembrance than desire! / How deeper than all longing is regret!” (1908: 115). Field is the pseudonym of Katharine Bradley (1846-1914) and Edith Cooper (1862-1913) who published together and were a lesbian couple for over forty years. Lesbian relationships are frequently alluded in the letters.

Water and Oil

[1] *Sir John Everett Millais* by Thomas Brock (1904). The bronze sculpture is located at the corner John Islip Street / Attenbury Streeet.

[2] Echoes D.H. Lawrence’s judgement: ‘Millais might have been a painter, if he hadn’t been a Victorian. As it is, he is a wash out’ (1998: 259, slightly adapted).

[3] *Sir Henry Tate* by Thomas Brock (1898).

[4] Meisel 2010.

Queen Elizabeth I

[1] *Portrait of Elizabeth I (Hampden Portrait)* by Meulen, Steven van der, or Steven van Herwijck (c.1563) was on temporary loan to Tate and is currently in private collection. The painting has been reattributed to George Gower, c. 1567 (Town and David 2020).

[2] “A Songe betwene the Quenes Majestie and Englande,” published in 1559, in “The Ballad History of the Reigns of the Later Tudors” by C.H. Firth (1909: 70-1).

Susanna and the Elders

[1] *Susanna and the Elders* by Peter Lely (c.1650–5)

[2] The reference is to the peeping scene in Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960). From a whole in the drawing room wall, Norman peeps Marion while she prepares to take a shower before bed in Cabin 1. Marion changes her mind and Norman goes back to the house. (For detailed analysis of the scene, see Skerry 2008: 117-21) The painting concealing the peeping hole has been identified as *Susanna and the Elders* by Frans van Mieris the Elder (1635-1681), stolen in 1973 from the Hyacinthe Rigaud museum, Perpignan (Stelzner-Large 1990). In the trailer, Hitchcock presents Mieris' painting with a suspended "Oh, by the way, this picture has great significance, because …". Hitchcock's use of the painting to cover Norman's voyeurism transposes the Baroque use of Susanna's story as pretext for the depiction of nudity. However, the specific relation between painting and film lays, we believe, in Susanna's raised hand invoking God in Mieris' painting reflecting Marion's hand stretched towards the camera as she dies in the shower. The blind spot in the two scenes is occupied by God's panoptical perspective and the multiple camera angles in the shower scene. "The only thing that matters is whether the installation of the camera at a given angle is going to give the scene its maximum impact. The beauty of image and movement, the rhythm and the effects—everything must be subordinated to the purpose." This is the essence of Hitchcock's "absolute camera." (Skerry 2013: 21).
Lely's painting thematises the problem raised by Gertrude's detailed description of Ophelia's death. Why did the witness to the scene do nothing to rescue her? For instance, John William Waterhouse places in the third version of the scene (*Ophelia,* 1910, Private collection), two women looking at Ophelia from a bridge the distance, too far for intervening in time. While others see it as a clue of Gertrude's murder of Ophelia (Risden 2012: 149) also in the novel by Minette Walters, *The Scold's Bridle* (1994: 14).

[3] The site on which Henry Tate built National Gallery of British Art (begun 1893, opened 1897) was part of the land originally purchased by Jeremy Bentham in 1799 to realize the first panopticon prison. The plan was abandoned in 1812 and instead, the construction of the Millbank Penitentiary begun the same year, completed under Robert Smirke in 1821. It was the largest prison in the UK, infamous for its isolation cells and appalling living conditions of its inmates. After the prison was demolished in 1890, the site accommodated a military hospital with a parade ground and is now home to the Chelsea College of Arts and Tate Britain (Cottell and Mueller 2020).

Pamela Writing

[1] *I: Mr B. Finds Pamela Writing* by Joseph Highmore (1743-4) first of a series of twelve paintings illustrating Samuel Richardson's novel *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded* (1740).

[2] *Portrait of Samuel Richardson* by Joseph Highmore (1750, National Portrait Gallery, London).

[3] Žižek explains Lacan's interpretation of the skull in Holbein's *The Ambassadors* in the essay "Troubles with the Real":

> This is objet a: an entity that has no substantial consistency, which is in itself "nothing but confusion," and which acquires a definite shape only when looked upon from a standpoint distorted by the subject's desires and fears – as such, as a mere "shadow of what it is not," objet a is the strange object which is nothing but the inscription of the subject itself into the field of objects, in the guise of a stain which acquires form only when part of this field is anamorphically distorted by the subject's desire. (Žižek 2009).

Three Ladies

[1] *Three Ladies Adorning a Term of Hymen* by Joshua Reynolds (1773).

[2] At the time of the sitting, Barbara is 16 (?1757-88, will marry John Beresford 4 June 1774), Elizabeth is 22 (1751-83, will marry Luke Gardiner 3 July 1773), and Anne is 21 (1752-1819, married George Townshend 19 May 1773).

[3] Attached to the letter, is a colour copy of Joshua Reynolds' "Studio Experiments in Colour and Media." (*s.d.*, Royal Academy, London) with the annotation: "Sir Sloshua Slosh's slushiest sloshes! [heart]".[4]

[4] Muslin was a notoriously flammable fabric, as James Gillray caricatures in "Advantages of wearing muslin dresses! Dedicated to the serious attention of the Fashionable Ladies of Great Britain" (1802).

Lady Macbeth

[1] The engraving by James Heath (1804) shows that its source is a lightning. Tracing a connection with Joseph Priestley's *The History of the Idea of Positive and Negative Electricity* (1775), Peter Tomory comments that the "Now becomes a violent electrical discharge, with its accompanying light and smell." (1972: 125, slightly modified).

[2] The profile of Lady Macbeth bares similarities with Sarah Siddons' profile as drawn by George Romney (c. 1784). Richard Altick notes in *Paintings from Books* that in the first years when "Shakespeare subjects began to be painted in some quantity (the 1780's), a distinction was made between paintings derived from the literary text and those that originated in the theatre. The former bore the more honoured credentials." (1985: 256) The profile shows that the distinction was less clear cut than Altick suggests.

[3] Henry Fuseli had already drawn Shakespeare's scene twice before choosing different 'pregnant moments' as Fuseli calls them with Lessing (or time crystals as Deleuze calls them with Proust). During his first stay in London (1763-1770):

> 'Garrick was in the height of his reputation; and as Fuseli considered the theatre the best school (…) to acquire the pronunciation of the English language, and Garrick's performance an excellent imitation of the passions, (…) he never missed the opportunity of seeing him act, and he was generally to be found in the front row of the pit …) As a proof of the strong impression which Garrick's acting made at this period upon Fuseli, there are now (…) two drawings, which he presented to . . . Cadell [bookseller and publisher Thomas Cadell, the elder (1742-1802)]; the one representing Garrick and Mrs. Pritchard as Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, from the passage, "I have done the deed;" the other, Garrick as Richard the Third, making love to Lady Anne, over the corpse of her father-in-law, Henry the Sixth. These, according to an inscription on the second, were made in London, in 1766.' (Knowles 1831 v.1: 39-40)

"Garrick and Mrs Pritchard as Macbeth and Lady Macbeth after the Murder of Duncan" (c. 1760) and "Garrick as Duke of Gloucester waiting for Lady Anne at the Funeral Procession of her father-in-law, Henry VI" (1766) demonstrate the practice, that continued until the 1850s of studying human expressions, gestures, and actions from theatre performances rather than paintings or sculptures. Theatricality is better understood as an approximation to life rather than its idealisation.

[4] The Pre-Raphaelite critique of academic painting was condensed in the noun "slosh" (a watery mud) used as derogatory attribute of various painters. Reynolds' nickname "Sloshua" is recorded for the first time in a poem by John Tupper published on the Brotherhood journal *The Germ* "And who paint as Sloshua did / have all their sloshy fingers frozen" (Ormond 2006; Murgia 2015). The term may have been introduced by Millais, that Dante Gabriel Rossetti caricatured with a speech bubble saying "slosh" (1852-3).

[4] Pamela’s state corresponds to Edward Burke’s “delightful horror”:

> The passions which belong to self-preservation, turn on pain and danger; they are simply painful when their causes immediately affect us; they are delightful when we have an idea of pain and danger, without being actually in such circumstances; this delight I have not called pleasure, because it turns on pain, and because it is different enough from any idea of positive pleasure. Whatever excites this delight, I call *sublime.* The passions belonging to self-preservation are the strongest of all the passions. (Burke 1998: 47)

and “the most genuine effect and truest test of the sublime” (1998: 24) is what Lacan calls jouissance (Baunstein 2020).

[5] The painting is *Horse Frightened by a Lion* by George Stubbs (?1763).

[6] Cf. Gilbert Austen’s *Chironomia* (1806: 487 and fig. 101) and the same gesture in Michelangelo’s *Peccato originale e cacciata dal Paradiso terrestre* in the Sixtine Chapel.

[7] The reference was identified by Andrei Pop (2015: 59).

[8] Cf. “‘Painting Upon the Darkness’: les visions artistiques de Thomas De Quincey” by Béatrice Laurent (2003).

Flatford Mill

[1] John Constable’s *Flatford Mill. 'Scene on a Navigable River'* (1816-7). The “patch of green” may be a reference to the “patch of white wall” that George Didi-Huberman discovers in Fra Angelico’s fresco of the Annunciation in the corridor of San Marco convent, Florence (introduced in *Fra Angelico: Dissemblance and Simulation*, 1995: 34; conceptualised in *Confronting Images*, 2005: 16 ff.) or rather, to Didi-Huberman’s own source, Proust’s *Swan’s Way* (1995: 9 and n.7), where the fictional writer Bergotte encounters the “little patch of yellow wall” in Iohannes Vermeer’s *View of Delft* (1660-1). Its location in the painting is discussed by Lorenzo Renzi in his *Proust e Vermeer: apologia dell’imprecisione* (1999). A better choice of term than “inexact” (*impreciso*) may heve been “anexact” that refers to “every variation falling between the two relative thresholds of a meaning can be subsumed in a single diagram or statement. Such a diagram is not exact since it does not explicitly account for each potential actualization. But, if carefully used, neither is it inexact, because it does not overstep the limits beyond which an essentially different event transpires. It is calculated to be ***anexact,*** to precisely span a range of virtuality. The concept of anexactitude allows one’s analysis to function at a certain level of generality without losing sight of the multiplicity immanent to each unique speech act.” (Massumi 1992: 158 n.60)

[2] The comparison is not between the colour green in Constable and that in Millais’ copy but rather between two sensations. For Deleuze, ‘sensation’ is the defining concept of art and constitutive of an artwork:

> What is preserved—the thing or the work of art—is a bloc of sensations, that is to say, a compound of percepts and affects. Percepts are no longer perceptions; they are independent of a state of those who experience them. Affects are no longer feelings or affections; they go beyond the strength of those who undergo them. Sensations, percepts, and affects are beings whose validity lies in themselves and exceeds any lived. They could be said to exist in the absence of man because man, as he is caught in stone, on the canvas, or by words, is himself a compound of percepts and affects. The work of art is a being of sensation and nothing else: it exists in itself. (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 164)

The passage allows to establish, at least in principle, an equivalence between artworks based on the identity of sensation. Phenomenology finds sensation in perceptual and affective “a priori materials” that transcend the perceptions and affections of the lived: Van Gogh's yellow or Cezanne's innate sensations. (Deleuze

and Guattari 1994: 178) If Deleuze's 'a priori materials' are grounded neither in concept, nor artistic and historical context, nor psychological aesthetic experience, how can the sensation of Constable's green be distinguished from that of Millais' green? Deleuze's answer that 'sensation is realized in the material and does not exist outside of this realization' (193) does not resolve the problem of univocity.

[3] Leslie refers the following dialogue occurred in 1823 between Constable and George Beaumont, his patron and established amateur painter:

> At another time, Sir George recommended the colour of an old Cremona fiddle for the prevailing tone of everything, and this Constable answered by laying an old fiddle on the green lawn before the house. Again, Sir George, who seemed to consider the autumnal tints necessary, at least to some part of a landscape, said, "Do you not find it very difficult to determine where to place your brown tree?" And the reply was, "Not in the least, for I never put such a thing into a picture." But however opposite in these respects their opinions were, and although Constable well knew that Sir George did not appreciate his works the intelligence, the wit, and the fascinating and amiable manners of the Baronet had gained his heart, and a sincere and lasting friendship subsisted between them. (Leslie 1896: 140-1)

The experiment is not about the colour of grass, as the text ironically presents it, but reveals the power relation between institutional normativity, represented by Reynolds' rules of painting, and minor artistic practices, represented by Constable's naturalism. Over thirty years later, indicatively counted from Constable's *Flatford Mill* (1816) to Millais's *Isabella* (1849), the PRB opposition to the RA system still played out around the detail and colour of nature, though never so seriously as for Constable, who was barely elected full member after repeated failures in 1829.

[4] In the same 1780 room as Fuseli's *Lady Macbeth*, Joseph Wright of Derby's *Sir Brooke Boothby* (1781).

[5] The reference is to *Rousseau juge de Jean Jacques. Dialogue. D'après le manuscript de M. Rousseau laissé entre les mains de M. Brooke Boothby* published by Boothy (London 1780).

[6] Boothby was an amateur botanist. He participated in the translation into English of Linnaeus' *A System of Vegetables and The Families of Plants* and in 1793, became a Fellow of the Linnaean Society upon the recommendation of Erasmus Darwin. The out of scale marsh marigold or kingcup (*Caltha palustris*) under the shoes might be alluding to Boothby's support for constitutional monarchy (Boothby 1792). A kingscup also appears in Millais' *Ophelia* (the yellow flower between the poppy and Ophelia's right hand), probably alluding to Claudius' poisoned goblet.

[7] Thomas Gainsborough's *Gypsy Encampment, Sunset* (c.1778–80), also in the 1780 room.

[8] Constable distinguishes between generic trees, recognisable as belonging to a species, and individual trees. This can be seen in *Flatford Mill* comparing the ash trees in the foreground with the poplar and willow in the middle ground. The difference of detailing, that Millais flattens, is not only a way to accentuate depth but also affective. For instance, Constable tells the story of 'An ash tree' (1835) in one of his Hampstead lectures on landscape (July 1836):

> Many of my Hampstead friends may remember this *young lady* at the entrance to the village. Her fate was distressing, for it is scarcely too much to say that she died of a broken heart. I made this drawing when she was in full health and beauty; on passing some time afterwards, I saw, to my grief, that a wretched board had been nailed to her side, on which was written in large letters, 'All vagrants and beggars will be dealt with according to law.' The tree seemed to have felt the disgrace, for even then some of the top branches had withered. Two long spike nails had been driven into her side. In another year one half became

paralysed, and not long after the other shared the same fate, and this beautiful creature was cut down to a stump, just high enough to hold the board. (Leslie 1845: 360)

The drawing and the narrative focus on the relation between the tree and the board but Constable may also be referring to the relation between the notice and the vagrant with a social commentary.

[9] As in Constable, Gainsborough's greens are complex mixtures, using Prussian blue extensively for his middle green (Jones 1994; Bomford, Roy and Saunders 1988). For influence of Gainsborough on the early Constable, see Michael Kitson's 'A Context For Constable's Naturalism' (1991) and Felicity Owen's 'Early Influences on John Constable' (1991).

[10] Constable defines chiaroscuro as 'that power which creates space; we find it everywhere and at all time in nature; opposition, union, light shade, reflection, and refraction, all contribute to it.' (Thornes 1999: 89). Compared to Gainsborough's landscapes, *Flatford Mill* shows sharper contours, reduced local contrast, extended tonal range especially in the mid tones, overall brighter and colder light, 'the cool tint of English daylight' (Leslie 1845: 147).

[11] Although the first evidence of their long-term friendship dates to 1829 (Rhyne 1990), Field was the leading experimental chemist engaged in preparing colours (Gage 2001). His *Chromatics* (1817) was well received, and the colour green has in it a special role. It is the middle A in a musical-chromatic scale (35) and the main colour of nature: 'Note IV. § 12. (Medially the secondary green) It is worthy to remark that *green* is the centre, the absolute mean of the middle order of colours, (Example 9). In nature also, *green* appears to be the harmonic mean of which the extremes are the *light* of the sun, attended by *yellow*, and its surrounding shade, the sky, by *blue*; which colours are the elements of green.' (50) Moreover, Fields describes optical mixtures with reference to green (51-5).

[12] Thomas Gainsborough, *Mr and Mrs Andrews*, c. 1750, National Gallery, London

[13] John Constable, *Wivenhoe Park, Essex*, 1816, National Gallery of Art, Washington. Constable began using new colours from 1819 including ultramarine blue and emerald green.

[14] John Constable, *Water-meadows near Salisbury*, 1820 or 1829 (painted), Victoria and Albert Museum, London. The RA hanging committee of the 1830 exhibition, of which he himself was a member, rejected the painting as 'a nasty green thing' (Reynolds 1983: 182).

[15] On the 19 June 1824, Delacroix notes in his journal: "Saw [Léon] Cogniet, and the picture by Gericault [*The Raft of the Medusa*], also the Constables. It was too much for one day. That Constable did me a world of good. Came home about five o'clock. Spent two hours in the studio. Great want of sex. I am utterly abandoned." (Delacroix 1995: 49)

[16] Eugéne Delacroix, *Massacres at Chios,* 1824, Louvre, Paris. While Delacroix's encounter with Constable's paintings is common knowledge (Floorisone 1957), its interpretation might need a wider perspective. For instance, Delacroix's engagement for British culture went beyond Constable (Noon and Riopelle 2015: 20-2) and can be inserted in the second wave of French anglomania (Patrick 2016) in which art dealers, mainly John Arrowsmith and Claude Schroth, tried to tap in during the Bourbon Restauration (Whitely 1983: 69-71). More in general, "The Western canon […] is not a universal entity distributed among, and displayed by, national and other galleries […] It is instead a blanket draped over a map of national cultures, each of which conceives and authors this art somewhat differently to reflect national tastes, history, culture and

relationships. […] in some measure affected by the culture and setting in which it is shown." (Knell 2016: 67-8).

[17] Delacroix's *Journal* supplement, entry dated 23 September 1846 (Ives and Barker 2000: 94). The visit needs not be doubted as it is confirmed by a letter from Claude Schroth in Paris, delivered by Eugene Delacroix to Constable in London 17 May 1825, informing him of the very favourable reception of his new pictures in Paris (Rhyne 1990), although Delacroix is not crediting Constable with an influence on his colouring technique.

[18] The critic of Pierre-Athanase Chauvin regarded Delacroix's work as the ultimate Romantic insult to classical beauty:

> It is not to arrest the development of our young artists that I am so quick to indicate the steps by which a distinguished painter, the teacher of their teachers [David], led the historical genre to the apogee of its glory; it is rather to establish a necessary point of comparison, which ought to humiliate no one; it is, in short, to avoid the words 'classic' and 'romantic', or, if you will, to explain them clearly and precisely. The classic is drawn from *la belle nature* it touches us, it moves us, it satisfies heart and mind together. The more one studies, the more one discovers its beauties; one leaves it with regret, and returns to it with pleasure. The romantic, on the contrary, has something forced, unnatural, which at first glance shocks the eye and upon examination repels it. The artist, in delirium, uselessly combines atrocious scenes, sheds blood, tears out innards, paints despair and agony. Uselessly again, he obtains partial effects in the midst of a thousand extravagances, and makes people who know nothing about it shout, 'Miracle!' Posterity will never accept such works, and contemporaries of good faith will grow weary of them; they are weary already. Conclusion: I call *Leonidas* [a painting by David] … classic, and the *Massacres of Chios* romantic. (Jobert 1998: 75–6; see also MacNamidhe 2015: 57)

Théodore Géricault was as deeply impressed by Constable as Delacroix: "Constable is a remarkable man and one of English glories. I already told you of the impression he made on me when I was painting the Massacre of Chios. He and Turner are true reformists. They got themselves out of the rut of the old landscape painters. Our school, currently full of talents in this genre, has benefited largely from their example. Géricault returned feeling dizzy from their large landscapes." (Sylvestre 1864: 78-9 my translation)

[19] Although Constable sold twenty-two paintings in France between 1824 and 1827, he always refused to travel to France even after being awarded the gold medal for *The Haywain* at the Salon 1824.

[20] After quoting Sylvester quoting Delacroix, Signac concludes that "This last sentence clearly proves that the decomposition of tints in degrading strokes, such an important of *division*, has been anticipated by the great painter so that his passion for colour lead him necessarily to realise the benefits of optical mixing." (Signac 1911: 9 my translation) The comment follows Kemp 1990: 316. Optical colour mixing was identified in the Byzantine mosaics at Hagia Sophia (James 1996: 4), Deleuze accepts the same conclusion from different studies (1993: 191 n15).

[21] As a critic and influential trustee of Tate, Reed played a major role in promoting Modernism in Britain since the 1930s at the expenses of Victorian Pre-Raphaelitism and Aestheticism, as the fate of Millais' statue testifies. The revaluation of Constable is made clear in the following passage from his Introduction to the *History of Modern Painting from Baudelaire to Bonnard. The Birth of a New Vision*: "Research, experiment […] is all a persistent attempt to correlate art and reality. It is the research not of the absolute, but of the concrete, of the *image*, and behind it all is not only the divorce of the artist from the processes of production, but also the concurrent attempt to establish a philosophy of reality, a phenomenalism that

owes nothing to divine revelation or universal truths, but brings to the analysis of human existence the same faculties that the artist brings to the analysis of nature. Constable, Cézanne, Picasso—Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger: these names represent parallel movements in the evolution of human experience.” (Raynal 1949: xviii)

[22] Constable’s shift in his artistic practice is stated in a letter to John Dunthorne, 29 May 1802:

And however one’s mind may be elevated, and kept us to what is excellent, by the works of the Great Masters — still Nature is the fountain’s head, the source from whence all originally must spring — and should an artist continue his practice without referring to nature he must soon form a manner, & be reduced to the same deplorable situation as the French painter mentioned by Sir J. Reynolds, who told him that he had long ceased to look at nature for she only put him out. For the last two years I have been running after pictures, and seeking the truth at second hand. I have not endeavoured to represent nature with the same elevation of mind — but have neither endeavoured to make my performances look as if really executed by other men. I am come to a determination to make no idle visits this summer, nor to give up my time to common-place people. I shall return to Bergholt, where I shall make some laborious studies from nature — and I shall endeavour to get a pure and unaffected manner of representing the scenes that may employ me. (Bermingham 1989: 117-8)

Delacroix follows Reynold’s critique of French painting: “I pray you to bring the fine works of which you told me. Our school has great need of being infused with new blood. Our school is old and it appears to me that the English school is young. They (the English) appear to seek the natural while we are only occupied at imitating pictures. Don’t stone me for borrowing outside these feelings which I sadly share.” (Sylvestre 1864: 79, my translation)

[23] ‘Painting is a science and should be pursued as an inquiry into the laws of nature. Why, then, may not a landscape be considered as a branch of natural philosophy, of which pictures are but experiments?’ (*The History of Landscape Painting*, fourth lecture, Royal Institution (16 June 1836) in Constable (1970: 69). The quote was highlighted by Ernst Gombrich in his 1978 lecture at the Royal Institution (1980).

[24] Joseph Wright of Derby, *An Experiment on a Bird in the Air Pump*, 1768, National Gallery, London.

[25] The term ‘experiment’ is used in the title rather loosely and better corresponds to the current ‘demonstration’ which purpose is not the production of new knowledge, but its social acceptance and geographical dissemination. The distinction ‘between “trying” an experiment, “showing” it, and “discoursing” upon it’ was already clear in Boyle (Shapin 1988: 399-404). Wright sees the function of the painter in ‘showing’ the experiment as equivalent to that of the demonstrator. The detail is relevant as it positions the demonstration within a meeting of the Lunar Society organized in various locations on the Monday closest to a full moon (Uglow 2003: 10, 15). Wright of Derby was close friend of two members of the Lunar Society, the geologist and engineer, John Whitehurst and the doctor, scientist, and poet Erasmus Darwin. The location of the painting is Darwin’s house in Litchfield where Wright stayed in 1767 (King-Hele 1999: 83).

[26] The hemispheres are not only a historical recognition of Otto von Guericke’s work, but emphasizes the conceptual difference of Boyle’s use of the pump. His *New Experiments* begin by repositioning vacuum demonstrated by Torricelli and von Guericke’s experiment, presenting it not as a philosophical principle or as matter of experiment, but as a ‘technical object’ underlying the basic function of the air pump: “To proceed now to the *Phaenomena*, exhibited to us by the Engine above described; I hold it not unfit to begin with what doth constantly and regularly offer it self to our observation, as depending upon the Fabrick of the Engine it self, and not upon the nature of this or that particular Experiment which ‘tis employed to try.

First, then, upon the drawing down of the Sucker (the Valve being shut) the Cylindrical space, deserted by the Sucker, is left devoid of Air […].” (Boyle 1682: 11)

For Hans-Joerg Rheinberger technical objects ‘are the instruments, apparatus, and other devices enabling and at the same time, bounding and confining the assessment of the epistemic things under investigation. Their rigidity and specificity is necessary to keep the vagueness of the epistemic objects limited and to confine their criticality. Without such specificity of the technical objects, the epistemic things would not become shaped, but would rather dissipate in the hands of the researcher.’ (Rheinberger 2009: 21) Now, that vacuum is turned into a technical object and incorporated into the technical conditions of the experimental system, air becomes the new ‘epistemic thing’.

In Experiment 10, Ferguson connects small purposely built hemispheres to the air-pump:

Join the two brass hemispherical cups A and B, together, with a wet leather between them, having a hole in the middle of it; then screw the end D of the pipe CD into the plate of the pump at *i*, and turn the cock E, so as the pipe may be open all the way into the cavity of the hemispheres: then exhaust the air out of them, and turn the cock a quarter round, which will shut the pipe CD, and keep out the air. This done, unscrew the pipe at D from the pump; and screw the piece FH upon it at D; and let two strong men try to pull the hemi spheres asunder by the rings g and h, which they will find hard to do: for if the diameter of the hemispheres be four inches, they will be pressed together by the external air with a force equal to 190 pounds. And to shew that it is the pressure of the air that keeps them together, hang them by either of the rings upon the hook P of the wire in the receiver M (Fig. 1), and upon exhausting the air out of the receiver, they will fall asunder of themselves. (Ferguson 225)

[27] A transparent glass bottle is half full of water, a goose quill stripped of its barbs floats in it, half sticking out the bottle neck, and the cork lays on the table to the left. The cork, that would fit tight in the bottle neck, might indicate a separate experiment on air pressure (Berry, Osborne, Peppin 1999) similar to Ferguson’s experiment 22: “Put a cork into the square phial A, and fix it in with wax or cement; put the phial upon the pump-plate with the wire cage B over it, and cover the cage with a close receiver. Then, exhaust the air out of the receiver, and the air that was corked up in the phial will break the phial by the force of its spring, because there is no air left on the outside of the phial to act against the air within it.” (Ferguson 230)

The cork not cemented but forced in the bottle, would simply pop without breaking the bottle. In the narrative of the demonstration, the experiment complements the previous one with the Magdeburg hemispheres, demonstrating air pressure from inside the bottle towards the outside. As the quill is hollow, it can function as a common drinking straw. An indication of its purpose can be found at the beginning of the section ‘on the air pump, where Ferguson refers to his explanation of ‘the common pump’ in his previous ‘Lecture V: Of Hydrostatics’: ‘The air-pump being constructed the same way as the water-pump, whoever understands the one, will be at no loss to understand the other.’ (Ferguson 1806: 213; see 142 ff.). Ferguson used a glass model for his lecture, but the action of sucking the water with the quill, possibly performed by one of the girls, would be enough to demonstrate the basic function of the water pump, the air pump and the lungs.

[28] A straight pipe appears to be inserted through the pluck inside the lungs of a small animal, so that they can be inflated to demonstrate pulmonary respiration. The demonstration is still used for secondary school students (Stem Learning 2010-9). The demonstration relates to Boyle’s conclusions about the functioning of the lungs:

But the chief of the Controversies formerly pointed at, is not yet decided, namely, *what it is that conveys the Air into the Lungs.* For when, to counterballance all that hath been alledg'd, those that plead for the Lungs demand what it is that should bring the Air into the Lungs, if themselves do not attract it, their Antagonists disagree about the Reply. For when to this question some of the best Modern Philosophers answer, That by the dilatation of the Chest the contiguous Air is thrust away, and that pressing upon the next Air to it, and so onwards, the Propulsion it continued till the Air be driven into the Lungs, and so dilate them: When this (I say) is answered, it is Objected even by *Bartholine* himself [Thomas Bartholin, *De pulmonum substantia et motu*. Copenhagen 1663], as a convincing Reply, that, according to this Doctrine, a Man could not fetch his Breath from a great Vessel full of Air, with a slender Neck, because, that when his Mouth covers the Orifice of the Neck, the dilatation of his *Thorax* could not propell the Air in the Vessel into his Lungs, by reason of its being separated by the inclosing Vessel from the ambient Air; and yet, say they, Experience witnesseth, that out of such a Vessel a Man may suck Air. But of this difficulty our Engine furnisheth us with an easie Solution, since many of the former Experiments have manifested, That in the case proposed, there needs not be made any (though 'tis true that in ordinary Respiration there is wont to be made some) propulsion of the Air by the swelling *Thorax* or *Abdomen* into the Lungs; since upon the bare Dilatation of the *Thorax*, the Spring of that internal Air, or halituous substance that is wont to possess as much of the cavity of the Chest as the Lungs fill not up, being much weaken'd, the external and contiguous Air must necessarily press in at the open Wind pipe into the Lungs, as finding there less resistance than any where else about it.
And hence (by the way) we may derive a new assistance to judge of that famous Controversie disputed among Naturalists and Physicians, ever since Galen's time, some maintaining that the Chest, with the contained Lungs, may be resembled to a pair of Bellows, which comes therefore to be fill'd because it was dilated: And others pleading to have the comparison made to a Bladder, which is therefore dilated because it is fill'd. (Boyle 1682: 172-3)

The demonstrator would have inflated the lungs under water to simulate inhaling, while the water pressure would have been sufficient to expel the air, simulating exhalation. This also justifies the position of the candle.

[29] The model for Wright's air pump is derived from Boyle and Hook in the upper part (the receiver and the wooden structure) and from Frances Hauksbee in the double barrel mechanism (Brundtland 2012: 268).

[30] Boyle had already used the air pump on a lark and a sparrow to prove the relation between respiration and air, as he describes in Experiment 41:

To satisfie our selves in some measure, about the account upon which Respiration is so necessary to the Animals, that Nature hath furnished with Lungs, we took (being then unable to procure any other lively Bird, small enough to be put into the Receiver) a Lark, one of whose Wings had been broken by a shot, of a Man that we had sent to provide us some Birds for our Experiment; but notwithstanding this hurt, the Lark was very lively, and did, being put into the Receiver, divers times spring up in it to a good height. The Vessel being hastily, but carefully clos'd, the Pump was diligently ply'd, and the Bird for a while appear'd lively enough; but upon a greater exsuction of the Air, she began manifestly to droop and appear sick, and very soon after was taken with as violent and irregular Convulsions, as are wont to be observ'd in Poultry, when their heads are wrung off: For the Bird threw her self over and over two or three times, and dyed with her Breast upward, her Head downwards, and her Neck awry. And though upon the appearing of these Convulsions, we turn'd the Stop-cock, and let in the Air upon her, yet it came too late; whereupon casting our Eyes upon one of those accurate Dyals that go with a *Pendulum*, and were of late ingeniously invented by the Noble and Learned *Hugenius* [Christian Huygens], we found that the whole Tragedy had been concluded within ten Minutes of an hour, part of which time had been imploy'd in cementing the Cover to the Receiver. Soon after we got a Hen-sparrow which being caught with Bird-lime was not at all hurt; when we put her into the Receiver, almost to the top of which she would briskly raise her self, the Experiment being try'd with this Bird, as it was with the former, she seemed to be dead within seven minutes, one of which were imployed in cementing on the Cover: But upon the speedy turning of the Key, the fresh Air flowing in, began slowly to revive her, so that aster some pantings she opened her eyes, and regain'd her feet, and in about a ¼ of an hour after, threatned to make an escape at the top of the Glass, which had been unstopped to let in the fresh Air upon her: But the Receiver being closed the second time, she was killed with violent Convulsions, within five Minutes from the beginning of the Pumping. (Boyle 1682: 162-3)

[31] A reflection of the candle flame is noticeable above the bird's wing. The connection between the behaviour of the flame as the air is extracted and that of the animal enabled Boyle to draw a connection between combustion and respiration reinforced by the position of the candle and the lungs in the jar. At the same time, Wright uses the candle snuffer on the table to reinforce the metaphor of extinguishing the candle flame for killing the bird.

[32] The public allegorises moral positions in relation to the sympathy felt for the agonising bird: cruel (the boy), curious (scientist), utilitarian (father), egoistic (lovers), indifferent (young servant), melancholy (philosopher), sad (elder sister), frightened (younger sister).

[33] *Frankenstein*, directed by James Whale, 1931. The comparison on the theme death and science is already established between Wright's painting and Mary Shelly's novel (Boucherie 2017).

[34] The 'logic of the gaze' (Bryson 1979) in *An Experiment* requires some further analysis. There are eleven characters in the painting that can be ordered in four groups according to the direction of their look or pointing:

towards the bird: the father, the young scientist, the young boy, the little girl

away from the bird: the elder sister, the melancholy philosopher

towards other characters: the young couple, the father*

towards the viewer: the bird, the demonstrator, the young servant

The last group has a special significance as the characters' look aligns to the gaze and includes the viewer into the image (Lacan 1998: 105-6). As the looks do not converge in the same spot, the viewer is presented with a moral choice between alternative positions: reason, sentiment, insensitivity. A fourth position, that of the painter, will be considered later.

[35] The relation between knowledge and consensus production in the Hobbes Boyle debate is in Shapin and Schaffer 2011. The fictioning of the phaenomenon is examined in Schwab 2015. A study on instrument mediated knowledge in Vermeer and Leeuwenhoek in Huerta 2016. The position of the viewer and the public has its antecedent in Rembrandt's *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Tulp* discussed in Riegl 2011: 272 ff. Sebald's interpretation was used earler. Lessing's 'pregnant moment' as in Lely's Susanna and the Elders.

[36] Little attention is paid in the literature to the role of children and the theme of education in *An Experiment* and in the other paintings of Wright's sci-fi trilogy: *A Philosopher Giving that Lecture on an Orrery, in which a Lamp is put in the Place of the Sun* (1760) and *The Alchemist, In Search of the Philosopher's Stone, Discovers Phosphorus, and prays for the successful Conclusion of his operation, as was the custom of the Ancient Chymical Astrologers* (1771). Arguing that Wright's paintings have a sci-fi narrative goes beyond the boundaries of this chapter, but follows Isaac Asimov's definition of science fiction 'as that branch of literature which deals with the reaction of human beings to changes in science and technology' (1975: 92; for a survey on the prehistory of sci-fi see Stableford 2003). At least, the motif of scientific education provides a narrative spanning the three paintings, strongly related in terms of execution, milieu, lighting and composition. *Lecture on an Orrery* begins by praising technical scientific education, *An Experiment* shows that it needs to be founded upon a 'sentimental education', to borrow Flaubert's expression, and *The Alchemist* reminds of the superiority of natural religion.

'Sentimental education' is advocated in *An Experiment* demonstrating the consequences of its lack. Each aspect is dramatised by the characters according to age, gender and class and can be read against Jean-

Jacques Rousseau's *Emile*. Published in 1762 within the following year, *Emile* circulated in three English translations (McEachern 1984: 116-19). Although the Lunar Society did not keep official records of their meetings, Roussseau's philosophy of education would have been debated amongst the 'Lunatics', especially after Richard Lovell Edgeworth joined them in 1766 (Uglow 2002: 256). Edgeworth introduced Thomas Day in 1768 (363 ff), that Wright portrayed in 1770 holding a copy of *Emile* (Uglow 2002b).
The following passage from book IV of Rousseau's *Emile* is particularly significant to Wright's painting: Emile. having reflected little on sensitive beings, will know late what it is to suffer and die. He will begin to have gut reactions at the sounds of complaints and cries, the sight of blood flowing will make him avert his eyes; the convulsions of a dying animal will cause him an ineffable distress before he knows whence come these new movements within him. If he had remained stupid and barbaric, he would not have them; if he were more learned, he would know their source. He has already compared too many ideas to feel nothing and not enough to have a conception of what he feels.

Thus is born pity, the first relative sentiment which touches the human heart according to the order of nature. To become sensitive and pitying, the child must know that there are beings like him who suffer what he has suffered, who feel the pains he has felt, and that there are others whom he ought to conceive of as able to feel them too. In fact how do we let ourselves be moved by pity if not by transporting ourselves outside of ourselves and identifying with the suffering animal, by leaving, as it were, our own being to rake on its being? We suffer only so much as we judge that it suffers. It is not in ourselves, it is in him that we suffer. Thus, no one becomes sensitive until his imagination is animated and begins to transport him out of himself. (Rousseau 1979: 222-3)

One can identify some of the aspects depicted by Wright: the instinctive reaction in the little girl, the more conscious reaction of her elder sister, the 'stupid and barbaric' young servant who goes about his duty. In other passages one can recognize the young lovers 'playing at sentiment' (222); 'the mannered, polite, civilized child, who only awaits the power of putting to work the premature instructions he has received' (220); the melancholy man leaning on a walking stick and staring at the lung specimen without his glasses: 'A frail body weakens the soul. This is the origin of the empire of medicine, an art more pernicious to men than all the ills it claims to cure. As for me, I do not know of what illness the doctors cure us; but I do know that they give us quite fatal ones: cowardice, pusillanimity, credulousness, terror of death.' (54); the man of industry (notice his hands) justifying the experiment to his daughter 'It is true. then, that man is the king of the earth he inhabits; for not only does he tame all the animals, not only does his industry put the elements at his disposition, but he alone on earth knows how to do so […]' (277).
Describing the viewer's positions in *An Experiment*, we also mentioned a forth. This privileged position in which the painter puts himself and from which he looks back at the viewer is the point of view of the image. The painting uses two vanishing points outside the picture that can be easily reconstructed using the archway on the right and the window on the left. Significant is however the position of the horizon line (notice the capitals of the air pump columns) and the perpendicular that intersects it in the point of sight (notice that it coincides with the vertical axe of the glass jar) which allows to infer that the painter is sitting at the center of the composition roughly at eye level with the little girl. This fourth position supports that sentimental education has a special importance in the painting.

[37] David Hume's thought experiment on a particular shade of blue in *Treatise of Human Nature* 1.1.1. (2007 v.1: 10).

[38] A a pair of Wright's oil landscapes recently acquired by Derby Museums, *A View of Cromford Bridge* and *Arkwright's Mills*, c.1795-6.

