

Drawing Conclusions: Visual Literacy in Fiction

by

Emily Lauer

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2010

2010
Emily Seville Lauer
All rights reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 28, 2010

David Greetham

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

April 28, 2010

Steven Kruger

Date

Executive Officer

Rachel Brownstein
Ammiel Alcalay
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

DRAWING CONCLUSIONS: VISUAL LITERACY IN FICTION

by Emily Lauer

Advisor: Professor David Greetham

In “Drawing Conclusions,” I engage in an interdisciplinary examination of the words and pictures in four Victorian masterpieces of the illustrated novel, arguing that the unique publishing situation of each of these texts and the very different interactions between the authors and illustrators of each have resulted in four distinct examples of the functions illustrations in fiction can fulfill.

The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club, written by Dickens and illustrated by Browne, among others, was published in 1836. Once Browne became involved in the project, Dickens established a working relationship between them in which he provided lengthy descriptions of scenes to be illustrated – sometimes of scenes not yet written – and it became Browne’s job to interpret these descriptions. I posit that in *Pickwick Papers*, which became paradigmatic for later illustrated serial novels, the illustrations function as a sort of running commentary on the written text, complicating the idea of a division of labor between words and pictures even as the illustrations played up some of the same visual thematic elements in Dickens’ written text.

In *Vanity Fair*, written and illustrated by Thackeray a decade after *Pickwick Papers* was published, I find that Thackeray’s full-page captioned plates and smaller vignettes both reinforce and add nuance to the written text, by creating tone and allegory. Thackeray also begins each chapter with a historiated initial – an illustrated capital that combines the functions of letter and picture in a way requiring readerly participation.

Here, the many illustrations by the author are integral to an understanding of the novel. The reader must collaborate with the text in order to process both the word and picture at the same time.

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, written by Lewis Carroll, contains 42 illustrations by John Tenniel. Because their intended audience was children, and because Carroll acknowledged Tenniel's greater experience in publishing matters, the author and illustrator of *Wonderland* were very mindful of the effect of their collaboration. I argue that the result is a combination of word and picture in which the pictorial representation of the protagonist melds with her written representation to form two views on one solid and realistic subject, reinforcing Alice's normality as she explores a strange dreamworld.

Finally, I discuss an edition of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), published with illustrations by Hugh Thomson in 1894. The hundreds of line drawings in this edition draw attention to those aspects of the novel's plot most interesting to Thomson's late Victorian readership. The subtle gloss provided by these illustrations affected the way Austen entered the literary canon as well as the way Thomson's audience thought about Austen's own priorities.

Ultimately, the four different scenarios I address – Dickens instructing his illustrator in an imperious manner, Thackeray illustrating his own written text, Carroll and Tenniel collaborating closely, and Hugh Thomson modifying Austen to suit his contemporary readership – each result in a different role for the illustrations in the narrative. In “Drawing Conclusions,” I draw the conclusion that pictures can comment on, complicate, reinforce or update a written text based on the situation in which the written text and illustrations are combined.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my dissertation advisor and committee, whose enthusiasm and suggestions have been consistently remarkable; and to Christopher Cotter, for the digital cameras, the days spent helping me format my bibliography, the unwavering emotional support and the daffodils: thank you.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to the many librarians who assisted my book searches, allowed me to photograph pages, and suggested other texts I might peruse. My thanks to the librarians of the British Library, the Donnell and the Main Branch of the New York Public Library, the Fales Collection of the Bobst Library at New York University, The Mina Rees Library at the CUNY Graduate Center, the Morgan Library and Museum, the Goucher College Library, and the Grolier Club.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 In Context: Text and Image in Victorian Illustrated Novels	1
Chapter 2 Leaving Space: <i>Pickwick Papers</i> complicates assumed roles for words and pictures	36
Chapter 3 Signs as Designs: Thackeray's multivalent <i>Vanity Fair</i> illustrations	74
Chapter 4 Pictures and Conversations: Nuance and Neutrality in <i>Alice's Adventures in Wonderland</i>	113
Chapter 5 Drawn to the Classics: Afterlives of Victorian Illustration for <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	158
Postscript The four illustration models applied to the present day	216
Bibliography	241
Appendix 1 Figures	253
Appendix 2 Two ways of looking at an illustration history	322

List of Figures

Figure 1:1. Alice's arm coming out of the rabbit's house	253
Figure 1:2. Pictures in a series	254
Figure 1:3. First plate of <i>A Harlot's Progress</i>	255
Figure 1:4. A comparison between two Ws	256
Figure 2:1. Two pictures of Mr. Pickwick surrounded	257
Figure 2:2. The original cover of <i>Pickwick Papers</i> as released serially	258
Figure 2:3. Advertisements for Chapman and Hall's upcoming titles in the front cover of a number of <i>Pickwick Papers</i>	259
Figure 2:4. The announcement of Buss's participation in <i>Pickwick Papers</i> next to an illustration by Buss	260
Figure 2:5. The First Appearance of Mr. Samuel Weller	261
Figure 2:6. Duckrabbit	262
Figure 2:7. Mr. Pickwick Slides	263
Figure 2:8. Mrs. Bardell faints in Mr. Pickwick's Arms	264
Figure 2:9. The Trial	265
Figure 3:1. Front cover of the first number of <i>Vanity Fair</i>	266
Figure 3:2. Explanatory illustration in footnote	267
Figure 3:3. Footnote on anachronistic dress	268
Figure 3:4. "Becky's second Appearance in the Character of Clytemnestra"	269
Figure 3:5. Opening initial for Chapter XII	270
Figure 3:6. Opening initial for Chapter XLIV	271
Figure 3:7. Detail of advertisement for <i>Punch</i> inset in a number of <i>Vanity Fair</i>	272