[39] The connection was first made by Henry Fuseli in 1823: "'Speaking of me, he says, 'I like de [imitates Fuseli's German accent] landscapes of Constable; he is always picturesque, of a fine colour, and de lights always in de right places; but he makes me call for my great coat and umbrella.'" (Leslie 1845: 109).

Constable himself was fully aware of it, for instance when he noted in a letter to John Fisher (8 April 1826) that *The Cornfield* (1826) 'has certainly got a little more eye-salve than I usually condescend to give" (letter JCC VI, p. 217 in Reynolds 1983: 76). Ray Lambert argues for Constable's picturesque convincingly (2004: 190-209).

'These three terms […] picturesque, sentimental (or sentiment and feeling), and romantic began to be important at about the same time and were to a considerable degree interchangeable.' (Pipkin 1985: 42) but our argument requires that some distinction be made. John Ruskin in 'Of the Turnerian Picturesque' in *Modern Painters IV* (1856) analyses Turner's *Windmill and Lock* (Ruskin 1900: 8-9). Ruskin can rescue Turner's picturesque by placing him in a category of its own, the 'high picturesque because he remains truthful (8-9) and sympathetic to his subject (10-12). Leaving aside Ruskin's taste on picturesque subject matter, his critical rejection of the 'low picturesque' is based on its superficiality. First, the painter is oriented towards the external effect of the painting on the viewer rather than the inner knowledge of the subject he presents in the painting. Second, the painter exploits sentimental subjects rather than having a sincere affective connection with them. Third, the painter's knowledge of the subject depends upon the intensity of his sympathy with it: "there is no definite bar of separation between the two; but that the dignity of the picturesque increases from lower to higher, in exact proportion to the sympathy of the artist with his subject. And in like manner his own greatness depends (other things being equal) on the extent of this sympathy." (Ruskin 1900: 12-3) Against Ruskin, we will apply the above criteria to Constable to show the relation of landscape painting to knowledge and experiment.

[40] The reference is to a passage in Constable's Third Lecture at the Royal Institution (1836) in which he contrasts Ruisdael's understanding of the natural signs in the landscape with his use of allegory in the painting:

> *We see nothing truly till we understand it*. An ordinary spectator at the mouth of the river which Ruysdael has here painted, would scarcely be conscious of the existence of many of the objects that conduce to the effect of the picture certainly not of their fitness; for pictorial effect. Constable pointed to a copy of a small evening winter-piece, by Ruysdael. "This picture," he said, "represents an approaching thaw. The ground is covered with snow and the trees are still white but there are two windmills near the centre, the one has the sails furled, and is turned in the work, the other has the canvas on the poles, and is turned another way, which indicates a change in the wind the clouds are opening in that direction, which appears by the glow in the sky to be the south (the sun's winter habitation in our hemisphere), and this change will produce a thaw before the morning. The concurrence of these circumstances shows that Ruysdael understood what he was painting. He has here told a story but in another instance he failed, because he attempted to tell that which is out of the reach of the art. In a picture which was known, while he was living, to be called 'An Allegory of the Life of Man' (and it may therefore be supposed he so intended it), there are ruins to indicate old age, a stream to signify the course of life, and rods and precipices to shadow forth its dangers but how are we to discover all this? (Leslie 1893: 393)

Constable's critique of allegory will be applied in Millais and developed through Benjamin (Straughan 2016: 142-4).

[41] Immediacy and infinity are the two characteristics of the Romantic theory of medium, according to Benjamin (Menninghaus 1999: 28).

[42] Constable's 'feeling' does not map onto Deleuze's 'sensation' without some discussion. Feelings, or sentiments, are subjective and of a higher order than passions, while sensations are impersonal and include perception. Constable's notion of feeling is rather generic but seems to derive from Wordsworth's Preface to the 1802 edition of Lyrical Ballads (1991: 245-7) that Wordsworth gave to Constable probably during their meeting of 1806 when he visited him during his tour of the Lake District (Peckham 1953; Watson 1962; Storch 1966). In the Preface, Wordsworth speaks of identification between the character and the poet and a correspondence with other minds, the two being conjoined by a process of selection. The Poet has a disposition to be affected more than other men by absent things as if they were present; an ability of conjuring up in himself passions, which are indeed far from being the same as those produced by real events, yet (especially in those parts of the general sympathy which are pleasing and delightful) do more nearly resemble the passions produced by real events, than anything which, from the motions of their own minds merely, other men are accustomed to feel in themselves:— whence, and from practice, he has acquired a greater readiness and power in expressing what he thinks and feels, and especially those thoughts and feelings which, by his own choice, or from the structure of his own mind, arise in him without immediate external excitement. (ibid.)

Wordsworth's similarities to Hume's Treatise have already been noticed (Chandler 2015: 167) but the decisive move in our argument is switching the perspective from the artist to the artwork, as Deleuze does in this passage of his early essay on Hume, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*: "The work of art has therefore its own particular mode of existence, which is not the mode of a real object nor the mode of an actual passion: the lesser degree of belief is the condition for another kind of belief. Artifice has its own belief." (Deleuze 2001: 56) The mode of existence of the artwork, Deleuze will later identify with sensation that retains all its ambivalence between object and passion:

> Sensation has one face turned toward the subject (the nervous system, vital movement, 'instinct,' 'temperament' – a whole vocabulary common to both Naturalism and Cezanne) and one face turned toward the object (the 'fact,' the place, the event). Or rather, it has no faces at all, it is both things indissolubly, it is Being-in-the-World, as the phenomenologists say: at one and the same time I become in the sensation and something happens through the sensation, one through the other, one in the other. 1 And at the limit, it is the same body which, being both subject and object, gives and receives the sensation. As a spectator, I experience the sensation only by entering the painting, by reaching the unity of the sensing and the sensed. […] Sensation is what is painted. (Deleuze 1993: 34-5)

As part of that vocabulary of Naturalism, feeling can now be incorporated into sensation and the equivalence established between Constable's 'painting is but another word for feeling' and Deleuze's 'Sensation is what is painted'.

[43] The concept of 'analogon' is taken from Satre's essay *The Imaginaion* of 1940:

> Let us examine our example more deeply. We have employed three procedures to give ourselves the face of Pierre. In the three cases we found an 'intention', and that intention aims, in the three cases, at the same object. This object is neither the representation, nor the photo, nor the caricature: it is my friend Pierre. Moreover, in the three cases, I aim at the object in the same way: it is on the ground of perception that I want to make the face of Pierre appear, I want to 'make it present' to me. And, as I cannot make a direct perception of him spring up, I make use of a certain matter that acts as an analogon, as an equivalent of perception. (Sartre 2004: 18)

We use Sartre's concept as it has the same function. As ours, the schema follows that of the forth kind of metaphor explained by Aristotle in *Poetics* 37b as a similarity of relations (1996: 34-5).

[44] Kenneth Clark considered 'those so-called 'full-size sketches' … Constable's supreme achievement' because 'the force of sensation is always strong enough to lift them above the commonplace.' (1950: 77)

[45] Lambert 1994

[46] 'Farington records: "Constable called and informed me of the death of his Father at 78 years of age wanting one day.—He has left 3 sons and 3 daughters & has divided his property equally amongst them leaving thereby to each abt. £200 per anum. Constable wd. this day put his name down on the list of Candidates for Associate vacancies. I told Him it was my intention to propose to several of the Academicians to fill at least 4 of the 5 Vancancies by electing such Artists as had been sometime on the list and were of considerable standing in years." (Farington XIV, p. 4844)' (Rees 1990: 30 May 1816) 'Upon J.C.'s father's death, Abram takes on the family business and is to distribute the profits among the other children, yielding J.C. about two hundred pounds a year, which by his own calculation, gives him about four hundred pounds a year when added to his other incomes. (JCC II, pp. 185-86)' (Rhyne 1990: May 1816).

[47] Farington records: '… Constable told me today that under all circumstances He had made up His mind to marry Miss Bicknell witht. further delay & to take the chance of what might arise. He said they should have abt. £400 pr. annum.' (Farington XIV, pp. 4864-66; see also JCC II, p. 186 and JCC VI, p. 28)' (Rhyne 1990: 2 July 1816)

[48] 'J.C. and Maria, against the wishes of Maria's family, are married at the church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, her parish-church, by John Fisher. (JCC II, p. 211; see also JCC I, p. 139 and JCC VI, p. 30)' (Rhys 1990: 2 October 1816). To mark this resolution, Constable paints her portrait in July 1816.

[49] After a long honeymoon (Rhyne 1990: November-December 1816), John and Mary Constable move to Fitzrovia in Constable's old lodgings at 63 Charlotte Street (Rhyne 1990: 9 December 1816; Leslie 1845: 33) one block from n. 76 his last residence between 1822 to 1834 now demolished (see Rhyne 1990: 10 November 1812; Weinreb and Hibbert 1995: 143-4; for a photograph see 'Plate 6: Constable's House (No. 76 Charlotte Street) and Colville Place', in *Survey of London: Volume 21, the Parish of St Pancras Part 3: Tottenham Court Road and Neighbourhood*, ed. by J R Howard Roberts and Walter H Godfrey (London, 1949), p. 6. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol21/pt3/plate-6). The following May, Constable shows at the RA *Flatford Mill* with three other paintings (*Portrait of John Fisher*, *Wivenhoe Park* and a *Suffolk scene [A Cottage]*) and takes a house in Bloomsbury on the current site of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine: 'Farington records: "Constable called to inform me that He had taken a House No. 1 Keppel st. which, including taxes, wd. not cost Him more than £100 per annm. He has engaged it for 7 years from Midsummer next. . . . We had much conversation respecting Art.—Constable & Mrs. Constable came to tea & the conversation continued." (Farington XIV, pp. 5030-31; see also JCC II, p. 224)' (Rhys 1990: 6 June 1817)

[50] The house in Church Street, East Bergholt was demolished in 1840-1 but Constable preserves shows it in an oil sketch as a brick-red rectangle set in green (*East Bergholt House*, c.1809).

[51] The terms correspond to Joseph Mallord William Turner's *Lecture Diagram 15: The Terminology of Perspective of Dr Brook Taylor* (circa 1810) as follows:

horizon = Horizontal Plane

perpendicular to the horizon from the point of sight = 'Vertical and Perpendicular Planes'
point of sight = 'Center [sic] Point', 'Point of Sight | Center [sic] of the Picture'
ground = 'Original Line | for | Measure of Figures | Ground | & Base Line'
standing point = 'Station Point | Place of the | Spectator' (modernised as 'centre point')

Although the terms do not explicitly appear in Taylor (Friedricksen 2012), Turner derives the points from Thomas Kirby's *Dr. Brook Taylor's method of perspective made easy* (1755) and Joseph Malton's *The Young Painter's Maulstick* (1800), already mentioned about the perspective in Joseph Highmore's *Mr B. Finds Pamela Writing*. Turner used the diagram in the second of his six lectures on perspective, delivered from 1811 as Professor of Perspective at the RA from 1807 to 1837 (Bailey 1994: 279 ff) Constable's attendance is not recorded.

Reconstructing a perspective diagram of *Flatford Mill* has its difficulties in the scarcity of straight lines in the picture and Constable's skilled manipulation of perspective, clearly visible when comparing the sketches (see Parris 1981). For instance, the lines of the mill don't converge, while parts of the bank and bridge deck seem to indicate a single vanishing point on the central perpendicular, while Taylor's diagram is for a two-point perspective. Further manipulations of perspective for extending the illusion of depth and width can be observed in the exaggerated scaling of the figures, in the misalignment between the centre point, coinciding with the point of sight on the tip of the fishing rod, and centre of the picture higher on the right, in the receding zigzag of the composition as in Claude, and in the slight curvature of the horizon towards the mill.

[52] The relation to height (from eye level to the ground) is clear in Taylor 1719: Figure 1 and Malton 1800: Plate 4. Kirby also shows that the distance signifies the height of the painter as well as that of the viewer (1755: B.2).

[53] 'In Deleuze's work, a zone of indiscernibility is a domain of partial coincidence between elements; it involves a connection and an interchange between two or more terms. Zones of indiscernibility are, thus, the milieu of becoming; they are regions of mutation.' (Gilson 2007: 100)

[54] Golding modelled for Jesus in *Christ Blessing the Children* at St Michael the Archangel Church in Brantham.

[55] 'No. 251. A Scene on the River Stour. J. Constable. This choice falls happily on the picturesque, and the river scene is clothed, like the pictures of Ruysdael [Jacob van Ruisdael] and Hobbima [Meindert Hobbema], with a rich variety of forms, on which the artist has displayed his usual skill in the truth and character of the de tail. This picture is one of the largest we remember to have seen from his pencil, and would, we think, have appeared to more advantage, had it not been placed so near the eye.' (Carey 1819: 428) The hanging height is relevant in relation to the centre point and the standing position.

[56] Spielmann 1898: 14.

[57] Cf. Hunt 1905 v.2: 25-6.

[58] Arguably, *The Blind Girl* (1854-6).

[59] John Everett Millais, *Self Portrait* (1847), oil on board, 27.3 x 22.2 cm, Walker art Gallery, Liverpool.

[60] The details are insufficient for any definite identification. However, the format of the canvas, position of the trees, water and sky resemble Claude Lorrain, *Landscape with Hagar and the Angel* (1646). The

painting is central to the formation of young Constable who painted a copy, now lost, when it was still in George Beaumont's collection (1795). Beamont presented it to the National Gallery in 1828.

[61] John Everett Millais' *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* (1849-50) and *The Woodman's Daughter* (1850-51). Compare *Ferdinand* with the outline style in the independent drawing *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* (1848), ink on paper, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool. See also the sketch (1849, pencil on paper, 25.4 x 16.7 cm, Victoria and Albert Museum, London) and the preparatory painting *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*, 1849?, Sudley House, Liverpool. Between the two paintings Millais, drew the head of the art critic Frederic George Stephens as Ferdinand in "Study for the Head of Ferdinand in 'Ferdinand Lured by Ariel'", 1849.

[62] The meaning is unclear. The annotation "Radiation in a sarcophagus" is found in the notebooks next to an article on the 'Shelter Object' constructed to encase the smouldering remains of Unit 4 of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant in the Ukraine. The reinforced concrete structure, popularised in the media as 'the sarcophagus', was built in the eight months that followed the nuclear disaster (26 April 1986). At the time of writing, the crumbling sarcophagus is being encased in the New Safe Confinement that should seal off the contaminated ruins, soil and air for the next century (Walker 2016).

The expression 'Ophelia's sarcophagus' refers metaphorically to the river landscape in the painting. With *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* painted in Oxford over the summer 1849 (Rosenfeld 2012: 36 ff), Millais emphasises the natural setting to which he extends the outline style (Cruise 2011: 47-63) further into the background and deeper into detail. As he draws rather than paint the foliage, Millais uses few and unmixed shades of green that create monotony, even lighting that reduces the tonal range, increased detail resolution and compressed perspective, that squash the figure onto the background. Nature surrounds the figures (*The Woodman's Daughter*), envelops them (*Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*) and swallows them up (*Ophelia*).

In *Ophelia* Millais handles green more successfully, owing to different and better pigments, his improved chiaroscuro technique, the thin layering and wet ground colouring that produce greater vibrance, tonal extension and separation. Nevertheless, Millais resolve the problem of green dominance by reducing and breaking up large monochrome areas. For instance, the bluish water and the brown tree stub in *Ophelia* or the red brickwall behind the lovers in *A Huguenot, on St. Bartholomew's Day, Refusing to Shield Himself from Danger by Wearing the Roman Catholic Badge* (1852), oil on canvas, 92.71 cm × 64.13 cm, Makins Collection. His last Pre-Raphaelite painting *The Blind Girl* (1856) reconsiders the PRB programme in many ways, including the use of large monochrome areaes, as the unbroken yellow of the corn field behind the two girls. Millais' *The Artist Attending the Mourning of a Young Girl* (1847) reinforces the image of Ophelia's sarcophagus and more will be said about it later.

The Woman in Yellow and the Woman in White

[1] Dante Gabriel Rossetti's *Woman in Yellow* (1863).

[2] The reference is to Rossetti's wife, Elisabeth 'Lizzie' Siddal (1829-1862) who met him in 1849 while modelling for Walter Howell Deverell who first discovered her (Viola disguised as Cesario in *Twelfth Night Act II, Scene IV,* 1850 Forbes Magazine Collection, New York). William Holman Hunt paints her as the young girl in *A Converted British Family Sheltering a Christian Missionary from the Persecution of the Druids* (1849–50, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) and as Sylvia (later overpainted) in *Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus* (1850-1, City Art Gallery, Birmingham) and then Millais. She Siddal, after

posing for *Ophelia*, she became Rossetti's exclusive model and moves in with him in 1852. Rossetti begins his relation with Cornforth in 1856, during one of Siddal's long stays in France for health reasons. (Hawksley 2009). The expression 'angelic woman' refers to a portrait Rossetti made of her after she died, *Beata Beatrix* (c.1864–70, Tate Britain, London).

[3] Gallery director Sandra Penketh calls Jane Morris "ultimate femme fatale" (2014), a stereotype challenged by Wendy Parkins in her monograph (2013).

[4] The *Woman in Yellow* is considered a study for Rossetti's *Helen of Troy* (1863). The inscription at the back of the painting quotes Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, 689-90 "Helen of Troy […], destroyer of ships, destroyer of men, destroyer of cities. painted by D. G. Rossetti. 1863".

[5] "She has often been described as an illiterate Cockney prostitute – none of which was true," Stonell Walker said. "She was a model, and a woman who had to work hard all her life to keep herself, with very little help from anyone else." (Kennedy 2015). See also Kirsty Stonell Walker's biography *Stunner: The Fall and Rise of Fanny Cornforth* (2012).

[6] In 1872-73, Rossetti altered *Lady Lilith* (1866-68) substituting Cornforth's head for that of Alexa wielding. The altered oil painting at Delaware Art Museum (1867a) can be compared to the watercolour copy done by Rossetti's assistant after the original (1867b).

[7] Frederick Walkers' *The Woman in White* (1871). The gouache on paper was used for what is considered to be the first artist advert poster, drawn for the staging of Willkie Collins' theatrical adaptation of his novel (Olympic Theatre, London 1871). The painting that does not depict Anne Catherick escaping from the asylum before encountering Walter Hartright on Hampsted Heath, as Collins did not include the famous episode at the beginning of the novel (chapter III) in his play script. Instead, the painting illustrates the less dramatic prologue of the play in which Anne, who is visiting Mrs Fairlie's tomb, is about to enter the graveyard through the door of Old Welmingham church. Meanwhile, Percival Glyde, who is inside to temper with the church register kept in the vestry, calls her from behind to get rid of her quickly. Walker contributes to the misreading of the painting, inserting in the door frame a starry sky that is inconsistent both with the episode from the novel, in which "the moon was full and broad in the dark blue starless sky" (Collins 2006*:* 62), and with the episode from the play that occurs in the early morning.

The text refers to the condition of asylums with a reference to the last line of Dante's Inferno (24.139) "And thence we came forth to look again at the stars." (Dante 1996: 359. The reference is partly justified by Collin's use of the Divine Comedy in the novel (Caracciolo 1971).

Collins drew material for his novel from Lady Rosina Bulwer's case of wrongful confinement to a private asylum and the Lunacy Panic in the press of 1859-9. For and overview on the condition of asylums, Scull 2006; for an account of the Lunacy Panic, McCandless 1978.

"Ophelia became the prototype not only of the deranged woman in Victorian literature and art but also of the young female asylum patient" (Showalter 1985: 90). The identification between Ophelia on stage and young women in the asylum is clear in this passage of literary criticism by John Conolly the psychiatrist and asylum reformer:

> In days when the life of every man and woman above the reach of the lowest poverty is diversified by frequent changes of scene and incident, all this may seem overstrained, as if to dwell on disappointed affections were but a weakness, and to die of a broken heart a mere phrase. Physicians, however, still recognise these casualties, and in every rank; sometimes in words, but more frequently in their effects,

revealed, if not confessed, in various forms of sickness and decline. Our asylums for ruined minds now and then present remarkable illustrations of this fatal malady, so that even casual visitors recognise in the wards an Ophelia; the same young years, the same faded beauty, the same fantastic dress and interrupted song. An actress, ambitious of something beyond cold imitation, might find the contemplation of such cases a not unprofitable study. (Connolly 1863: 177-8).

The story of Ellen Terry visiting Bedlam to prepare her Ophelia (Royal Lyceum Theatre, London 30 December 1878) is well known and cements the dress code of Ophelia's madness until today, for example in *Hamlet* directed by Lyndsey Turner (2015), with Benedict Cumberbatch as Hamlet, Sian Brooke as Ophelia. Fifty years earlier, Harriet Smithson had chosen a black veil to represent grief-stricken Ophelia in her epochal performance (Odéon, Paris 11 September 1827) that started a short-lived fashion "à la Miss Smithson", a coiffure *à la folle* consisting of a 'black veil with wisps of straw tastefully interwoven' in the hair" (*Corsaire magazine* 11 October 1827 in Raby 1982: 75. Smithson's dress already turns white in the series of thirteen prints illustrating *Hamlet* that Delacroix begun in 1834 based on the impressions of her performance (Delacroix, *Mort d'Ophélie,* 1843).

To close the circuit between the two paintings, we should return to Lady Rosina Bulwer-Lytton on which case Collins drew for his novel. When meeting her husband after her release from the asylum, she is described wearing a white dress, while she is wearing a yellow dress according to Sarah Wise's more sympathetic account (2012: 439-44).

[8] John Guille Millais tells the story of their chance encounter with Caroline Graves with whom Wilkie Collins begun a complicated relationship from 1858 until his death in 1889 (1900 v.1: 278-81).[5]

[9] Anne Catherick's white dress has in the novel at least four symbolical connotations: Anne's remembrance and grief for the deceased Mrs Fairlie and her connection to Laura, her half-sister whom Mrs Fairlie also used to dress in white (Collins 2006: 137); Anne's communion dress becoming Laura's wedding dress in the prophetic dream that Anne describes in her letter to Laura (116-8); sign of ghostliness, for instance when schoolboy Jacob Postlethwaite describes Anne's sighting: "Arl in white—as a ghaist should be," answered the ghost-seer, with a confidence beyond his years." (123-4); sign of Laura's swapped identity:

[5] Millais reports with affected discretion, his father's and Wilkie Collins' recollections of the encounter, presenting them as "the real facts." On the other hand, the corresponding episode in *The Woman in White* (Collins 2006: 62-71) is also presented as a true story: "As the Judge might once have heard it, so the Reader shall hear it now. No circumstance of importance, from the beginning to the end of the disclosure, shall be related on hearsay evidence.". The two sensationalist and gothic narratives are equally fictive, but when taken within their respective contexts, a historical biography and a novel, rather than constituting the event they describe, they conjure together "a twilight zone between common sense and lunacy" (Eco 1998: ix).

A new status of narration follows from this: narration ceases to be truthful, that is, to claim to be true, and becomes fundamentally falsifying. This is not at all a case of 'each has its own truth', a variability of content. It is a power of the false which replaces and supersedes the form of the true, because it poses the simultaneity of incompossible presents, or the coexistence of not-necessarily true pasts. . . . We have not mentioned the author who is essential in this regard: it is Nietzsche, who, under the name of 'will to power', substitutes the power of the false for the form of the true, and resolves the crisis of truth, wanting to settle it once and for all, but, in opposition to Leibniz, in favour of the false and its artistic, creative power ..." (Deleuze 1989: 131)

This artistic power is not intended to misrepresent the past, on the contrary, the power of the false opposes fictionality by exposing the experience of creating that space (cf. Wiese 2014: 39-40).

The nurse, on the first night in the Asylum, had shown her the marks on each article of her underclothing as it was taken off, and had said, not at all irritably or unkindly, "Look at your own name on your own clothes, and don't worry us all any more about being Lady Glyde. She's dead and buried; and you're alive and hearty. Do look at your clothes now! There it is, in good marking-ink; and there you will find it on all your old things, which we have kept in the house—Anne Catherick, as plain as print!" (435)

[10] Carlotta Valdes is an unseen character in Alfred Hitchcock's *Vertigo* (1958). Ex-police officer Scottie Ferguson is hired by his old school mate Gavin Elster to prevent his wife Madeleine Elster from committing suicide. Scottie reluctantly agrees and follows Madeleine to a florist where she buys a bouquet of flowers, to the Mission San Francisco de Assis and the grave of one Carlotta Valdes (1831–1857), and to the Legion of Honor art museum, San Francisco. Here she sits on a museum bench looking at *Portrait of Carlotta* of which Scottie realises an uncanny resemblance with Madeleine. Later in the film, bookshop owner and local historian Pop Leibel explains that Carlotta Valdes had been the mistress of a wealthy married man of whom she bore his child. The otherwise childless man kept the child and jilted Carlotta. Gavin reveals that Carlotta who he fears is possessing Madeleine, is Madeleine's great-grandmother, although Madeleine has no knowledge of this, and does not remember the places she has visited. Scottie tails Madeleine as she drives to Fort Point, San Francisco. She stands a while looking at the bridge, throws the flowers of her bouquet, watches them floating in the water and jumps into the bay, immediately followed by Scottie who rescues her. Hitchcock's reference to Millais' *Ophelia* is thematised in Victor Burgin, *The Bridge – Venus Perdica,* 1984 (cf. Vest 1989). Hitchcock's connection between the cemetery with Carlotta's grave and the museum with Carlotta's portrait is summarised by Steven Jacobs: "Since the museum scene in Vertigo is entirely focused on the portrait of a dead woman who haunts the living, the scene seems perfectly in line with a recurring cliché in cinematic museums—the museum as a place of both fatal encounters and death. In feature films, museums are often produced as treasure chambers dominated by spiritual and atavist powers. When cinema deals with paintings, for instance, it almost always shows instances of what Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz have called "effigy magic," the primitive belief that a person's soul resides in his or her image or effigy." (Jacobs 2011: 201)

[11] Pomeroy, Frederick William. *The Nymph of Loch Awe*, 1897. Pomeroy's sculpture was part of the exhibition inaugurating the new Linbury Galleries *Exposed: The Victorian Nude,* Tate Britain, 1 November 2001 – 13 January 2002, that Richard Dorment described as: "a tired survey that tells us nothing we do not already know" (2002). The thematic organisation of the exhibition followed Kenneth Clark's distinction between 'nude' and 'naked': "English language, with its elaborate generosity, distinguishes between the naked and the nude. To be naked is to be deprived of our clothes, and the word implies some of the embarrassment most of us feel in that condition. The word "nude," on the other hand, carries, in educated usage, no uncomfortable overtone. The vague image it projects into the mind is not of a huddled and defenceless body, but of a balanced, prosperous, and confident body: the body re-formed." (Clark 1956: 3)

Lynda Nead comments to Clark can be extended to the exhibition: "The transformation of the female body into the female nude is thus an act of regulation: of the female body and of the potentially wayward viewer whose wandering eye is disciplined by the conventions and protocols of art." (Nead 1992: 6)

Against Clark and Nead, another letter argues that the nude is a not subject and quotes from *Being Nude. The Skin of Images* by Jean-Luc Nancy and Fedeico Ferrari: "Something true right at the skin, skin as truth:

neither the beyond-the-skin sought by desire, nor the underside that science aims for, nor the spiritual secret of flesh revealed. For us, the nude is neither erotic nor anatomical nor authentic. It remains on the edge of or beyond these three postulations. The truth right at the skin is only true in being exposed, in being offered without reserve but also without revelation. After all, what the nude reveals is that there is nothing to be revealed, or that there is nothing other than revelation itself, the revealing and what can be revealed, both at once. It doesn't have the power to lay bare; that is to say, it is naked only in this very narrow place-the skin-and for this very brief time." (Nancy and Ferrari 2014: 2).

The Lady of Shalott

[1] John William Waterhouse's *The Lady of Shalott* (1888). Waterhouse is illustrating the previous stanza (4.2) of Tennyson's 1830/1842 poem *The Lady of Shalott,* (Tennyson 1971: 27). The connection to the willow, the white dress and floating downstream are reminiscent of Ophelia as is the outcome of "the male fantasy of female eroticism which the poem embodies" (Shaw 1988: 105). The connection was clear to Millais who made a pen and ink study for the Lady of Shalott similar to his *Ophelia* (*The Lady of Shalott.* 1854, Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide). Elisabeth Siddal draws the Lady of Shalott (1853, Maas Gallery, London) sitting at the weaving frame loom in her cursed prison. She sees the reflection of Lancelot riding past (3.4.6-9):

From the bank and from the river
He flash'd into the crystal mirror,
"Tirra lirra," by the river
Sang Sir Lancelot.

and turns around to look while the mirror, now behind her, begins to crack. She raises suddenly breaking the web of threads, the mirror cracks and death falls upon her:

She left the web, she left the loom,
She made three paces thro' the room,
She saw the water-lily bloom,
She saw the helmet and the plume,
    She look'd down to Camelot.
Out flew the web and floated wide;
The mirror crack'd from side to side;
"The curse is come upon me," cried
    The Lady of Shalott.

(cf. Boime 2007: 280). Siddal's appears to be the model in Hunt's early drawing for *The Lady of Shalott* (1850, National Gallery of Victoria, Adelaide). Unlike all other paintings around this motif, Siddal depicts the Lady's anxiety, announcing the object a moment before the real irrupts into the imaginary (cracking of the mirror) and the symbolic (breaking of the web). Siddall places herself sitting at the centre of a skewed room. On the left side, the round mirror with Lancelot's faint reflection hangs on the wall and the large frame loom crossed by her hands holding the spools. On the right side behind her, a crucifix stands on a low chest in front of a large open window and beyond it, a landscape by a navigable river with Camelot visible on the other side. The Lady's head is turned towards her left shoulder, as if she had just heard something. The threads on the loom are waving under a gust of wind that carries Lancelot's song: "Tirra lirra". As for Ophelia, music is the lure of the gaze. For an overview, see Karen Hodder's 'The Lady of

Shalott in Art and Literature' (1989). The influence of the Arnolfini Portrait acquired by the National Gallery in 1842 on this Pre-Raphaelite motif see *Reflections: Van Eyck and the Pre-Raphaelites*, National Gallery, London, 2 October 2017 – 2 April 2018.

[2] Probably, because 'boat (race)' is the Cockney rhyming slang for 'face,' the expression is meant to mock, in poor taste, Waterhouse's over adorned boat and Tennyson's final lines:

But Lancelot mused a little space;
He said, "She has a lovely face;
God in his mercy lend her grace,
The Lady of Shalott.

'Face' and 'boat' also occur in W.H. Auden' Introduction to Tennyson among the examples for his second category of bad poetry, the unintentionally funny:

We must not, however, make the mistake of concluding from this that the Victorians had exceptionally bad taste . . . A poet may write bad poetry in three ways. He may be bored or in a hurry and write work which is technically slipshod or carelessly expressed. From this fault, of which Shakespeare is not infrequently guilty, Tennyson is quite free. Secondly, by overlooking verbal and visual associations he may be unintentionally funny at a serious moment; e.g., in describing the martyrdom of St. Stephen, Tennyson writes: "But looking upward, full of grace, / He pray'd, and from a happy place / God's glory smote him on the face." And in his dedicatory poem to Lord Dufferin, on whose yacht his own son had died: "But ere he left your fatal shore. / And lay on that funereal boat, / Dying, "Unspeakable" he wrote / 'Their kindness,' and he wrote no more; Thirdly, he may suffer from a corruption of his own consciousness and produce work the badness of which strikes the reader as intentional; i.e., in the case of carelessness or accidental bathos, one feels it would only have to be pointed out to the poet for the latter to recognize it instantly, but in the case of this kind of badness one feels certain that the poet is very pleased with it. (Auden 1946: xii)

[3] John Everett Millais. *Flowing to the River* (1871). The reference to the ghostliness of the figure at the centre derives from this biographical episode

. . . when a short-sighted lady saw the picture in the artist's studio on "Show Sunday", she pointed to the miller's son fishing in the middle of the stream and asked, 'Why does he put a statue there?' Millais, overhearing the criticism and recognising its truth, left the group who were loading him with uncared-for praises, seized his palette and quickly painting in the red scarf that now appears, turned to his young critic and said, with his jovial affectation of egoism – 'There! now you can say that you made Millais alter one of his pictures! (Spielmann1898: 126-7)

The Millstream, as J.G. Millais calls it, "was painted in the autumn of 1871, presenting a view of the little brook below the mill at Stormontfield salmon-ponds, some six miles above Perth" (Millais 1900 v.2: 39) and was shown at the 1872 exhibition together with *Flowing to the Sea* (1871, Southampton City Art Gallery). An American commentator, called them "the queerest compositions I have ever seen by an artist of reputation" (Harte 1872: 228) and how the paintings relate to each other has not found explanation so far. In the background of *Flowing to the River*, a mill is visible behind the autumnal foliage and some workers in white are loading a cart. Jason Rosenfeld compares the scene to Constable's *Hay Wain* suggested by the cart abandoned in the water on the right. The white clothes may be a reference to the large Linen Bleeching Works at Stormontfield, opened in 1794 and demolished in 1971 for the housing development at Colenhaugh. We propose to identify the mill in the painting with the Old Barley Mill at Innenbruist that had a stream entering the Mill Lade. The canal was about 3 miles long and connected the Linen Bleeching Works to Waulkmill Ferry, the location of *Flowing to the Sea* (Edwards 2002:

http://www.stormontfield.co.uk/html/the_lade.html). In this case, the experimental salmon breeding ponds would be located further south of the scene (Edwards 2002: http://www.stormontfield.co.uk/html/fishponds.html. A 'Birdseye View of the Salmon-Breeding Ponds at Stormontfield' was published on The Illustrated London News (1863). The economy around *Flowing to the River* makes Constable's *Flatford Mill* appear a more meaningful connection (Rosenfeld 2012: 196-8).

[4] John Everett Millais' *Mariana* (1851). Tennyson's poem 'Mariana in the Moated Grange' is based on Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (see Tennyson 1971: 7).

[5] Augustus Leopold Egg. *Past and Present. 1* (1816–63). The picture was exhibited between the other two paintings of the series at the 1858 Exhibition with no title and the inscription 'August the 4th – Have just heard that B – has been dead more than a fortnight, so his poor children have now lost both parents. I hear she was seen on Friday last near the Strand, evidently without a place to lay her head. What a fall hers has been!'

References

Texts

Adams, Henry Gardiner. [1851?] *Oriental Text Book and Language of Flowers.* London: Dean & Son.

Adams, Tessa. 2007. "The psychoanalytic framing of the art object as narcissistic agency" in Narcissism. A Critical Reader. Edited by Anastasios Gaitanidis with Polona Curk. London: Karnak, 147-66.

Adelman, Janet. 1992. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to the Tempest*. New York: Routledge.

Addonizio, Shari. 1999. "Portraits of Madwomen: Another Look at Dr Hugh Welch Diamond's Photographs of the Insane Female in Victorian England." *Athanor* 17 (January), 53-9.

AEC, CILECT / GEECT, Culture Action Europe, Cumulus, EAAE, ELIA, EPARM, EQ-Arts, MusiQuE, SAR. 2020. "The Vienna Declaration on Artistic Research." Policy paper. https://cultureactioneurope.org/download/?filename=/files/2020/06/Vienna-Declaration-on-AR_corrected-version_24-June-20-1.pdf [accessed 24 April 2022].

Agamben, Giorgio. 2000. *Means without Ends. Notes on Politics.* Trans. by Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Cesarini. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Agamben, Giorgio. 2011. "Nymphs." Trans. by Amanda Minervini. In: Releasing the Image: From Literature to New Media. Edited by Jacques Khalip and Robert Mitchell, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 60-81.

Agency. 2015. "Charles Dickens' desk saved for the nation." The Telegraph. 29 March. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/11502701/Charles-Dickens-desk-saved-for-the-nation.html [accessed 21 July 2020]

Aikens, Kristina. [2008]. 'A Pharmacy of Her Own: Victorian Women and the Figure of the Opiate.' Unpublished PhD Thesis, Tufts University.

Aitken, Robert. 2001. "Whistler v. Ruskin." *Litigation* 27 (2, MILLENNIUM Winter), 65-70.

Alberti, Leon Battista. 2011. On Painting. A New Translation and Critical Edition. Ed. and trans. By Rocco Sinisgalli. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allen, Shirley S. 1971. *Samuel Phelps and Sadler's Wells Theatre*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Alliez, Eric. 2015. "Structuralism's afters: Tracing Transdisciplinarity through Guattari and Latour." *Theory, Culture & Society* 32 (5–6): 139–158.

Altick, Richard D. 1973. *Victorian people and ideas. A companion for the modern reader of Victorian literature*. London and New York: Norton.

Altick, Richard Daniel. 1957. *The English Common Reader. A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*. Columbus: Ohio University Press.

Altick, Richard Daniel. 1985. *Paintings from Books: Art and Literature in Britain, 1760-1900.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

American Psychiatric Association. 1994. *Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of Mental Disorders. Fourth Edition.* Arlington VA: author.

American Psychiatric Association. 2013. *Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of Mental Disorders. Fifth Edition*. Arlington VA: author.

Amirault, Chris. 1993-4. "Posing the Subject of Early Medical Photography." *Discourse* 16 (2, A Special Issue on Expanded Photography, Winter), 51-76.

Amis, Martin. 1993. "Madonna" in Visiting Mrs. Nabokov and Other Excursions, London: Cape.

Ammannati, Giulia. 2017. *Pinxit industria docte mentis. Le iscrizioni di Virtù e Vizi dipinte da Giotto nella Cappella degli Scrovegni*. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Andersen, Kirsti. 1992. *Brook Taylor's Work on Linear Perspective. A Study of Taylor's Role in the History of Perspective Geometry. Including Facsimiles of Taylor's 'Two Books on Perspective'*. New York: Springer.

Anderson, Olive. 1987. *Suicide in Victorian and Edwardian England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Antonioli, Manola. 2019. "Mapping the Unconscious." In Why Guattari? A Liberation of Cartographies, Ecologies and Politics. Edited by Thomas Jellis, Joe Gerlach, and JD Dewsbury. Oxon and New York: Routledge, 34-44.

Apollon, Willy, Danielle Bergeron, and Lucie Cantin. 2002. *After Lacan: clinical practice and the subject of the unconscious.* New York: Suny Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Appleton Standen, Edith, Dianne Sachko MacLeod, Robert W. Baldwin, Sarah Phelps Smith and Virginia M. Allen. 1985. “Letters.” The Art Bulletin 67 (n. 2, June), 317-324.

Arasse, Daniel. 2013. *Take a closer look*. Translated from the French by Alyson Waters. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Arenas, Alicia, with G. Brodsky, J. Delmont, E. Leon, L. Luongo, and A. Waine de Tambascio. 1994. “The Other in Hysteria and Obsession.” In *Lacanian Theory of Discourse. Subject, Structure, and Society*. Ed. by Mark Bracher, Marshall W. Alcorn, Jr., Ronald J. Corthell, and Françoise Massardier-Kenney. New York and London: New York University Press, 145-50.