Figure 3:8. Thackeray’s self insertion in chapter tail to Chapter 9	273
Figure 3:9. Detail of “Miss Sharp in her School-room”	274
Figure 3:10. “Mr Jos shaves off his mustachios”	275
Figure 3:11. Vignette in Chapter XXXVI	276
Figure 3:12. Vignette in Chapter XLV	277
Figure 3:13. Initial for Chapter LVIII	278
Figure 4:1. Two Alices in pools of tears	279
Figure 4:2. Alice goes through the looking glass – two illustrations on recto and verso of the same sheet in the first edition	280
Figure 4:3. Mouse tail/tale	281
Figure 4:4. Alice swims with a mouse	282
Figure 4:5. Alice plays nervously with a puppy	283
Figure 4:6. Two cats by Tenniel	284
Figure 4:7. The White Rabbit and the March Hare	285
Figure 4:8. Left: Alice with the caterpillar	286
Figure 4:9. Inking of Alice with the bottle labeled “Drink Me”	287
Figure 4:10. Two inkings of Alice cradling a pig	288
Figure 4:11. A page from Sabuda’s pop-up and the Tenniel illustration that inspired it	289
Figure 4:12. Three disparate Alices	290
Figure 5:1. Headpiece to “The first day at the Tabard: The Beginning of the Pilgrimage”	291
Figure 5:2. Frontispiece to Bentley’s edition of <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	292
Figure 5:3. The seal for the publishing company George Allen Press, Ruskin House	293

Figure 5:4. The beginning of Chapter LX in the large-page edition	294
Figure 5:5. “On the Stairs” chapter head for Chapter XXVII	295
Figure 5:6. A page spread from a reproduction of the 1894 edition of <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> published by George Allen	296
Figure 5:7. Thomson and Brock’s late Victorian illustrations	297
Figure 5:8. “I Hope Mr Bingley will like it,” Chapter II head	298
Figure 5:9. Chapter XV head	299
Figure 5:10. “He protested that he never read novels”	300
Figure 5:11. “A Travelling Coach From Felton’s Treatise on Carriages, 1801”	301
Figure 5:12. Title page	302
Figure 5:13. Frontispiece	303
Figure 5:14. Frontispiece and title page	304
Figure 5:15. “Parlour in Chawton Cottage with Jane Austen’s Desk” inset into <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	305
Figure 5:16. Illustration for the First Ball	306
Figure 5:17. Lady Catherine and Elizabeth in the garden	307
Figure 5:18. Illustration for Chapter 13	308
Figure 5:19. Frontispiece captioned “I take my leave of you Miss Bennet”	309
Figure 5:20 Two of Edgard Cirlin’s illustrations	310
Figure 5:21. Similar stances in an illustration and a fashion plate	311
Figure 6:1. A Masonic map of London inset facing Appendix 1	312
Figure 6:2. Two contrasting morning scenes	313
Figure 6:3. The Bone cousins	314
Figure 6:4. Fone Bone meets Thorn for the first time	315

Figure 6:5. Kitty Pryde depicted in both regular and chibi (cat ears) versions	316
Figure 6:6. Fone Bone interacts with human characters	317
Figure 6:7. Lucius comforts Thorn while Fone and Smiley Bone look on	318
Figure 6:8. Two pictures of Arthur Spiderwick from <i>The Spiderwick Chronicles</i>	319
Figure 6:9. Three current cover designs for <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	320
Figure 6:10. Mailed advertisement for <i>Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics</i>	321
Figure 7:1. A family tree of some strains of illustrating <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	323
Figure 7:2. Alice was beginning to get very tired	325
Figure 7:3. She ran across the field after it	326
Figure 7:4. Falling down a very deep well	326
Figure 7:5. Another long passage	327
Figure 7:6. A little door ... into the loveliest garden	327
Figure 7:7. “Drink Me”	328
Figure 7:8. “Eat Me”	328
Figure 7:9. Turning the Tenniel Transparency	329

Chapter 1

In Context: Text and Image in Victorian Illustrated Novels

Last March, I braved a spring flood to attend a one-day symposium called “Rodolphe Topffer & the Word/Image Problem” hosted by Parsons and the New School in Manhattan. Topffer has been called the inventor of the comic strip, for his series of funny captioned pictures, published in the 1830s, and the Parsons event was occasioned by a new annotated edition of a collection of his pictorial stories. The symposium presented scholarship and commentary on a wide spectrum of the combination of text and image in various cultures and eras, connecting analysis of such disparate media as Chinese and Indian picture scrolls and post-Enlightenment French murals to the history of the comic strip. However, since I had to fight my way through the rain past an art bookstore and a flourishing comic book shop to get from the subway to the symposium, I was skeptical about the title of the event. Is there a problem in the word/image problem? After all, words themselves are images, and even without pictures, words can create meaning aesthetically as well as literally.