Armstrong, Carol. 2006. ‘Francesca Woodman: a ghost in the house of the "woman artist." In *Women Artists at the Millennium.* Edited by Carol Armstrong and Catherine de Zegher, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 347-70

Aronberg Lavin, Marilyn. 2009. *Artists' Art in the Renaissence*. London: Pindar Press.

Aronson, Jeffrey K, and Manoj Ramachandran. 2006. “The diagnosis of art: melancholy and the portrait of Dr. Gachet.” Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 99 (n. 7), 373-4.

Art Union. 1845. "The Royal Academy. Seventy-seventh Exhibition." The Art Union 7 (June), 179-198.

Art-Union. 1842. “The Royal Academy. The Exhibition.” *Art-Union* 4 (June), 120-1.

Astor, Maggie. 2017. “10 Hurricanes in 10 Weeks: With Ophelia, a 124-Year-Old Record is Matched.” *New York Times*, 11 October. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/11/climate/hurricane-ophelia.html [archived 21/12/2020]

Athenaeum. 1850. "Fine Arts. National Institution." *The Athenaeum* (n. 1173, 20 April), 423-4.

Athenaeum. 1851. “Music and the Drama. The Italian Operas” *The Athenaeum* (1244, 30 August), 933.

Athenaeum. 1860. “Fine Arts. Royal Academy.” *The Athenaeum,* January-July (n. 1697, 6 May), 620-2.

Atkinson, Joseph Beavington. 1880. *The Schools of Modern Art in Germany.* London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.

Auden, Wystan H. 1946. ‘Introduction’ in *Tennyson. An Introduction and a Selection by W.H. Auden*. London: Phoenix House.

Auerbach, Erich. 1984. "Figura." In *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature: Six Essays*. Trans. by Ralph Mannheim. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Auerbach, Erich. 2003. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Fiftieth-Anniversary Edition*. Trans. by Willard R. Trask (Translator), with an introduction by Edward W. Said. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Auerbach, Nina. 1980. “The Rise of the Fallen Woman.” *Nineteenth- Century Fiction* 35 (1), 29-52.

Austen, Gilbert. 1806. *Chironomia, or a Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery*. London: Cadell and Davies.

Azzopardi, Chris. 2016. “A ‘Joy’-ful outlook.” Washington Blade, 6 January. https://www.washingtonblade.com/2016/01/06/isabella-rossellini-a-joy-ful-outlook/ [accessed 13/11/2018

Bachelard, Gaston. 1983. *Water and Dreams. An Essay on the Imagination of Matter.* Translated by Edith R. Farrell. Dallas: The Pegasus Foundation.

Bachelard, Gaston. 2002. *The Formation of the Scientific Mind. A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge.* Introduced, translated and annotated by Mary McAlester Jones. Manchester: Clinamen Press.

Bailey, Helen Phelps. 1964. *Hamlet in France: From Voltaire to Laforgue ; (with an Epilogue).* Geneva: Droz.

Baker, George, Rosalind Krauss, Benjamin Buchloh et al. 2002. "Round Table: The Present Conditions of Art Criticism." *October* (100), 200–28

Baker, George, Rosalind Krauss, Benjamin Buchloh, et al. 2002. "Round Table: The Present Conditions of Art Criticism." *October* (100, Spring, Special issue: *Obsolescence*), 200-28.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel. Notes toward a Historical Poetics." In *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays.* Ed. by Michael Holquist. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 84-258.

Bale, Miriam. 2015. “Todd Haynes Explains the Cinematic Influences That Impacted His Carol.” Online article. Indiewire. 23 November. https://www.indiewire.com/2015/11/todd-haynes-explains-the-cinematic-influences-that-impacted-his-carol-52091/

Baljon, Cornelis J. 1997. “Interpreting Ruskin: The Argument of the Seven Lamps of Architecture and the Stones of Venice.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (4, Autumn), 401-14.

Ballarin, Alessandro. 1991. “Ticiano y taller, ‘Muchacha ante el espejo,’” in *La colección Cambó*, exhibition catalogue, Madrid and Barcelona, 296–312

Baltrusaitis, Jurgis. 1978. *Le miroir. Révélations, science-fiction et fallacies*, Paris, Le Seuil-Aline Elmayan.

Balyss, Wyke. 1855. *The Elements of Aerial Perspective; Or, Light, Shade, and Color*. London: Reeves and Son.
Bann, Stephen. 1997. *Paul Delaroche: History Painted*. London: Reaktion Books.
Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning.* Durham NC andLondon: Duke University Press.
Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entangle-ment of Matter and Meaning.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Barlow, Peter. 2000. "Millais, Manet, Modernity." In *English art, 1860-1914: Modern Artists and Identity*. Ed. by David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 49-63.
Barrett, Estella, and Barbara Bolt. Eds. 2007. *Practice as research : approaches to creative arts enquiry.* London: I.B. Tauris.
Barringer, Tim and Jason Rosenfeld. 2012. "Victorian Avant-Garde." In *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde*. Edited by Tim Barringer, Jason Rosenfeld and Alison Smith. London: Tate Publishing, 9-17.
Barthes, Roland. "The Reality Effect." In *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. by Richard Howard, Oxford: Blackwell, 141-8.
Barthes, Roland. 2000. *Camera Lucida. Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. London: Vintage.
Barthes, Roland. 2001. "The Metaphor of the Eye." Trans. by J. A. Underwood. In *Story of the Eye*, by Georges Bataille, London: Penguin, 119– 27.
Bartlett, Peter. 1999. *The Poor Law of Lunacy: The Administration of Pauper Lunatics in Mid-nineteenth Century England*. London and Washington: Leicester University Press.
Bartram, Michael. 1985. *The Pre-Raphaelite Camera: Aspects of Victorian Photography.* Boston : Little, Brown and Company.
Bataille, George. 1955. *Manet. Biographical and Critical Study*. Translated by Austryn Wainhouse and James Emmons. Milano: Skira.
Bataille, Georges. [1928] 1987. *Story of the Eye by Lord Auch*. Trans. by Joachim Neugroschel. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
Bate, Jonathan. 2019. *How the Classics Made Shakespeare.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Bauer, Heike. 2017. "Dracula and Sexology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Dracula.* Ed. by Roger Luckhurst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 76–84.
Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Liquid Modernity.* Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity Press.
Baxandall, Michael. 1979. "The Language of Art History" in *New Literary History* 10 (3, Spring), 453–65.
Baxendale Sallie. 2004. "Memories aren't made of this: amnesia at the movies." *British Medical Journal* (Clinical research ed.), 329(7480), 1480–1483. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.329.7480.1480
Bayer, Thomas M., and John R. Page. 2011. *The Development Of The Art Market In England: Money As Muse, 1730–1900. London:* Pickering and Chatto.
Beizer, Janet L. 1994. *Ventriloquized Bodies: Narratives of Hysteria in Nineteenth-century France*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
Bell, Desmond. 2019. *Research in the Creative and Media Arts. Challenging Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
Belsey, Catherine. 2012. "The Myth of Venus in Early Modern Culture." *English Literary Renaissance*, 42 (2, Spring), 179-202.
Bemong, Nele, Pieter Borghart, Michel De Dobbeleer, Kristoffel Demoen, Koen De Temmerman, Bart Keunen. Eds. 2010. *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives*. Gent: Academia Press.
Benedetti, Maria Teresa. 1982. "Nazareni e Preraffaeliti. Un nodo della cultura del XIX secolo." *Bollettino d'Arte* 68, serie 6 (14, aprile-giugno), 121-44.
Bengal, Rebecca. 2018. "Smithereens: Breakfast at the Peppermint Lounge." On Film/Essays 20 August. https://www.criterion.com/current/posts/5823-smithereens-breakfast-at-the-peppermint-lounge [archived 13/11/2019]
Benhabib, Seyla. 1995 "Feminism and Postmodernism" in *Feminist Contentions: a Philosophical Exchange*. By Seyla Benhabib, et al. with an introduction by Linda Nicholson. London and New York: Routledge: 17-34.
Benjamin, Andrew. 1986. "The Decline of Art: Benjamin's Aura." *Oxford Art Journal* 9 (n. 2), 30-5.
Benjamin, Walter. 1996a. "On Language as Such and on the Language of Man", in: *Selected Writings 1, 1913-1926*. Ed. by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 62-74.
Benjamin, Walter. 1996b. "Goethe's Elective Affinities." In *Selected Writings. Vol I. 1913-1926.* Edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. London and Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 297-360.

Benjamin, Walter. 1996c. “The Concept of Criticism in German Romanticism.” In *Selected Writings. Vol I. 1913-1926.* Edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. London and Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 116-200.
Benjamin, Walter. 1996d. “The Task of the Translator.” In *Selected Writings. Vol I. 1913-1926.* Edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. London and Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 253-263.
Benjamin, Walter. 1998. *The Origin of German Tragic Drama.* Trans. by John Osborne Introduction by George Steiner. London and New York: Verso.
Benjamin, Walter. 1999. “The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility (Third Version).” In *Selected Writings. Vol 4. 1938-1940.* Ed. by Michael William Jennings. Trans. by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 251-283.
Benjamin, Walter. 2002. *The Arcades Project.* Translated by Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge MA and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Benjamin, Walter. 2006. “On the Concept of History.” In *Selected Writings. Vol. 4: 1938–1940*. Ed. by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 389-400.
Benjamin, Walter. 2006. *The Writer of Modern Life. Essays on Charles Baudelaire.* Edited by Michael W. Jennings. Translated by Howard Eiland, Edmund Jephcott, Rodney Livingstone and Harry Zohn. Harvard: Belknap Press.
Benjamin, Walter. 2007a. “The Task of the Translator.” In *Illuminations*. Trans. by Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 69-82.
Benjamin, Walter. 2007b. “Franz Kafka. On the Tenth Anniversary of His Death.” In *Illuminations*. Trans. by Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 111-40.
Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Bennett, Mary. 1984. "An Early Drawing for 'The Tempest' by John Everett Millais." *The Burlington Magazine* 126 (977, August), 502-504.
Bentley, D.M.R. 1990. "From Allegory to Indeterminacy: Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Positive Agnosticism." Part 1, *Dalhousie Review* 70 (1), 70-106; Part 2, *Dalhousie Review* 70 (2), 146-68.
Berg, Maggie. 1982. “John Ruskin’s Definition of D. G. Rossetti’s Art.” Victorian Poetry, 20 (n. ¾, An Issue Devoted to the Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Autumn – Winter), 103-12
Berger, John. 1972. *Ways of Seeing.* London, Penguin Books.
Berridge. Virginia. 1999. *Opium and the People: Opiate Use and Drug Control Policy in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century England.* London and New York: Free Association Books.
Berrios, G.E., and N. Kennedy. “Erotomania: A Conceptual History.” *History of Psychiatry* 13 (n. 52, October), 381–400.
Berry, Philippa, and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, eds. 2003. Textures of Renaissance Knowledge. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
Bertrand, Jean-Pierre. 2019. “Le Rimbaud de Laforgue, ‘un cas’.” In *Rimbaud, Verlaine et zut À la mémoire de Jean-Jacques Lefrère*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 105-13.
Betzwieser, Hagen. 2012. "Post Artistic Research." In *Artistic research as aesthetic science. Contributions to a transdisciplinary hybridisation of science and art.* Ed. by Martin Tröndle and Julia Warmers. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 357-8.
Beveridge Allan. 2018. “Sir Alexander Morison and The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases: Part 1.” *The journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*, 48 (3), 272–283.
Beveridge, Allan. 2018. “Sir Alexander Morison and The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases: Part 2.” *The journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*, 48 (4), 352–367.
Bhaskar, Roy, Berth Danermark, and Leigh Price. 2018. *Interdisciplinarity and Wellbeing. A Critical Realist General Theory of Interdisciplinarity*. London and New York: Routledge.
Bhaskar, Roy. 2010. “Contexts of interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity and climate change.” In *Interdisciplinarity and Climate Change. Transforming knowledge and practice for our global future*. Ed. by Roy Bhaskar, Cheryl Frank, Karl Georg Høyer, Petter Næss and Jenneth Parker. London and New York: Routledge, 1-24.
Bickerdike, Jennifer Otter. 2017. Why Vinyl Matters: A Manifesto from Musicians and Fans. Woodbridge: ACC Art Books.
Bickers, Patricia. 2021. *The Ends of Art Criticism*. London: Lund Humphries.
Bickley, Pamela, Jenny Stevens. Eds. 2020. *Studying Shakespeare Adaptation: From Restoration Theatre to YouTube*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
Biggs, Michael and Henrik Karlsson. "Evaluating Quality in Artistic Research." In *The Routledge Companion t0 Research in the Arts.* Ed. by Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London and New York: Routledge, 405-24.

Biggs, Michael and Henrik Karlsson. Ed. 2011. *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. London and New York: Routledge.

Billington, Michael, Matthew Warchus, Cicely Berry, Stephen Poliakoff, Simon Reade. 1998. "Wot – No More Shakespeare?" Roundtable Discussion, *RSC Magazine* (Summer), 8–9.

Biow, Douglas. 2018. *Vasari's Words. The 'lives of the Artists' as a History of Ideas in the Italian Renaissance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blain, Virginia. 1990. "Rosina Bulwer Lytton and the Rage of the Unheard." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 53 (3, Summer), 210-36.

Bloom, Gina, Anston Bosman, and William N. West. 2013. "Ophelia's Intertheatricality, Or, How Performance Is History." *Theatre Journal* 65 (n, 2), 165-82.

Blunt. Wilfrid. 1975. *England's Michelangelo. A Biography of George Frederic Watts, O.M., R.A.* London: Hamilton.

Boas, George. 1941. "Il Faut être de son Temps." The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism. 1 (n. 1 Spring), 52-65.

Boase, T.S.R. 1954. "The Decoration of the New Palace of Westminster, 1841-1863." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17 (3/4), 319-58.

Boime, Albert. 2007. *Art in an Age of Civil Struggle, 1848-1871.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bonnet, Gérard. 1977. "Fétichisme et exhibitionnisme chez un sujet féminin," Psychanalyse a l'université 2, 231-257.

Borowitz, Helen O. 1978. "'King Lear' in the Art of Ford Madox Brown." *Victorian Studies* 21 (3, Spring), 309-334.

Borris, Kenneth. 2017. *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism.* London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Boswell, Parley Ann and Paul Loukides. 1999. Reel Rituals: Ritual Occasions from Baptisms to Funerals in Hollywood Films. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

Bouillaud, Jean-Baptiste. 1835. Traité clinique des maladies du coeur : précédé de recherches nouvelles sur l'anatomie et la physiologie de cet organe. Tome 1. Paris and London: J.-B. Baillière.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2017. *Manet: A Symbolic Revolution*. Trans. by Peter Collier and Margaret Rigaud-Drayton. Cambridge and Madford: Polity.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2017. Manet: A Symbolic Revolution. Trans. by Peter Collier and Margaret Rigaud-Drayton. Cambridge and Madford: Polity.

Bowen, Christopher. 2018. Grammar of the Shot. New York and Oxon: Routledge.

Bowen, Jonathan P. 2010. "A Brief History of Early Museums Online" The Rutherford Journal 3, Special Issue on the History of Computing, Edited by B. Jack Copeland, Carl Posy, Oron Shagrir, and Parker Bright. http://www.rutherfordjournal.org/article030103.html [accessed 19/6/2020]

Boyer, Laure. 2002. "Robert J. Bingham, photographe du monde de l'art sous le Second Empire." *Études photographiques* 12 (*L' âge d'or revisité*, November). http://journals.openedition.org/etudesphotographiques/320

Bracher, Mark. 1994. "On the psychological and social functions of language: Lacan's Theory of the Four Discourses." In *Lacanian Theory of Discourse: Subject, Structure and Society*. Ed. By Mark Bracher, New York: New York University Press, 107–128.

Bradley, A. C. 1905. *Shakesperean Tragedy. Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*. Second Edition. London: Macmillan.

Braun, Johanna. Ed. 2021. *Hysterical Methodologies in the Arts. Rising in Revolt.* London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Braunstein, Nestor. 2020. *Jouissance. A Lacanian Concept*. Trans. by Silvia Rosman. Albany NY: Suny Press.

Brecht, Bertolt. 2018. *The Collected Poems of Bertold Brecht*. Trans. and ed. by Tom Kuhn and David Constantine with the assistance of Charlotte Ryland. New York and London: Norton.

Brenson, Michael. 2004. "Resisting the Dangerous Journey: The Crisis of Journalistic Criticism." In *Acts of Engagement: Writings on Art, Criticism, and Institutions, 1993-2002*. Lanham and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 83-98.

Briggs, Jo. 2012. "The Old Feelings of Men in a New Garment": John Everett Millais's A Huguenot and Masculine Audiences in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 11 (3 Autumn). https://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn12/briggs-john-everett-millais-a-huguenot

British Medical Journal. 1859. "A Bill to Regulate the Keeping and Sale of Poisons." *British Medical Journal* n. 103, n.s. (26 February), 173-4.

Britton, Piers D. G. 2002. "The signs of faces: Leonardo on physiognomic science and the 'Four Universal States of Man'." *Renaissance Studies* 16 (2, June), 143-62.

Bronfen, Elizabeth. 1992. *Over her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic.* Manchester: Mancherster University Press.

Brotton, Jerry. 2015. The Sale of the Late King's Goods: Charles I and His Art Collection. London: Pan Macmillan.
Brousse, Marie-Hélène. 1998. "The Drive (II)". In *Reading Seminar XI The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. by Richard Feldstein, Bruce Fink, and Maire Jaanus. New York: SUNY Press, 109-18.
Brown, Alan David, and Sylvia Ferino-Pagden. 2006. *Bellini, Giorgione, Titian and the Renaissance of Venetian Painting: Allegories and Mythologies*. New Haeven and London: Yale university Press
Brown, Daniel. 2016. *Representing Realists in Victorian Literature and Criticism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Brown, Sue. 2009. *Joseph Severn, A Life The Rewards of Friendship.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Bryson, Bill. 2011. At Home: A Short History of Private Life. New York: Anchor.
Bryson, Norman. 1983. *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Brzoska, Matthias. 2003. "Meyerbeer: *Robert Le Diable* and *Les Huguenots*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Grand Opera*. Ed. by David Charlton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 189-207.
Buch, Robert Caspar. 2010. *The Pathos of the Real: On the Aesthetics of Violence in the Twentieth Century.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Buchanan, Ian. 2020. *Assemblage Theory and Method.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.
Buchanan, Robert. 1872. The Fleshly School of Poetry and Other Phenomena of the Day. London: Strahan.
Buchholz, Larissa, Gary Alan Fine, and Hannah Wohl. 2020. "Art markets in crisis: how personal bonds and market subcultures mediate the effects of COVID-19." American Journal of Cultural Sociology 8, 462–76.
Buchloh, Benjamin. 1981. "Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art." *Artforum* 21 (1, September), 43-56.
Budge, Gavin. 2012. *Romanticism, Medicine and the Natural Supernatural: Transcendent Vision and Bodily Spectres, 1789–1852*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Bullen, J.B. 1998. *The Pre-Raphaelite Body. Fear and Desire in Painting, Poetry, and Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Burgin, Victor. 2006. "Thoughts on 'research' degrees in visual arts departments." *Journal of Media Practice*, 7 (2), 101-8
Burke, Edmund. 1998. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origins of the Sublime and Beautiful: And Other Pre-Revolutionary Writings*. London and New York: Penguin.
Burke, Edmund. Ed. 1845. *Annual Register, Or A View Of The History And Politics Of The Year 1844.* London: printed for F. And J Rivington.
Burrows, Adrienne and Iwan Schumacher. 1979. *Doktor Diamonds Bildnisse von Geisteskranken.* Frankfurt a.M.: Syndikat.
Burty, Philippe. 1859. "Exposition de la Société française de photographie." *Gazette des beaux-arts* 15 (May), 218.
Busfield, Joan. 1994. "The Female Malady? Men, Women and Madness in Nineteenth Century Britain." *Sociology* 28 (n. 1 February), 259–77.
Busfield, Joan. 1996. *Men, Women and Madness: Understanding Gender and Mental Disorder.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
Butler, Rex. Ed. 2014. *The Žižek Dictionary.* Oxon and New York: Routledge.
Butt, Danny. 2017. *Artistic Research in the Future Academy*. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect.
Butterworth, Robert D. 2011. "Thomas Hood, Early Victorian Christian Social Criticism, and the Hoodian Hero." Victorian Literature and Culture 39 (2), 427-441.
Caduff, Corina and Tan Wälchl. 2019. "Introducing Literature in the Discourse of Artistic Research." In *Artistic Research and Literature.* Ed. by Corina Caduff and Tan Wälchl. Leiden, Boston, Singapore and Paderborn: Brill, 1-12.
Cagnolo di Parma, Nicolò. 1867. Lucrezia Borgia in Ferrara sposa a don Alfonso d'Este : memorie storiche estratte dalla Cronaca ferrarese di Bernardino Zambotto dov'e inserita la relazione di Nicolo Cagnolo da Parma, con annotazioni. Ferrara: D. Taddei.
Cameron, Rita. 2015. *Ophelia's Muse.* London: Kensington Publishing.
Campbell, Joseph. [1949] 2004. The Hero with a Thousand Faces. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Caracciolo, Peter. 1971. "Wilkie Collins's Divine Comedy: The Use of Dante in The Woman in White, *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 25 (4, March), 383-404.
Carlson, Eric Josef. 2000. "English Funeral Sermons as Sources: The Example of Female Piety in Pre-1640 Sermons." *Albion* 32, (4 Winter), 567-97.

Carlyle, Thomas 1899. “Novalis” in The Works of Thomas Carlyle in Thirty Volumes. Vol. 27. Critical and Miscellaneous Essays in Five Volumes. Vol. II. London: Chapman, 1-55.
Carol Jacobs, Carol. 1975. "The Monstrosity of Translation." *MLN* 90 (6, Comparative Literature: Translation: Theory and Practice), 755-66.
Carras, Christi. 2020. “Madonna knows best: Pop icon will direct and co-write her own biopic.” Los Angeles Times, 15 September. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment-arts/movies/story/2020-09-15/madonna-biopic-movie-universal-amy-pascal.
Carrier, David. 1987. "Naturalism and Allegory in Flemish Painting." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 45 (3, Spring), 237-249.
Carroll, Lewis. 1920. Though the Looking Glass. In The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll. New York: Random House.
Carter, Angela. 1979. *The Sadeian Woman. An Exercise in Cultural History.* New York and London: Penguin.
Casola, Tiziano. 2021. "Le origini della British Academy of Arts di Roma: alcune precisazioni storiche, nuove fonti documentarie, una nuova ipotesi / The origins of the British Academy of Arts in Rome: new sources, some historical clarifications, and a new hypothesis." *Il capitale culturale* (23), 493-528. DOI: 10.13138/2039-2362/2601.
Casteras, Susan P. 1985. “John Everett Millais’s ‘Secret-Looking Garden Wall’ and the Courtship Barrier in Victorian Art.” *Browning Institute Studies* 13, 71–98.
Casteras, Susan P. and Ronald Parkinson. Eds. 1988. *Richard Redgrave 1804-1888.* With essays by Elizabeth Bonython, Shirley Bury, Lionel Lambourne, Oliver Millar, Robert Twyman-Heaven. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Caviezel, Flavia, and Markus Schwander. Eds. 2015. *Eitghty-Seven Questions on Artistic Research.* Basel: SARN.
Cazotte, Jacques. 1925. The Devil in Love. With six engravings on copper by J. E. Laboureur. London: William Heinemann.
Chaboudez, Gisèle. 2013. “Le plus-de-joir,” ERES 25, 197-225. https://www.cairn.info/revue-figures-de-la-psy-2013-1-page-197.htm
Chadwick, Henry. 1986. Augustine. A Very Short Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chang, Ting. 2004. “Gustave Courbet’s ‘The Meeting’” *The Art Bulletin* 86 (n. 4, December), 719-30.
Chapman, Alison A. 2007. “Ophelia’s ‘Old Lauds’: Madness and Hagiography in ‘Hamlet.’” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 20, 111-135.
Chastel, André. 1986. “Gesture in Painting: Problems in Semiology.” Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance Et Réforme, n.s. 10 (n. 1, February), 1-22. (Chastel 1986: 18-9)
Cheang, Sarah. 2007. “Selling China: Class, Gender and Orientalism at the Department Store” Journal of Design History 20 (n. 1), 1-16.
Cherry, Deborah, and Griselda Pollock. 1984. ‘Patriarchal Power and the Pre-Raphaelites’, *Art History*, 7 (1984), 480–95.
Churchwell, Sarah. 2018. “Sarah Churchwell on Madonna: ‘She remains the hero of her own story.’” The Guardian, 15 July. https://www.theguardian.com/music/2018/jul/15/sarah-churchwell-on-madonna-power-success-feminist-legacy
Cinquemani, Sal. 2003. “Review: Madonna, Bedtime Stories.” Slant, 9 March. https://www.slantmagazine.com/music/madonna-bedtime-stories/
Cixous, Hélène. 1976. “Fiction and Its Phantoms: A Reading of Freud's *Das Unheimliche* (The ‘Uncanny’).” *New Literary History* 7 (3, Spring), 525-48, 619-45.
Cixous, Helene. 1986. *The Newly Born Woman.* With Catherine Clement, trans. by Betsy Wing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Clark T. J. 1985. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Clark, Anna. 1992. "The Rhetoric of Chartist Domesticity: Gender, Language, and Class in the 1830s and 1840s." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1, Jan.), 62-88.
Clark, Anna. 2019. *Desire. A History of European Sexuality.* London and New York: Routledge
Clark. Kenneth. 1956 *The Nude. A Study in Ideal Form*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Clarke, Mary Cowden. 1851/2009. *The Girlhood of Shakespeare’s Heroines. In a Series of Fifteen Tales.* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Clary, Frank Nicholas. 2007. “Maclise and Macready: Collaborating Illustrators of “Hamlet.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 25 (n. 1, Special Issue *Hamlet” and the Still Image*, Spring), 33-59.
Clavreul, Jean. 1980. ‘The Perverse Couple.’ In Returning to Freud: Clinical Psychoanalysis in the School of Lacan. Ed. and trans. by Stuart Schneiderman, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 215–33.
Clavreul, Jean. 1980. “The perverse couple.” In How Lacan’s ideas are used in clinical practice. Ed. by Stuart Schneiderman, Northvale: Jason Aronson, 215–233.

Clinton-Baddeley, Victor C. 1961. “Wopsle.” *Dickensian* 57, 150-59.
Codell, Julie. “On the Grosvener Gallery, 1877-90.” *BRANCH: Britain, Representation and Nineteenth-Century History*. Ed. by Dino Franco Felluga. Online publication. https://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=julie-codell-on-the-grosvener-gallery-1877 [archived 20/08/2021]
Cohen, Michael. 1995. *Sisters. Relation and Rescue in Nineteenth-century British Novels and Paintings.* London and Toronto: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
Cohen, Simona. 2008. Animals as Disguised Symbols in Renaissance Art. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Cole, Michael. 1998. *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline*. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press.
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. 1937. *Lectures on Shakespeare.* London: Dent.
Collins, Mathew, Michael Sutherland, Lawrence Bouwer, S.-M. Cheong, T. Frölicher, H. Jacot Des Combes, M. Koll Roxy, I. Losada, K. McInnes, B. Ratter, E. Rivera-Arriaga, R.D. Susanto, D. Swingedouw, and L. Tibig. 2019. “Extremes, Abrupt Changes and Managing Risk.” In: *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate.* Ed. by Hans-Otto Pörtner, Debra C. Roberts, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama, N.M. Weyer. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In press. Online version: https://www.ipcc.ch/srocc/chapter/chapter-6/ [archived 9/8/2021]
Collins, Philip. 1999. “John Ruskin” s.v. in Oxford Reader’s Companion to Dickens. Ed. by Paul Schlicke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 503
Collins, Wilkie. 2008. *The Woman in White.* Ed. by Maria K. Bachman and Don Richard Cox. Toronto et al.: Broadview Editions.
Conley, Carolyn A. 2020. *Debauched, Desperate, Deranged. Women Who Killed, London 1674-1913.* London and New York: Oxford University Press.
Conley, Carolyn A. 2020. *Debauched, Desperate, Deranged: Women Who Killed, London 1674-1913.* Oxford and New York: Oxford Unniversity Press.
Cooper, Suzanne Fagence. 2010. *The Model Wife: Effie, Ruskin and Millais*. london: Duckworth Overlook.
Cooper, Wyn. Director. 1974. The Egg. Online video from Super 8 original. 1 min 03 sec, color, no sound. https://madonnaunderground.com/filmography/the-egg/
Coppel, Alec and Samuel Taylor. 1957. *Vertigo*. Draft of film script (9 December). http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/vertigo.html
Cottell, Fran, and Marianne Mueller. 2020. “From Pain to Pleasure: Panopticon Dreams and Pentagon Petal.” In *Bentham and the Arts.* Ed. by Anthony Julius, Malcolm Quinn, and Philip Schofield. London: UCL Press, 244-69
Coursen, Herbert R. 1993. *Watching Shakespeare on Television*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.
Cowan, Bainard. 1981. “Walter Benjamin’s Theory of Allegory.” *New German Critique* n. 22 (Special Issue on Modernism, Winter), 109-22
Cowan, Bainard. 1981. “Walter Benjamin's Theory of Allegory” *New German Critique* 22 (Special Issue on Modernism, Winter), 109-122.
Cowie, Elizabeth. 1978. “Woman as Sign,” m/f (issue 1), 49-63.
Cox, Geoff, Azadeh Fatehrad, Anya Lewin, Andrew Prior, Laura Hopes, Hannah Drayson, and Allister Gall. Eds. 2018. "Artistic Research Will Eat Itself. Proceedings of the 9th SAR International Conference on Artistic Research." University of Plymouth, 11-13 April. Research Catalogue. https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/512748/512749/0/0 [accessed 24 April 2022].
Crary, Jonathan. 1990. *Techniques of the Observer. On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
Crary, Jonathan. 1999. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
Cross, Anthony. 2017. "Art Criticism as Practical Reasoning." *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 57 (3, July),299–317.
Cruise, Colin. 2011. *Pre-Raphaelite Drawing.* London: Thames and Hudson.
Cruise, Colin. 2011. *Pre-Raphaelite Drawing.* London: Thames and Hudson.
Culler, Jonathan. 1984. “Textual Self-Consciousness and the Textual Unconscious.” *Style* 18 (n. 3, Psychopoetics, Summer), 369-76.
Cunningham, Hugh. 1975. *The Volunteer Force. A Social and Political History 1859-1908*. London: Routledge.
Da Vinci, Leonardo. 2008. Notebooks. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Dafforne, James. 1859. "British Artists: Their Style and Character, with Engraved Illustrations. No. XLV--Richard Redgrave R.A." Art Journal n.s. 5 (July), 205-7.
Dante, Alighieri. 1996. *The Divine Comedy. Vol. I Inferno.* Edited and translated by Robert M. Durling. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dante. 1985. *Divina Commedia. Vol.1 Inferno.* Ed. by Natalino Sapegno. Firenze: Nuova Italia.
Dante. 2003. *The Divine Commedy of Dante Alighieri. Vol. II Purgatorio.* Edited and translated by Robert M. Durling, Introduction and Notes by Ronald L. Martinez and Robert M. Durling. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Danton, Eric R. 2013. Lou Reed Memorial Set for Thursday in New York. Public event to feature 'just Lou's voice, guitar music & songs'. Rolling Stone, 13 November. https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/lou-reed-memorial-set-for-Thursday-in-new-york-113171/
Darbellay, Frédéric. 2019. "Postdisciplinarity: imagine the future, think the unthinkable." In Postdisciplinary Knowledge. Ed. by Tomas Pernecky. London and New York: Routledge, 235-50.
Darren, Allison. 2000. Lesbian Film Guide. London and New York: Cassel.
Davenport, Nancy. 2012. "William Holman Hunt: Layered Belief in the Art of a Pre-Raphaelite Realist." Religion and the Arts 16, (n. 1-2), 29-77, doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/156852912X615874
David, Deidre. 2001. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. by Deidre David. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-16.
Davis, Ben. 2013. *9.5 Thesis on Art and Class.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.
Davison, Will. 2014. "Madonna Desperately Seeking Susan jacket auctions for $257,000." Paul Fraser Collectibles. Online blog. 10 November. https://www.paulfrasercollectibles.com/blogs/music-memorabilia/madonna-desperately-seeking-susan-jacket-auctions-for-257-000 [accessed 20/6/2020]
Dawkins, Richard. 2016. *The Selfish Gene. 40th Anniversary Edition.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Dawson, Anthony. 1997. *Hamlet.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Dayan, Daniel. 1974. "The Tutor-Code of Classical Cinema," Film Quarterly 28 (n. 1 Autumn), 22-31.
De Assis, Paulo. 2018. *Logic of Experimentation: Rethinking Music Performance through Artistic Research*. Orpheus Institute Series. Leuven: Leuven University Press. [OA] https://www.oapen.org/search?identifier=1001749
De Duve, Thierry and Brian Holmes. 1998. "How Manet's 'A Bar at the Folies-Bergère' Is Constructed." Critical Inquiry, 25 (n. 1, Autumn), 136-68.
De Duve, Thierry. 2000. *Look, One Hundred Years of Contemporary Art.* Trans. by Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods. Brussels: Ludion.
De Jong, Jan L. 2009. "Dido in Italian Renaissance Art. The Afterlife of a Tragic Heroine." *Artibus et Historiae* 59, 73-89.
De Lorris, Guillaume and Jean de Meun. 1995. The Romance of the Rose. Trans. By Charles Dahlberg. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
De Man, Paul. 1983. "The Rhetoric of Temporality." In Blindness and Insight Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism. Second Edition, Revised. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 187-228.
De Man, Paul. 1996. "The Concept of Irony." In *Aesthetic Ideology*. Ed. by Andrzej Warminski. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 163-84.
De Man, Paul. 1997. *Resistance to Theory.* London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Dean, Tim. "Art as Symptom: Žižek and the Ethics of Psychoanalytic Criticism." *Diacritics* 32 (2), 21-41.
DeLanda, Manuel. 2016. *Assemblage Theory.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Delap, Lucy. 2011. "The 'Woman Question' and the Origins of Feminism." In *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought.* Ed. by Gareth Stedman Jones and Gregory Claeys, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 319–48.
Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. 2007. *Dialogues II.* Revised ed. Trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Deleuze, Gilles and Michel Foucault. 1977. "Intellectuals and Power." In Michel Foucault, *Language, Couter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews.* Edited with an Introduction by Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 205-17.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Claire Parnet. 2007. *Dialogues II. Revised edition*. Trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus.* Trans. by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1994. *What Is Philosophy?* Trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1988. *Foucault.* Translated and edited by Sean Hand. London and Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1988. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Trans. by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1989. *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1991. "Coldness and Cruelty." In *Masochism*. New York: Zone Books.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1991. *Empiricism and Subjectivity: An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*. Trans. by Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. *Difference and Repetition.* Trans. by Paul Patton, New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1995. "The Exhausted." Trans by Anthony Uhlmann. *SubStance* 24 (3), 3-28.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1995. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2007. "The Brain Is The Screen." *Two Regimes of Madness.* Trans. by Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina. Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e)/MIT Press, 282-91.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2000. *Proust and Signs: The Complete Text*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Denney, Colleen. 2000. *At the Temple of Art: the Grosvenor Gallery, 1877–1890*. Cranbury, London and Mississagua: Associated University Presses.

Dennis, Geoffrey W. 2016. S.v. "Lilith." In The Encyclopedia of Jewish Myth, Magic and Mysticism. Second Edition. Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn Publications.

Department of Health, United Kingdom. 2015. Mental Health Act 1983: Code of Practice. Norwich: TSO, 342-348. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/435512/MHA_Code_of_Practice.PDF. [accessed 21 July 2020]

Department of Heralth and Social Care. 2015. "Mental Health Act 1983: Code of Practice." Norwich: The Stationary Office. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/435512/MHA_Code_of_Practice.PDF [Archived 21/12/2020].

Derrida, Jacques. 2006. *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. London: Routledge.

Diamond, Hugh W. 1857. "Communications read 22 May 1856. I. On the application of photography to the physiognomic and mental phenomena of insanity." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 8 (1 January): 117.

Diamond, Hugh Welch. 1857. "On the application of photography to the physiognomic and mental phenomena of insanity." Abstract. *Proceedings of the Royal Society. London*. 8 (1 January), 117.

Dickens, Charles. 1844. "Threatening Letter to Thomas Hood, from an Ancient Gentleman. By favor of Charles Dickens." Hood's Magazine and Comic Miscellany. 1 (May), 409-14.

Dickens, Charles. 1850. "Old Lamps for New Ones" Household Words 1 (n. 12, 15 June), 265-7.

Dickens, Charles. 1870. *The Mystery of Edwin Drood. With Twelve Illustrations by S.L. Fildes, and a Portrait.* London: Chapman and Hals.

Dickens, Charles. 2008. *Great Expectations.* Edited by Margaret Cardwell, with an Introduction and Notes by Robert Douglas-Fairhurst. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dickens, Charles. 2009. A Christmas Carol and The Chimes and The Haunted Man. London: Vintage.

Dickens, Henry. 1934. *The Recollections of Sir Henry Dickens, KC*. London: William Heinemann.

Diderot, Denis. 1876. "Pensées détachées sur la Peinture, la Sculpture, l'Architecture, et la Poésie." In Oevres Complétes. Tome 12. Paris: Garnier Frères, 75-133.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. 1995. *Fra Angelico: Dissemblance and Figuration*. Translated by Jane Marie Todd Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. 2003. *Invention of Hysteria. Charcot and the Photographic Iconography of the Salpêtrière*. Trans. by Alisa Hartz. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. 2005. *Confronting Images. Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art*. Trans. by John Goodman. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Didi-Huberman, Georges. 2016. *The Surviving Image. Phantoms of Time and Time of Phantoms: Aby Warburg's History of Art.* Translated by Harvey Mendelsohn. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Dijkstra, Bram. 1988. Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Disraeli, Benjamin. 1845. *Sybil or The Two Nations. In Three Volumes.* London: Henry Colburn.

Dombois, Florian. 2006. "Kunst als Forschung: Ein Versuch sich selbst eine Anleitung zu entwerfen." *Jahrbuch Hochschule der Künste Bern*, 21–29.

Dombois, Florian. 2018. "PhD-Programm mit Florian Dombois an der Zürcher Hochschule der Künste" Proposal (30 September). https://www.zhdk.ch/file/live/be/befbcc87e5b05fdfb0060538bd1af69874065446/180930_phd_konzept_dombois.pdf [accessed 25 April 2022].