The publicity for the event claimed provocatively that, “the separation of word and image persists in the academy. The symposium examines the traditions of the picture-story, picture-recitations, concrete vs. mental images, the materiality of symbols, illustration, and nonverbal communication” (Katchor). The continued worldwide prevalence of the very “picture stories” and illustrations addressed by the speakers seemed to indicate that there was no problem with this mode of conveying a narrative.

The problem, perhaps, is in the perceived split between pictures and words on the part of “the academy:” that is, it is problematic to present word and image in binary

opposition. Recently, as evidenced by the growing prevalence of interdisciplinary programs in colleges, and classes on comics and videogames being taught in English departments, even the slow-moving “academy” seems increasingly ready to acknowledge the idea that words and pictures are integral to each other’s ability to make meaning. The varied subject matter of the symposium indicated that the partnership between words and pictures is far reaching in time and space.¹

In this dissertation, I am interested in celebrating the multitudinous ways that word and image can be combined, and considering the ways that their combination can make meaning and create effect. In the illustrated novels I discuss, when word and picture are combined successfully, the resulting text requires both means to further the narrative. I will use four models of illustration, based on four scenarios in which words and pictures can be combined, to discuss the various ways that pictures can affect a fictional narrative.

I am here concerned with the convergences of word and picture in illustrated fiction, in a specific time and place – the 63 years of Victoria’s reign in England. The years 1837-1900 included changes in printing technology that enabled larger print runs of more finely illustrated books. At the same time, rising literacy rates combined with a robust visual literacy, prized in all social classes, causing the form of the illustrated novel to flourish. This dissertation engages in an interdisciplinary examination of the words and pictures in four Victorian masterpieces of the illustrated novel: *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club*, written by Charles Dickens and illustrated by Hablôt Knight

¹ The intersections of the visual and the literary are currently in the forefront of book creators’ and theorists’ minds due to new publishing methods made possible by burgeoning digital technology. The “vook,” clearly on the fringes of social consciousness, for instance, uses video clips to “illustrate” a digital edition of a novel.

Browne, among others; *Vanity Fair*, written and illustrated by William Makepeace Thackeray; *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, written by Lewis Carroll and illustrated by John Tenniel; and finally, *Pride and Prejudice*, written by Jane Austen and illustrated by Hugh Thomson many decades after the author's death. The unique publishing situation of each of these texts and the very different interactions between the authors and illustrators of each, have resulted in four distinct models of illustration providing different examples of the functions illustrations in fiction can fulfill.

Illustrations in fiction, though very diverse themselves, are merely one way to combine words and pictures, and thus my argument is necessarily situated in a larger network of visual meaning-making. In this first chapter, I hope to sketch out the wide field into which my dissertation can fit. For instance, since all the illustrations in these novels are printed in black and white, I will discuss some issues particular to black and white pictures. I will also address the idea of "context" in a few different ways – the way lines of letters and pictures create a context for each other in an illustrated page of written text, the context of an individual page in the many pages of a book, and finally, the historical context of the novels which comprise my study, particularly the precedent set by Hogarth in making a nuanced narrative out of a series of pictures.² My discussion of functions for illustrations in these four novels addresses larger questions about the relationship between text and image, as part of both textual and cultural criticism.

² It seems that Topffer is credited with the inception of comics because his picture stories were comic, and because they presented multiple panels on one page. However, Hogarth's picture stories should be at least partially credited with the popularization of the graphic narrative (in the West).

How Illustrations Work

In *Eye and Brain*, Richard Gregory notes that the eyes must work together to see in three dimensions: “[a] remarkable thing about the visual system is its ability to synthesize the two somewhat different images [from the left and right eye] into a single perception of solid objects lying in three dimensional space” (Gregory 72). To continue the conceit of a narrative as a viewable object, I posit that the combination of words and pictures in the creation of a narrative functions like the two eyes working together to synthesize a view of the narrative. It is generally in the texts created by an author and illustrator working closely together, or a text for which one person has been both author and illustrator, that the combination of word and picture will work well. In texts in which the words and pictures themselves seem to collaborate, the two modes of communication really seem to be different angles on the same object. However, even when the pictures and words correspond beautifully, they can never be exactly the same. And when the pictures and words seem to be violently opposed to each other, their intersections and divergences offer points for analysis. When reading an illustrated novel, the reader is required to elide the two forms of meaning-making in order to understand the combination as one multivalent object. . Though the disjunction is sometimes great and sometimes slight, it is always present, because it arises from perceiving a narrative via two different modes. This disjunction is the site of analysis that makes my dissertation necessary.