Dombois, Florian. Ed. 2009. *Neuland – Ein Grundlagenprojekt zur künstlerischen Forschung.* Bern: Hochschule der Künste Bern.
Donohue, Joseph. 2004 "Introduction: the theatre from 1660 to 1800." *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Volume 2: 1660 to 1895*. Edited by Joseph Donohue. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-53.
Dorment, Richard. 2002. 'Review of the Year: Face to Face with Greatness" *The Telegraph.* 29 December. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/3571075/Review-of-the-year-face-to-face-with-greatness.html
Dornbach, Marton. 2020. "The Saving Line: Benjamin, Adorno, and the Caesuras of Hope." Evanston: Northwet University Press.
Driver, Felix. 2004. *Power and Pauperism. The Workhouse System, 1834-1884*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Drohan, Christopher M. 2009. *Deleuze and the Sign*. New York: Atropos Press.
Dromgoole, Dominic. 2017. *Hamlet Globe to Globe: Two Years, 193,000 Miles, 197 Countries, One Play.* Edinburgh: Cannongate Books.
Duchenne, Guillaume-Benjamin. 1862. *Mécanisme de la physionomie humaine, ou Analyse électro-physiologique de l'expression des passions. Avec un atlas composé de 74 figures electro-physiologiques photographiées.* Paris: Jules Renouard.
Duncan, Sophie. 2016. *Shakespeare's Women and the Fin de Siècle.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Eagleton, Terry. 1982. *The Rape of Clarissa. Writing, Sexuality and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
Eastlake, Charles Lock. 1846. Materials for a History of Oil Painting. London: Longman, Brown, Green, a1nd Longmans.
Eastlake, Charles. 1872. A History of the Gothic Revival. An Attempt to Show How the Taste for Medieval Architecture which Lingered in England during the Two Last Centuries Has since Been Encouraged and Developed. London: Steepwood.
Eco, Umberto. 1979. *The Role of the Reader. Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts.* Bloomigton: Indiana University Press.
Eco, Umberto. 1984. Semiotics and the philosophy of language. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Eco, Umberto. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation.* With Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler and Christine Brooke-Roase. Ed. by Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eco, Umberto. 1998. *Serendipities. Language and Lunacy.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Edward Morris, Edward. 1970. "The Subject of Millais's Christ in the House of His Parents." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 33, 343-45.
Edwards, Justin and Rune Graulund. 2013. Grotesque. London and New York: Routledge.
Edwards, Lee R. 1979. 'The Labors of Psyche: Towards a Theory of Female Heroism', Critical Inquiry, 6 (n. 1, Autumn), 33-49.
Edwards, Philip. 2016. "Hamlet and the Actors: Restoration to Victorian Players." In *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare.* Ed. by Bruce R. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1567–71.
Eliot, George. 1859. *Adam Bede. In Three Volumes.* Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.
Eliot, George. 1985. *Selections from George Eliot's Letters*. Ed. by Gordon S. Haight. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press.
Eliot, T.S. 1920. "Hamlet and His Problems." In *The Sacred Wood. Essays on Poetry and Criticism.* London: Meuthen, 87-94.
Elkins, James. 1991. "On the Arnolfini Portrait and the Lucca Madonna: Did Jan van Eyck Have a Perspectival System?" The Art Bulletin 73 (n. 1, March), 53-62.
Elkins, James. 2004. *On the Strange Place of Religion in Contemporary Art*. London and New York: Routledge.
Ellis-Petersen, Hannah. 2015. "Tate Britain director Penelope Curtis to step down after five years in charge." *The Guardian*, 31 March. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/mar/31/tate-britain-director-penelope-curtis-to-depart
Elsner, Jas. 2010. "Art History as Ekphrasis." *Art History* 33, 10–27.
Erbland, Kate. 2016. "Susan Seidelman Looks Back: How 'Smithereens' Defined Her Career – Girl Talk." Online interview. Indiewire. 28 June. https://www.indiewire.com/2016/07/susan-seidelman-smithereens-desperately-seeking-susan-1201710555/ [accessed 20/6/2020]
Erhardt, Michelle A. and Amy M. Morris. Eds. 2012. Mary Magdalene, Iconographic Studies from the Middle Ages to the Baroque. Boston and Leiden: Brill.
Ettinger, Bracha L. 2006. *The Matrixial Borderspace*. (Essays from 1994 to 1999). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Ettinger, Bracha L. 2020. Matrixial Subjectivity, Aesthetics, Ethics. Volume 1: 1990-2000. Edited with an introduction by Griselda Pollock. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

European Medicine Agency. 2017. “Zyprexa.” Database entry. http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/medicines/000115/human_med_001189.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124 (accessed 17 May 2018)

Fairbairn, Patrick. 1845. *The Typology of Scripture, or, the Doctrine of Types investigated in its principles and applied to the explanation of the earlier revelations of God, considered as preparatory exhibitions of the leading truths of the Gospel. With an appendix on the restoration of the Jews.* Edinburgh: Thomas Clark.

Fairholt, Frederick William. 1854. A Dictionary of Terms in Art. London: Virtue, Hall and Virtue.

Faught, C. Brad. 2003. *The Oxford Movement. A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*. University Park PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Feher-Gurevich, Judith. 2003. “A Lacanian approach to the logic of perversion.” In The Cambridge Companion to Lacan. Edited by Jean-Michel Rabaté. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191-207.

Feher-Gurewich, Judith. 2003. “A Lacanian approach to the logic of perversion” in The Cambridge Companion to Lacan. Edited by Jean-Michel Rabaté. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191-207.

Fehl, Philipp. 1957. "The Hidden Genre: A Study of the Concert Champêtre in the Louvre." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 16 (2, Dec.), 153-168.

Ficino, Marsilio. 1998. Three Books on Life. Critical Edition with an Introduction and Notes by Carol V. Kaske and John R. Clark. Tempe: The Renaissance Society of America.

Field, Michael. 1908. *Wild Honey from Various Thyme.* London: Fisher Unwin.

Filippini, Nadia Maria. 2021. *Pregnancy, delivery, childbirth: a gender and cultural history from antiquity to the test tube in Europe*. Trans. By Clelia Boscolo. London: Routledge.

Finch, Mariko. 2018. “The Pre-Raphaelites’ Enduring Influence: From Tolkien to Led Zeppelin.” *Sotheby’s Blog*, 17 July. https://www.sothebys.com/en/news-video/blogs/all-blogs/european-discoveries/2018/07/the-pre-raphaelites-enduring-influence-from-tolkein-to-led-zeppelin.html [archived 21/12/2020]

Findlay, Alison. 1994. ‘Hamlet: A Document in Madness.’ In *New Essays on Hamlet.* Ed. by Mark Thornton Burnett and John Manning. New York: AMS Press, 189–205.

Fine, Gail. 2014. *The Possibility of Inquiry. Meno’s Paradox from Socrates to Sextus.* London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Fink, Bruce. 1995. The Lacanian Subject. Between Language and Joissance. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fink, Bruce. 1997. A Clinical Introduction to Lacanian Psychoanalysis: Theory and Technique. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Fink, Bruce. 2004. Lacan to the Letter. Reading Ecrits Closely. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Fink, Eugen. 1957/1981. “Operative Begriffe in Husserls Phänomenologie.” *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 11 (n. 3 July – September), 321-37. Trans. as “Operative Concepts in Husserl’s Phenomenology.” In: *Apriori and World. European Contributions to Husserlian Phenomenology*. Ed. by William McKenna, Robert M. Harlan, and Laurence E. Winters. Dordrecht: Springer, 56-70.

Fink, Eugen. 1981. "Operative Concepts in Husserl’s Phenomenology." In: *Apriori and World*. Ed. by McKenna, W., Harlan, R.M., Winters, L.E. (eds), The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 56-70.

Finkelstein, Richard. 1997. “Differentiating ‘Hamlet’: Ophelia and the Problems of Subjectivity.” *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance Et Réforme*, n.s. 21 (n. 2), 5-22.

Firth, C. H. 1909. “The Ballad History of the Reigns of the Later Tudors.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 3: 51–124.

Fischlin, Daniel. Ed. 2014. *OuterSpeares: Shakespeare, Intermedia, and the Limits of Adaptation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fisher, Jane, Meena Cagral de Mello and Takahashi Izutsu. 2009. “Pregnancy, Childbirth and the Postpartum Period.” In *Mental Health Aspects of Women’s Reproductive Health. A Global Review of the Literature.* Ed. by Jane Fisher, Meena Cagral de Mello and Takahashi Izutsu. Geneva: World Health Organisation Press, 8-43.

Fisher, Judith L. 1996. “Magnificent or Mad? Nineteenth-Century Periodicals and the Paintings of Joseph Mallord William Turner.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 29 (n. 3, Fall), 242-60.

Flanagan, Tim. 2009. "The Thought of History in Benjamin and Deleuze" In *Deleuze and History.* Ed. by Jeffrey Bell, and Claire Colebrook. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 103-20.

Fletcher, Tom. 2003. “The Pythian”. New York Architecture. Website. 24 August. http://www.nyc-architecture.com/UWS/UWS009.htm [accessed 20/8/2020]

Floyd-Wilson, Mary. 2009. “Hamlet, the Pirate’s Son.” *Early Modern Literary Studies*. 12 (Special Issue, 19), 1-11. http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-19/floyhaml.html. [accessed 21 July 2020]

Flusser, Vilem. 2000. *Towards a Philosophy of Photography.* London: Reaktion Books.

Fornaciari, Gino, Valentina Giuffra, Federica Bortolotti and Franco Tagliaro. 2015. “A medieval case of Digitalis poisoning: the sudden death of Cangrande della Scala, lord of Verona (1291-1329)” Journal of

Archaeological Science Journal of Archaeological Science 54 (February), 162-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2014.12.005
Fortier, Mark. 2014. “Beyond Adaptation.” In *OuterSpeares: Shakespeare, Intermedia, and the Limits of Adaptation*. Ed. by Daniel Fischlin. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 372-386.
Fothergill, J. Milner. 1871. “The Hastings Prize Essay, 1870. On Digitalis: Its Mode Of Action And Its Use.” The British Medical Journal, 2 (n. 553, 5 August), 146-9.
Foucault, Michel. 1988. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* London and New York: Vintage.
Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1. An Introduction*. Trans. by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 2. The use of Pleasure*. Trans. by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 3. The Care of the Self*. Trans. by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, Michel. 2009. *Manet and the Object of Painting*. Trans. by Matthew Barr. London: Tate Publishing.
Foucault, Michel. 2009. *Manet and the Object of Painting*. Trans. by Matthew Barr. London: Tate Publishing.
Foucault, Michel. 2013. *Lectures on the Will to Know and Oedipal Knowledge: Lectures at the Collège de France 1970–1971*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Founta, Xenia. 2014. “A walk through British Art – Pre-Raphaelites return to Tate Britain” *Glass,* 11 August. Online article. https://www.theglassmagazine.com/a-walk-through-british-art-pre-raphaelites-back-to-tate-britain/
Fowler, Alistair. 2003. *Renaissence Realism. Narrative Images in Literature and Art.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Fredericksen, Andrea. 2002. “The Etching Club of London: A Taste for Painters’ Etchings.” *Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin* 92 (n. 388, Special Issue: *The Etching Club of London: A Taste for Painters’ Etchings,* Summer), 2-3+6-35.
Freeman Loftis, Sonya, Allison Kellar, and Lisa Ulevich. Eds. 2018. *Post-Hamlet: Shakespeare in an Era of Textual Exhaustion.* London: Routledge.
Freiligrath, Ferdinand. 1844. ‘Hamlet’, in *Ein Glaubensbekenntniß. Zeitgedichten*. Mainz: Viktor von Zabern, 253–7.
French, Christopher. 2011. “The Good Life in Victorian and Edwardian Surbiton: Creating a Suburban Community Before 1914”, *Family and Community History* 14 (n. 2), 105-120.
Freud, Sigmund. 1955. “The Uncanny.” In *Standard Edition, Volume 17 (1917-1919): An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works*. Translated from the German under the General Editorship of James Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press, 217-256.
Freud, Sigmund. 1961. “Fetishism.” In *Standard Edition. Vol 21 (1927-1931). The Future of an Illusion, Civilisation and Its Discontents, and Other Works*. Trans. and ed. by James Strachey London Hogarth Press, 149-157.
Freud, Sigmund. 1999. Totem and Taboo. Some Points of Agreement Between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics. Trans. By James Strakey. London: Routledge.
Freud, Sigmund. 2011 [1925h]. “On Negation” in On Freud’s Negation. Ed. by Mary Kelly O’Neil and Salman Akhtar, London: Karnak, 13-7.
Fried, Michael. 1996. *Manet’s Modernism: Or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Fried, Michael. 1996. *Manet's Modernism. Or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s.* London and Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Fried, Michael. 2005. “Barthes’ Punctum.” Critical Inquiry 31 (Spring), 239-74.
Friedlaender, Eli. 2012. *Walter Benjamin: A Philosophical Portrait*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Frith, William P. 1887. My Autobiography and Reminiscences. Vol. 1. Second edition in two volumes. London: Richard Bentley.
Frodeman, Robert. 2017. “The Future of Interdisciplinarity: An Introduction to the 2nd Edition.” In: The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity, Second Edition. Edited by Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Roberto C. S. Pacheco. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Frojmovic, Eva. 1996. “Giotto’s Allegories of Justice and the Commune in the Palazzo della Ragione in Padua: A Reconstruction.” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 59, 24-47
Frugoni, Chiara. 2011. “Playing with Clouds.” The Burlington Magazine 153, 518–520
Fyfe, Paul. 2014. “Accidental Death: Lizzie Siddal and the Poetics of the Coroner’s Inquest.” Victorian Review 40 (Fall), 17-22.
Gallop. Jane. 1982. *Feminism and Psychoanalysis. The Daughter’s Seduction.* London: Macmillan.

Garcia, Laia. 2016. “The Lenny Interview: Susan Seidelman. The iconic movie director talks about Smithereens, unexpected successes, and Sex & the City.” Lenny, 9 September. https://www.lennyletter.com/story/the-lenny-interview-susan-seidelman
Garff, Joakim. 2017. *Kierkegaard’s Muse: The Mystery of Regine Olsen*. Translated by Alastair Hannay. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Garibaldi, Christina. 2014. “Here’s The Wardrobe Malfunction That Made Madonna’s ‘Like A Virgin’ VMA Performance Legendary.” Online article. MTV News. 28 October. http://www.mtv.com/news/1978552/madonna-video-music-awards-like-a-virgin/ [accessed 20/6/2020]
Garin, Eugenio. 1993. "Galileo e la cultura del suo tempo." In *Scienza e vita civile nel Rinascimento italiano.* Roma: Laterza, 109-46.
Garton, Stephen. 2004. *Histories of Sexuality.* London: Equinox.
Gasché, Rodolphe. 1992. “The Sober Absolute: On Benjamin and the Early Romantics.” *Studies in Romanticism* 31 (n. 4, special issue: Walter Benjamin on Romanticism, Winter), 433-53.
Gasché, Rudolph. 1988. *The Tain of the Mirror. Derrida and the Philosophy of Reflection.* Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.
Gasperoni, John. 1996. “The Unconscious Is Structured Like A Language.” *Qui Parle* 9 (n. 2, Special Issue on Lacan, Spring/Summer), 77-104.
Gates, Barbara T. 1988. *Victorian Suicide: Mad Crimes and Sad Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gautier, Théophile, Jules Janin and Philarète Chasles. 1845. *Les beautés de l’Opéra, ou Chefs-d’oeuvre lyriques illustrés par les premiers artistes de Paris et de Londres.* Paris: Soulié.
Gautier, Théophile. 1856. “Paul Delaroche.” *L’Artiste* 18, 317-21.
Gautier, Théophile. 1858. “L’œuvre de Paul Delaroche photographié.” *L’Artiste* 3 (7 March), 155.
Gautier, Théophile. 1901. “Paul Delaroche.” In *The Works of Théophile Gautier in Twenty-four Volumes. Vol. 6: Portraits of the Day*. New York: George D. Sproul, 241-57.
Geertz, Clifford. 2000. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency. An Anthropological Theory.* Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press.
Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Genosko, Gary. 2008. "A-Signifying Semiotics." *The Public Journal of Semiotics* 11 (1), 11-21.
Gervais de Lafond, Delphine. 2012. “Ophélie in Nineteenth-Century French Painting.” In *The Afterlife of Ophelia.* Ed. by Kaara Peterson and Deanne Williams. Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 169-92.
Gervais, David. 1984. “Delacroix’ Hamlet.” *The Cambridge Quarterly* 13 (1), 40-70.
Gherovici, Patricia. 2014 "Where Have the Hysterics Gone?: Lacan’s Reinvention of Hysteria." ESC 40 (1, March), 47–70.
Gherovici, Patricia. 2014. *Please Select Your Gender. From the Invention of Hysteria to the Democratizing of Transgenderism*. London and New York: Routledge.
Gherovici, Patricia. 2015. “How to Be a More Perfect Hysteric.” European Journal of Psychoanalysis 3. https://www.journal-psychoanalysis.eu/how-to-be-a-more-perfect-hysteric/
Gherovici, Patricia. 2017. *Transgender Psychoanalysis: A Lacanian Perspective on Sexual Difference.* London and New York: Routledge.
Giebelhausen, Michaela. 2006. *Painting the Bible. Representation and Belief in Mid-Victorian Britain.* London and New York: Routledge.
Gietinger, Klaus. 2019. *The Murder of Rosa Luxemburg*. Translated by Loren Balhorn. London and New York: Verso.
Giglio, Raffaele. 2017. "Gabriele Rossetti" s.v. In *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, vol. 88: Robusti - Roverella.* Ed. by Lorenzo Gennaro Bianconi. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.
Gildersleeve, Matthew. 2016. “Method in the Madness: Hysteria and the Will to Power.” *Social Sciences* 5 (3), 1-25.
Giles, Jeff. 2010. “Uncovered: a-ha, ‘Hunting High and Low.’” Pop Dose, 30 August. https://popdose.com/uncovered-a-ha-hunting-high-and-low/
Gilman, Sander L. 1996. *Seeing the Insane.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Ginzburg, Carlo. 1989. "From Aby Warburg to E. H. Gombrich: A Problem of Method." In *Clue, Myths, and Historical Method.* Translated by John and Anne C. Tedeschi. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 17-59.
Girard, René. 1979. *Violence and the Sacred.* Trans. by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.
Girard, René. 1989. *The Scapegoat*. Trans. by Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.

Gitter, Elisabeth G. 1974. "Rossetti's Translations of Early Italian Lyrics." *Victorian Poetry* 12 (4, Winter), 351-362.
Gitter, Elisabeth G. 1984. “The Power of Women’s Hair in the Victorian Imagination” PMLA, 99 (No. 5, October), 936-954
Glick, Claris. 1969. “Hamlet in the English Theater. Acting Texts from Betterton (1676) to Olivier (1963).” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20 (n. 1, Winter), 17-35.
Glynos, Jason. 2001. “The grip of ideology: A Lacanian approach to the theory of ideology.” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 6 (n. 2), 191-214.
Goddé, Jules. 1858. *Oeuvre de Paul Delaroche reproduit en photographie par Bingham; accompagné d’une notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Paul Delaroche; et du catalogue raisonné de l’oeuvre par Jules Godé.* Paris: Goupil et C.
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. 1984. Faust I & II. Goethe’s Collected Works, Volume 2. Edited and Translated by Stuart Atkins With a new introduction by David E. Wellbery. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press
Goffen, Rona. 1997. “Introduction” in Titian’s Venus of Urbino, Ed. by Ron Goffen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-22.
Goffen, Rona. 2002. Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian. Cambridge MA: Yale University Press.
Gombrich, Ernst H. 1970. Aby Warburg: an Intellectual Biography. London: The Warburg Institute.
Gombrich, Ernst Hans. 1987. Reflections on the History of Art. Views and Reviews. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Goodway, David. 2002. *London Chartism 1838-1848.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gorfain, Phyllis. 1986. “Play and the Problem of Knowing in *Hamlet*: An Excursion into Interpretive Anthropology.” In *The Anthropology of Experience.* Ed. by Victor Turner and Edward Bruner. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 207-38.
Gorham, Deborah. 1982. *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Goux, Jean-Joseph. 1990. Symbolic Economies: After Marx and Freud. Trans. By Jennifer Curtiss Gage. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press.
Grady, Hugh. 2009. *Shakespeare and Impure Aesthetics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Graff, Harvey J. 2015. *Undisciplining Knowledge. Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
Graw, Isabelle. 2009. *High Price. Art Between the Market and Celebrity Culture.* Berlin: Starnberger Press.
Grayer-Moore, Jennifer. 2016. “Madonna Wanna-be (1984-1985).” In Fashion Fads Through American History: Fitting Clothes into Context. Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio 113-6
Greenberg, Clement. 1973. The new art : a critical anthology. Revised edition. Ed. by Gregory Battcock. New York: Dutton, 66-77.
Greenberg, Clement. 1993. “Modernist Painting.” In The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume 4: Modernism with a Vengeance. Ed. by John O’Brian, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 85-93.
Greenberg, Roger P. and Seymour Fisher. 1980. “Freud’s penis—baby equation: Exploratory tests of a controversial theory.” British Journal of Medical Psychology. 53 (4, December), 333-42.
Greer, Germaine. 2006. “The genius of Madonna.” The Independent, 30 July. “https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/germaine-greer-the-genius-of-madonna-409826.html
Grewe, Cordula. 2009. *Painting the Sacred in the Age of Romanticism*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Grey, Erik. 2013. “Victorian Miltons.” In The Oxford Handbook of Victorian Poetry. Ed. by Matthew Bevis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 184-200.
Grieve, Alastair. 1971. “Whistler and the Pre-Raphaelites.” *Art Quarterly* 34 (Summer), 219-24.
Grieve, Ev. 2009. “Last Day for Love Saves the Day: Sunday” Ev Grieve. Blog entry. 13 January. https://evgrieve.com/2009/01/last-day-for-love-saves-day-Sunday.html [accessed 20/6/2020]
Grigg, Russell. 2008. *Lacan, Language, and Philosophy.* New York: State University of New York Press.
Grigg, Russell. s.d. “The Concept of Semblant in Lacan’s Teaching.” Lacan.com. https://www.lacan.com/griggblog.html.
Groneman, Carol. 1994. “Nymphomania: The Historical Construction of Female Sexuality.” *Signs* 19 (n. 2, Winter), 337-67.
Gröschel, Petra. 1996. *Ophélie, un thème littéraire dans l’art français (1827-1914),* Mémoire de maîtrise. Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
Gross, George C. 1972. “The Girlhood of Shakespeare’s Heroines,” and the Sex Education of Victorian Women.” *Victorian Studies* 16 (n. 1, Sep.), 37-58.

Guattari, Félix. 2010. *The Machinic Unconscious. Essays in Schizoanalysis.* Translated by Taylor Adkins. Cambridge MA and London: MIT Press.
Guattari, Félix. 1995. *Chaosmosis. An ethico-aesthetic paradigm.* Translated by Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis. Bloomigton and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
Guernsey, Rocellus Sheridan. 1883. *Suicide: history of the penal laws relating to it in their legal, social, moral, and religious aspects, in ancient and modern times. Revised and Enlarged.* New York: L. K. Strouse.
Guizot, François. 1821. *Oeuvres complètes de Shakspeare, traduites de l'anglais par Le Tourneur. Nouvelle édition, revue et corrigée par F. Guizot et A.P., traducteur de Lord Byron, précédée d'une notice biographique et littéraire sur Shakspeare, par F. Guizot. Tome I.* 13 vols, Paris: Ladvocat, 1821.
Haarmann, Anke. 2019. *Artistic Research. Eine epistemologische Ästhetik*. Bielefled: transcript Verlag.
Haarsma, Reindert J., Wilco Hazeleger, Camiel Severijns, Hylke de Vries, Andreas Sterl, Richard Bintanja, Geert Jan van Oldenborgh, and Henk W. van den Brink. 2013. "More hurricanes to hit western Europe due to global warming." *Geophysical Research Letters* 40 (12 May), 1783–1788, doi:10.1002/grl.50360
Hackett, James Henry. 1863. *Notes, Criticism and Correspondence, upon Shakespeare's Plays and Actors*. New York: Carleton.
Hackney, Stephen. 1982. *Completing the Picture. Materials and Techniques of Twenty-six Paintings in the Tate Gallery.* London: Tate Publishing.
Halsall, Francis. 2008. Systems of Art. Art, History and Systems Theory. Oxford, Bern Berlin: Peter Lang.
Hamacher, Walter. 2005. "Now: Walter Benjamin on Historical Time." In *Walter Benjamin and History.* Ed. by Andrew Benjamin. London and New York: Continuum, 38-68.
Hamacher, Werner. 2001. " 'NOW': Walter Benjamin on Historical Time." In *The Moment. Time and Rupture in Modern Thought.* Edited by Heidrun Friese. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press,161-96.
Han, Younglim. 2001. *Romantic Shakespeare: From Stage to Page*. Cranbury: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
Handler, Rachel. 2020. "Rosanna Arquette Answers Every Question We Have About Desperately Seeking Susan". Online article. Vulture, 26 March. https://www.vulture.com/2020/03/rosanna-arquette-remembers-desperately-seeking-susan.html [accessed 8/7/2020]
Hannula, Mika, Juha Suoranta and Tere Vadén. 2005. *Artistic Research. Theories, Methods and Practices*. Helsinki: Academy of Fine Arts and Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg / ArtMonitor.
Hannula, Mika, Juha Suoranta and Tere Vadén. 2014. *Artistic Research Methodology. Narrative, Power and the Public.* New York, Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang.
Hansen, Miriam Bratu. 2008. "Benjamin's Aura." *Critical Inquiry* 34 (n. 2, Winter), 336-75.
Harari, Roberto, 2004. Lacan's Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. An Introduction. Trans. By Judith Filc. New York: Other Press.
Harding, Geoffrey. 1988. *Opiate Addiction, Morality and Medicine: From Moral Illness to Pathological Disease.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Harman, Graham. 2011. "Realism without Materialism." *SubStance* 40 (2), 52-72.
Harman, Graham. 2016. "Object-Oriented Seduction: Baudrillard Reconsidered." In *The War of Appearances: Transparency, Opacity, Radiance*. Ed. by Joke Brouwer, Lars Spuybroek and Sjoerd van Tuinen. Rotterdam: V2_Publishing, 128-43.
Harman, Graham. 2017. *Object Oriented Ontology: A New Theory of Everything.* London: Pelican.
Harrington, Richard. 1985. "Madonna." *The Washington Post.* 26 May. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/style/1985/05/26/madonna/7ec6c4c2-a508-458f-8613-6faee3be2266/ [archived 21/12/2021]
Harte, Bret. 1872. "London Art Exhibition of 1872" *The Overland Monthly*, 9 (September), 226-35.
Hartley, Lucy. 2005. *Physiognomy and the Meaning of Expression in Nineteenth-Century Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haskell, Francis. 1971. "Giorgione's 'Concert Champetre and Its Admirers." Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 119 (n. 5180, July), 543-55.
Hawksley, Lucinda. 2004. *Lizzie Siddal. The Tragedy of a Pre-Raphaelite Supermodel*. London: Andre Deutsch.
Hawksley, Lucinda. 2016. *Bitten by Witch Fever: Wallpaper & Arsenic in the Nineteenth-Century Home.* London: Thames & Hudson.
Hawksley, Lucinda. 2018. *Dickens's Artistic Daughter Katey. Her Life, Loves and Impact.* Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books.
Hazlitt, William. 1906. *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*. London: Dent.
Hazlitt, William. 1908. *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. H. Lobban. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heald, Suzette and Ariane Deluz. Eds. 1994. Anthropology and Psychoanalysis. An encounter through Culture. London and New York: Routledge.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 2018. *The Phenomenology of Spirit.* Trans. Terry Pinkard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heidelman, Rachel. 2020. "Rosanna Arquette Answers All of Our Questions About Desperately Seeking Susan" Vulture 26 May. https://www.vulture.com/2020/03/rosanna-arquette-remembers-desperately-seeking-susan.html [accessed 31/7/2020]

Heilmeyer, Marina. 2001. The Language of Flowers: Symbols and Myths, Munich, London and New York: Prestel.

Henke, Silvia, Dieter Mersch, Thomas Strässle, Jörg Wiesel, Nicolaj van der Meulen. 2020. *Manifesto of Artistic Research. A Defence Against Its Advocates*. Zurich: Diaphanes.

Hennion, Antoine and Bruno Latour. 1996. "L'art, l'aura et la technique selon Benjamin, ou comment devenir célèbre en faisant tant d'erreurs à la fois…" *Les cahiers de médiologie* 1 (n. 1), 235-41.

Henry, Patrick Thomas. "A Defense of the Artist-Critic: Part One of Two." The Massachusetts Review 58, no. 4 (2017): 702-718.

Henry, Patrick Thomas. "A Defense of the Artist-Critic: Part Two of Two." The Massachusetts Review 59, no. 1 (2018): 145-161.

Hess, Liam. 2020. "The Story Behind Madonna's Iconic Jean Paul Gaultier Cone Bra." Vogue, 18 April. https://www.vogue.com/article/madonna-blonde-ambition-jean-paul-gaultier-cone-bra.

Hewitson, Owen. 2013. "The first great Lacanian text not to be written by Lacan himself" – Reading Miller's 'Suture'." Blog post. "LacanOnline.com". 5 April. https://www.lacanonline.com/2013/04/the-first-great-lacanian-text-not-to-be-written-by-lacan-himself-reading-millers-suture/ [archived 21/9/2021]

Hewitt, Martin. Ed. 2000. *An Age of Equipoise? Reassessing Mid-Victorian Britain.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hindley, Meredith. 2015. "King Tut: A Classic Blockbuster Museum Exhibition That Began as a Diplomatic Gesture." Online article. Humanities, 36 (n. 5, September/October). https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2015/septemberoctober/feature/king-tut-classic-blockbuster-museum-exhibition-began-diplom [accessed 20/7/2020]

Hodder, Karen. 1989. 'The Lady of Shalott in Art and Literature' in *Sexuality and Subordination: Interdisciplinary Studies of Gender in the Nineteenth Century.* Edited by Susan Mendus and Jane Rendall, London and New York: Routledge, 60-88.

Hole, James. 1851. *Lectures on Social Science and the Organization of Labour.* London: Chapman.

Holert, Tom. 2020. *Knowledge Beside Itself: Contemporary Art's Epistemic Politics.* Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Hollander, Robert. 1977. Boccaccio's Two Venuses. New York: Columbia University Press.

Holleran, James V. 1989. "Maimed Funeral Rites in Hamlet." *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1), 65-93.

Holmlund, Chris. 2002. Impossible Bodies: Femininity and Masculinity at the Movies. London and New York: Routledge.

Holt, Mack P. 1995. *The French wars of religion, 1562-1629.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hood, Thomas. 1827. *The Plea of the Midsummer Fairies; Hero and Leander; Lycus The Centaur, And Other Poems.* London: Printed for Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green.

Hood, Thomas. 1843. "The Song of the Shirt" Punch 5 (16 Dec.), 260.

Hood, Thomas. 1844. "The Bridge of Sighs." *Hood's Magazine and Comic Miscellany* 1 (May), 414-7.

Hood, Thomas. s.d. [c. 1872]. *The poetical works of Thomas Hood. Edited, with a critical memoir, by William Michael Rossetti ; illustrated by Gustave Doré*. London : E. Moxon, Son, & Company. Millais' family copy has a landscape pencil sketch to verso of frontispiece with pencilled note: 'Drawn by Mary in bed & very sleepy. 1875'. Pencilled gift inscription to half-title: 'Mary Hunt Millais - / Feb. 1873 - / from Mama & Papa - / Bought with money given'. https://antiquates.co.uk/rare-books/antiquarian-book/18765/HOOD+Thomas+The+poetical+works

Hourticq, Louis. 1919. La Jeunesse de Titien. Paris : Hachette.

Hui, Yuk and Louis Morelle. 2017. "A Politics of Intensity: Some Aspects of Acceleration in Simondon and Deleuze." *Deleuze Studies* 11 (n. 4), 498-517.

Hui, Yuk. 2016. On the Existence of Digital Objects. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Hulbert, Jennifer, Kevin J. Wetmore Jr.,and Robert L.York. Eds. 2006. *Shakespeare and Youth Culture.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Humpherys, Anne. 1975. "Dickens And Mayhew On The London Poor." *Dickens Studies Annual* 4 (1975), 78-90, 175-179.

Hunt, Violet. 1938. Rossetti's Wife. Her Life and Death. New York: Dutton.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1994. Irony's Edge. The Theory and politics of Irony. London and New York: Routledge.

Hutfless, Esther. 2018."The Case of Dora. A Queer Perspective on Hysteria and Perversion." In *Dora, Hysteria, Gender. Reconsidering Freud's Case Study. A Sigmund Freud Museum Symposium*. Ed. by Daniela Finzi and Herman Westerink. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 135-48.

Hyldgaard, Kirsten. 2004, "The Conformity of Perversion." The Symptom, no. 5.

Illustrated London News. 1863. ‘Birdseye View of the Salmon-Breeding Ponds at Stormontfield’, *The Illustrated London News* 42 (13 June), 646, illustration 639.

Inturrisi, Louis. 1988. ‘Going to Pieces Over Masterpieces’, The New York Times Archives, 6 November. https://nyti.ms/2k4MVWu. [Accessed 17 May 2018].

Ireland, Kenneth R. 1979. “A Kind of Pastoral: Rossetti’s Versions of Giorgione.” Victorian Poetry, 17 (4, Winter), 303-15.

Irving, Henry. 1877. “An Actor’s Notes on Shakespeare No. 2, Hamlet and Ophelia Act III Sc . 1. In *Nineteenth Century,* 1 (n. 3, May), 524-30 .

Iversen, Margaret. 1994. “What is a photograph?” Art History 17 (3, September), 450-64

Jackson, Russell. 2004. “Victorian and Edwardian stagecraft: techniques and issues.” In *The Cambridge companion to Victorian and Edwardian theatre.* Ed. by Kerry Powell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-69.

Jacobi, Carol. 2012. “Sugar, Salt and Curdled Milk: Millais and the Synthetic Subject.” *Tate Papers* 18 (Autumn). https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/18/sugar-salt-and-curdled-milk-millais-and-the-synthetic-subject

Jacobs, Jerry A., 2013. *In defense of disciplines : interdisciplinarity and specialization in the research University.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Jacobs, Steven. 2011. *Framing Pictures. Film and the Visual Arts.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jacobus, Laura. 2012. “ The tomb of Enrico Scrovegni in the Arena Chapel, Padua.” The Burlington magazine 154 (June): 403-9.

Jaffe, Audrey. 2016. *The Victorian Novel Dreams of the Real: Conventions and Ideology.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Jäger, Jens. 2001. “Photography: a means of surveillance? Judicial photography, 1850 to 1900”, *Crime, Histoire & Sociétés / Crime, History & Societies*, 5 (1), 27-51.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *On Translation*. Ed. by Reuben E. Brower. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Jakobson, Roman. 2009. “The metaphoric and metonymic poles.” In *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast.* Ed. by René Dirven and Ralf Pörings. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 41-48.

Jalayer, Robabeh and Alireza Anushiravani. 2017. “Transcultural Hamlet: Representations of Ophelia and Gertrud in 21st-century Iran.” *kata* 19(2, December). DOI: 10.9744/kata.19.2.55-62

James, Alex. 2016. Denmark’s only Olympic fencer … is a Brit. *The Post*, 31 July. http://cphpost.dk/news/sports/denmarks-only-olympic-fencer-is-a-brit.html. [accessed 21 July 2020]

James, Henry. 1908. “The Novels of George Elliot.” In *Views and Reviews.* Ed. by Le Roy Phillips. Boston, The Ball publishing company, 1-40.

James, William, ed. 1947. *The Order of Release. The Story of John Ruskin, Effie Gray and John Everett Millais Told for the First Time in their Unpublished Letters.* London: John Murray.

Jameson, Anna. 1832. *Shakespeare’s Heroines. Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical, and Historical. In Two Volumes*. London: Saunders and Otley.

Jameson, Fredric. 1973. “The Vanishing Mediator: Narrative Structure in Max Weber.” *New German Critique* 1 (Winter), 52-89.

Jameson, Fredric. 2002. *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.

Januszczak, Waldemar. 2014. “Tate Britain is in a right old mess.” Online article. *The Sunday Times*, 6 April. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/tate-britain-is-in-a-right-old-mess-lv9ndrmr6k9.

Januszczak, Waldemar. 2019. “Art review: Pre-Raphaelite Sisters, National Portrait Gallery.” *The Sunday Times.* 20 October). https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/art-review-pre-raphaelite-sisters-national-portrait-gallery-vk9jpc72m

Jay, Martin. 1988. “Scopic regimes of modernity.” in H. Foster (ed.), *Vision and Visuality*, Seattle, Bay Press, 1988: 3-23.

Jay, Martin. 2011. “Scopic regimes of modernity revisited.” In *Essays from the Edge. Parerga and Paralipomena.* Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 51-63.

Jayne, Sears R. 1944. Marsilio Ficino’s Commentary on Plato’s Symposium. Columbia: University of Michigan.

Jeevendrampillai, David. 2019. The Making of a Suburb. In *London’s Urban Landscape: Another Way of Telling*. Ed. by Christopher Tilley. London: UCL Pres, 178-203.

Johnson, Christopher D. 2012. *Memory, Metaphor, and Aby Warburg’s Atlas of Images*. Ithaka: Signale.

Johnson, Henry. 2005. “Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Japan: The Musical Instrument Depicted in The Blue Bower and A Sea Spell.” Music in Art 30 (n. ½, Spring–Fall), 145-53.

Jones, Daisy and Tschepo Mokoena. 2019. “Every Madonna Persona Identified, Then Ranked. From ‘BDSM Madonna’ to ‘Tonguing Britney Madonna’, she’s been them all and more.” *Vice*, 25 April. https://www.vice.com/en/article/ywydw5/madonna-personas-ranked-2019

Jones, Ernest. 1910. “The Œdipus-Complex as an Explanation of Hamlet’s Mystery: A Study in Motive.” *The American Journal of Psychology* 21 (n. 1, Jan.), 72-113.

Jones, Ernest. 1955. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud Volume II: 1901—1919 Years of Maturity*. New York: Basic Books.

Jones, Jonathan. 2012. “One nation in one man: the portrait of Benjamin Disraeli.” *The Guardian* 3 October. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/jonathanjonesblog/2012/oct/03/disraeli-portrait-one-nation-labour

Jones, Jonathan. 2012b. "Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde at Tate Britain - review." *The Guardian* 12 September. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2012/sep/10/preraphaelites-exhibition-victorian-sexuality-drama [accessed 25 April 2022].

Jones, Rosalind L. 1994. “An empirical study of Freud’s penis-baby equation.” Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 182 (3), 127–35.