Illustrations can regulate a response to the written text they illustrate because the pictures – their subject, style, size and frequency – help construct the reader’s interaction with the narrative. This means that an illustrator is in a position to make a beautiful

character less so, to make an offhand reference to a location gain importance by illustrating it with a sweeping and elaborate landscape plate, or to leave whole subplots un-illustrated and thus reduce their importance. To encounter visual representations of the reader's anticipated or encouraged focus modifies the reading experience.

In non-collaborative instances of illustration, the combination of word and picture is still powerful. There are many ways that originally un-illustrated words can be adjusted, subverted, commented upon, belittled or complemented by pictures added later. Michael Camille explores these possibilities in *Image on the Edge*, when he observes that medieval manuscript marginalia have the ability to “gloss, parody, modernize, and problematize the text's authority, while never totally undermining it” (Camille 10). These options are possible for the printed Victorian illustrations I will discuss as well as for medieval marginalia.³

Black and white

Since all of the Victorian illustrations I will discuss are printed in black and white, the particular properties of reproduced black and white two-dimensional art deserve some discussion here. Printing with black ink on white paper is the default method for reproductions of both pictures and written text in books in the West. This is, of course partly because both pictures and letterforms could be carved on woodblocks in reverse,

³ In this dissertation, I am concerned with complete texts in their original language. When novels have been abridged or translated, it is possible for illustrations to perform a whole host of additional functions to compensate for the missing or altered written text. Conversely, all illustrations to unabridged written texts are additions: that is, as long as no words have been removed to make way for the pictures, illustrations neither replace nor displace the written text.

inked, and then pressed onto paper to create the pages of books. The similarity in methods and materials for the reproduction of words and pictures led to similar assumptions about how they would appear. Though not all the illustrations I will discuss have been printed off of woodblocks, the similarity of reproducing methods and materials leads to a similarity in the form of the product.

Because pictures reproduced in black and white are so common, it can be easy to overlook all the complicated ways black and white pictures make meaning. Essentially, it is the capacity for a multiplicity of meaning both from the black and from the white that needs explication.

What Mary Olson calls “graphé,” meaning any mark on a page, can just as easily assemble itself into a letterform as a picture as long as it resolves itself into a form we recognize. The context of the lines on the page and how they fit together help the viewer turn an arrangement of lines into a recognizable pictorial representation just as the context and the way these lines fit together helps a reader recognize an alphabetic letter. For instance, the number one and the lowercase L look the same in this font (1 and l) as well as in many people’s handwriting. It is context that helps the reader determine what is represented by the “1.” Similarly, a capital H and a capital E may be composed of the same amount of ink, and have lines that fit together in the same right angles, but the specific arrangement of them indicates two different letters.

The same kinds of rules of context and composition create meaning in pictorial representation as well, and when, in an illustrated book, both the written text and pictures are black and white, the lines and their contexts are interchangeable in many ways and in many instances. Gregory points out that, “if the brain were not constantly on the look-out

for objects, the cartoonist would have a hard time. But, in fact, all [the cartoonist] has to do is present a few lines to the eye and we see a face, complete with an expression” (Gregory 18). As readers and viewers of images, we are always looking for meaning to the extent that we help the image create its own context. The mark that could be a number 1 or a lowercase l could also be a stick figure’s torso, or part of the border between two states.

If you consider a circle rather than a line, it will become apparent that the white space is also deeply implicated by the role the circle will play. A black circle printed on a white page could be a capital or lowercase O, a picture of a ball for children to play catch with, the top of a can of soup, or an unfinished map of the moon. Context is necessary again for that circle to mean something specific. However, unlike the line, context for the circle can be provided within as well as without. For instance, drawing two children on either side of the circle might make it clear that the circle should here represent a ball, but shading the inside of the lines of the circle could also make it look like a ball, even without the children on either side.

Similarly, a legend near the circle, and topographical markers for the craters of the moon inside the circle, would make it clear that the circle delineates a lunar map, while the addition of the letters m, o, and n would make it clear that the circle was part of the word “moon” itself. Any of these – shading, filling in space with indications of topography, or adding other shapes outside would provide enough context to make the circle represent something.

Gregory further asserts that, “the art of the draughtsman and painter is, in large part, to make us accept just one out of the infinite set of possible interpretations of a

figure” (Gregory 178). In other words, the role of the visual artist is one of disambiguation. The nature of the printed line can only be understood through context.

The black marks on the white page can make meaning in a variety of ways partly because of our culture’s assumptions about light and dark, foreground and background. In a painted portrait or still life, it is quite likely that the foreground will be light and the background darker. In painting, light colors generally indicate that a pictured object is well-illuminated and thus to be focused on. Backgrounds are often blurred slightly with distance to make the foreground stand out. In a black and white picture on a white page, however, the relationship between front and back and black and white are generally reversed because the black delineates and shades some areas of white in order to set them off from the rest of the white page. Black marks must be acknowledged as sometimes outline, adding structure; sometimes shading, adding areas of darkness to indicate three dimensions; and sometimes both.

In Figure 1:1 from *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice’s arm descends from the window of the White Rabbit’s house. Her arm is both delineated, that is, outlined with black; and shaded with black, that is, small lines create areas of shadow on her arm to indicate three-dimensionality.

The white areas must similarly represent lightly colored areas (such as the White Rabbit’s fur); the area of an object inside an area delineated with black outline; and the blank, nonrepresentational area outside of the picture itself. Of course, as any who peruse old or inexpensive books will acknowledge, the ink is not always really black and the page itself is not always really white. Rather, we accept that for the purposes of black

and white printing, the tan, brown, or yellow pages before us represent white. It is only through collective agreement to refer to them as white that they appear so to us.

Gregory explains that “the eye tends to accept as white not a particular mix of colors, but rather the general illumination whatever this may be... the reference for what is taken as white can shift” (Gregory 135). In simple black and white drawings, we accept as white the un-inked page. It is blankness. Moreover, in black and white book illustrations, the ‘white’ is the same stuff as the gutter that surrounds the words, signals the ends of chapters and offers itself as ground for seeing (both viewing and understanding) what will be printed onto it. The page, then, in its blank state, allows the reader to make sense of what will be presented by the ink to come. It is, as Gregory points out, the general illumination into which the delineations of ink will be added and ordered in some meaning-making way.⁴

Three Kinds of Context

In illustrated written texts, the lines that make up a picture gain meaning through the other lines in that picture, other lines in other pictures, and the lines of written text that the picture illustrates. As J. Hillis Miller notes in his book, *Illustration*, since both words and pictures can stand for or represent things other than themselves, “when verbal inscription and graphic representation are set side by side each turns the other into a form of itself” (Miller 147).

⁴ If I seem to be mixing my metaphors by referring to the white page as both a source of illumination and a ground on which the illustration stands, it is because both conceits are used to describe illustrations and book crafting generally. The implications of this mixed metaphor will be discussed later in the introduction.

That is, when readers are confronted with both words and pictures, the picture-like quality of the words and the word-like qualities of the pictures are made manifest. Miller recognizes that the combination of words and pictures creates a more or less successful hybrid between these two forms, the illustration component bringing to the fore the visual aspects of the words and the readability of the words forefronting the pictures' readability. In illustrated fiction, the narrative is composed of both image and text, and the words and pictures – both images and both text – are often made of the same materials, arrangements of dark ink on a light page.

However, illustrations make meaning not just in terms of their lines on a page, but also in the order they are presented with the written text, and then also in how the combination of picture and word is packaged and presented to a reader. Finally, the historical specificity of when these modes of communication come together influences the efficacy and function of their combination. Thus, in addition to considering how illustrations make meaning at their most granular level, other types of context must also be considered.

Context of pages in sequence

In *Fair and Varied Forms*, Mary Olson has commented on the implied teleological pull of making a narrative. She asserts that “[a] narrative is made possible by its ending” (114) and that furthermore, in any narrative, “time is distorted by the pull of the ending, [and] items which are given the attention of extra detail are more likely to be part of a causal chain” (119-120). This leads to an assumption, especially when reading a novel, that all the presented moments are integral to reaching that pre-ordained ending. A

narrative must be selective to tell a coherent story. In a narrative, even a fictional one, actions are represented as if they were plucked from a stream of chronology in order to form a plot and it is assumed that the inclusion of any event connotes its importance in the plot. In an illustrated novel, the illustrator's selection of subject matter can be seen as a similar process of collecting and arranging moments and subject matter in order to tell a story.

Keith Smith, a contemporary book artist, differentiates between "series" and "group" when he discusses how images can be included together in book form (Smith). While a group might suggest some sort of thematic connection between the images provided, a series requires viewing the images in a specific order. A group of images might include pictures of a car, a boat, a skateboard, and a helicopter, all framed from the same middle distance. Their relationships might not change, and their meaning in aggregate might not change even if the images were reordered. A series, on the other hand, creates a sort of narrative in its presentation.

Figure 1:2 shows a series of images from Keith Smith's discussion of series in *The Visual Book*. In these five frames, it seems that the viewer gradually moves closer to a car tire until the tire itself is larger than the frame. While the lines of detail that provided context around the tire are gradually removed, the context of the preceding images remains in the reader's memory such that the few broken lines of the final image remain intelligible. The movement of the reader's eye from one image to the next creates a narrative relationship between the images. Though the images are here presented as a series of panels next to each other, the same chronological context would be created if each image was on a separate page and the viewer/reader turned the pages in sequence.

In the combination of words and pictures in an illustrated novel, which requires a narrative, both modes of meaning-making need to follow each other sequentially. They mean more by their combination because of the order and methods in which they are combined. In other words, to create narrative, the images must be presented in a series rather than a group.

Paratext as Context

Generally, I assume that illustrations present in the first edition of a novel are part of the text itself. In illustrated fiction, the words and pictures both take part in the composition of the page, and take part in the creation of the narrative. However, in some cases, illustrations must be considered to be among the “paratextual” contributions of an edition.