Jonsen, Albert R., and Toulmin, Stephen. 1988. The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jorgensen, Jay. 2010. Edith Head: The Fifty-year Career of Hollywood’s Greatest Costume Designer. Philadelphia: Running Press.

Jung, Carl. 1949. *Psychology of the unconscious; a study of the transformations and symbolisms of the libido, a contribution to the history of the evolution of thought*. New York: Moffat, Yard and Co.

Kael, Pauline. 2011. 5001 Nights at the Movies: A Guide from A to Z. Expanded edition. New York: Henry Holt.

Kalb, Jonathan. 1998. “On Hamletmachine: Müller and the Shadow of Artaud.” *New German Critique*, No. 73 (Special Issue on Heiner Muller, Winter), 47-66.

Kamp, David. 2013. “The King of New York” Online article. Vanity Fair. 13 May. https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2013/04/king-tut-exhibit-new-york [accessed 20/7/2020]

Kant, Immanuel. 1992. *Jäsche-Logik / Lectures on Logic*. Ed. and Trans. by J. Michael Young. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, AA 9, 92.

Kant, Immanuel. 1998. Critique of Pure Reason. Trans. by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, Louise. 1993. Female Perversions: The Temptations of Madame Bovary. London: Penguin.

Keats, John. 1958. *The Letters of John Keats.* 2 vols. Ed. by H. E. Rollins, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keats, John. 2002. *Selected Letters of John Keats*. Revised edition. Ed. by Grant Scott. Based on the texts of Hyder Edward Rollins. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Keble, John. 1914. *The Christian Year, Lyra Innocentium, and Other Poems. Together with his sermon on “National Apostasy”.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keenan, James F. 2002. “The Virtue of Prudence Iia Iiae, qq. 47–56” in The Ethics of Aquinas. Ed by Stephen J. Pope, Washington: Georgetown Univ. Press, 259–271.

Keene, Suzanne (1996): “Becoming digital”, Museum Management and Curatorship, 15:3, 299–313

Keller, Corey. 2013. *Francesca Woodman.* San Francisco: SFMoMA.

Kennedy, Maev. 2014. ‘Pre-Raphaelites return home to Tate Britain after world tour’, *The Guardian,* 7 August. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2014/aug/07/pre-raphaelites-return-tate-britain-ophelia-millais.

Kennedy, Maev. 2015. “From siren to asylum: the desperate last days of Fanny Cornforth, Rossetti’s muse.” *The Guardian*, 13 April. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/apr/13/discovered-lost-grave-pre-raphaelite-beauty-modelled-for-rossetti [accessed 20/5/2018]

Kennedy, Paul M. 1980. *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism, 1860-1914.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Kern, Stephen. 2004. Eyes of Love: The Gaze in English and French Paintings and Novels 1840-1900. London: Reaktion Books.

Kessaci, Lyasmine. 2015. “The Two Mothers. Antagonistic and ‘Ravaging’ Figures of the Mother” *Recherches en psychanalyse*, 2 (issue 20), 133-39. https://www.cairn.info/revue-recherches-en-psychanalyse-2015-2-page-133a.html

Kiefer, Carol solomon. 2001. *Myth and madness of Ophelia*. Amherst: Mead Art Museum, Amherst College.

Kierkegaard, Søren. 1987. *Either Or. Part I. Kierkegaard’s Writings. Vol. III.* Edited and translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Kim, Jin Sook. 2015. "Symbolic Death of the Subject in the Structure of Jacques Lacan." In *Death, Dying, and Mysticism. Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Study of Mysticism*. Ed. by Thomas Cattoi, and Christopher M. Moreman. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 103-15.

Kincaid, James R. 1992. *Child-Loving. The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture*. New York and London: Routledge.
Kirby, Joshua. 1755. *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy, Both in Theory and Practice. In Two Books. Being An Attempt to make the Art of Perspective easy and familiar; To Adapt it intirely to the Arts of Design; And To make it an entertaining Study to any Gentleman who shall chuse so polite an Amusement. Second Edition*. Ipswich: Printed by W. Craighton, for the Author.
Kjørup, Søren. 2011. *Pleading for Plurality. Artistic and Other Kinds of Research*. In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Ed. by Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, London: Routledge, 24-43.
Klein, Julian. 2010. "Was ist künstlerische Forschung?" *Gegenworte* 23 (1, *Wissenschaft trifft Kunst*), 24 – 28. Trans. as "What Is Artistic Research?", jar-online.net. doi: 10.22501/jarnet.0004 [accessed 24 April 2022].
Klein, Julie Thompson, et al. (2001) *Transdisciplinarity: Joint Problem Solving among Science, Technology, and Society: An Effective Way for Managing Complexity*. Basel: Birkhäuser.
Klein, Lisa. 2006, *Ophelia. A Novel.* London: Bloomsbury.
Knight, Charles. 1838. Prospectus for the 'Pictorial Edition of Shakspeare.' London: Charles Knight and Co.
Knights, Lionel Charles. 1933. *How many children had Lady Macbeth? An essay in the theory and practice of Shakespeare criticism*. Cambridge: G. Fraser, The Minority Press.
Knorr Cetina, Karin. 2001. "Objectual Practice." In *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory.* Edited by Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina, and Eike von Savigny. London: Routledge, 175–88.
Knowles, John. 1831. *The Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli*. 3 vols. London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley.
Knowles, Richard. 1987. "Dates for Some Serially Published Shakespeares." *Studies in Bibliography* 40, 187-200.
Knutson, Thomas R., Maya V. Chung, Gabriel Vecchi, Jingru Sun, Tsung-Lin Hsieh and Adam J. P. Smith. 2021. "Climate change is probably increasing the intensity of tropical cyclones." *Science Brief.* 26 March. https://news.sciencebrief.org/cyclones-mar2021/ [archived 03/08/2021]
Korda, Andrea. 2015. *Printing and Painting the News in Victorian London. The Graphic and Social Realism, 1869-1891.* Farnham: Ashgate.
Kosuth, Joseph. 1993. In *Art After Philosophy and After. Collected Writings*, *1966-1990.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 153-68.
Krauss, Rosalind E. 1994. *The Optical Unconscious.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press
Kristeller, Paul Oskar, 1988. *Il pensiero filosofico di Marsilio Ficino*, Florence: Le lettere.
Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Desire in Language. A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. by Alice Jardine, Leon Samuel Roudiez, Thomas Gora. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kristeva, Julia. 1997. "Revolution in Poetic Language (1974)." in The Portable Kristeva. Ed. by Kelly Oliver. New York: Columbia University press, 27-92
Kristeva, Julia. 2008. *Teresa, my love: an imagined life of the saint of Avila.* Translated by Lorna Scott Fox. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kromm. Jane E. 1994. "The Feminization of Madness in Visual Representation" *Feminist Studies* 20 (n. 3, Autumn), 507-35.
Kubler, George. 2008. *The Shape of Time. Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Kugler, Franz. 1842. Handbook of the History of Painting. From the Age of Constantine the Great to the Present Age. Part I: The Italian Schools of Painting. Trans. by "A Lady" [Margaret Hutton] Ed. with notes by Charles Eastlake. London: John Murray.
Kushner, Howard I. 2009. "Suicide, Gender, and the Fear of Modernity." In Histories of Suicide. International Perspectives on Self-Destruction in the Modern World. Ed. by John Weaver and David Wright. Toronto, Buffalo and London: Toronto University Press, 19-52.
Kutner, Max. 2015. "A Slice of New York City History Goes Up in Smoke". Newsweek. 27 March. https://www.newsweek.com/slice-new-york-city-history-goes-smoke-317484 [accessed 20/6/2020]
Lacan, Jacques and Madeleine Chapsal. 1957. "Les clefs de la psychanalyse." Interview *L'Express*, 31 May. https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/societe/1957-lacan-livre-les-clefs-de-la-psychanalyse_2095718.html
Lacan, Jacques. (1956–1957). The Seminar. Book IV: The Object Relation. Translated from an unedited transcript by L. V. A. Roche (Trans.). Unpublished.
Lacan, Jacques. 1972. "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter'" Trans. by Jeffrey Mehlman. Yale French Studies 0 (issue 48, French Freud: Stuctural Studies in Psychoanalysis), 39-72.
Lacan, Jacques. 1974. "Television." *October* 40, 6–50.
Lacan, Jacques. 1975. Le Séminaire. Livre XX. Encore, 1972-73. Ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Seuil, 17.

Lacan, Jacques. 1977. “Desire and the Interpretation of Desire in Hamlet.” Trans. by James Hulbert. *Yale French Studies*, (no. 55/56, Literature and Psychoanalysis. The Question of Reading: Otherwise), 11-52.

Lacan, Jacques. 1988. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book 2: The Ego in Freud’s Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lacan, Jacques. 1990. *Television. A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment.* Trans. by Denis Hollier, Rosalind Krauss, Annette Michelson, and Jeffrey Mehlman. Ed. by Joan Copjec. New York and London: Norton.

Lacan, Jacques. 1991. Le Séminaire. Livre IV. La relation d’objet, 1956-57. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Seuil.

Lacan, Jacques. 1993. The Seminar. Book III. The Psychoses, 1955-56. Trans. By Russell Grigg. London: Routledge.

Lacan, Jacques. 1997. Seminar VII. The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960. Trans. with notes by Dennis Porter. London and New York: Norton.

Lacan, Jacques. 1998. *The seminar of Jacques Lacan, book XI: The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. Trans. by Alan Sheridan. London and New York: Norton.

Lacan, Jacques. 1998b. *The Seminar, Book XX. Encore, On Feminine Sexuality: The Limits of Love and Knowledge (1972-1973)*. Trans. By Bruce Fink. New York: W.W. Norton.

Lacan, Jacques. 2006. Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English by Jacques Lacan. Trans. By Bruce Fink. New York: W.W. Norton, 285.

Lacan, Jacques. 2006. Le Séminaire, Livre XVI (1968-1969), D’un Autre à l’autre. Paris, Le Seuil.

Lacan, Jacques. 2008. *My Teaching.* London and New York: Verso.

Lacan, Jacques. 2008. The Seminar, Book XVII: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. by Russell Grigg, New York: Norton.

Lacan, Jacques. 2014. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book X: Anxiety. Trans. By A.R. Price. Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity.

Lacan, Jacques. 2015. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book VIII. Transference (1960-61). Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, translated by Bruce Fink. Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity Press.

Lacan, Jacques. 2016. The Seminar, Book XXIII: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. by A.R. Price, Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity.

Lacan, Jacques. 2017. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book V. Formations of the Unconscious (1957-58). Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, translated by Bruce Fink. Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity Press.

Lacan, Jacques. 2018. The Seminar, Book XIX: … or Worse. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. by A.R. Price, Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity.

Lacan, Jacques. s.d. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book IV. The Object Relation (1956–1957). Trans. with notes from unedited transcripts by L.V.A. Roche, unpublished.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2018. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.

Lady Gaga and Terry Richardson. 2011. *Lady Gaga and Terry Richardson*. New York: Grand Central Publishing.

Laforgue, Jules. 1921. *Hamlet , Ou les suites de la piété filiale*. In *Oeuvres Complètes de Jules Laforgue. Moralités Légendaires, Les Deux Pigeons*. Paris. Mercure de France, 17-72.

Lakatos, Imre. 1978. *Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes.* Ed. by John Worrall and Gregory Currie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamb, Charles and Mary Lamb. *Tales from Shakespeare, Volume 2*. 1909. London: Dent / New York: Dutton.

Lamb, Susan. 2002. “Applauding Shakespeare’s Ophelia in the Eighteenth Century: Sexual Desire, Politics, and the Good Woman.” In *Women as Sites of Culture. Women’s roles in cultural formation from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*. Ed. by Susan Shifrin. London and New York: Routledge.

Landow, George P. 2015. *William Holman Hunt and Typological Symbolism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lasinio, Carlo. 1828. Pitture a fresco del Campo Santo di Pisa. Firenze: A. Bernardini.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2007. "Can We Get Our Materialism Back, Please?" *Isis*, 98, 138–142.

Laurent, Béatrice. 2003 . ‘Painting Upon the Darkness’ : les visions artistiques de Thomas De Quincey.” In *Lectures d’une Œuvre : Confessions of an English Opium-Eater de Thomas De Quincey.* Ed. by Jean-Pierre Naugrette. Editions du Temps, 123-45.

Laurent, Eric. 1995. Alientation and Separation (II). In Reading Seminar XI, Lacan’s Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. Ed. by Richard Feldstein, Bruce Fink, and Maire Jaanus. New York: State University of New York Press, 29-38.

Law, Joanne. 2014. "Constellations: Walter Benjamin's allegories and montage and the contingent assemblies of fragments in art practice." PhD thesis, Murdoch University.

Le Brun, Charles. 1701. *Conference Of Monsieur Le Brun, Cheif Painter To The French King, Chancellor and Director Of The Academy Of Painting and Sculpture; Upon Expression, General and Particular. Translated from the French, and Adorned with 43 Copper-Plates*. London: Printed for John Smith at the Lion and Crown, Edward Cooper at the Three Pidgeons, and David Mortier.

Le Gaufey, Guy. 2020. Lacan and the Formulae of Sexuation. Exploring Logical Consistency and Clinical Consequences. Trans. by Cormac Gallagher. London: Routledge.

Le Tourneur, Pierre. 1779. *Shakespeare traduit de l'anglois, dédié au Roi. Tome 5. Le roi Lear; Hamlet.* In 20 vols. Paris: Chez le veuve Duchesne, libraire, Musier, fils, Nyon, La Combe, Ruault, Le Jay, Clousier.

Lebihan, Jill. 2006, "Feminism and Literature." In The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism. Ed. by Sarah Gamble. London and New York: Routledge, 103-10.

Leclaire, Serge. 1966. "L'analyste à sa place?" Cahiers pour l'analyse 1 (n. 4, January-February), 50-52. Synopsis in English available at: http://cahiers.kingston.ac.uk/synopses/syn1.4.html

Lee, Hermione. 2005. *Virginia Woolf's Nose: Essays on Biography*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Lee, Jackson. 2014. *Dirty Old London: The Victorian Fight Against Filth.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Lehner, Ernst and Johanna Lehner. 2003. *Folklore and Symbolism of Flowers, Plants and Trees.* New York: Dover.

Lemaire, Anika. 1977. *Jacques Lacan*. London, Boston, and Henley: Routledge.

Leng, Andrew. 1988. "Millais's "Mariana": Literary Painting, the Pre-Raphaelite Gothic, and the Iconology of the Marian Artist." The Journal of Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic Studies 1 (Spring), 63-74.

Lesage, Julia. 1981. "Celine and Julia Go Boating. Subversive fantasy." Jump Cut, no. 24-25, March. https://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC24-25folder/CelineJulie.html [accessed 20/6/2020].

Lesser, Zachary. 2015. *Hamlet After Q1. An Uncanny History of the Shakespearean Text*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Levin, Colette G. 2000. "Hollywood Remakes of French Films: Cultural and Cinematic Transformation." In France at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century, Trends and Transformations. Edited by Marie-Christine W. Koop, Rosalie Vermette. Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 255-64.

Levine, Nick. 2020. "How an 'anti-porn' movie almost ruined Madonna: the story behind A Certain Sacrifice." The Telegraph, 29 January. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/films/0/anti-porn-movie-almost-ruined-madonna-story-behind-certain-sacrifice/

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 2020. *Wild Thought. A New Translation.* Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman and John Leavitt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lidz, Theodore. 1975. *Hamlet's enemy: Madness and myth in Hamlet*. New York: Basic Books.

Liedtke, Ralf. 2003. *Das romantische Paradigma der Chemie. Friedrich von Hardenbergs Naturphilosophie zwischen Empirie und alchemistischer Spekulation.* Paderborn: Mentis.

Lin, Tao [@tao_lin]. 2021. "Replying to @TYRANTBOOKS." Twitter post. 26 January, 7:23 pm. https://twitter.com/tao_lin/status/1354132748957442048 [acccessed 21 December 2021].

Linàs, A. 1874. s.v. "Monomanie." In *Dictionnaire encyclopaedique des sciences medicales*. Vol. 61. Ed. by A. Dechambre and L. Lereboullet. Paris: Masson, 146-95.

Lindroos, Kia. 1998. *Now- Time, Image-Space. Temporalisation of Politics in Walter Benjamin's Philosophy of History and Art*. Jyvaskyla: SoPhi.

Lipkin, Arthur. 1999. Understanding Homosexuality, Changing Schools. Oxford: Westview Press.

Lippard, Lucy. 1997. *Six Years The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Lippert, Sarah J. 2019. *The paragone in nineteenth-century art.* Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Lisa Lewis. 2003. "A Madonna 'Wanna-be' Story on Film" in Movie Music, the Film Reader. Ed. By Kay Dickinson.London and New York: Routledge, 181-90.

Lloyd, Peter and Erica Tempesta. 2016. "'It's truly tragic to see her maudlin displays of self-pity': Feminist Camille Paglia hits back at Madonna's claims she was rebuffed by her female peers at the start of her career." Daily Mail Online, 14 December. https://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-4029528/Feminist-Camille-Paglia-hits-Madonna-s-claims-rebuffed-female-peers-start-career.html

Loewy, Michael. 2005. *Fire Alarm. Reading Walter Benjamin's 'On the Concept of History'.* Trans. By Chreis Turner. London and New York: Verso.

Loh, Maria H. 2019. Titian's Touch. Art, Magi and Philosophy. London: Reaktion Books.

Lollini, Fabrizio. 2017. "'Quasi stupida laetitia'" Stultitia e Prudentia nella Cappella Scrovegni: una postilla," Engramma 177 (september). http://www.engramma.it/eOS/index.php?id_articolo= 3199

Lomax, Montagu. 1921. *The Experiences of an Asylum Doctor, with suggestions for asylum and lunacy law reform.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

London, Michael. 1985. “Strong-Willed Women Behind ‘Seeking Susan’” Los Angeles Times. 2 April. Online edition, https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1985-04-02-ca-19508-story.html [accessed 31/7/2020]

Loshak, David. 1963. “G. F. Watts and Ellen Terry.” *The Burlington Magazine* 105 (n. 728, Victorian Art. Painting, Furniture, Sculpture, Nov.), 476+478-485+487.

Lovecraft, H. P., and Hazel Heald. 1989. ‘‘Out of the Aeons.’’ In The Horror in the Museum and Other Revisions, ed. by S. T. Joshi. Sauk City, WI: Arkham House.

Ludley, David A. 1991-2. “Anna Jameson and D. G. Rossetti: His Use of Her Histories.” *Woman’s Art Journal* 12 (n. 2 Autumn-Winter), 29-33.

Maas, Rupert. 2015. “The life of Charles Allstem Collins (1828-73): And his painting "The Devout Childhood of St Elizabeth of Hungary." *The British Art Journal*, 15 (3), 38-60.

Mac Donald, Michael. 1986. “The Secularization of Suicide in England 1660-1800.” *Past & Present* n. 111 (May), 50-100

Mackay, Alan N. 1991. *Dictionary of Scientific Quotations.* Bristol: IOP Publishing.

Macmillan, John Duncan. 1972. “Holman Hunt’s Hireling Shepherd: Some Reflections on a Victorian Pastoral.” *The Art Bulletin* 54 (n. 2, June), 187-97.

Macready, William Charles. 1875. Macready's Reminiscences, And Selections from His Diaries and Letters. Ed. by Frederick Pollock. New York: Harper.

Madden, Thomas. 2012. Venice. A New History. London: Viking.

Madonna, “Universal Pictures Announces Film Based On The Untold True Story Of Madonna.” Official website. Madonna.com, 15 September. https://www.madonna.com/news

Madonna. 1984. “Desperately Seeking Susan Rushes & Behind the Scenes” YouTube video. Uploaded by Veronica Electronica, no date. https://youtu.be/acpXWH0YatM [accessed 20/8/2020]

Madonna. 1992. Sex. Photography by Steven Meisel, Art directed by Fabien Baron, edited by Glenn O’Brian. Includes the CD single “Erotic”. New York: Warner Books.

Magherini, Graziella. 1989. *La syndrome di Stendhal*. Firenze: Ponte alle Grazie.

Mandler, Peter. Ed. 2006. *Liberty and Authority in Victorian Britain*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Maniglier, Patrice. 2019. "Problem and Structure: Bachelard, Deleuze and Transdisciplinarity." *Theory, Culture & Society* 38 (2, Special Issue: Problematizing the Problematic), 25-45.

Maniglier, Patrice. 2021. “Problem and Structure: Bachelard, Deleuze and Transdisciplinarity.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 38 (2, March): 25–45.

Marchant, Jo. 2020. “Is this Nefertiti’s tomb? Radar clues reignite debate over hidden chambers.” Online article. Nature. 578, 497-498 [accessed 20/7/2020]

Marcus, Jane. 1988. “Daughters of anger/material girls: Con/textualizing feminist criticism.” Women’s Studies 15 (Issue 1-3: Last Laughs: Perspectives on Women and Comedy), 281-308.

Margolin, Uri. 2009. s.v. “Narrator.” In *Handbook of Narratology*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter. Edited by Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert. 351-69.

Margolis, Joseph. 1974. “Works of art as physically embodied and culturally emergent entities.” *British Journal of Aesthetics* 14 (3), 187-196.

Margolis, Joseph. 1977. “The Ontological Peculiarity of Works of Art.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 36 (n. 1, Autumn), 45-50.

Marsh, Jan and Peter Funnell. 2019. *Pre-Raphaelite Sisters.* London: National Portrait Gallery.

Marsh, Jan. 1985. Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood. London: Quartet Books.

Marsh, Jan. 2018. *Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood*. London: Lume Books.

Marsh, Jan. 2019. *Pre-Raphaelite Sisters.* Exhibition catalogue for *Pre-Raphaelite Sisters: Models, Artists, Muses* (National Portrait Gallery, London 17th October 2019 – 26th January 2020). London: National Portrait Gallery.

Martindale, Charles. 2004. “Shakespeare and Virgil.” In *Shakespeare and the Classics.* Ed. by Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 89-108.

Massumi, Brian. 1992. *A User’s Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Matson, Lisa Dallape. 2010. *Re-presentations of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Portrayals in Fiction, Drama, Music, and Film.* Amherst: Cambria Press.

Matthew Schifrin and Peter Newcomb, “A Brain for Sin and a Bod for Business,” Forbes, October 1, 1990, 162–66.

Matthews, David and Michael Sanders. Eds. 2021. *Subaltern Medievalisms – Medievalism and the Working Classes in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Matviyenko, Svitlana and Judith Roof. Eds. 2018. *Lacan and the Posthuman.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

McAdam, Gloria. 1999. "Willing women and the rise of convents in nineteenth-century England." *Women's History Review* 8 (3), 411-41.

McCabe, Janet. 2004. Feminist Film Studies: Writing the Woman into Cinema. London and New York: Wallflower.
McCall, Jessica and Kavita Mudan Finn. 2019. “Exit, pursued by a fan. Shakespeare, Fandom and the Lure of an Alternate Universe” In Shakespeare and Creative Criticism, Edited by Rob Conkie and Scott Maisano, Oxford and New York: Berghahn, 38-53.
McCandless, Peter. 1978. “Liberty and Lunacy: The Victorians and Wrongful Confinement.” *Journal of Social History*. 11 (3): 366-386.
McCandless, Peter. 1983. “Dangerous to Themselves and Others: The Victorian Debate over the Prevention of Wrongful Confinement.” *Journal of British Studies* 23 (n. 1, Autumn), 84-104.
McGowan, Iain, Marlene Sinclair and Mark Owens. 2007. “Maternal suicide: Rates and trends.” *RCM midwives* 10 (n. 4, April), 167-9.
McWilliam, David. 2016. “London’s Dispossessed: Questioning the Neo-Victorian Politics of Neoliberal Austerity in Richard Warlow’s *Ripper Street*.” *Victoriographies* 6 (1), 42-61.
Mehlman, Jeffrey. 1972. "The "Floating Signifier": From Lévi-Strauss to Lacan." Yale French Studies 48 (special issue, French Freud: Structural Studies in Psychoanalysis), 10–37.
Meisel, Martin. 1983. *Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial, and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Merriam-Webster. 2003. Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition. Springfield MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.
Meyerbeer, Giacomo. 1851. *Gli Ugonotti (Les Huguenots). A grand opera in four acts.* Music by Giacomo Meyerbeer. Libretto by Eugène Scribe with Émile Deschamps. Translated into Italian by Manfredo Maggioni. Translated into English by Thomas Grieve. London: T. Brettell.
Milios, John. 2018. The Origins of Capitalism as a Social System. The Prevalence of an Aleatory Encounter. London: Routledge.
Miller, J. Hillis. 1991. “The Mirror’s Secret: Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s Double Work of Art.” Victorian Poetry, 29 (n. 4, Contemporary Critics Look at Victorian Poetry, Winter), 333-49.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 1977. ‘Suture (Elements of the Logic of the Signifier)’, trans. Jacqueline Rose. Screen 18 (n. 4, Winter 1977-78), 24-34.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 1996. “A discussion of Lacan’s “Kant with Sade.” In Reading Seminars I and II: Lacan’s Return to Freud. Ed. by Richard Feldstein, Bruce Fink, and Maire Jaanus, Albany: State University of New York Press, 212–237.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 1996b. “On perversion.” In Reading seminars I and II: Lacan’s return to Freud. Edited by R. Feldstein, B. Fink, and M. Jaanus, Albany: State University of New York Press, 306–320.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 1999. “Of Semblants in the Relation Between Sexes.” Psychoanalytical Notebooks of the London Circle, 3 (Fall), 9-25.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 2007. “Jacques Lacan and the voice.” In The later Lacan: An introduction. Ed. by Veronique Voruz and Bogdan Wolf. Albany: State University of New York Press, 137–46.
Miller, Jacques-Alain. 2009. “The phallus and perversion.” Trans. by B. Fulks, Lacanian Ink, 33, 57–71.
Millward, Liz, Janice G. Dodd, and Irene Fubara-Manuel. 2017. Killing Off the Lesbians: A Symbolic Annihilation on Film and Television. Jefferson: McFarland.
Milton, John. 1732. Paradise Lost. A New Edition by Richard Bentley. London: Printed for Jacob Tonson et al.
Milton, John. 1840. Traduzione delle opere poetiche di Giovanni Milton in tre tomi. Il Paradiso Perduto. Tomo II. Italian trans. by Gaetano Polidori. London: Stampato presso il traduttore.
Milton, John. 1841. Paradise Lost with Variorum Notes. Ed. by James Prendeville. London: Samuel Holdsworth.
Milton, John. 1859. The Poems of John Milton with Notes. Vol. II. London: Chapman and Hall.
Milton, John. 1874. The Poetical Works of John Milton. Vol. I. Ed. by David Masson. London: Macmillan.
Milton, John. 1880. The Poetical Works of John Milton. Including the Latin Poems and Translations from the Italian Poets. Ed. by William Michael Rossetti. London and Melbourne: Ward, Lock and Co.
Milton, John. 1997. Paradise Lost. Second Edition. Ed. by Alastair Fowler. London and New York: Routledge.
Milton, John. 2003. Paradise Lost. A Poem in Twelve Books. New Edition. Ed. by Merritt Yerkes Hughes, Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett.
Milton, John. 2005. Paradise Lost. Ed. by Gordon Teskey. New York and London: Norton.
Milton, John. 2007. Paradise Lost. Ed. by Barbara K. Lewalski. Malden MA, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell.
Ministero Beni Culturali, Segretariato Regionale per il Piemonte. 2014. “I Preraffaelliti al Polo Reale di Torino.” Press release. https://www.piemonte.beniculturali.it/index.php/it/using-joomla/extensions/components/content-component/archived-articles/108-mostre/517-i-preraffaelliti-al-polo-reale-di-torino [accessed 15/6/2020]
Minogue Valerie. 1989. “Rimbaud’s Ophelia.” *French Studies* 43 (4, October), 423–6.
Mitchell, Rosemary Ann. 1998. “The busy daughters of Clio”: Women Writers of History from 1820 to 1880.” *Women's History Review* 7 (1), 107-134.

Mitchell, Julie. 1975. Psychoanalysis and Feminism. London: Penguin Books.
Mitchell, W. J. Thomas. 2005. *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. London and Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Mogensen, Jannie Uhre. 2006. "Fading into Innocence: Death, Sexuality and Moral Restoration in Henry Peach Robinson's Fading Away." *Victorian Review* 32 (1), 1-17.
Moi, Toril. 2020. "Real Characters. Literary criticism and the existential turn." *The Point* 20 (28 January). https://thepointmag.com/criticism/real-characters-literary-criticism-existential-turn-toril-moi/
Monardes, Nicolas. 1577. *Joyfull newes out of the new found world: wherein are declared the rare and singular vertues of divers and sundrie herbs, trees, oyles, plants & stones. . . with their applications as well to the use of phisicke, as chirurgery ... Also the portrature of the sayde herbes, very aptly described. English'd by Iohn Frampton.* London: William Norton.
Moore, Matthew and David Sanderson. 2020. "One in five vinyl buyers has no record player." The Times, 24 April. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/one-in-five-vinyl-buyers-has-no-record-player-k8wcd8850
Moran, Maureen. 2004. "The Art of Looking Dangerously: Victorian Images of Martyrdom." Victorian Literature and Culture, 32 (n. 2), 475-93.
Moran, Maureen. 2007. Catholic Sensationalism and Victorian Literature. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
Morris, Bethany. 2020. *Sexual Difference, Abjection and Liminal Spaces. A Psychoanalytic Approach to the Abhorrence of the Feminine.* London and New York: Routledge.
Morris, William. 1984. *The Collected Letters of William Morris. Vol. II 1885-1888.* Ed. by Norman Kelvin. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Morton, Timothy, and Dominic Boyer. 2021. *Hyposubjects. On Becoming Human.* London: Open Humanities Press.
Morton, Timothy. 2007. *Ecology Without Nature. Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics.* Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.
Morton, Timothy. 2011. "The Mesh." In *Environmental Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. With and Introduction by Stephanie LeMenager, Teresa Shewry, and Ken Hiltner. London and New York: Routledge, 19-30.
Morton, Timothy. 2013. Hyperobjects. Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
Mühl, Sebastian. 2016. "Artistic Research as a Challenge for Art Criticism." *Notebook for Art, Theory and Related Zones*, 20 (Special Online Issue).
Müller, Heiner. 1995. *Theatremachine.* Trans. and ed. by Marc von Henning. London: Faber and Faber.
Mulvey, Laura. 1975. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", Screen, 16 (3, 1 October), 6–18.
Mulvey, Laura. 1989. "Afterthoughts on 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' inspired by King Vidor's Duel in the Sun (1946)." In Visual and Other Pleasures. New York: Palgrave, 29-38.
Mulvey, Laura. 1993. "Some Thoughts on Theories of Fetishism in the Context of Contemporary Culture." October, (65, Summer), 3-20.
Murgia, Camilla. 2015. "From Academy to "Sloshua": Joshua Reynolds' Perception in the Victorian Era." *Studies in Visual Arts and Communication* 2 (n. 2), ISSN 2393 – 1221.
Murphy, Andrew. 2003. *Shakespeare in Print. A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Murphy, Andrew. 2003. *Shakespeare in Print. A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Murran, Samuel R. 2020. "How Madonna Became the Ultimate LGBTQ Icon: A Timeline." Parade. 25 April. https://parade.com/889697/samuelmurrian/madonna-lgbtq-icon/
Nabokov, Vladimir. 1991. *The Annotated Lolita*. New York: Vintage Books.
Nägele, Rainer. 2002. "Phantom of a Corpse: Ophelia From Rimbaud to Brecht." *MLN* 117 (5, Comparative Literature Issue, December):1069-82.
Nail, Thomas. 2017. "What is an Assemblage? *SubStance* 46 (1), 21-37.
Najemy, John M., 2006. *A history of Florence 1200–1575*. Malden, MA and Oxford; Blackwell.
Nancy, Jean-Luc and Federico Ferrari. 2014. *Being Nude. The Skin of Images.* Translated by Anne O'Byrne and Carlie Anglemire. New York: Fordham.
Nancy, Jean-Luc and Federico Ferrari. 2014. *Being nude: the skin of images*. Translated by Anne O'Byrne and Carlie Anglemire. New York: Fordham University Press.
Natale, Simone. 2012. "A short history of superimposition: From spirit photography to early cinema." *Early Popular Visual Culture,* 10 (2), 125-45.
Nead, Lynda. 1992. *The Female Nude. Art, Obscenity and Sexuality*. London and New York: Routledge.
Nead, Lynn. 1984. "The Magdalen in Modern Times: The Mythology of the Fallen Woman in Pre-Raphaelite Painting." Oxford Art Journal 7 (1, Correspondences), 26-37.

Neale, Anne. 2010. "Considering the lilies: Symbolism and revelation in "Convent Thoughts" (1851) by Charles Allsten Collins (1828-73)." The British Art Journal 11 (1), 93-8.
Neely, Carol Thomas. 1991. "Documents in Madness": Reading Madness and Gender in Shakespeare's Tragedies and Early Modern Culture." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (n. 3, Autumn), 315-38.
Neely, Carol Thomas. 2018. *Distracted Subjects. Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
Nelson, Robin. Ed. 2013. *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Neumann, Gerhard. 1998. "Iphigenia: Sacrifice and Ritual in Drama." *The World of Music* 40 (1, Music, the Arts and Ritual), 101-11.
Newey, Katherine. 2009. " Speaking Pictures: The Victorian Stage and Visual Culture." In *Ruskin, the Theatre and Victorian Visual Culture*. Edited by Anselm Heinrich, Katherine Newey, and Jeffrey Richards. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-18.
Newman, Michael. 2008. "The Specificity of Criticism and Its Need for Philosophy." In The State of Art Criticism. Ed. by James Elkins and Michael Newman. London and New York: Routledge, 29-60.
Newman, Michael. 2008. "The Specificity of Criticism and Its Need for Philosophy." In *The State of Art Criticism.* Ed. by James Elkins and Michael Newman. London and New York: Routledge, 29-60.
Nochlin, Linda. 1967. "Gustave Courbet's Meeting: A Portrait of the Artist as a Wandering Jew." *The Art Bulletin* 49 (n. 3, September), 209-22.
Nochlin, Linda. 1971. *Realism*. London and New York: Penguin.
Nochlin, Linda. 1978. "Lost and Found: Once More the Fallen Woman." *The Art Bulletin* 60 (n. 1, March), 139-53.
Nochlin, Linda. 1989. "Manet's Masked Ball ath the Opera. In The Politics of Vision. Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society. Oxon and New York: Routledge, 75-94.
Nooteboom, Bart. 2020. "Objects, Relations, Potential and Change." *Open Philosophy* 3, 53-67.
Norwich, John Julius. 2003. A History of Venice. London: Penguin.
Nosworthy, J. M. 1964. "The Death of Ophelia." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15 (n. 4, Autumn), 345-8.
Novalis. 2005. *The Novices of Sais*. Trans. by Ralph Manheim. Brooklyn: Archipelago Books.
Nowotny, Stefan. 2006. "'Culture' and the Analysis of Power." Trans. by Aileen Derieg. *translate. Beyond Culture: The Politics of Translation*, 19 April. https://translate.eipcp.net/strands/01/nowotny-strands01en.html
O'Brian, Lucy. 2007. "Madonna: For the first time, her friends and lovers speak out." Independent, 2 September. https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/music/features/madonna-for-the-first-time-her-friends-and-lovers-speak-out-463608.html
O'Brien, Lucy. 2018. Madonna. Like and Icon. London: Random House.
O'Sullivan, Simon. 2005. *Art Encounters Deleuze and Guattari. Thought Beyond Representation.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
OECD. 2002. *Frascati Manual. Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development.* Paris: OECD Publications.
OECD. 2015. *Frascati Manual. Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development.* Paris: OECD Publications.
Old Bailey Proceedings Online. 1844. "Trial of Mary Furley (t18440408-1279)." 8 April. https://www.oldbaileyonline.org/browse.jsp?div=t18440408-1279 [archived 25/07/2021].
Olin, Margaret. 2003. s.v. "Gaze" In *Critical Terms for Art History.* Ed. by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 318-29.
Oliver, Kelly. 2017. "The male gaze is more relevant, and more dangerous, than ever." New Review of Film and Television Studies, 15 (4), 451-5.
Ormond, Leonée. 2006. "Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Old Masters." The Yearbook of English Studies, 36 (n. 2, Victorian Literature) 153-68
Ortiz, Joseph M. 2016. *Shakespeare and the Culture of Romanticism.* London and New York: Routledge.
Osborne, Peter. 2015. "Problematizing Disciplinarity, Transdisciplinary Problematics." *Theory, Culture & Society* 32 (5–6), 3–35.
Osborne, Thomas. 2013. "Inter that Discipline!" In Interdisciplinarity Reconfigurations of the Social and natural sciences. Ed. by Andrew Barry and Georgina Born. London and New York: Routledge, 82-98.
Oudart, Jean-Pierre. 1977. "Cinema and Suture," trans. Jacqueline Rose. Screen 18 (n. 4, Winter 1977-78), 35-47.
Owens, Craig. 1980. "The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism." Part 1, *October* 12 (Spring), 67-86; Part 2, (Summer), 58-80.
Paes, Luciana Lourenço. 2015. "Les quatre representations de la 'Mort d'Ophélie' d'Eugène Delacroix." *Figura* 3 (January).

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309548584_Les_quatre_representations_de_La_mort_d%27Ophelie_d%27Eugene_Delacroix [archived 20/08/2021].
Paglia, Camille. 1990. “Madonna — Finally, a Real Feminist.” The New York Times, 14 December, 39.
Palazzo, Lynda. 2002. *Christina Rossetti’s Feminist Theology*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave.
Panofsky, Erwin, 1956. "Galileo as a Critic of the Arts: Aesthetic Attitude and Scientific Thought." *Isis* 47 (1, March), 3-15.
Panofsky, Erwin. 1966. *Early Netherlandish Painting. Its Origins and Character*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
Panofsky, Erwin. 1969. Problems in Titian, mostly iconographic. New York: New York University Press.
Panofsky, Erwin. 1991. Perspective as Symbolic Form. New York : Zone Books.
Pardo, Mary. 1993. “Artifice as Seduction in Titian.” In Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe. Ed. by J. G. Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55-89.
Pardo, Mary. 1993. “Artifice as Seduction in Titian.” In Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe. Institutions, texts, images. Ed. by James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55-89.
Parkins, Wendy. 2013. *Jane Morris: The Burden of History*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Parris, Leslie. Ed. 1984. *The Pre-Raphaelites.* Exhibition catalogue. London: Tate Gallery Publication.
Parry, J. P. 2001. “The Impact of Napoleon III on British Politics, 1851-1880.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 11, 147–75.
Pasko, Martin (script), Joe Staton (pencils) and Rick Burchett (inks). 1983. E-Man. 2 (issue 6, September). Chicago: First Comics. In the cover story “Feed Me!”, E-Man is in the hospital after a battle with Thoughtmaster and dreams about his life.
Pasture, Patrick. 2012. "Beyond The Feminization Thesis: Gendering The History Of Christianity In The Nineteenth And Twentieth Centuries." In *Beyond the Feminization Thesis and Gender Christianity in Modern Europe*. Ed. by Patrick Pasture, Jan Art and Thomas Buerman. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 7-34.
Patai, Raphael. 1978. The Hebrew Goddess, 3rd enlarged edition New York: Discus Books.
Patricia Egan, “Poesia and the Fete Champêtre,” The Art Bulletin, vol. 41, no. 4 (Dec., 1959), pp. 303-313.
Patrick, Max J. 1953. ‘‘The Problem of Ophelia.’’ In *Studies in Shakespeare.* Ed. by Arthur D. Matthews and Clark M. Emery. Coral Gables: University of Miami, 139-44.
Paul Joannides, Titian to 1518: The Assumption of Genius (Yale, 2001).
Payne, Christiana, and Charles Brett. 2010. *John Brett: Pre-Raphaelite Landscape Painter*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Pearl, Sharrona. 2009. “Through a Mediated Mirror: The Photographic Physiognomy of Dr Hugh Welch Diamond.” *History of Photography*, 33 (n. 3), 288-305.
Peery, William. 1952. “The Hamlet of Stephen Dedalus.” *The University of Texas Studies in English* 31, 109-19.
Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1998. The Essential Peirce. Volume 2. Ed. by Peirce Edition Project. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Penketh, Sandra. 2014. “Rossetti’s Obsession: Images of Jane Morris.” Exhibition press release. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Wirral, 20 June – 21 September.
Perni, Remedios. 2012. “At the Margins: Ophelia in Modern and Contemporary Photography.” In *Afterlife of Ophelia.* Ed. by Kaara L. Peterson and Deanne Williams, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan*,* 193-212.
Peter Humfrey, Painting in Renaissance Venice (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
Peterson, Kaara L., and Deanne Williams, eds. 2012. *The Afterlife of Ophelia.* New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Peterson, Mark A. 2011. *Galileo's Muse: Renaissance Mathematics and the Arts.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Petit-Coq, Pierre-Philippe. 1881. “Rosier Noisette Aimée Vibert.” Journales des Roses 5 (1, January), 24-5. Part translated from the French in Dickerson, Brent. 2001. S.v. “Aimée Vibert” In The Old Rose Advisor: Updated, Enlarged, and Revised Second Edition, Volume 2. Lincoln: Authors Choice Press, 7-9.
Petrarca, Francesco. 1821. Il Canzoniere di Messer Francesco Petrarca ; con la giunta. Firenze: All’ insegna di Pallade. https://www.librarything.com/work/8475159/book/46548698
Petrarca, Francesco. 1821. Rime di F. Petrarca. Edited by Nicolà Giosafatte Biagioli, Paris: Presso l’editore. https://www.librarything.com/work/503660/book/46547530
Petrarca, Francesco. 2014. The Poetry of Petrarch. Translated by David Young. New York: Macmillan.
Pfannkuchen, Antje. 2021. “Image, Language, Science: Hieroglyphs and the Romantic Quest for Primordial Truth.” In *Before Photography: German Visual Culture in the Nineteenth Century.* Ed. by Belgum, Kirsten, Byrd, Vance and Benjamin, John D.. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 243-66.

Pigler, Agnès. 2003. Plotin: Une métaphysique de l'amour, Paris: Vrin.
Pilger, Zoe. 2014. "Ruin Lust at Tate Britain, art review". Online article. *Independent*, 9 March. https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/features/broken-britain-ruins-inspire-at-the-tate-britain-9179851.html
Pisani, Giuliano. 2008. I volti segreti di Giotto. Le rivelazioni della Cappella degli Scrovegni. Milano: Rizzoli.
Plotinus. 2018. The Enneads. Ed. by Lloyd P. Gerson. Trans. by George Boys-Stones, John M. Dillon, R.A.H. King, Andrew Smith, and James Wilberding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pluth, Ed and Cindy Zeiher. 2019. On Silence. Holding the Voice Hostage. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Poggioli, Renato. 1968. The Theory of the Avant-Garde. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Polhemus, Robert M. 1994. "John Millais's Children: Faith, Erotics, and the Woodman's Daughter." *Victorian Studies* 37 (n. 3, Spring), 433-50
Pollock, Griselda. 2003. "Woman as sign in Pre-Raphaelite literature: the representation of Elizabeth Siddall (written in collaboration with Deborah Cherry)." In *Vision and Difference. Feminism, Femininity and the Histories of Ar*t. London and New York: Routledge, 128-62.
Pop, Andrei. 2015. *Antiquity, Theatre, and the Painting of Henry Fuseli.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Porter, Bernard. 1991a. "'Monstrous Vandalism': Capitalism and Philistinism in the Works of Samuel Laing (1780–1868)." *Albion* 23 (n. 2, Summer), 253–68.
Porter, Bernard. 1991b. "Was Laing Right?" *Albion* 23 (n. 2, Summer), 285-9
Pratt, Anne and Thomas Miller. S.d. The language of flowers : the associations of flowers. Popular tales of flowers. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co.
Primorac, Antonija. 2018. Neo-Victorianism on Screen. Postfeminism and Contemporary Adaptations of Victorian Women. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Probert, Rebecca (2009) Control over marriage in England and Wales, 1753-1823 : the Clandestine Marriages Act of 1753 in context. Law and History Review, Vol.27 (No.2). pp. 413-450. doi:10.1017/S0738248000002054
Proust, Antonin. 1913. Eduard Manet. Souvenirs publié par E. Barthélemy. Paris: H. Laurens.
Puppi, Lionello. 2016. "The Volubility of Beauty and the Adventures of a Face." In Titian Vanitas. The Poet of the Image and the Shade of Beauty. Exhibition catalogue. Ed. by Lionello Puppi and Serena Baccaglini. Silvana Editoriale, 48-67.
Purse, Nigel. 2016. *Tom Stoppard's Plays*. Leiden and Boston: Brill Rodopi.
Quilligan, Maureen. 1992. *Incest and Agency in Elizabeth's England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Quinet, Alfonso. 2018. *Lacan's Clinical Technique. Lack(A)nian Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
Quinet, Antonio. 1999. "The Functions of the Preliminary Interviews." European Journal of Psychoanalysis n. 8-9 (Winter-Fall). http://www.psychomedia.it/jep/number8-9/quinet.htm
Quinet, Antonio. 2018. *Lacan's Clinical Technique. Lac(k)anian Analysis*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
Rabinovich, Dana. 2003. "What is a Lacanian Clinic?" In The Cambridge Companion to Lacan. Ed. by Jean-Michel Rabaté. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 208-20.
Raby, Peter. 1982. *'Fair Ophelia': A life of Harriet Smithson Berlioz*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rackin, Phyllis. 2016. "Misogyny Is Everywhere." In *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare.* Ed. by Dympna Callaghan. Malden MA and Oxford: Wiley, 60-74.
Ragland Sullivan, Ellie. 1991. "The Sexual Masquerade: A Lacanian Theory of Sexual Difference." In Lacan and the subject of language. Ed. by Ellie Ragland-Sullivan and Mark
Ragland, Ellie. 1995. "Psychoanalysis and Courtly Love." Arthuriana 5 (n. 1, Spring), 1-20.
Ragland, Ellie. 2004 *The logic of sexuation: from Aristotle to Lacan*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Ragland, Ellie. 2004. *The Logic of Sexuation. From Aristotle to Lacan*. Albany: SUNY Press.
Rainone, Antonio. 2015. "Dialettica del desiderio e struttura della percezione sensoriale in Lacan" Il cannocchiale, 40 (1, special issue Lacan d'après Lacan), 169-206.
Rajchman, John. 1988. "Foucault's Art of Seeing," *October* 44 (102, Spring), 88-117.
Ralls, Walter. 1974. "The Papal Aggression of 1850: A Study in Victorian Anti-Catholicism." *Church History* 43 (n. 2, June), 242 – 256
Rampley, Matthew. 1997. "From Symbol to Allegory: Aby Warburg's Theory of Art." *Art Bulletin* 79 (1), 71-55.
Rancière, Jacques. 2004. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Ed. and trans. by Gabriel Rockhill. London: Bloomsbury.
Rankin, Sloan. 1998. 'Peach Mumble – Ideas Cooking.' In *Francesca Woodman*. Edited by Hervé Chandès, New York: Scalo, 33–7.

Rapin, René. 1728. *Of Gardens. A Latin Poem in Four Books. Englished by Mr Gardiner. Third Edition Revised and Finished*. London: Bernard Lintot.
Redgrave, Richard. 1850. "Autobiography of Richard Redgrave A.R.A." The Art Journal 12 (February), 48-9.
Redgrave, Richard. 1853. "An Introductory Address on the methods adopted by the Department of Practical Art to impart instruction in art to all classes of the community." In *Addresses of the Superintendents of the Departments of Practical Art Delivered in the Theatre at Marlborough House.* London: Chapman and Hill, 41-81.
Reed, Rex. 2019. "Daisy Ridley's 'Ophelia' Will Have Shakespeare Turning Over in His Grave." *The Observer*, 28 June. https://observer.com/2019/06/ophelia-review-daisy-ridley-rex-reed/ [archived 20/6/2020]
Rees, Emma L. E. 2013. The Vagina: A Literary and Cultural History. London: Bloomsbury.
Reid, John. 1849. *The Language of Flowers: Being a Lexicon of the Sentiments Assigned to Flowers, Plants, Fruits and Roots*. Glasgow: John Morrison.
Reines, Ariana. 2013. "An Hourglass Figure: On Photographer Francesca Woodman." *Los Angeles Review of Books.* Online article. 4 April. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/an-hourglass-figure-on-photographer-francesca-woodman/
Reisert, Rebecca. 2003. *Ophelia's Revenge.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.
Remes, Pauliina. 2008. Neoplatonism. Stockfield Hall: Acumen.
Renié, Pierre-Lin. 1999. "Delaroche par Goupil: portrait du peintre en artiste populaire." In *Paul Delaroche. Un peintre dans l'Histoire.* Ed. by Claude Allemand-Cosneau and Isabelle Julia. Paris: RMN, 173–218.
Renié, Pierre-Lin. 2006. "The Image on the Wall: Prints as Decoration in Nineteenth-Century Interiors." *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 5 (n. 2, Autumn). http://www.19thcartworldwide.org/autumn06/156-the-image-on-the-wall-prints-as-decoration-in-nineteenthcentury-interiors.
Renzi, Lorenzo. 1999. *Proust e Vermeer: apologia dell'imprecisione.* Bologna: Il Mulino.
Repo, Jemina. 2015. *The Biopolitics of Gender.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Resnikoff, Paul. 2016. "I'm Madonna. And This Is the Blatant Sexism, Misogyny, and Constant Bullying That I've Faced…" Digital music News, 10 December. https://www.digitalmusicnews.com/2016/12/10/madonna-sexism-misogyny-women/)
Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg. 1997. *Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg. 1997. Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Rhodes, Kimberly. 2008. *Ophelia and Victorian Visual Culture: Representing Body Politics in the Nineteenth Century.* Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate.
Richards, Thomas. 1990. *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England. Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Richardson, Angelique, and Chris Willis. Eds. 2002. *The New Woman in Fiction and in Fact : Fin De Siècle Feminisms.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Riches, Harriet. 2004. 'A Disappearing Act: Francesca Woodman's Portrait of a Reputation', *Oxford Art Journal*, 27 (1), 97–113.
Ridley, Matthew, Gautam Rao, Frank Schilbach and Vikram Patel. 2020. "Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms." *Science* 370 (Issue 6522, 11 Dec 2020), 156-64.
Ridolfi, Carlo. 1835. Le maraviglie dell'arte, ovvero le vite degli illustri pittori veneti e dello stato. Seconda edizione corretta ed arrichhita d'annotazioni. Volume primo. Padova: Tipografia e Fonderia Cartallier.
Riede, David G. 1983. Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Limits of Victorian Vision. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
Rimbaud, Arthur. 2008. *Complete Works.* Trans. by Paul Schmidt. London, New York et. al.: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
Ripa, Cesare. 1764. Iconologia. Vol. IV. Perugia: Piergiovanni Costantini.
Rischin, Abigail S. Ekphrasis and the Art of Rescue: Rossetti's Sonnets "For Ruggiero and Angelica by Ingres." The Eye of the Poet: Studies in the Reciprocity of the Visual and Literary Arts from the Renaissance to the Present. Ed. Amy Golahny. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1996.
Risden, Edward L. 2012. *Shakespeare and the Problem Play: Complex Forms, Crossed Genres and Moral Quandaries*. Jefferson and London: McFarland.
Rivers, Nicola. 2017. *Postfeminism(s) and the Arrival of the Fourth Wave. Turning Tides.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Rivers, Thomas. 1854. The Rose Amateur's Guide . . . Fifth edition corrected and improved. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
Rivière, Joan. 1991. "Womanliness as Masquerade." In The Inner World and Joan Riviere. Collected Papers: 1920-1958. Edited and with a biographical chapter by Athol Hughes. London and New York: The Melanie Klein Trust/Karnac Books, 90-101.

Robert C. Cafritz, Lawrence Gowing, and David Rosand. 1988. Places of Delight: The Pastoral Landscape. Washington, D.C.: Phillips Collection.

Roberts, Helene E. 1974. "The Dream World of Dante Gabriel Rossetti." Victorian Studies, 17 (n. 4, June), 371-93.

Roberts, Lynn. 1985. "Nineteenth Century English Picture Frames. I: The Pre-Raphaelites. The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship (4), 155-72.

Robertson, Brian. 2015. *Lacanian Antiphilosophy and the Problem of Anxiety An Uncanny Little Object.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Robinson, Henry Peach. 1860. "On Printing Photographic Pictures from Several Negatives." *British Journal of Photography*, 7 (115), 94.

Robinson, Henry Peach. 1869. *Pictorial Effect in Photography: Being Hints On Composition And Chiaroscuro For Photographers*. London: Piper & Carter.

Robinson, Peter. 2019. "The Poetry of Modern Life: On the Pavement." In *The Oxford Handbook of victorian Poetry.* Ed. by Matthew Bevis. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 254-72.

Rodowick, David. 1982. "The Difficulty of Difference," Wide Angle 5 (1): 4-15. The author readdresses his original article in 1991. The Difficulty of Difference. London: Routledge, 1-17.

Roesch Wagner, Sally. 1982. "Pornography and the Sexual Revolution: The Backlash of Sadomasochism" in Against Sadomasochism. A Radical Feminist Analysis. Edited by Robin Ruth Linden, Darlene R. Pagano, Diana E. H. Russell, and Susan Leigh Star. East Palo Alto: Frog in the Well, 23-44.

Roman, Luke and Monica Roman. 2010. Encyclopedia of Greek and Roman Mythology. New York: Infobase Books.

Romanska, Magda. 2005. "NecrOphelia. Death, femininity and the making of modern aesthetics." *Performance Research* 10 (3), 35-53.

Romanska, Magda. 2005b. "Onthology and Eroticism: Two Bodies of Ophelia." *Women's Studies* 34 (n. 4), 485-513.

Rosenberg, Brian. 1984. "Reading the World: Visual Imagination In Dickens and Ruskin." The Arnoldian 11 (1, Winter), 5-13.

Rosenberg, Marvin. 1993. *The Masks of Hamlet.* Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Rosenfeld, Jason. 2012. *John Everett Millais.* London and New York: Phaidon Press.

Rossetti Angeli, Elena. 1906. Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Bergamo: Instituto Italiano D'Arti Grafiche.

Rossetti, Christina. 1896. New Poems. Hitherto Unpublished or Uncollected. Edited by William Michael Rossetti. London and New York: Macmillan.

Rossetti, Christina. 2008. Poems and Prose. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1861. *The Early Italian poets from Ciullo d'Alcamo to Dante Alighieri (1100-1200-1300): in the original metres, together with Dante's Vita nuova.* London: Smith, Elder and Co.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1901b. The Collected Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Edited with Preface and Notes by William Michael Rossetti. Vol. 2: Translations, Prose-Notices of Fine Art. London: Ellis and Elvey.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1965-7. Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. 3 vols. Ed. by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 2002. *The Correspondence of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. Vol. 3 1863-1867. Ed. by William E. Fredeman. Woodbridge and Rochester NY: Boydell & Brewer.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 2002. *The Correspondence of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. *The Formative Years 1835-1854*. Two volumes. Ed. by William E. Fredeman. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 2007. The House of Life. A Sonnet Sequence. Variorum Edition with and Introduction and Notes by Roger C. Lewis. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1826-7. *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri con comento analitico di Gabriele Rossetti. In sei volumi.* Vols. 1-2: *L'Inferno.* London: John Murray.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1832. Sullo spirito antipapale che produsse la riforma: e sulla segreta influenza ch'esercito nella letteratura d'Europa, e specialmente d'Italia, come risulta da molti suoi classici, massime da Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio. Londra: Stampato per l'Autore. https://www.librarything.com/work/10069709/book/47345495

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1832. *Sullo spirito antipapale che produsse la Riforma, e sulla segreta influenza ch'esercito nella letteratura d'Europa, e specialmente d'Italia come risulta da molti suoi classici, massime da Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, disquisizioni di Gabriele Rossetti*. London: self-published.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1834. *Disquisitions on the Antipapal Spirit which Produced the Reformation; Its Secret Influence on the Literature of Europe in General, and of Italy in Particular.* In Two Volumes. Trans. by Caroline Ward. London: Smith, Elder and Co.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1861. *Poesie di Gabriele Rossetti ordinate da G.C.* Ed. by Giosuè Carducci, Firenze: Barbera.

Rossetti, Gabriele. 1966. *Commento analitico al "Purgatorio" di Dante Alighieri*. Ed. by Pompeo Giannantonio. Firenze: Olschki.
Rossetti, William Michael. 1895. Dante Gabriel Rossetti; his family-letters, with a memoir by William Michael Rossetti. London: Elis and Elvey.
Rowland, Ingrid and Noah Charney. 2017. *The Collector of Lives: Giorgio Vasari and the Invention of Art*. New York: Norton.
Royal Academy of Arts. 1852. *The exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts. MDCCCLII. The eighty-fourth*. London: Royal Academy of Arts. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/exhibition-catalogue/ra-sec-vol84-1852 [accessed 25 April 2022].
Rush, Fred. 2002. "Jena Romanticism and Benjamin's Critical Epistemology," In *Walter Benjamin and Romanticism*. Ed. by Andrew E. Benjamin and Beatrice Hanssen. New York: Continuum, 123–36.
Ruskin, John. 1851. *Pre-Raphaelitism*. New York: Wiley.
Ruskin, John. 1903-12. "Letter 79. Life Guards of New Life." In *The Works of John Ruskin. Library Edition. Vol. 24. Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain. Vol. III Containing Letters 73-96 (1877, 1878-80-83-84)*. Ed. by E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: George Allen, 146-69.
Ruskin, John. 1903-12. *The Works of John Ruskin. Library Edition Vol. 3. Modern Painters. Vol. I Containing Parts I and II of General Principles and of Truth*. Ed. by E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: George Allen.
Ruskin, John. 1903-12. *The Works of John Ruskin. Library Edition Vol. 37. Letters, 1870-1889*. Ed. by E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: George Allen.
Ruskin, John. 2014. *'A New and Noble School': Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites.* Ed. with a Preface by Stephen Wildman, introduced by Robert Hewison. London: Pallas Athene.
Russell, Anne E. 1991. "'History And Real Life': Anna Jameson, Shakspeare's Heroines And Victorian Women." *Victorian Review* 17 (n. 2, Winter), 35-49.
Russell, Anne E. 1991. "History And Real Life": Anna Jameson, Shakspeare's Heroines and Victorian Women." *Victorian Review* 17 (n. 2, Winter), 35-49.
Rutter, Carol Chillington. 2001. *Enter the Body. Women and representation on Shakespeare's stage.* London and New York: Routledge.
Saliot, Anne-Gaëlle. 2015. *The Drowned Muse. Casting the Unknown Woman of the Seine Across the Tides of Modernity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Salkeld, Like. 2010. "Amateur sleuth discovers the site where Sir John Millais painted famous work of Ophelia." *Daily Mail Online*, 1 July. https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1290887/Amateur-sleuth-discovers-site-Sir-John-Millais-painted-famous-Ophelia.html [archived 21/12/2020]
Sand, George. 1847. *Letters of a traveller.* Trans. by Eliza A. Ashurst, London: E. Churton.
Sartoni, Enrico. Ed. 2014. *Da Michelangelo alla Contemporaneità. Storia di un primato mondiale. 450 anni dell'Accademia delle Arti del Disegno*. Firenze: Archivio di Stato.
Sassatelli, Roberta. 2011. "Interview with Laura Mulvey: Gender, Gaze and Technology in Film Culture." Theory Culture and Society, 28 (5), 123-43.
Satô, Saburô. 1987. "The Japanization of Ophelia in Shimazaki Tôson's Plays." Comparative Literature Studies 24 (n. 3, East-West Issue), 231-42.
Savransky, Martin. 2020. Problems All the Way Down." *Theory, Culture & Society* 38 (2, Special Issue: Problematizing the Problematic), 3-23.
Saxo Grammaticus. 2015. *Gesta Danorum: The History of the Danes*. *Vols. 1-2.* Ed. by K. Friis-Jensen Trans. By Peter Fisher. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Schartzkopf, Jutta. 1991. *Women in the Chartist Movement*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schechner, Sara J. 2005. "Between Knowing and Doing: Mirrors and Their Imperfections in the Renaissance." Early Science and Medicine 10 (no. 2), 137-62.
Schmid, Wolf. 2009. s.v. "Implied Author." In *Handbook of Narratology*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter. Edited by Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert, 161-73.
Schmiechen, James A. 1991. "Free Market Capitalism: Fundamentally Philistine?" *Albion* 23 (n. 2, Summer), 269-74
Schoch, Richard W. 2004. "Theatre and mid-Victorian society, 1851–1870." In *The Cambridge History of British Theatre. Vol. 2 1660 to 1895*. Ed. by Joseph Donohue. 331-51.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,.
Schor, Naomi, 1985. "Female Fetishism: The Case of George Sand." Poetics Today, 6 (1/2, The Female Body in Western Culture: Semiotic Perspectives), 301-310.
Schroeder, Janice. 2019, "The Publishing History of Henry Mayhew's 'London Labour and the London Poor.'" *BRANCH: Britain, Representation and Nineteenth-Century History*. Ed. by Dino Franco Felluga. Online

publication. https://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_articles=janice-schroeder-the-publishing-history-of-henry-mayhews-london-labour-and-the-london-poor [archived 21/08/2020].
Schruers, Fred. 1985. “Lucky Stars. How Rosanna Arquette, Madonna and director Susan Seidelman lost tempers and found each other through Desperately Seeking Susan.” Rolling Stone, 9 May, 27-29.
Schuman, Samuel. 2014. *Nabokov's Shakespeare.* London and New York: Bloomsbury.
Schwab, Michael and Henk Borgdorff. Eds. 2014. The Exposition of Artistic Research. Publishing Art in Academia. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Schwab, Michael. 2011. "Editorial", *Journal for Artistic Research* issue 0. https://www.jar-online.net/en/issues/0 [accessed 24 April 2022].
Schwab, Michael. 2012. “Beween a Rock and a Hard Place.” In *Intellectual Birdhouse. Artistic Practice as Research.* Ed. by Florian Dombois, Ute Meta Bauer, Claudia Mareis, and Michael Schwab. London: Koenig Book, 229-48.
Schwab, Michael. 2013. “Introduction.” In Experimental Systems. Future Knowledge in Artistic Research. Ed. by Michael Schwab. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 5-14.
Schwab, Michael. 2018. “Introduction.” In Transpositions: Aesthetico-Epistemic Operators in Artistic Research. Ed. by Michael Schwab. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 7-22.
Schwab, Michael. 2018. “Transpositionality and Artistic Research.” In Transpositions: Aesthetico-Epistemic Operations in Artistic Research. Edited by Michael Schwab. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 191-214.
Schwab, Michael. 2019. "Expositionality." In *Artistic Research. Charting a Field in Expansion.* Edited by Paulo de Assis and Lucia D'Errico. London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 27–45.
Schwab, Michael. Ed. 2013. *Experimental Systems. Future Knowledge in Artistic Research.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Schwab, Michael. Ed. 2018. *Transpositions. Aesthetico-Epistemic Operators in Artistic Research*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Schwichtenberg, Cathy. 1992. “Madonna's postmodern feminism: Bringing the margins to the center”, Southern Communication Journal, 57 (2), 120-31.
Scott, Grant F. 1999. “Language Strange: A Visual History of Keats's “La Belle Dame sans Merci.” Studies in Romanticism 38 (n. 4, Winter), 503-35.
Scull, Andrew. 1989. *Social Order/Mental Disorder: Anglo-American Psychiatry in Historical Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Scull, Andrew. 2006. “The Insanity of Place” in *The Insanity of Place/The Place of Insanity. Essays in the History Psychiatry*. London and New York: Routledge, 14-29.
Scull, Andrew. 2009. *Hysteria. The Disturbing History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Searle, Adrian. 2014. 'Phyllida Barlow at Tate Britain review: 'In every way tremendous'' *The Guardian.* Online article. 31 March. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2014/mar/31/phyllida-barlow-dock-2014-tate-britain-review
Seidler, Kareen, and Lukas Erne. Eds. 2020. *Early Modern German Shakespeare: Hamlet and Romeo and Juliet. William Shakespeare, Der Bestrafte Brudermord and Romio und Julieta in Translation.* London, New York: The Arden Shakespeare.
Sekula, Allan. 1986. “The Body and the Archive.” *October* 39 (Winter), 3-64.
Shakespeare, William. 1838-43. *The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakespere. Ed. by Charles Knight*. 56 monthly parts, 8 vols. London.
Shakespeare, William. 2016. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: Modern Critical Edition: The Complete Works.* Ed. by Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan. Osford: Oxford University Press.
Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet.* 2006. Ed. by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare.
Shakespeare. 1821. The plays and poems of William Shakspeare, with the corrections and illustrations of various commentators: Comprehending a life of the poet, and an enlarged history of the stage, by the late Edmond Malone. With a new glossarial index. Vol. 8. Much Ado About Nothing, Hamlet. 21 vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, T. Egerton, et al.
Shakespeare. 1825. *The First Edition of the Tragedy of Hamlet by William Shakespeare*. London: Shakespeare Press.
Shakespeare. 1838-43. The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere. Edited by Charles Knight. Tragedies. Vol. 1. London: Charles Knight & Company.
Shakespeare. 1843. The works of Shakspere, revised from the best authorities: with a memoir and essay on his genius by Barry Cornwall: also annotations and remarks by many writers, illustr. with engr. from designs by Kenny Meadows. Vol. 2. Tragedies. London: Robert Tyas.
Shakespeare. 1843. *The works of Shakspere. Revised from the best authorities, with a memoir, and essay on his genius, by Barry Cornwall; also, annotations and introductory remarks on the plays, by many distinguished writers; illustrated with engravings on wood, from designs by Kenny Meadows.* 3 Vols. Ed. by Barry Cornwall [pseud. Bryan Waller Procter]. London: Robert Tyas.

Shakespeare. 1992. *Hamlet - The First Quarto*. Ed. and introduced by Graham Holderness and Bryan Loughrey. London: Routledge.
Shakespeare. s.d. [1867]. The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakspere. Edited by Charles Knight. Tragedies. Vol. 1. London: Virtue and Co.
Shapiro, Gary. 2014. "Painting (and Photography)." In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon.* Ed. by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 327-33.
Sharp, William. 1882. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a Record and a Study. London: Macmillan.
Shaviro, Steven. 2014. *No Speed Limit. Three Essays on Accelerationism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Shaw, Marion. 1988. *Alfred Tennyson.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Shelley, Percy Bysshe. 1914. "Scenes from Goethe's Faust." In The complete poetical works of Percy Bysshe Shelley, including materials never before printed in any edition of the poems. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 740-53
Shepherd, Anna and David Wright. 2002. "Madness, Suicide and the Victorian Asylum: Attempted Self-Murder in the Age of Non-Restraint." *Medical History* 46 (May), 175-96.
Shorter, Edward. 1997. *A history of psychiatry: from the era of the asylum to the age of Prozac*. New York, Chichester et al.: Wiley.
Shorter, Edward. 2005. 'Paranoia' in *A Historical Dictionary of Psychiatry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 206-11.
Showalter, Elaine. 1993. "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism." In *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Ed. by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. London and New York: Routledge, 77–94. First published in 1985 by Methuen, London.
Showalter. Elaine. 1985. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830-1980.* London and New York: Penguin.
Siegert, Bernhard. 2011. "The map *is* the territory." *Radical Philosophy* 169 (September/October), 13-6.
Sigmund Freud. 1938. "The Sexual Aberrations," in The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud, trans. and ed. A. Brill. New York: Random House.
Sillars, Stuart. 2006. *Painting Shakespeare: The Artist as Critic, 1720–1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Silver, Brenda M. 2010. "Virginia Woolf Icon." In *The Edinburgh Companion to Virginia Woolf and the Arts*. Ed. by Maggie Humm. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 392-414.
Silver, Larry. 2001. "God in Detail: Bosch and Judgment(s)," The Art Bulletin, 83 (4), 626-50.
Silver, Larry. 2016. "Crimes and Punishments: Bosch's Hells." In Bosch. Ed. by Pilar Silva Maroto, Madrid: Prado, 115– 134.
Sinclair, Leah. 2016. "Are these the most controversial photography books ever?" Dazed, 22 July. https://www.dazeddigital.com/photography/article/25580/1/are-these-the-most-controversial-photography-books-ever
Sisti, Donatella. 2004. *Gabriele Rossetti. L'altra identità del poeta.* Bari: CopyRight.
Skerry, Philip J. 2008. *Psycho in the Shower: The History of Cinema's Most Famous Scene*. New York and London: Continuum.
Skerry, Philip J. 2013. *Dark Energy. Hitchcock's Absolute Camera and the Physics of Cinematic Spacetime*. New York and London: Bloomsbury.
Smiles, Sam. 2020. The Late Works of J. M. W. Turner. The Artist and his Critics. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Smith, Alison. 2017. *Reflections: Van Eyck and the Pre-Raphaelites.* With Caroline Bugler, Susan Foister, and Anna Koopstra. London: National Gallery.
Smith, Daniel W. 2012. "Deleuze's Theory of Sensation: Overcoming the Kantian Duality." In *Essays on Deleuze.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 89-105.
Smith, Nigel M. 2016. "Is Madonna's acting really that bad? A career retrospective lets you be the judge." The Guardian. Online edition. 21 August. https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/aug/21/madonna-acting-career-metrograph-new-york-retrospective [accessed 20/6/2020].
Smith, Roberta. 2013. "Blazing a Trail for Hypnotic Hyper-Realism: 'Pre-Raphaelites' at National Gallery of Art," *The New York Times* (28 March). http://nyti.ms/1EdhF1d
Smith, Sarah Phelps. "From Allegory to Symbol: Rossetti's Renaissance Roots and his Influence on Continental Symbolism." Pre–Raphaelite Art in its European Context. Eds. Susan P. Casteras and Alicia Craig Faxon. London: Associated University Presses, 1995. 50–65.
Smith, Sarah Phelps. 1979. "Dante Gabriel Rossetti's 'Lady Lilith' and the Language of Flowers." Arts Magazine 53 (n. 6): 142–145.
Smith, Alison, and Christopher Newall. 2004. *Pre-Raphaelite Vision: Truth to Nature*. London: Tate.
Smithies, James. 2017. *The Digital Humanities and the Digital Modern.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Snell, Robert. 2016. *Portraits of the Insane: Theodore Gericault and the Birth of the Subject of Psychotherapy.* London and New York: Karnak Books.
Snow, C.P. 2012. *The Two Cultures. With an Introduction by Stefan Collini.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Soler, Colette. 1995. “The Body in the Teaching of Jacques Lacan (May 1984).” Trans. by Lindsay Watson, Journal of the Centre of Freudian Analysis & Research, 6 (Winter), 6-38. https://jcfar.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/The-Body-in-the-Teaching-of-JacquesLacan-Colette-Soler.pdf
Sollers, Phillipe. 1998. “The Sorceress” in *Francesca Woodman*. Edited by Hervé Chandès, Paris: Fondation Cartier pour l’Art Contemporain, 9-13.
Sooke, Alastair. “Tate Britain Commission 2014: Phyllida Barlow, review,” *The Telegraph.* Online article. 31 March. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/art-reviews/10734669/Tate-Britain-Commission-2014-Phyllida-Barlow-review.html
Spectator. 1852. "Fine Arts. Royal Academy Exhibition." *The Spectator* (1248, 29 May), 519-20.
Spectator. 1860. “Fine Arts. Royal Academy.” *The Spectator* 33 (n. 1663, 12 May), 456.
Spencer, Robin. 1991. “Manet, Rossetti, London and Derby Day.” The Burlington Magazine, 133 (n. 1057, Apr.), 228-36.
Spielmann, Marion Harry. 1898. *Millais and his works, with special reference to the exhibition at the Royal Academy 1898, by M. H. Spielmann ... with a chapter “Thoughts on our art of to-day”, by Sir J. E. Millais*. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons.
Squire, Michael. 2015. "Ecphrasis: Visual and Verbal Interactions in Ancient Greek and Latin Literature." *Oxford Handbooks Online.* DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.58.
Stanford, Derek. 1970. “The Pre-Raphaelite Cult of Women: From Damozel to Demon.” *Contemporary Review*, 217 (July), 26–33.
Starr, Peter. 2001. “Rien n’est Tout”: Lacan and the Legacy of May ‘68.” *L’Esprit Créateur* 41 (n. 1, The Legacy of May ‘68 / L’Héritage de Mai 68, Spring), 34-42.
Starr, Peter. 2001. “Rien n’est Tout”: Lacan and the Legacy of May ‘68” L’Esprit Créateur 41, (n. 1, The Legacy of May ‘68 / L’Héritage de Mai 68, Spring), 34-42.
Stein, Richard L. 1970. “Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Painting and the Problem of Poetic Form.” Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900 10(n. 4, Nineteenth Century, Autumn), 775-92
Stelzner-Large, Barbara. 1990. ‘Zur Bedeutung der Bilder in Alfred Hitchcocks Psycho’, in *Kunst und Künstler im Film.* Edited by Helmut Korte and Johannes Zahlten. Hameln: Niemeyer, 121-133.
Stem Learning. 2010-9. *Get Set Demonstrate. Pluck Dissection*. Website. https://www.stem.org.uk/cx62g [accessed 21/08/2017].
Stendhal. 1919. *Rome, Naples et Florence [par] Stendhal. Texte établi et annoté par Daniel Muller, préf. de Charles Maurras*. Paris: E. Champion.
Stephens, Frederic George. 1860. *William Holman Hunt and his Works. A memoir of the artist’s life, with description of his pictures.* London: James Nisbet & Co.
Stephens, Frederic George. 1886. *Exhibition of the Works of Sir John E. Millais, Bart., R.A.*, London: The Grosvenor Gallery.
Stern, Alexander. 2019. *The Fall of Language. Benjamin and Wittgenstein on Meaning*. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press.
Stern, Bert and Annie Gottlieb. 1982. The Last Sitting. New York: William Morrow and Co.
Stevenson, Angus and Christine A. Lindberg eds. 2010. New Oxford American Dictionary. 3rd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
Stewart, Amy. 2008. Flower Confidential: The Good, the Bad, and the Beautiful. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books.
Stewart, Stacy R. 2018. “Hurricane Ophelia.” Tropical Cyclone Report. 27 March. Miami: National Hurricane Center. http://www.nhc.noaa.gov/data/tcr/AL172017_Ophelia.pdf [archived 21/12/2020]
Stivale, Charles J. 2006. "Guattari's Proust: From Signs to Assemblages." *L'Esprit Créateur*, 46 (4), 113-24.
Stoker, Bram. 1983. *Dracula.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Stone, George Winchester. 1934. “Garrick’s Long Lost Alteration of Hamlet.” *PMLA* 49 (n. 3, September), 890-921.
Stonell Walker, Kirsten. 2012. Stunner: The Fall and Rise of Fanny Cornforth. S.l.: CreateSpace.
Stoppard, Tom. 1976. *The fifteen minute Hamlet*. London and New York: French.
Storr, Anthony. 1973. Jung. London: Fontana.
Story, Alfred T. 1892. *The Life of John Linnell. In Two Volumes.* London: Richard Bentley and Son.
Strachey, Edward. 1848. *Shakespeare’s Hamplet: An Attempt to Find the Key to a Great Moral Problem, by Methodical Analysis of the Play*. London: J.W. Parker.
Strachey, Lytton. 1918. *Eminent Victorians: Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Arnold, General Gordon.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Stremlin, Boris. 2004. "Constructing Authority. The Rise of Science in the Modern World." In *Overcoming the Two Cultures: Science versus the Humanities in the Modern World-System*. Ed. by Richard E. Lee, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Eric Mielants. London and New York: Routledge.
Sullivan, Caroline. 2013. "How we made Cut (the Slits)." The Guardian, 24 June. https://www.theguardian.com/music/2013/jun/24/how-we-made-cut-the-slits
Sullivan, Graeme. 2005. *Art Practice as Research. Inquiry in Visual Arts. Second Edition*. London: SAGE.
Sumic, Jelica. 2007. "On the Path of the Semblant." Umbr(a), 11-36.
Sundell, Margaret. 1996.'Vanishing Points: The Photography of Francesca Woodman' in *Inside the Visible: An Elliptical Traverse of 20th Century Art: In, of, and from the Feminine*, Edited by Carol Armstrong and Catherine de Zegher, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 435–39.
Sussman, Herbert. 2008. *Victorian Masculinities. Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sutton, David and Peter Wogan. 2009. Hollywood Blockbusters: The Anthropology of Popular Movies. Oxford and New York: Berg.
Swales, Stephanie F. 2012. Perversion: A Lacanian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Subject. London: Routledge. [Based on Lacan's quaternary schema of perversion in Seminar XVI, the construction of the viewer as masochist is opposed to that of the (male) voyeur watching Ophelia's death. The ambivalence of the painting appeal between voyeurism and masochism elicited in the viewer is a key element of its enduring fascination.
Swift, Roger. 1987. "The Outcast Irish in the British Victorian City: Problems and Perspectives." *Irish Historical Studies* 25 (n. 99, May), 264-76.
Symons, Stéphane. 2019. *The Work of Forgetting. Or, How Can We Make the Future Possible?* London: Rowman and Littlefield.
Tafreshi, Samuel. 2019. "When Hamlet Speaks Persian: A History of Shakespeare Translation in Iran." Blog post. Ajam Media Collective. 2 December. *https://ajammc.com/2019/12/02/persian-translation-shakespeare/* [archived 21/12/2020]
Talbot, William Fox. 2016. "Brief Historical Sketch of the Invention of the Art." In *10 Must Reads. History of Photography. From Original Sources.* Edinburgh and Boston: Museums ETC, 12-27.
Tan, Stephen, Catherine Shea and Lili Kopala. 1997. "Paranoid schizophrenia with delusions regarding the internet." Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience 22 (n. 2, March), 143. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1188843/ [accessed 21 July 2020]
Tate. 2014. "Tate Britain Welcomes Home Ophelia." Press release. 7 August. https://www.tate.org.uk/press/press-releases/tate-britain-welcomes-home-ophelia [archived 21/12/2020]
Tate. 2014. Tate Britain Welcomes Home Ophelia. Press release. 7 August. https://www.tate.org.uk/press/press-releases/tate-britain-welcomes-home-ophelia. [accessed 20/6/2020]
Tate. 2022. "Look Closer. The Story of Ophelia. Explore Millais's iconic painting, Ophelia, looking at the subject, materials, techniques and conservation." Website. Tate.org.uk. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-ophelia-n01506/story-ophelia [accessed 1/9/2022].
Taunton, Geoffrey. 1987. "The refurbishment of E.M. Barry's rooms in the National Gallery, London." *International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship*, 6 (Issue 2, June), 121-41.
Taylor Gary. 2001. "Hamlet in Africa 1607." In *Travel Knowledge*. Ed. by Ivo Kamps and Jyotsna G. Singh. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 223-48.
Taylor, A.B. 2007. "Ovid's myths and the unsmooth course of love in A Midsummer Night's Dream." In *Shakespeare and the Classics.* Ed. by Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 49-65.
Taylor, Alex. 2018. "The iconography behind Beyonce's 'iconic' Coachella sets" Online article. BBC News. 23 April. https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-43783861 [accessed 20/7/2020]
Taylor, Gary. 2017. "Artiginality. Authorship after Postmodernism." The New Oxford Shakespeare. Authorship Companion. Edited by Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-26, 23.
Taylor, Jessica. 2020. *Why Women Are Blamed For Everything. Exposing the Culture of Victim-Blaming*. London: Constable.
Teman, Elly. 2008. " The Red String: The Cultural History of a Jewish Folk Symbol." In *Jewishness: Expression, Identity, and Representation*. Edited by Simon J. Bronner. Oxford and Portland: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 29-54.
Tennyson, Alfred. 1971. "Lady of Shalott." In *Poems and Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 26-8.
Terry, Ellen. 1908. *The Story of My Life.* London: Hutchinson.
The Athaeneum. 1842. "Fine Arts. The Royal Academy." *The Athaeneum* (758, 7 May), 409-11
The Athenaeum. 1852. "Fine Art – the Royal Academy." 25 (n. 1282, 22 May).
The Illustrated London News. 1854. "The Hood Memorial." *The Illustrated London News* 16 (15 July), 36-7.