In his book *Paratexts*, Gerard Genette is primarily concerned with the extratextual written material that visually and culturally surrounds a text, rather than pictorial representation that might be packaged with, or in some way influence the reading of a text. Genette does note that the format of a book, for instance its size and paper quality is part of the publisher’s “peritext” (17) and has repercussions for the volume’s social worth as well as its monetary cost (18). However, he seems to discount the contributions of the publisher’s peritext when he further considers that “if the typesetting is only a materialization of the text, the paper is only an underpinning for that materialization, even further removed from the constitutive ideality of the work” (35). Overall, he is less concerned with the importance of visual cues than he is with extratextual written text in his understanding of paratextual material.

In this dissertation, of course, I am particularly concerned with the visual cues given by paratextual material. I believe illustrations added to a written text, as well as the chapter titling and page numbering, the blurbs on the back of the volume and the paper and font choices that Genette discusses, all help make up the different aesthetic choices that govern the presentation of a book. These choices constitute an argument, sometimes cogent, sometimes confused, about how the text should be read. Thus, in thin-paper anthologies, like the ubiquitous Norton Readers, the texts collected have a different feel from that of text printed on thicker paper in a pocket paperback. In particularly inexpensive pocket paperbacks, woodchips are sometimes visible in the pulp of the paper.

Whether or not these elements should be considered paratextual, they should certainly be considered part of the “material textuality” of the edition. For instance, in *Material Modernism*, George Bornstein discusses “material textuality as both the physical features of the text that carry semantic weight and the multiple forms in which texts are physically created and distributed” (Bornstein 1). The time a reader spends on a page will always be determined by the reader’s interest and investment with the content of that page. Written paratextual material, book design, and illustrations can all be seen as attempts to secure readerly interest and maintain it once it is secured. The illustrator, the author, the editor, the publisher are each aiming for the engagement of the reader, a hope for engagement that stays constant despite the changes in actual readings.

Book designers sometimes believe that the physical object of the book itself should not influence a reading of the textual material the book contains and thus, that the goal of the book designer should be to make the medium as transparent as possible. In their manual *Typefaces for Books*, James Sutton and Alan Bartram state, “while display

faces can be extrovert, colourful and rich in character, book faces must be transparent, allowing the reader to hear the author's voice without distortion or interference" (Sutton 7). The idea that the typeface used for a book should be transparent is part of a larger argument: that it should be possible to forget the materiality of the book, and that the book's physical and visual presence should not influence a reading at all.

It may be that book designers sometimes believe the best book construction is the one that makes the reader forget he or she is holding a book at all. However, the goal of transparency of medium is not a universal one. For instance, Charlene Garry, in her essay "Illustrated books as Original Works of Art: Form as Complement to Content," claims that fine bookmaking should try to provide a "suitable stage set" for the words of the text (124).

It is a central question for printers, publishers, and book designers whether the driving conceit of book design should be, as Sutton and Bartram state, a transparent window, through which the content of the text can be seen; or a stage set, on which the text is played out. These two ways of thinking about the book form, it should be noted, are comparable to the two ways of thinking about the white space in black and white illustrations as discussed earlier: if the book is a window, does the light space illuminate? If the book is a stage set, is the blank page neutral ground? Should the page of the book be the light that illuminates, or the ground on which actions are delineated?

Even when the goal of transparency is embraced, it can be problematic. Sutton and Bartram further state that "the basic task of the book typographer is to present a text in its clearest and most appropriate form" (26) but problems arise when these two tasks are not compatible. Some texts do not aim for clarity, and to meet the goal of housing the

text in its most appropriate form might actually mean obfuscating the readability of the written text. A layout of this kind could create an aesthetically pleasing and meaningful book art object, even as it precluded the transmission of the text it housed.

In book construction, then, the illustrations are merely one site of evidence among many of the reading encouraged by a specific edition of a text.

Historical Context: Hogarth's influence

In the Victorian era, pictures in novels could perform many different functions in the fiction. The importance of visual literacy in England in the late eighteenth century had produced and nurtured print artists such as William Hogarth; and Clara Tuite, among others, has commented on the influence of visual caricature on written fiction. All of the illustrated novels of the Victorian era owed a debt not just to the book illustrators of the generation before them, but also specifically to Hogarth, who had exposed the depths of meaning possible in picture narratives and thus set the bar high for all participants in narrative construction of words and pictures in the century to come.

It would be difficult to overstate the influence Hogarth had on the Victorian illustrated novels I will discuss. Hogarth established a middle class moralizing narrative art, and in doing so, established the means through which pictures can convey narrative. Hogarth's prints, especially his print series, shaped thoughts about the usages of pictures in narratives for all following book artists.

After early work of engraving metal and painting, in the 1730s Hogarth produced *The Harlot's Progress* and *The Rake's Progress*, two series of prints that told stories in pictures. While Dutch and English satirical prints had already been established as a

popular art for the lower classes, it is F. Antal's contention that Hogarth pioneered a new, essentially British and essentially middle class art by combining the reproduction methods and the visual language of the satirical print with the methods and visual language of elite European painting in order to tell moral narratives (Antal 36ff).