The Irish Times. 2017. “Hurricane Ophelia: a warning on climate inertia.” 17 October. https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/editorial/hurricane-ophelia-a-warning-on-climate-inertia-1.3258180 [archived 21/12/2020]
The Spectator. 1842. “Fine Arts.” *The Spectator* 15 (723, 7 May), 449-51.
The Spectator. 1852. “Fine Arts. The Royal Academy Exhibition.” *The Spectator* 25 (n. 1246, 15 May), 471-2.
The Spectator. 1882. “Mr Watts’s Painting. The Grosvenor Gallery. First Notice.” *The Spectator* 55 (n. 2793, 7 January), 14-5.
Themi, Tim. 2016. “Lacan, Barthes, Bataille, and the Meaning of the Eye— or Gaze.” The Undecidable Unconscious: A Journal of Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis 3, 93-123.
Thomalla, Ariane. 1972. *Die ‘femme fragile’: Ein literarischer Frauentypus der Jahrhundertwende.* Düsseldorf: Berteismann Universitätsverlag.
Thomas, Julia. 2000. *Victorian narrative painting*. London: Tate Publishing.
Thomas, William Luson. 1888. “The Making of the Graphic.” *The Universal Review* 2 (September-December), 80-93.
Thorpe, Vanessa. 2001. “Hamlet will reign for the English.” *The Guardian.* 2 December. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2001/dec/02/classics.artsandhumanities
Tibbets, John. 1994. “Breaking the Classical Barrier: Franco Zeffirelli Interviewed by John Tibbets.” *Literature/Film Quarterly* 22, 136-40.
Toffanin, Marco. Dir. 2020. La Cappella degli Scrovegni in Padova, storia, restauro, conservazione. University of Padova. HD video, Italian and English, 20’ 52’’. https://youtu.be/gCUYR15A51c
Tomasulo, Frank P. 1997. “Theory to Practice: Integrating Cinema Theory and Film Production.” Cinema Journal 36 (3, Spring), 113-7.
Tomory, Peter. 1972. *The Life and Art of Henry Fuseli.* New York: Praeger Publishers.
Tomšič, Samo. 2015. *The Capitalist Unconscious. Marx and Lacan.* London and New York: Verso.
Tosh, Will. 2018. *Playing Indoors. Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse*. London: Bloomsbury.
Town, Edward and Jessica David. 2020. “George Gower: portraitist, Mercer, Serjeant Painter”. *The Burlington Magazine* 162 (1410): 731–47.
Townsend, Joyce H., 1996. “Painting Techniques and Materials of Turner and Other British Artists 1775-1875.” In *Historical Painting Techniques, Materials, and Studio Practice.* Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 176-85.Townsend, Joyce H. 2002. “The Materials Used by British Oil Painters in the Nineteenth Century.” *Studies in Conservation.* 47 (supplement 1 “Reviews in Conservation 3”), 46-55.
Townsend, Joyce H., Jacqueline Ridge, Stephen Hackney. 2004. *Pre-Raphaelite Painting Techniques 1848-1856*. London: Tate.
Tronicke, Marlena. 2017. Shakespeare’s Suicides: Dead Bodies That Matter. London: Routledge.
Turner, James Grantham. 2017. Eros Visible: Art, Sexuality and Antiquity in Renaissance Italy. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Turner, Victor. 1969. The Ritual Process. Structure and Anti-Structure. Ithaca and New Yor. Cornell University Press.
Turner, Victor. 1988. *The Anthropology of Performance.* New York: PAJ Publications.
Tutter, Adele. 2011. “Metamorphosis and the aesthetics of loss: II. Lady of the woods--the transformative lens of Francesca Woodman”, *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92 (6, December), 1517-39.
Tyas, Robert. 1842. The Sentiment of Flowers; or The Language of Flora. London: R. Tyas.
Tyler, Carol-Anne. 2013. Female Impersonators. London: Routledge.
Tyler, Graeme. 2014. Physiognomy in the European Novel. Faces and Fortunes, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Van Gennep, Arnold. 1960. The Rites of Passage. Trans. by Monika B. Yizedom and Gabrielle L. Coffee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Van Meter, Jonathan. 2009, “The Godfather.” Vogue United States, May, 192-9, 232-4.
Vanheule Stijn. 2016. “Capitalist Discourse, Subjectivity and Lacanian Psychoanalysis.” Frontiers in Psychology, 7 (1948, December). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01948
Vanheule, Stijn. 2011. “Lacan’s construction and deconstruction of the double-mirror device.” Frontiers in Psychol.ogy (13 September). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00209
Vanheule, Stijn. 2016. “Capitalist Discourse, Subjectivity and Lacanian Psychoanalysis.” *Frontiers in Psychology* 7 (9 December). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01948
Vanheule, Stijn. 2016. “Capitalist Discourse. Subjectivity and Lacanian Psychoanalysis.” Frontiers of Psychology (9 December). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01948
Vasari, Giorgio. 1759-60. *Vite de piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti / scritte da Giorgio Vasari... corrette da molti errori e illustrate con note [Giovanni Bottari].* 3 vols. Roma: Niccolò e Marco Pagliarini. https://www.e-rara.ch/zut/doi/10.3931/e-rara-13450 [accessed 25 April 2022].

Vasari, Giorgio. 1991. *The Lives of the Artists.* Trans. with an introduction and notes by Julia Conaway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vassallo, Peter. 2010. "John Hookham Frere, Gabriele Rossetti, and Anglo-Italian Cooperation in Exile." In *Exiles, Emigrés and Intermediaries*. Ed. by Barbara Schoff. Leiden: Brill, 131–139.
Vellodi, Kamini. 2015. "Tintoretto's Time." *Art History*, 38 (3), 414-433.
Vendler, Helen. 1983. The Odes of John Keats. Cambridge MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Venturi, Lionello. 1964. *History of art criticism (New revised edition).* New York: Dutton.
Venturi, Lionello. 1985. *Four steps toward modern art : Giorgione, Caravaggio, Manet, Cézanne*. Wesport: Greenwood Press.
Verhaege, Paul. 1999. Does the Woman Exist? From Freud's Hysteric to Lacan's Feminine. Trans. by Marc du Ry. New York: The Other Press.
Verhaege, Paul. 2000. "The Collapse of the Function of the Father and Its Effect on Gender Roles." In *Sexuation.* Ed. by Renata Salecl. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 131-55.
Verstegen, Ian. 2013. *A Realist Theory of Art History.* London and New York: Routledge.
Vest, James M. 1989. "Reflections of Ophelia (And of "Hamlet") in Alfred Hitchcock's Vertigo" *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 22 (1, Spring), 1-9.
Vickers, Brian. 1982. "The Emergence of Character Criticism, 1774–1800." In *Shakespeare Survey.* Ed. by Stanley Wells, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-22
Vighi, Fabio. 2019. " The Subversion of the Subject and the Dialectic of Desire in the Freudian Unconscious." In *Reading Lacan's Écrits: From 'Signification of the Phallus' to 'Metaphor of the Subject'.* Ed. by Stijn Vanheule, Derek Hook and Calum Neill. London and New York: Routledge.
Virgil. 2007. *Aeneides.* Trans. by Frederick Ahl. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Virtel, Louis. 2017. "10 Reasons Madonna Is An Eternal Inspiration to the LGBTQ Community."Bollboard. 6 June. https://www.billboard.com/articles/news/pride/7824546/madonna-lgbtq-inspiration-ally-moments.
Vogler, Christopher. 1999.The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure for Storytellers and Screenwriters. London: Pan.
Voller, Debbi. 1999. Madonna: The Style Book, London: Omnibus Press.
Wajcman, Gerard. 2003. "The Hysteric's Discourse." In *Jacques Lacan. Critical Evaluations in Cultural Theory. Vol. 1 Psychoanalytic Theory and Practice*. Ed. by Slavoj Žižek. London and New York: Routledge, 77-89.
Walker, Joely. 2014. "Madonna's Iconic Beauty Looks. We chart Madonna's beauty evolution". Elle. UK online edition. 8 August. https://www.elle.com/uk/beauty/make-up/beauty-tips/g22462/madonnas-best-beauty-hair-makeup-looks-of-all-time/?slide=4
Wallace, David Foster. 2006. *Infinite Jest. A Novel. Forworded by Dave Eggers.*New York, Boston and London: Little, Brown, and Company.
Wallace, David Foster. 2011. *The Pale King. An Unfinished Novel*. New York, Boston and London: Little, Brown, and Company.
Walters, Barry. 2017. "Madonna's 'Erotica,' 'Sex': Why Musical Masterpiece, Defiant Book Still Matter." Rolling Stone, 19 October. https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/madonnas-erotica-sex-why-musical-masterpiece-defiant-book-still-matter-200685/
Walters, Minette. 1994. *The Scold's Bridle.* London: Picador.
Warburg, Aby. 1999. Arte italiana e astrologia internazionale nel Palazzo Schifanoia di Ferrara." In *La tirannia degli astri. Gli affreschi astrologici di Palazzo Schifanoia.* Ed. by M. Bertozzi, Livorno 1999, pp. 84-111.
Ward, John L. 1983. "On the Mathematics of the Perspective of the Arnolfini Portrait and Similar Works of Jan van Eyck." The Art Bulletin 65 (n. 4, December), 680-6.
Warhol, Andy. 1975. *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol. From A to B and Back Again.* Orlando: Harvest Books.
Warner, Malcolm. 2009. "Millais in Reproduction." In *Writing the Pre-Raphaelites : Text, Context , Subtext*. Edited by Michaela Giebelhausen and Tim Barringer. Farnham: Ashgate, 215-36.
Wasser, Audrey. 2017. "How Do We Recognise Problems?" *Deleuze Studies* 11 (1), 48–67.
Waters, Hazel. 1995. "The Great Famine and the rise of anti-Irish racism." *Race and Class* 37 (n. 1, July), 95-108.
Watson, Janell. 2009. *Guattari's Diagrammatic Thought. Writing between Lacan and Deleuze.* London: Continuum.
Waugh, Norah. 1954. Corsets and Crinolines. London: Routledge.
Weigel, Sigrid. 2015. "The Flash of Knowledge and the Temporality of Images: Walter Benjamin's Image-Based Epistemology and Its Preconditions in Visual Arts and Media History." Translated by Chadwick Truscott Smith and Christine Kutschbach. *Critical Inquiry* 41 (2, Winter), 344-366.

Weigel, Sigrid. 2015. “The Flash of Knowledge and the Temporality of Images: Walter Benjamin’s Image-Based Epistemology and Its Preconditions in Visual Arts and Media History.” Translated by Chadwick Truscott Smith and Christine Kutschbach. *Critical Inquiry* 41 (n. 2, Winter), 344-66.

Weiner, Dora B., Simon Varey and Rafael Chabrán. Eds. 2000. *Searching for the Secrets of Nature: The Life and Works of Dr. Francisco Hernández.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Weingust, Don. 2014. “Authentic performances or performances of authenticity? Original practices and the repertory schedule.” *Shakespeare* 10 (n. 4), 402-10.

Welldon, Estela V. 2017. “No Longer a Taboo: Understanding Female Perversion in Motherhood.” In Perversion Now! Ed. by Diana Caine and Colin Wright, New York: Palgrave, 147-54.

Wells, Diana. 1997. *100 Flowers and How They Got Their Names*. New York: Workman Publishing.

Welter, Barbara. 1974. “The Feminization of American Religion: 1800-1860” In *Clio’s Consciousness Raised*. Ed. by Mary Hartman and Lois Banner. New York: Octagon Books, 137-157.

Werner, Marcia. 2005. Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth-Century Realism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, James V. 2004. "Mediation." In *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky.* Edited by Harry Daniels, Michael Cole, James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 178-92.

Westman, Robert S. 2011. The Copernican Question: Prognostication, Skepticism, and Celestial Order. Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 2011)

Westman, Robert S. 2013. “The Copernican Question Revisited: A Reply to Noel Swerdlow and John Heilbron,” Perspectives on Science 21, 100–136.

Westman, Robert S. 2016. “Copernicus and the Astrologers.” Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. and http://library.si.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/generalpages/2013-dibnerlecture-robertswestman.pdf.

Westman, Robert S. 2019. “How Did Copernicus Become a Copernican?” Isis 110 (issue 2, June), https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/703410.

Whistler, James Abbott McNeill. 1922. *The Gentle Art of Making Enemies*. London: William Heinemann.

Whitley, Alvin. 1956. “Keats and Hood.” *Keats-Shelley Journal* 5 (Winter), 33-47.

Whorton James C. 2010. *The Arsenic Century. How Victorian Britain Was Poisoned at Home, Work, and Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whorton, James C. 2010. The Arsenic Century. How Victorian Britain was Poisoned at Home, Work, and Play. Osford: Osford University Press.

Wiese, Dora. 2014. *The Powers of the False: Reading, Writing, Thinking Beyond Truth and Fiction*. Evanston: Northwerstern University Press.

Wilde, Oscar. 1909. "The Critic as Artist, with Some Remarks upon Doing Nothing." In *The Collected Works of Oscar Wilde. Vol. 3, Intentions and The Soul of The Man*. Boston: John Luce, 99-224.

Wilkens, Matthew. 2006. "Toward a Benjaminian Theory of Dialectical Allegory." *New Literary History* 37 (2, Critical Inquiries, Spring), 285-298.

Willcocks, Thomas. Ed. 1834. Flora poetica; or, Poetry on Flowers. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, & co.

William, Morris. 1884. “The Exhibition of The Royal Academy. By a Rare Visitor” *To-Day.* 2 (July-December), 75-91.

Williams, Deanne. 2014. “Enter Ofelia playing on a Lute. In *Shakespeare and the Performance of Girlhood*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 73-91.

Williams, James. 2011. *Gilles Deleuze’s Philosophy of Time: A Critical Introduction and Guide.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Williams, Raymond. 1966. Modern Tragedy. London: Chatto and Windus.

Williams, Robert. 2016. "Kunstwissenschaft, Bildwissenschaft, and Vasari." In *Vasari als Paradigma. Rezeption, Kritik, Perspektiven/ The Paradigm of Vasari. Reception, Criticism, Perspectives*. Ed. by Fabian Jonietz e Alessandro Nova. Collana del Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, 20. Venezia: Marsilio, 43-50.

Willoughby, Leonard Ashley. 1912. Dante Gabriel Rossetti and German Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winstanley, Lilian. 1921. Hamlet and The Scottish Succession, Being an Examination of the Relations of the Play of Hamlet to the Scottish Succession and the Essex Conspiracy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wise, Sarah. 2012. *Inconvenient People. Lunacy, Liberty and the Mad-Doctors in Victorian England*. London: The Bodley Head.

Withering, William. 1785. An Account of the Foxglove and Some of Its Medical Uses: With Practical Remarks on Dropsy and Other Diseases. Birmingham: M. Sweeny.

Wohl, Anthony S. 1991. “Gold and Mud”: Capitalism and Culture in Victorian England. Albion 23 (n. 2, Summer), 275-84.

Wojcik, Daniel. 2009. “Spirits, Apparitions, and Traditions of Supernatural Photography.” *Visual Resources: An International Journal of Documentation*, 25 (1-2), 109-36.

Wolffe, John. 2012. “The Victorian funeral sermon.” In: *Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon 1689-1901*. Edited by Francis, Keith A. and Gibson, William. Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 338–353.

Wong, Jack. 2015. "Remapping the Constellation of Walter Benjamin's Allegorical Method." American British and Canadian Studies 25 (1, December), 37-59.

Wood, Mikael. 2015. “Q&A: Madonna: ‘Caring about what people think is the death of all artists’.” Los Angeles Times, 10 March. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/music/posts/la-et-ms-madonna-rebel-heart-interview-20150310-story.html#page=1

Woods, Angela. 2011. *The Sublime Object of Psychiatry. Schizophrenia in Clinical and Cultural Theory.* London and New York: Oxford University Press.

World Metereological Organisation. 2021. “Tropical Cyclone Names.” Website. https://public.wmo.int/en/our-mandate/focus-areas/natural-hazards-and-disaster-risk-reduction/tropical-cyclones/Naming [archived 03/08/2021]

Wornum, Ralph N.. Ed. 1848. *Lectures on Painting by the Royal Academicians. Barry, Opie and Fuseli.* London: Henry G. Bohn.

Wright, Addison G. 1982. “The Widow’s Mites: Praise or Lament?—A Matter of Context.” The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 44 (n. 2), 256-65.

Wright, Elizabeth. 2000. *Lacan and Postfeminism.* Cambridge: Icon Books.

Wright, William C. 1974. "Hazlitt, Ruskin, and Nineteenth-Century Art Criticism." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (4, Summer), 509-523.

Wullschlager, Jackie. 2013. “Tate Britain’s rehang. The new chronology that brings British art to the global stage.” *Financial Times.* 17 May. https://www.ft.com/content/45978c56-bc9f-11e2-9519-00144feab7de

Yeates, Amelia and Serena Trowbridge. Eds. 2014. Pre-Raphaelite Masculinities. Constructions of Masculinity in Art and Literature. London: Routledge.

Yeates, Amelia, and Serena Trowbridge. Eds. 2017. *Pre-Raphaelite Masculinities Constructions of Masculinity in Art and Literature.* London and New York: Routledge.

Yin, Robert K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. London: SAGE.

Young, Alan R. 2002. *Hamlet and the Visual Arts, 1709-1900*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Young, Alan R. 2009. “Charles Knight and the Nineteenth-century Market for Shakespeare,” *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 103 (1), 19-41.

Young, Alan R. 2010. "Kenny Meadows’s Illustrations for Robert Tyas’s “Shakspere for the People” Project (1839–43)." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 104 (2), 219-251.

Young, Alan R. 2013. “Sarah Bernhardt’s Ophelia.” *Borrowers and Lenders* 8 (n. 1, Spring-Summer). https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/borrowers/article/view/2199

Young, Stephen Edward. 2003. *William Dodsworth 1798-1861: the origins of Tractarian thought and practice in London*. PhD thesis The Open University. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000e88f.

Yriarte, Charles. 1891. Autour des Borgia. Paris: Rothschild.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology.* New York: Verso.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1991. “Why Should a Dialectician Learn to Count to Four?” *Radical Philosophy* 58 (Summer). https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/why-should-a-dialectician-learn-to-count-to-four [archived 10/8/2021]

Žižek, Slavoj. 1995. “Woman is One of the Names-of-the-Father, or How Not to Misread Lacan’s Formulas of Sexuation.” *Lacanian Ink* 10, 24-39.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1996. “I Hear You with My Eyes.” In *Gaze and Voice as Love Objects*. Ed. by Slavoj Žižek and Renata Salecl, Durham: Duke University Press.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1996. *The Indivisible Remainder: An Essay on Schelling and Related Matters*. London: Verso.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1997. “Desire: Drive = Truth: Knowledge.” *Umbra*, 147–52. http://www.lacan.com/Žižekdesire.htm> [archived 27/7/2020]

Žižek, Slavoj. 2001. *Enjoy Your Symptom!: Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out*. Revised edition. New York.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2001. *The Fright of Real Tears. Krzysztof Kieslowski between Theory and Post-Theory*. London: British Film Institute.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2004. “The Structure of Domination Today: A Lacanian View.” *Studies in East European Thought* 56 (n. 4, The Many Faces of Slavoj Žižek’s Radicalism, December), 383-403.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2006. *How to Read Lacan*. London and New York: Norton.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2008. *The Plague of Fantasies.* London and New York: Verso.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2009. “Troubles with the Real. Lacan as a Viewer of *Alien.*” Lacan.com, 6 April. https://www.lacan.com/essays/?p=180 [archived 20 December 2021].

Žižek, Slavoj. 2013. “Why does a Letter Always Arrive at Its Destination?” *The Symptom* 13. https://www.lacan.com/symptom16/why.html [accessed 21 July 2020].

Images

Atkinson, Thomas Lewis. 1864. “The Black Brunswicker” after the painting by John Everett Millais *The Black Brunswicker*, 1859-60. Engraving and aquatint, 75 x 51.4 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1109975/the-black-brunswicker-print-atkinson-thomas-lewis/

Bingham, Robert Jefferson. 1858. “La Jeune Martyre” Albumen print, 21,5 x 16,6 cm. In *Oeuvre de Paul Delaroche / reproduit en photographie par Bingham; accompagné d’une notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Paul Delaroche ; et du catalogue raisonné de l’oeuvre par Jules Godé.* Table 75.

Bouguereau, William Adolphe. 1875. *Young Ophelia.* Oil on canvas, 56.5 x 46 cm. Private collection. https://www.bridgemanimages.com/en/asset/615712/

Brown, Ford Madox. 1847-48, reworked 1859-60. *The First Translation of the Bible into English.* Oil on canvas, 119.4 x 153.7 cm. Bradford Museums and Galleries. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-first-translation-of-the-bible-into-english-wycliffe-reading-his-translation-of-the-new-testament-to-his-protector-john-of-gaunt-duke-of-lancaster-in-the-presence-of-chaucer-and-gower-his-retainers-23065.

Brown, Ford Madox. 1848, reworked 1854. *Lear and Cordelia.* Oil on canvas, 71.1 × 99.1 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/brown-lear-and-cordelia-n03065.

Brown, Ford Madox. 1849. *William Shakespeare (c.1564–1616).* Oil on canvas, 135 x 87.5 cm. Manchester Art Gallery. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/william-shakespeare-c-15641616-205500/search/actor:brown-ford-madox-18211893-65244/page/2.

Burgin, Victor. 1984. *The Bridge – Venus Perdica*. Gelatin silver print, 112.3 x 76.6 cm. (object size), George Eastman House, Rochester NY. https://collections.eastman.org/objects/199404/the-bridge–venus-perdica?ctx=5922b6c9-3c3c-4209-994d-ae0305124771&idx=0

Cameron, Julia Margaret. 1875. *Emily Peacock (Ophelia).* Carbon print, 512 x 375 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1417860/emily-peacock-photograph-cameron-julia-margaret/

Constable, John. 1820 or 1829 (painted). *Water-meadows near Salisbury.* Oil on canvas, 45.7 x 55.3 cm estimate. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O80569/water-meadows-near-salisbury-oil-painting-john-constable/.

Constable, John. 1816. *Maria Bicknell, Mrs John Constable*. Oil on canvas 30.5 x 25.1 cm, Tate, London. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/constable-maria-bicknell-mrs-john-constable-n02655.

Constable, John. 1816. *Wivenhoe Park, Essex*. Oil on canvas, 56.1 x 101.2 cm, National Gallery of Art, Washington. https://www.nga.gov/content/ngaweb/Collection/highlights/highlight1147.html.

Constable, John. 1816-7. *Flatford Mill (Scene on a Navigable River)*. Oil on canvas. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/constable-flatford-mill-scene-on-a-navigable-river-n01273

Constable, John. 1835. ‘An ash tree.’ Pencil and watercolor on paper, 99 x 68 cm, Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1069290/an-ash-tree-watercolour-and-pencil-john-constable/

Constable, John. c. 1809. *East Bergholt House*, c.1809. Oil on canvas, 22.5 x 68.6 mm. Tate, London. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/constable-east-bergholt-house-n01235.

Constable, John. c.1816. Study for ‘Flatford Mill’. Graphite on paper. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/constable-study-for-flatford-mill-t05493

Cot, Pierre Auguste. 1870. *Ophelia / Pause for Thought.* Oil on canvas, 125.7 x 78.1 cm. Private collection. https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/55/Ophelia_%28Pierre_Auguste_Cot%29.jpg

Courbet, Gustave. 1849-50. *Burial at Ornans.* Oil on canvas, 315×668 cm. Musée d'Orsay, Paris. https://www.musee-orsay.fr/en/artworks/un-enterrement-ornans-924.

Courbet, Gustave. 1853. *The Meeting or “Bonjour, Monsieur Courbet”.* Oil on canvas, 129 cm × 149 cm. Fabre Museum, Montpellier.

David, Jacques-Louis. 1801 (first version). *Napoleon Crossing the Alps*. Oil on canvas, 261 × 221 cm. Château de Malmaison, Rueil-Malmaison

Delacroix, Eugène. 1824 (exhibited). *Massacres at Chios; Greek Families Awaiting Death or Slavery*. Oil on canvas, 4.19 x 3.54 m, Louvre, Paris. http://cartelen.louvre.fr/cartelen/visite?srv=car_not_frame&idNotice=22745&langue=en.

Delacroix, Eugène. 1838. *Death of Ophelia*. Oil on canvas, 37.9 × 45.9 cm. Neue Pinakothek, Munich. https://www.sammlung.pinakothek.de/de/artwork/A9xlknM4Wv

Delacroix, Eugène. 1843. "Death of Ophelia." Lithograph (1st state of 3), 25.9 x 18.8 cm (image), 43.2 x 34.8 cm (sheet). In *Hamlet, Treize Sujets Dessinés par Eug. Delacroix.* Paris: Gihaut Frères. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/337110

Delacroix, Eugène. 1844. *Death of Ophelia.* Oil on canvas, 52 × 64 cm. Oskar Reinhart Collection, Winterthur. https://www.akg-images.co.uk/archive/La-mort-d%E2%80%99Ophelie-2UMDHUDN2FRV.html

Delacroix, Eugène. 1853. *Death of Ophelia.* Oil on canvas, 23 x 30.5 cm. Louvre Museum, Paris. https://collections.louvre.fr/ark:/53355/cl010059387

Delaroche, Paul. 1853. *Christian Martyr Drowned in the Tiber During the Reign of Diocletian*. Oil con canvas, 73,5 x 60 cm. Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg. https://www.hermitagemuseum.org/wps/portal/hermitage/digital-collection/01.+Paintings/37605

Delaroche, Paul. 1855. *Young Christian Martyr*. Oil on canvas, 170 X 148 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris. https://collections.louvre.fr/ark:/53355/cl010066492

Deverell Walter Howell. 1850 (exhibited). *Twelfth Night. Act II, Scene IV*. Oil on canvas, 101.6 x 132.1 cm. Private collection. https://www.christies.com/en/lot/lot-4051719.

Devéria, Achille and Louis Boulanger. 1827. *Souvenirs du théâtre anglais à Paris, avec un texte par M. Moreau*. Paris, Henri Gaugain, Lambert et Compagnie.

Devéria, Achille. 1836. "Les Huguenots." *Album de l'Opéra.* 13. Act 5, scene 2, trio. Décor by Philippe Chaperon. Lithograph. Paris: Opéra. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84379784

Diamond, Hugh Welch. 1852. *Plate 32.* Albumen print from a wet collodion negative, Royal Society of Medicine, London.

Diamond, Hugh Welch. c. 1852-6. *Untitled.* Albumen print from wet collodion negative, 16.6 × 13.5 cm. MoMA, New York. https://www.moma.org/collection/works/49346

Diamond, Hugh Welch. c. 1852-8. *Untitled* ("Ophelia"). Albumen print from wet collodion negative. In Pearl 2009: 295, Burrows and Schumacher: 1979: Plate 15

Doré, Louis Christophe Paul Gustave. 1872. "'Take her up tenderly, lift her with care, Fashion'd so slenderly, young and so fair.'" Book illustration for "The Bridge of Sighs" [1844] in *The Favourite Poems of Thomas Hood. Illustrated by Gustave Doré.* London: Moxon. Engraved by Lumb Stocks. https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/the-favourite-poems-of-thomas-hood-with-illustrations-by-dor

Egg, Augustus. 1858. *Past and Present n. 1-3.* Oil on canvas 63,5 × 76,2 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/egg-past-and-present-no-1-n03278; https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/egg-past-and-present-no-2-n03279; https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/egg-past-and-present-no-3-n03280 [accessed 13/08/2021]

Fildes, Samuel Luke. 1869. "Houseless and Hungry." Wood engraving, 29.2 x 40.6 cm. *The Graphic* 1 (12 April), 9.

Fildes, Samuel Luke. 1874. *Applicants for Admission to a Casual Ward.* Oil on canvas. Royal Holloway College Collection, Egham, Surrey. https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/about-us/art-collections/collection-highlights/applicants-for-admission-to-a-casual-ward/ A copy of the painting made by Fildes after 1908 can be seen at Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/fildes-applicants-for-admission-to-a-casual-ward-t01227

Frohlich, Fabian. 2016. Portrait of Elizabeth I attributed to Steven van der Meulen. Color photograph. https://www.blindbild.com/london-tate-britain-september-2016/tate-britain-elisabeth/

Fuseli, Henry. 1766. "Garrick as Duke of Gloucester waiting for Lady Anne at the Funeral Procession of her father-in-law, Henry VI." Pen and wash on paper, 31.5 x 45.7 cm. Kunsthaus, Zurich. https://aith.unl.edu/Image_Display.php?ImageID=406

Fuseli, Henry. 1770-8. "The Death of Ophelia." From the "Roman Album." Brush drawing and grey wash, over graphite on paper. British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1885-0314-234

Fuseli, Henry. 1781, *Dido*. Oil on canvas, 244.3 x 183.4 cm, Yale Center for British Art, New Haven.

Fuseli, Henry. 1812 (? exhibited). *Lady Macbeth Seizing the Daggers*. Oil on canvas. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/fuseli-lady-macbeth-seizing-the-daggers-t00733

Fuseli, Henry. c. 1760. "Garrick and Mrs Pritchard as Macbeth and Lady Macbeth after the Murder of Duncan." Pen and wash, watercolour and white heightening on paper, 32.2 x 39.4 cm. Kunsthaus, Zurich. https://www.akg-images.com/archive/Garrick-and-Mrs.-Pritchard-as-Macbeth-and-Lady-Macbeth-after-the-murder-of-King-Duncan–2UMDHUD2J31U.html

Gainsborough, Thomas. c. 1750. *Mr and Mrs Andrews*. Oil on canvas, 69.8 x 119.4 cm, National Gallery, London. https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/thomas-gainsborough-mr-and-mrs-andrews.

Gainsborough, Thomas. c.1778–80. *Gypsy Encampment, Sunset.* Oil on canvas, 120.6 x 150.5 cm. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/gainsborough-gypsy-encampment-sunset-n05803.

Galileo Galilei. *Drawings of the Moon*, November-December 1609. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence, Ms. Gal. 48, f. 28r. Reproduced at the Museo Galileo

https://brunelleschi.imss.fi.it/galileopalazzostrozzi/object/GalileoGalileiDrawingsOfTheMoon.html [accessed 25 April 2022].

Galileo Galilei. *Drawings of the Moon*, November-December 1609. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence, Ms. Gal. 48, f. 28r. Reproduced at the Museo Galileo https://brunelleschi.imss.fi.it/galileopalazzostrozzi/object/GalileoGalileiDrawingsOfTheMoon.html [accessed 25 April 2022].

Géricault, Théodore. 1819-22. *Portrait of a Woman Suffering from Obsessive Envy, also known as The Hyena of the Salpêtrière.* Oil on canvas, 72 x 58 cm. Musée des Beaux Arts, Lyon. https://www.mba-lyon.fr/en/fiche-oeuvre/portrait-woman-suffering-obsessive-envy-also-known-hyena-salpetriere

Ghirlandaio, Domenico. 1485-90. Birth of the Baptist. Fresco. Tornabuoni Chapel, Santa Maria Novella, Florence. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tornabuoni_Chapel#/media/File:Cappella_tornabuoni,_12,_Nascita_di_san_giovanni_battista.jpg

Gibert, Antonio. 1809. "Napoleone Il Grande" After Jacques-Louis David's *Napoleon Crossing the Alps,* 1801. Engraving with etching, 66.0 x 47.4 cm. Royal Collection. https://www.rct.uk/collection/617691/napoleone-il-grande

Gillray, James. 1802. "Caricature of the advantages of wearing muslin dresses." Hand coloured engraving, 25.5 x 35.1 cm. Royal Holloway, University of London. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/advantages-of-wearing-muslin-dresses-282506

Heath, James. 1804. "Mac. I have done the deed. Act 2, Scene 2." Engraving after Lady Macbeth Seizing the Daggers by Henri Fuseli, in volume 21 x 15 cm. London: J. Robinson. https://jjhc.info/heathjames1834shakespeare13

Highmore, Joseph. 1743–4. I: Mr B. Finds Pamela Writing. Oil on canvas. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/highmore-i-mr-b-finds-pamela-writing-n03573

Highmore, Joseph. 1750. Samuel Richardson. Oil on canvas. National Portrait Gallery, London. https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw05320/Samuel-Richardson?LinkID=mp03775&role=sit&rNo=1

Hill, David Octavius and Robert Adamson. 1843-7. "Major and Misses Kemp [Group 151]." Salted paper print, 15.20 x 21.10 cm. Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh. https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/72622/major-and-misses-kemp-group-151?search=Kemp&search_set_offset=35

Hill, David Octavius and Robert Adamson. 1843-8. "Miss Kemp as Ophelia." Salted paper print from paper negative, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/268384.

Hogarth, William. 1743. *Marriage A-la-Mode: 4, The Toilette.* Oil on canvas, 69.9 cm × 90.8 cm. National Gallery, London. https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/william-hogarth-marriage-a-la-mode-4-the-toilette.

Hone, Nathaniel. 1775. *The Conjuror.* Oil on canvas, 145 x 173 cm. National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin. http://onlinecollection.nationalgallery.ie/objects/3257/the-conjuror.

Hughes, Arthur. 1852. *Ophelia*. Oil on canvas, 68.7cm x 123.8 cm. Manchester City Art Gallery. https://manchesterartgallery.org/collections/title/?mag-object-6087

Hunt, William Holman. 1849-50. *A Converted British Family Sheltering a Christian Missionary from the Persecution of the Druids.* Oil on canvas, 111 x 141 cm. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. https://collections.ashmolean.org/collection/browse-9148/object/44467

Hunt, William Holman. 1850. *The Lady of Shalott*. Black chalk, pen and ink, 235 x 142mm, National Gallery of Victoria, Adelaide. https://www.ngv.vic.gov.au/essay/the-breaking-of-the-web-william-holman-hunts-two-early-versions-of-the-lady-of-shallot/).

Hunt, William Holman. 1850-1. *Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus*. Oil on canvas. City Art Gallery, Birmingham. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1887P953/two-gentlemen-of-verona-valentine-rescuing-sylvia-from-proteus

Hunt, William Holman. 1850-1. *Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus.* Oil on canvas, 100.2 cm × 133.4 cm. Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham.