In both *Progresses*, a series of detailed frames had to be read in the particular order in which they were presented (meaning, not as a group) to convey the moralizing intended by Hogarth.⁵ Noting similarities among frames as well as the changes from frame to frame allowed the assumption of a continuous narrative. The moral plot of each was fairly simple: a youth becomes corrupted and is not redeemed. Hypocrisy is derided and the protagonist of each is held up as a sympathetic though negative example. Beyond the moral, however, there are layers of symbolic imagery in each image and in the combination of the images. Both Hogarth's *Progresses*, like the rest of the prints he would create later in life, reward visual literacy, because the pictorial symbolism through which they make meaning is apparent only to those viewers who realize they need to be readers. Thus, the images in the series reward not only close scrutiny, but also revisiting and reflection since some of their multilayered meanings become more apparent after the rest of the series is viewed.

In the first frame of *The Harlot's Progress* (Figure 1:3) alone, a suggestion of a chronological narrative can be read from left to right: the covered carriage connotes arrival in the city from the country, the brightly lit center shows our protagonist being approached by her future procuress, and the man in shadow on the right indicates the

⁵ David Brewer discusses a fan that was printed with selected scenes from Hogarth's *A Harlot's Progress* out of their narrative order, such that a print series with a clear, moralizing narrative was turned into a group of images with no inherent narrative.

future clients who await her. On the vertical register, the symbolic subtext is literally below the plot proper. At the ground level the tumbling bucket and dead goose in a basket offer commentary on the choices offered and made by the characters.

Like the Victorian illustrated novels that would follow, Hogarth's prints reached a mass audience because of their affordability. Hogarth's "works, as cheap engravings, usually costing a shilling or so apiece, reached an even wider public than did the great journalistic invention of the age, the literary periodicals" (Antal 36). This wide audience was very appreciative of Hogarth's work, even when the Royal Academy of Art was not. As David Brewer notes, "Hogarth's reputation prospered in the face of indifference and even hostility from the official institutions of visual art" (Brewer 23). It was, therefore, the mass audience that effectively canonized Hogarth through claiming him as their own. "Through dozens, perhaps hundreds, of seemingly slight appropriations [by fans], the graphic work of Hogarth (and to a lesser extent his paintings) became ingrained in English culture" (Brewer 21). Hogarth's prints, like the illustrated novels I will discuss, were popular art.

Hogarth's process was unusual. He created detailed, colorful paintings as "sketches" for inexpensive black and white art on paper, which was the inverse of the order expected (Bell 11ff). By making the small, inexpensive mass-produced art the end product, for which the painting was merely a preliminary stage, Hogarth helped elevate the status of the satirical print in a way that had an influence on the status of illustrated books in England for at least a century to follow.

I dwell on Hogarth's contributions because it is important to recognize the assumptions about pictorial narrative and representation with which readers approached

book illustrations during Victoria's reign. These assumptions, and a familiarity with Hogarth's visual symbolism, shaped the way illustrators created and readers understood the content of Victorian illustrations. The line between "understanding" and "interpreting" is blurred in the reading of a pictorial or written text because the very legibility of the text is determined by the reader's ability to absorb the cultural signifiers inherent in the signification. In Victorian England, cultural literacy included a visual literacy that shaped textual literacy. What a text means is bound up inextricably with the way in which it conveys that meaning. Thus, factors of cultural literacy are just as central to the success of the Victorian illustrated novel as the technological advances that made their reproduction possible.⁶

Vocabulary concerns

In illustrated books, pictorial representation and alphabetic text both exist in a continuum of created visual input that can be "read" for content. Similar language is used to describe the functions and abilities of pictures and words. This language conflates the idea of understanding with the idea of looking. Consider these statements:

The room was illuminated.

The manuscript was illuminated.

The words on the page were illuminating.

The words on the page were illustrated.

The words on the page were illustrative.

The words on the page had a kind of luster.

⁶ Since the four books I discuss span the years 1836-1894, I will address the particular technological and social forces at work in their production individually in each chapter.

The words on the page were enlightened.

The pictures on the page were enlightening.

In English generally, there are convergences of connotation and denotation that create word groups. I would like to point out with these examples that pictures that accompany words are discussed and defined by using the same metaphors of light and knowledge used to describe words themselves. The etymological bases “light,” “luster” and “lumin” can each be used to construct a multiplicity of denotations to apply to marks on a page. It is implied that both words and pictures can serve the same (en)lightening function. Miller takes this confluence of etymology as his conceit for the illustrations he discusses in *Illustration*. For instance, he discusses Michael Steig’s assertion that Mr. Pickwick, in Browne’s illustrations of the Dickens novel, often fulfills the function of a sun. He plays with the fact that Pickwick himself illuminates.

The cultural conceit is that both images and words provide some kind of light, because light is in some ways synonymous with understanding. In black and white graphic representation, then, it is the distinction between the light and dark that creates images, *as well as* the ability to understand what they represent. These general terms, however, are not precise enough to use for an in-depth discussion of the specific elements of book printing and illustration. Rather, the terms used to describe parts of illustrated books demand additional clarification to differentiate the functions of marks on the page.