Hunt, William Holman. 1851. *The Hireling Shepherd.* Oil on canvas, 110.4cm x 144.5 cm. Manchester City Art Gallery. https://manchesterartgallery.org/collections/title/?mag-object-195

Hunt, William Holman. 1851-6. *The Light of the World.* Oil on canvas, 49.8 x 26.1 cm. Manchester City Gallery. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-light-of-the-world-205246

Landseer, Edwin. 1841. *Waldman.* Oil on panel, 40.5 x 30.1 cm. Royal Collection. https://www.rct.uk/collection/403101/waldmann

Le Brun, Charles. [1801]. "Rapture" ["La Contemplation"] In *Heads Representing the Various Passions of the Soul, As They Are Expressed in the Human Countenance: Drawn by the Great Master Mons. Le Brun and Finely Engraved on Twenty Folio Copper Plates Nearly the Size of Life*. London: Darling &

Thompson, 6. Cf. the original engraving after Le Brun by Henri Testelin (1696), https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/369915.
Lely, Peter. c.1650–5. *Susanna and the Elders*. Oil on canvas. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/lely-susanna-and-the-elders-t00452
Lemaire, Madeleine (After). c. 1880. *Ophelia.* Photogravure from lost painting. 30.5 x 24.2 cm. https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/f/f7/Ophelia_%281880%29%2C_de_Madeleine_Lemaire_%281845-1928%29.jpg
Linnell, John. 1848. *Noah: The Eve of the Deluge*. Oil on canvas, 146 x 221 cm. Clevelan Museum of Art. https://www.clevelandart.org/art/1972.119
Lorrain, Claude. 1646. *Landscape with Hagar and the Angel*. Oil on canvas mounted on wood, 52.2 x 42.3 cm, National Gallery, London. https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/claude-landscape-with-hagar-and-the-angel
Maclise, Daniel. 1858-9. Cartoon for 'The Meeting of Wellington and Blücher After the Battle of Waterloo'. Chalk on paper, on ten separate sheets attached to individual panels, 337.2 x 1381.8 cm. Royal Academy of Arts, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/cartoon-for-the-meeting-of-wellington-and-blucher-after-the-battle-of
Maclise, Daniel. 1861. *The Meeting of Wellington and Blucher after the Battle of Waterloo*. Waterglass painting mural, 1392 x 368.3 cm. Parliamentary Art Collection, London. https://heritagecollections.parliament.uk/collections/getrecord/HOP_WOA_3246
Maclise, Daniel. Exhibited 1842. *The Play Scene in 'Hamlet'.* Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/maclise-the-play-scene-in-hamlet-n00422
Manet, Edouard. 1876. *Woman Before a Mirror.* Oil on canvas 93 x 71.6 cm. Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York.
Manet, Eduard. 1864. *The Dead Christ with Angels.* Oil on canvas, 179.4 x 149.9 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art, New York. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/436950
Masson, André. 1937. *Ophelia.* Oil on canvas, 113.7 × 146.7 cm. Baltimore Museum of Art, Baltimore. https://collection.artbma.org/objects/37706/ophelia?ctx=cd96b7a4d6e9f6e2ba0111ce5345c22d0d8dba96&idx=46
Meisel, Steven. 2010. "Water and Oil" In *Vogue Italia* (n. 720, August). https://www.vogue.it/en/fashion/cover-fashion-stories/2010/08/02/water-oil/?refresh_ce=
Meulen, Steven van der, or Steven van Herwijck, or George Gower. c.1563. *Portrait of Elizabeth I.* Oil on canvas transferred from wood panel, 196 x 140 cm. Private collection. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/meulen-herwijck-portrait-of-elizabeth-i-x49543 [accessed 20/7/2016] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Elizabeth_I_Steven_Van_Der_Meulen.jpg [accessed 25/12/2021]
Millais, John Everett (after). *Ophelia. After the painting in Tate, London*. Oil on canvas. Private collection. https://www.christies.com/lot/lot-after-sir-john-everett-millais-ophelia-5107146/?from=searchresults&intObjectID=5107146
Millais, John Everett, after. 1857. *A Huguenot*. Engraved by Thomas Oldham Barlow. Mezzotint on chine collé, 74,2 x 50.9 cm. British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_2010-7081-5524
Millais, John Everett. 1846. *The Tribe of Benjamin Seizing the Daughter of Shiloh in the Vineyards.* Oil on canvas, 102,2 x 128 cm. Private collection. https://www.sothebys.com/en/buy/auction/2019/19th-century-european-art/sir-john-everett-millais-p-r-a-the-tribe-of
Millais, John Everett. 1847. *The Artist Attending the Mourning of a Young Girl*. Oil on board, 18.7 x 25.7 cm, Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-the-artist-attending-the-mourning-of-a-young-girl-t07135
Millais, John Everett. 1847. *The Widow's Mite*. Fragment. Oil on canvas. 243,8 x 152,4. Christchurch Priory, Hampshire, UK. https://www.historychristchurch.org.uk/content/interesting-articles/significant-people/sir-john-millais-r-1829-1896-christchurch
Millais, John Everett. 1847-8. *Cymon and Iphigenia.* Oil on canvas, 114.3 x 147.3 cm. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Wirrall, Merseyside. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/cymon-and-iphigenia-102597
Millais, John Everett. 1848. "Ferdinand and Ariel." Pen and black ink on paper, 28.4 x 20 cm. Signed and dated. Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.
Millais, John Everett. 1848. *Portrait of Serjeant Ralph Thomas*. Oil on wood panel, 407 × 303 mm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-serjeant-ralph-thomas-n03159.
Millais, John Everett. 1848-9. *Isabella.* Oil on canvas, 142.8 x 103,0 cm. Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool. https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/isabella/CwFtBpu0rX8J_w?hl=en-GB.
Millais, John Everett. 1849. "Study for the Head of Ferdinand in 'Ferdinand Lured by Ariel'". Graphite on paper, 17.5 x 13 cm. Yale Center for British Art.

Millais, John Everett. 1849. *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*. Oil on board, 14.6 x 10.9 cm. Sudley House, Liverpool. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/ferdinand-lured-by-ariel-104502

Millais, John Everett. 1849. *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*. Oil on board, 14.6 cm x 10.9 cm. Sudley House, Liverpool. https://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/artifact/ferdinand-lured-ariel.

Millais, John Everett. 1849-50. *Christ in the House of His Parents (The Carpenter's Shop).* Oil on canvas, 86,4 x 139,7 cm. Tate, London.

Millais, John Everett. 1849-50. *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*. Oil on canvas, 64.8 x 50.8 cm. Private collection. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Lured_by_Ariel#/media/File:Millais_ferdy.jpg

Millais, John Everett. 1849-50. *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*. Oil on canvas, 65 cm × 51 cm. Private collection.

Millais, John Everett. 1850-1. "A Huguenot." Sketch of a Woman placing Chain and Cross round her Lover's Neck – Position Of Figures Approaches Final Design Except Girl Places Chain And Cross Around Lover's Neck Instead Of Badge On His Arm. Study For Oil. Pen and ink over pencil on paper. Birmingham Museum. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1906P622/a-huguenot-e59ae912-43f6-4843-be6a-93839caf453a

Millais, John Everett. 1850-1. *Mariana.* Oil on mahogany wood. 59,7 x 49,5 cm. Tate, London. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-mariana-t07553.

Millais, John Everett. 1850-1. *The Woodman's Daughter.* Oil on canvas, 88,9 x 64,8 cm. Guildhall Art Gallery, London.

Millais, John Everett. 1851. *Mrs. Coventry Patmore.* Oil on canvas, 19.7 x 20.3 cm. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. https://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/3638

Millais, John Everett. 1851. *The Bridesmaid*. Oil on panel, 27.9 x 20.3 cm. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

Millais, John Everett. 1851-2. "A Huguenot." Study of figures. Man standing on the left, girl on the right. Pencil on paper. Birmingham Museum. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1906P621/a-huguenot

Millais, John Everett. 1851-2. *A Huguenot, on St. Bartholomew's Day, Refusing to Shield Himself from Danger by Wearing the Roman Catholic Badge*. Oil on canvas 92.71 x 64.13 cm. Private collection.

Millais, John Everett. 1852. "A Huguenot." Compositional Study – The Figure Of The Huguenot Stands On The Right, And That Of The Girl On The Left, In The Design Finally Adopted In The Picture. Pen and ink on paper. Birmingham Museum. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1920P11/a-huguenot-475f9108-008b-4bef-a3ea-b0a8a64810d4

Millais, John Everett. 1852. "Head Study." Pencil On Cream-Toned Paper. Birmingham Museum. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1906P664/ophelia

Millais, John Everett. 1852. "Slight Sketch for the painting Ophelia." Graphite on light gray wove paper, 156 x 99 mm. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. https://www.themorgan.org/drawings/item/123164

Millais, John Everett. 1852–53. *The Proscribed Royalist, 1651.* Oil on canvas, 102.8 cm × 73.6 cm. Private collection.

Millais, John Everett. 1853-6. *The Blind Girl.* Oil on canvas, 53,4 x 80,8 cm. Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery. https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/the-blind-girl/kAF2cbM1fB9Hzw?hl=en

Millais, John Everett. 1854. *The Lady of Shalott*. 1854. Pen, brown ink & wash on paper, 16.0 x 24.6 cm, Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide. http://www.artgallery.sa.gov.au/agsa/home/Collection/detail.jsp?accNo=01D11

Millais, John Everett. 1858. "The Bridge of Sighs." Etching, 17.5 x 12.5cm (plate marks). In *Passages from the Poems of Thomas Hood, Illustrated by the Junior Etching Club, in Thirty-Four Plates*. Plate 10. London: Gambart. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O140176/the-bridge-of-sighs-print-millais-john-everett/

Millais, John Everett. 1858-9. *The Vale of Rest.* Oil on canvas, 102,9 × 172,7 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-the-vale-of-rest-n01507

Millais, John Everett. 1860. *The Black Brunswicker*. Oil on canvas, 104 cm × 68.5 cm. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Wirral. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-black-brunswicker-102595

Millais, John Everett. 1862. *My First Sermon.* Oil on canvas, 92 x 77 cm. Guildhall Art Gallery, London. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/my-first-sermon-51102

Millais, John Everett. 1864. "Illustrations to *The Parables of Our Lord.*" Series of 20 wood engravings on paper, 14.0 x 10.8 cm. In *The parables of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: with pictures by John Everett Millais. Engraved by the Brothers Dalziel*. London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, Farringdon Street. Tate, London https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-illustrations-to-the-parables-of-our-lord-engraved-by-the-dalziel-brothers-65652. British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1992-0406-244

Millais, John Everett. 1864. *My Second Sermon.* Oil on canvas, 97 x 62 cm. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/my-second-sermon-51103

Millais, John Everett. 1865. *Joan of Arc.* Oil on canvas, 82 x 62 cm. Private collection. https://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2003/important-british-pictures-l03123/lot.25.html
Millais, John Everett. 1868. *A Souvenir of Velazquez.* Oil on canvas, 102.7 x 82.4 cm. Royal Academy, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/a-souvenir-of-velazquez.
Millais, John Everett. 1870. "Dickens After Death." Graphite on paper, 21.35 × 34.6 cm. Charles Dickens Museum, London. Reproduced in Millais 1900 v. 2: 31.
Millais, John Everett. 1870. *Chill October.* Oil on canvas, 141 x 186.5 cm. Private collection. https://www.wikiart.org/en/john-everett-millais/chill-october
Millais, John Everett. 1871. *Flowing to the River.* Oil, canvas, 139.7 x 188 cm. Tate Britain, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-flowing-to-the-river-l01852
Millais, John Everett. 1871. *Flowing to the Sea*. Oil on canvas, 143.0 x 188.0 cm, Southampton City Art Gallery. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/flowing-to-the-sea-16884/search/actor:millais-john-everett-18291896/page/4).
Millais, John Everett. 1871. *The Martyr of the Solway.* Oil on canvas, 70.5 x 56.5 cm. Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool. https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/the-martyr-of-the-solway-john-everett-millais/zgHu888n3_dObw?hl=en
Millais, John Everett. 1881. *Benjamin Disraeli.* Oil on canvas, 127,6 x 93,1 cm. National Portrait Gallery, London. https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw00408/Benjamin-Disraeli-Earl-of-Beaconsfield
Millais, John Everett. 1881. *John Newman.* Oil on canvas, 121.3 x 95.3 cm. National Portrait Gallery, London. https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw07727/John-Newman
Millais, John Everett. 1884. *An Idyll of 1745.* Oil on canvas, 140 x 191 cm. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Wirral, UK. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/an-idyll-of-1745-102591
Millais, John Everett. 1886. *Bubbles (A Child's World).* Oil on canvas, 109.2 x 78.7 cm. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight, Liverpool.
Millais, John Everett. 1889–90. *Dew-Drenched Furze.* Oil on canvas, 173.2 × 123.0 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-dew-drenched-furze-t12865
Millais, John Everett. After. 1866. "Ophelia (Shakespeare, Hamlet, Act 4, Scene 7)". Mezzotint, etching and stipple on chine collé, 52.5 × 86.3 cm. Engraved by James Stephenson, Published by Henry Graves & Company (London). The MET, New York.
Millais, John Everett. After. 1886. "Bubbles." Chromolithograph, c. 44.1 x 33.7 cm. *The Illustrated London News* 89 (6 December, Christmas Edition).
Millais, John Everett. After. 1888 or 1889. "Pears' Soap." Advertisement. Chromolithograph, 16.5 x 11.6 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, london. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O727113/bubbles-print-millais-john-everett/
Millais, John Everett. c. 1849-50. "The Eve of the Deluge." Graphite, with pen and black ink on paper. British Museum, London. https://www.bmimages.com/preview.asp?image=00185584001
Millais, John Everett. *Ophelia*. 1851-2. Oil on canvas. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/millais-ophelia-n01506
O'Neil, After Henry Nelson. 1852. "Scene from Hamlet - King, Ophelia and Leartes." Wood engraving, unsigned, after O'Neil's untraced painting, 16.5 x 22.0 cm, published in *Illustrated London News*, 22 May 1852, 408. British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1857-0613-1065 [accessed 25 April 2022].
O'Neil, After Henry Nelson. 1852. "Scene from Hamlet - King, Ophelia and Leartes." Wood engraving, unsigned, after O'Neil's untraced painting, 16.5 x 22.0 cm, published in *Illustrated London News*, 22 May 1852, 408. British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1857-0613-1065 [accessed 25 April 2022].
Queen Victoria. 1852. "Grisi and Mario in Les Huguenots dated May 8 1852" Pencil and ink, 10.9 x 17.8 cm. Royal Collection. https://www.rct.uk/collection/980011-ap
Rackham, Arthur. 1909. "To this brook Ophelia came." Illustration. In . *Tales from Shakespeare, Volume 2*. by Carles Lamb and Mary Lamb. London: Dent / New York: Dutton, 268. https://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/d5f3c0b0-7af4-0130-ed34-58d385a7bbd0.
Raphael. 1507. *The Borghese Deposition*. Oil on wood, 184 × 176 cm, Galleria Borghese, Rome. https://galleriaborghese.beniculturali.it/en/opere/deposition/
Raphael. 1515-6. *Acts of the Apostles.* Seven of ten original cartoons for tapistries. Gouache on paper. Royal Collection on loan at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://www.vam.ac.uk/collections/raphael-cartoons#articles.
Redgrave, Richard. 1842. *Ophelia Weaving Her Garlands.* Oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O80570/ophelia-weaving-her-garlands-oil-painting-redgrave-richard/

Redgrave, Richard. 1844. *The Governess.* Oil on canvas, c. 71.1 x 91.5 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O17822/the-governess-oil-painting-redgrave-richard-cb/ For the sketches, see https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1250741/studies-for-the-poor-teacher-drawing-richard-redgrave/ Another version of the painting is *The Poor Teacher* (1845), oil on canvas, 63.8 x 76.4 cm. Shipley Art Gallery, Gateshead. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-poor-teacher-35661

Redgrave, Richard. 1846. "Compositional Study for *Love and Labour.*" Pen and ink, signed and dated at the back, 65 x 114 mm. Royal Academy, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/compositional-study-for-love-and-labour.

Redgrave, Richard. 1846. *The Sempstress.* Oil on canvas, 63.9 × 76.9 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/redgrave-the-sempstress-t14166.

Redgrave, Richard. 1848. "Or if the earlier season lead . . ." Etching, trial proof before text, signed and dated. 7.1 x 12.3 cm. In Casteras and Parkinson 1988: 133, n. 92

Redgrave, Richard. 1851. *The Outcast.* Oil on canvas 78.4 x 107.1 cm. Royal Academy of Art, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/the-outcast

Redgrave, Richard. 1852 (exhibited). *Love and Labour.* Location unknown. Etching by Butterworth and Heath published in *The Art Journal* n.s. 5, 1859, p. 205.

Redgrave, Richard. 1857, dated 1852. "The Lover's Reverie," Etching, 129 mm x 117 mm. In *Etchings for the Art-Union of London by the Etching Club*, 1857, [pl.22]. Royal Academy of Arts, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/the-lovers-reverie

Redgrave, Richard. c. 1842. *Cinderella About to Try on the Glass Slipper.* Oil on canvas, c. 107.7 x 142.2 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O80644/cinderella-about-to-try-on-oil-painting-redgrave-richard/

Redgrave, Richard. c. 1851. “Compositional study for The Outcast.” Pen and ink on wove paper, 9,5 x 13.8 cm. Royal Academy of Arts, London. https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/work-of-art/compositional-study-for-i-the-outcast-i

Redgrave. Richard. 1846. *The Sempstress.* Oil on canvas, 639 × 769 mm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/redgrave-the-sempstress-t14166.

Rembrandt. 1642. *Officers and Men of the Amsterdam Kloveniers Militia, the Company of Captain Frans Banning Cocq (The Night Watch).* Signed and dated ‘Rembrandt f 1642’. Oil on canvas, 363 x 438 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. https://www.rembrandthuis.nl/en/meet-rembrandt/rembrandt-the-artist/most-important-work/the-night-watch/; high resolution: https://g.co/arts/3ZxWe1L1FMYrxHcP7

Reynolds, Joshua. 1773. Three Ladies Adorning a Term of Hymen. Oil on canvas. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/reynolds-three-ladies-adorning-a-term-of-hymen-n00079

Reynolds, Joshua. 1783–4. *Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse.* Oil on canvas, 239. 4 x 147.6 cm, The Huntington, San Marino, CA. https://emuseum.huntington.org/objects/245/sarah-kemble-siddons-as-the-tragic-muse?ctx=36ddbf647270858d2b8ca6ea81377ca82b2a2ae4&idx=4 [accessed 20 June 2022].

Reynolds, Joshua. c.1775-81. *The Death of Dido.* Oil on canvas, 147.5 x 239.2 cm, Royal Collection, London. https://www.rct.uk/collection/404696/the-death-of-dido

Reynolds, Joshua. s.d. “Studio Experiments in Colour and Media.” Oil on canvas. Royal Academy of Arts, London. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/studio-experiments-in-colour-and-media-149141/search/keyword:joshua-reynolds/page/10

Robinson, Hery Peach. 1858. *Fading Away.* Albumen print, albumen silver print from five glass negatives, 23.8 x 37.5 cm. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1410548/fading-away-photograph-robinson-henry-peach/

Romney, George. c. 1784. “Mrs Siddons.” Oil on canvas, 75 x 65 cm. The Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/mrs-siddons-142657

Roqueplan, Camille. 1836. *Duet Raoul-Valentine from Meyerbeer’s Les Huguenots (Act IV).* Oil on canvas, 275 x 195 cm. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Bordeaux. https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/8/89/Roqueplan_Raoul_Valentine.jpg

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1848-9. *The Girlhood of Mary Virgin.* Oil on canvas, 83,2 × 65,4 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-the-girlhood-of-mary-virgin-n04872.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1851-3. *‘Slosh’: Caricature of John Everett Millais.* Pen and brown ink with ink wash on laid writing paper. Birmingham Museum. https://www.birminghammuseums.org.uk/explore-art/items/1904P437/caricature-of-john-everett-millais

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1853-4. *Hamlet and Ophelia.* Pen and brown ink over graphite on paper, 257 x 181mm, British Museum, London. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1974-0406-11

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1854. *Hamlet and Ophelia - Compositional Sketch.* Pencil, with lines of brown ink, on light blue laid paper, 218 x 304mm, Birmingham Museums and Art gallery. https://dams.birminghammuseums.org.uk/asset-bank/action/viewAsset?id=21363&index=48&total=&popularityId=3

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1858. *Hamlet and Ophelia, illustration to William Shakespeare's 'Hamlet', Act III, Sc i.* Pen and black ink, 309 x 261mm, British Museum, London. http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=738738&partId=1&searchText=rossetti+hamlet&page=1

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1863. *Helen of Troy.* Oil on board, 32.8 x 27.7 cm. Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg. https://www.hamburger-kunsthalle.de/sammlung-online/dante-gabriel-rossetti/helena-von-troja.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1863. *Woman in Yellow*. Watercolour on paper. Tate, London. Exhibited in "BP Highlights: Works on paper 1840-1910." http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-woman-in-yellow-n05233

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1864. *First Madness of Ophelia.* Watercolour on paper, 394 x 292mm, Gallery Oldham. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-first-madness-of-ophelia-244041

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1865. *Hamlet and Ophelia - Compositional Study.* 1865. Pen and brown ink, over pencil, on paper, 125 x 170mm. Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery. https://dams.birminghammuseums.org.uk/asset-bank/action/viewAsset?id=21261&index=30&total=34&view=viewSearchItem

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1866. *Hamlet and Ophelia.* Watercolor and gum arabic on paper, 381 x 279mm, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1866-8 (begun 1864, exhibited 1867, altered 1872-3). *Lady Lilith*. Oil on canvas, 99.1 × 86.4 cm. Delaware Art Museum, Wilmington, US. https://emuseum.delart.org/objects/6457/lady-lilith

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1867a. *Lady Lilith.* Reduced watercolour copy from the painting at the Delaware Art Museum. Private collection. https://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2017/victorian-pre-raphaelite-british-impressionist-art-l17132/lot.7.html

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 1867b. *Lady Lilith.* Watercolour copy after the painting at the Delaware Art Museum by Henry Treffry Dunn, Metropolitan Museum, New York. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/337500

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. c.1864–70. *Beata Beatrix*. Oil on canvas, 86.4 x 66.0 cm, Tate Britain, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/rossetti-beata-beatrix-n01279

Roth, Chrétien Frederic Guillaume. 1780. "Essai d'une distribution généalogique des Sciences et des Arts Principaux. Selon l'Explication détaillée du Système des Connaissances Humaines dans le Discours préliminaire des Editeurs de l'Encyclopédie publiée par M. Diderot et M. d'Alembert, À Paris en 1751 Reduit en cette forme pour découvrir la connaissance Humaine d'un coup d'oeil. Par Chrétien Frederic Guillaume Roth, À Weimar, 1769." Published as a fold-out frontispiece in Pierre Mouchon, *Table analytique et raisonnée des matieres contenues dans les XXXIII volumes in-folio du Dictionnaire des sciences, des arts et des métiers, et dans son supplément.* Vol. 1. Paris: Panckoucke. https://encyclopedie.uchicago.edu/content/arbre-g%C3%A9n%C3%A9alogique [accessed 20 June 2022].

S.n. after 1786. "Sarah Siddons as Ophelia. Enter Ophelia, fantastically dressed with straws and flowers. Laertes: "O heat, dry up my brains! tears, seven times salt, burn out the sense and virtue of mine eye!... — *Hamlet* Act IV" Pen and ink wash on paper, 18.7 x 16.3 cm., on sheet 27.0 x 20.3 cm. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington. https://luna.folger.edu/luna/servlet/detail/FOLGERCM1~6~6~361853~130645:Sarah-Siddons-as-Ophelia-in-Shakesp# [archived 21/12/2020]

Sant, James. 1864. *Ophelia* Oil on Canvas, 76.8 x 63.5 cm. Private collection.

Severn, Joseph. c. 1860. *Ophelia*. Oil con canvas 115 x 143.5 cm. Private collection. https://www.mutualart.com/Artwork/Ophelia/1933F762D99D2803
"According to the catalogue entry, a Miss Jane Mowatt served as Severn's model for the painting, which the artist sold to the Duke of Devonshire, Chatsworth. Ophelia was No. 701 at the 1862 International Exhibition." (Sotheby's Belgravia catalogue 1975, no. 49.https://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2011/victorian-edwardian-art/lot.27.html)

Shaw, Sam. 1955. "Marilyn Monroe Getting Ready at a Makeup Table, New York 1955." Black and White photograph. Getty Images ref. MarilynMonroeB&W186a_R.

Siddal, Elisabeth. 1853. *The Lady of Shalott*. Pencil on paper, 16.5 x 22.3 cm, Maas Gallery, London. https://www.pubhist.com/w22610

Stubbs, George. 1763 (? exhibited). *Horse Frightened by a Lion.* Oil on canvas, 70.5 × 101.9 mm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/stubbs-horse-frightened-by-a-lion-t06869

Titian. 1512-15. *Portrait of a Woman with a Mirror.* Oil on canvas 99 x 76 cm. Louvre Museum, Paris. http://merovingio.c2rmf.cnrs.fr/iipimage/ENI_Tiziano/

Turner, Joseph Mallord William. 1850 (exhibited). The Departure of the Fleet. Oil on canvas 89.9 × 120. 3 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/turner-the-departure-of-the-fleet-n00554

Veit, Philipp. 1840. *Der Heiland an der Türe.* Brush, pen and ink, 28.7 x 19.6 cm. Private collection. http://www.artnet.com/artists/philipp-veit/der-heiland-an-der-t%C3%BCre-9udMUpfBJSzd3r-v2haI5g2.

Velázquez, Diego Rodríguez de Silva y, and Workshop. 1654. *Portrait of the Infanta Margarita Theresa*. Oil on canvas, 70 x 58 cm. Louvre Museum, Paris. https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010060792

Vermeer, Johannes. 1660-1. *View of Delft*. Oil on canvas, 115.7 x 96.5 cm. Maurithuis, Delft. https://www.mauritshuis.nl/en/our-collection/artworks/92-view-of-delft/#detail-data

Vermeer, Johannes. 1666-8. The Art of Painting. Oil on canvas, 120 x 100 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien. https://www.khm.at/en/objectdb/detail/2574/

Von Max, Gabriel Cornelius. 1867. *The Anatomist.* Oil on canvas, 136,5 x 189,5 cm. Neue Pinakothek, Munich. https://www.pinakothek.de/en/node/1942

Walker, Frederick. 1871. *The Woman in White*. Watercolour on paper. Tate, London. Exhibited in "BP Highlights: Works on paper 1840-1910." http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/walker-the-woman-in-white-n02080

Warburg, Aby. 1986-1900. Nymphenfragment. Cover of Manuscript. Warburg Institute Archive, London. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312641190_Ninfa_e_Gradiva_dalla_percezione_individuale_alla_memoria_storica_sovrapersonale/figures?lo=1

Waterhouse, John William. 1888. *The Lady of Shalott*. Oil on canvas. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/waterhouse-the-lady-of-shalott-n01543

Waterhouse, John William. 1889. *Ophelia.* Oil on canvas 98 x 158 cm, Private collection.

Waterhouse, John William. 1894. *Ophelia.* Oil on canvas 73.6 × 124.4 cm, Private collection.

Waterhouse, John William. 1910. *Ophelia.* Oil on canvas 101.5 X 63.5 cm, Private collection. https://www.wikiart.org/en/john-william-waterhouse/ophelia-1910

Watts, George Frederic. 1848-50. *Found Drowned.* Oil on canvas, 119.4 x W 213.4 cm. Watts Gallery, Guildford, UK. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/found-drowned-12744

Watts, George Frederic. 1850. *Irish Famine.* Oil on canvas, 180.3 x W 198.1 cm. Watts Gallery, Guildford, Surrey. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/irish-famine-13375

Watts, George Frederic. 1850. *Song of the Shirt.* Oil on canvas, 144.8 x 127 cm. Watts Gallery, Guildford, Surrey. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/song-of-the-shirt-13371

Watts, George Frederic. 1850. *Under the Dry Arch.* Oil on canvas, 137 x 101.5 cm. Watts Gallery, Guildford, Surrey. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/under-the-dry-arch-12753

Watts, George Frederic. c. 1864, reworked 1878-80. *Ophelia*. Oil on canvas, approx. 25 x 30 inches. Watts Gallery, Guildford, Surrey. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/ophelia-13336

Watts, George Frederic. *Ophelia.* Oil on canvas, 76.2 x 63.5 cm. Watts Gallery, Guildford, UK. https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/ophelia-13336

West, Benjamin. 1792. *Hamlet: Act IV, Scene V (Ophelia before the King and Queen).* Oil on canvas, 276.9 x 387.4 cm, Cincinnati Art Museum. https://www.cincinnatiartmuseum.org/art/explore-the-collection?id=11295267

West, Benjamin. 1803. "XLV. ACT IV, SCENE V. Elsineur. King, Queen, Laertes, Ophelia, &c." Engraved by Francis Legat. In *A Collection of Prints, from pictures painted for the purpose of illustrating the Dramatic Works of Shakspeare, by the Artists of Great Britain*. Ed. by Josiah and John Boydell. London : J. & J. Boydell. https://ark.digitalcommonwealth.org/ark:/50959/h989r681f

Westall, Richard. 1793. *Ophelia*. Oil on canvas, 78.1 × 55.2 cm. Hood Museum of Art, Hanover NH. https://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/objects/2013.27

Whistler, James Abbott McNeill. 1875. *Nocturne in Black and Gold – The Falling Rocket.* Oil on panel, 60.3 cm × 46.6 cm. Detroit Institute of Arts. https://www.dia.org/art/collection/object/nocturne-black-and-gold-falling-rocket-64931 [accessed 25 April 2022].

Whistler, James Abbott McNeill. 1875. *Nocturne in Black and Gold – The Falling Rocket.* Oil on panel, 60.3 cm × 46.6 cm. Detroit Institute of Arts. https://www.dia.org/art/collection/object/nocturne-black-and-gold-falling-rocket-64931 [accessed 25 April 2022].

Wilkie, David. 1822. *The Chelsea Pensioners reading the Waterloo Dispatch.* Oil on canvas, 158 × 97 cm. Wellington Collection, London. https://www.wellingtoncollection.co.uk/collection-category/19th-century-paintings/

Woodman, Francesca. 1976. *Untitled (Boulder Colorado).* Silver gelatine print, Francesca Woodman Estate.

Woodman, Francesca. 1976. *Untitled, Providence, Rhode Island, 1976*. Silver gelatine print, 14.3 × 14.4 cm. Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/woodman-untitled-providence-rhode-island-ar00352.

Woodman, Francesca. 1977–8. *Italy, May 1977 - August 1978*. Gelatine silver print, 143 x 158mm, Tate, London and National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/woodman-italy-may-1977-august-1978-ar00353

Woodman's series of *Untitled, MacDowell Colony, Peterborough, New Hampshire,* 1980. Gelatine silver estate print, 203 x 254 mm, Victoria Miro, London. https://www.victoria-miro.com/artists/7-francesca-woodman/works/artworks11920/

Wright of Derby, Joseph. 1768. *An Experiment on a Bird in the Air Pump*, 1768. Oil on canvas, 183 x 244 cm, National Gallery, London. https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/joseph-wright-of-derby-an-experiment-on-a-bird-in-the-air-pump

Wright of Derby, Joseph. 1781. *Sir Brooke Boothby*. Oil on canvas, 148.6 x 207.6 cm, Tate, London. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/wright-sir-brooke-boothby-n04132

Wright of Derby, Joseph. c. 1795-6. *A View of Cromford Bridge*. Oil on canvas, 58.8 x 76.2 cm. Derby Museum. http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/Lot/joseph-wright-of-derby-ara-derby-1734-1797-5986865-details.aspx.

Wright of Derby, Joseph. c. 1795-6. *Arkwright's Mills*. Oil on canvas, 58.8 x 76.2 cm. Derby Museum. http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/Lot/joseph-wright-of-derby-ara-derby-1734-1797-5986865-details.aspx.

Film and Theatre

Boutang, Pierre-André Boutang. Dir. 2011. *Gilles Deleuze from A to Z.* 3 DVD set. With Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet. Translated by Chares Stivale. Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e). 443 min, colour, mono.

Cronenberg, David. Dir. 2011. *A Dangerous Method.* With Michael Fassbender as Carl Jung, Keira Knightley as Sabina Spielrein, Viggo Mortensen as Sigmund Freud. UK, Colour, stereo, 99 min.

Daldry, Stephen. Dir. *The Hours*. 2002. With Nicole Kidman as Virginia Woolf, Julianne Moore as Laura Brown, Meryl Streep as Clarissa Vaughan. UK, colour, stereo, 110 min.

Gay, Paul. 2009. *Desperate Romantics.* Ep. 2. Written by Peter Bowker and Franny Moyle. With Samuel Barnett as John Millais, Aidan Turner as Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Amy Manson as Lizzie Siddal. First broadcast BBC HD, 10 March 2010.

Hitchcock, Alfred. Dir. 1958. *Vertigo*. With James Stewart as John 'Scottie' Ferguson, Kim Novak as Madeleine Elster / Judy Barton, US, colour mono, 188 min.

Kozintsev, Grigori. 1964. *Hamlet.* With Innokenty Smoktunovsky as Hamlet, Mikhail Nazvanov as Claudius, Elze Radzinya as Gertrude, Anastasiya Vertinskaya as Ophelia. USSR, black and wite, mono, 140 min.

McCarthy, Claire. Dir. 2018. *Ophelia.* Written by Semi Chellas, from the novel by Naomi Klein. With Daisy Ridley as Ophelia, Naomi Watts as Gertrude/Mechtild, Clive Owen as Claudius, Tom Felton as Laertes, George MacKay as Hamlet, Sebastian De Souza as Edmund, Dominic Mafham as Polonius, UK/USA, colour, stereo audio, 106 min.

Olivier, Laurence. Dir. 1949. Hamlet. 1949. With Laurence Olivier as Hamlet, Jane Simmons as Ophelia. UK, black and white, mono, 214 min.

Palmer, Charlie. Dir. 2007. *The Shakespeare Code*. TV episode. *Doctor Who* series 3, episode 2 (aired 7 Apr). Written by Steven Moffat a.o., with David Tennant as The Doctor, Freema Agyeman as Martha Jones, Dean Lennox Kelly as Shakespeare. BBC, colour, stereo, 45 min.

Rickson, Ian. Dir. 2011. *Hamlet*. Witten by William Shakespeare. With Michael Sheen as Hamlet, Vinette Robinson as Ophelia. Young Vic Theatre, London, 28 October. https://www.youngvic.org/whats-on/hamlet.

Seidelman, Susan. Dir. 1985. *Desperately Seeking Susan*. Written by Leora Barish. With Rosanna Arquette, Aidan Quinn, Madonna, Robert Joy. United States: Orion Pictures. 104 minutes. DVD Kino Lorber 2006 includs audio commentary by the producers, original and alternate endings and original theatrical trailer.

Turner, Lyndsey. Dir. 2015. *Hamlet.* Written by William Shakespeare. With Benedict Cumberbatch as Hamlet, Sian Brooke as Ophelia. UK: Sonia Friedman Productions. http://ntlive.nationaltheatre.org.uk/productions/ntlout27-hamlet

Von Trier, Lars. Dir. and Writer. 2011. *Melancholia*. With Kirsten Dunst as Justine, Charlotte Gainsbourg as Claire. DE/FR/SE, colour, stereo, 195 min.

Whale, James. Dir. 1931. *Frankenstein*. With Colin Clive as Henry Frankenstein, Mae Clarke as Elisabeth, Boris Karloff as The Monster. Universal Pictures: Los Angeles. Black and white, mono, 70 min.

Willis, Scott. Dir. 2012. *The Woodmans*. With Francesca Woodman as Self (archive footage), George Woodman as Self, Betty Woodman as Self, Charles Woodman as Self. USA, colour, stereo, 82 min

Zeffirelli, Franco. Dir. 1990. *Hamlet.* With Mel Gibson as Hamlet, Helena Bonham Carter as Ophelia, Glenn Close as Gertrude. US, colour, stereo, 135 min.

Other Media

Barlow, Phyllida. 2014. dock 2014. Tate Britain Commission 2014. Installation. http://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-britain/exhibition/tate-britain-commission-2014-phyllida-barlow; http://www.tate.org.uk/about/press-office/press-releases/phyllida-barlow-dock-2014.

Barlow, Phyllida. 2014a. *Phyllida Barlow in conversation with Fiona Bradley and Briony Fer*. 2014. Online video. University College, London 9 June 2014. https://youtu.be/5fmWP7L6V_A

Barlow, Phyllida. 2014b. *Phyllida Barlow in conversation with Frances Morris*. 2014. Online video. Clore Auditorium, Tate Britain 30 September. https://youtu.be/ew0rXCg-tBM.

Barlow, Phyllida. 2014c. *William Townsend Lecture 2014: Phyllida Barlow "For No Reason"*. 2014. Online video. Slade School of Fine Art, London 5 November. https://youtu.be/9TOvZXx2EOY.

Bernard, Sarah. 1880. *Ophelia.* Marble bas-relief, 70 x 59 cm, private collection. http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2017/erotic-passion-desire-l17322/lot.1.html

Bernini, Gian Lorenzo. 1647-52. *Ecstasy of Saint Teresa.* Marble sculpture. Cornaro Chapel, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/6/6b/Ecstasy_of_Saint_Teresa_September_2015-2a.jpg

Bowie, David. 1982. “The Drowned Girl.” Music video. Dir. by David Mallet. Text by by Bertolt Brecht and Dominic Muldowney. UK, RCA. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0smYeB7Zxc

Brock, Thomas. 1898 exhibited. *Sir Henry Tate.* Bronze on stone base, 53.3 × 58.4 × 35.6 cm, Tate, London. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/brock-sir-henry-tate-n01765

Brock, Thomas. 1904. Sir John Everett Millais. Bronze sculpture. Tate, London. Located: Corner John Islip Street / Attenbury Streeet. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/brock-sir-john-everett-millais-t07664

Cornell University Library. 2013-16. *Mnemosyne. Meanderings through Aby Warburg’s Atlas.* Website. Ithaka: Cornell University. https://warburg.library.cornell.edu/ [accessed 15/08/2021]

Edmonds, Pauline. 2002. “Stormontfield Heritage.” Website. Stormontfield (Perth). https://www.stormontfield.co.uk/index.html [accessed 13/11/2018].

Giudici, Paolo. 2012-2021. “The Death of Ophelia. Translating Hamlet 4.7.166-183” Pinterest Board. https://www.pinterest.co.uk/usodimare/the-death-of-ophelia/

Google. 2017. “Year in Search. See what was trending in 2017 Ireland. Overall Searches.” Google Trends. https://trends.google.com/trends/yis/2017/IE/ [archived 21/12/2020]

McGuire, Davy and Kristin McGuire. 2014. *Ophelia’s Ghost.* Installation with holographic projection of into water. First exhibited in September at St. John the Baptist Church in Colsterworth, England. https://vimeo.com/112312758

Noble, Matthew. 1854. “The Bridge of Sighs.” Bas-relief. Part of Thomas Hood’s funeral monument, Kensal Green Cemetary, London. Current location unknown.

Pomeroy, Frederick William. 1897. *The Nymph of Loch Awe*. Marble sculpture. Tate, London. http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/pomeroy-the-nymph-of-loch-awe-n01759

Taylor, Roger. Ed. 2002. “Photographic Exhibitions in Britain 1839 -1865.” Website. Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada. http://peib.dmu.ac.uk/index.php [accessed 21/6/2021].

Warburg Institute Archive. s.d. *Bilderatlas Mnemosyne*. Website. London: Warburg Institute, School of Advanced Study, University of London. https://warburg.sas.ac.uk/archive/bilderatlas-mnemosyne [accessed 15/08/2021]

Weil, Kurt. 1928. *Das Berliner Requiem*. Cantata for tenor, baritone, three-part male chorus and wind orchestra. Text by Berthold Brecht. Wien: Universal Edition.

Wilhelm, Thomas, Manuel Burghardt, and Christian Wolff. 2013. “‘To See or Not to See’ - An Interactive Tool for the Visualization and Analysis of Shakespeare Plays.’ In *Kultur und Informatik - Visual Worlds & Interactive Spaces.* Edited by Regina Franken-Wendelstorf, Elisabeth Lindinger, and Jürgen Sieck. Glückstadt: Verlag Werner Hülsbusch, 175-185. Web-tool (Beta): http://www.thomaswilhelm.eu/shakespeare/output/hamlet.html# [accessed 21/6/2121].