Rudolf Arnheim in *Visual Thinking* calls pictures, symbols and signs “three functions fulfilled by images” (Arnheim 136), which can allow the term “image” much greater scope than any one of these component functions. Pictures, specifically, are images that “portray things” (Arnheim 137) while a symbol, such as the letter A, can

purport to portray a concept. Of course, when it comes to illustrating fiction, the “things” in the story world are themselves concepts, so many of Arnheim’s distinctions become more complex.

As Arnheim differentiates between picture, symbol and sign, so too can we differentiate between various functions of non-alphabetic marks on a page meant to accompany written text, and sometimes incorporating alphabetic text. For instance, decoration, illustration and illumination may in fact be considered different functions fulfilled by a larger category of “picture.” Others have noted this division of functions for images in books. James Whitlark’s book *Illuminated Fantasy* deals with the differences between illustration and illumination, while Douglas McMurtrie’s *Golden Book* has separate chapters about book illustration and book decoration. Notably, McMurtrie’s list of what he considers to be book decoration, “(1) initial letters; (2) page borders; (3) headbands and tailpieces” are themselves often the site of illustrations (McMurtrie 334). Rather than adhering to McMurtrie’s distinctions based on the location of the image, I consider the difference between illustration and decoration to be less determined by the placement and size of the elements and more by the function of the image: that is, what is represented. If the initial letter is covered with fine scrollwork, it is probably a decoration, though the scrollwork may be associated with thematic threads in the written text. If, on the other hand, the initial letter is peopled with recognizable characters from the narrative, it is probably an illustration. Illustrations themselves are subject to further subdivision by function, since they might clarify, obfuscate, define, or highlight specific parts of the written text they accompany.

And of course not all illustrations do their illustrating job successfully. Writing from the epicenter of the Arts and Crafts Movement, Walter Crane differentiated between book illustrations that increased the beauty and worth of the book as a whole and pictures that seemed unconnected to the form of the book. In his treatise *Of the Decorative Illustration of Books Old and New* (1896), Crane wrote that there existed “much modern illustration which may indeed illustrate, but does not ornament a book” (157). Crane’s concern was aesthetic. He wanted the visual elements to harmonize on the page, making the book physically beautiful. I posit that the same arguments can be made for the content that can be made for form. For instance, Bornstein examines multiple editions of Marianne Moore’s poem “The Fish,” which changes subtext as it is published in different ways. Bornstein notes that an illustrated deluxe edition of Moore’s poetry actually removes metaphoric content by adding pictures of fish to “The Fish.” No longer can this poem be read allegorically about soldiers returning home from the first world war, which other contexts in early politicized editions made possible, because the addition of illustration reduces the poem to only its literal meaning (Bornstein 103). Pictures that are inappropriate in content can detract from the worth of a book as well as can pictures that are inappropriate in aesthetic form.

Vocabulary Use

Figure 1:4 shows two drop caps – that is, two large, decorative capital letters that begin chapters in books. The shapes of these two initial Ws are quite similar, and their two instances of publication have much in common. Both of these Ws open new chapters in late Victorian editions of old, familiar texts by authors well-known to the British

readership of their time, reset in luxury editions inspired by the Arts and Crafts Movement's fantasy of medieval book production. I have chosen them to set against each other because all these similarities help them provide an example of the difference between decoration and illustration.

The W on the left is reproduced from the beginning of "The Knight's Tale" in William Morris's 1896 edition of *Chaucer's Works*. It is clearly highly decorative, not just with scrollwork, but with recognizable leaf forms. However, I would not consider the letter to be illustrated, nor would I consider the letter to function as an illustration, because the leaf forms do not have a bearing on the narrative of "The Knight's Tale." What is depicted in the decoration does not illustrate the story the initial begins.⁷ The W on the right, however, does present an illustration. It opens Chapter 11 of the 1894 edition of *Pride and Prejudice* illustrated by Hugh Thomson and published by George Allen. It presents the forms of two ladies, one throwing a shawl through the vertical lines of the W onto the shoulders of the other. As the opening words of the chapter reveal, it is a depiction of Elizabeth ensuring that her sister Jane is "well-guarded from cold" (Austen 69). The repetition of the "w" sound in the phrase "well-guarded" is particularly neat in tying the small figures in the initial W to the content of the written text.

As is demonstrated by these two initial Ws, alphabetic letters of a fictional narrative can be involved in the ways that decoration and illustration provide meaning and tone in fictional texts. The lines are blurred between all these terms but can at least be

⁷ However, the leaf forms do have a strong cultural importance for any reader familiar with Arts and Crafts era decoration. That is, while a reader may not recognize that this W begins the "Knight's Tale," he or she might recognize that the W is a product of the Kelmscott Press.

seen to exist, even if their placement shifts in different contexts. Vocabulary in this field is slippery and complicated, so I shall briefly address my use of specific terms:

Picture: I use the word picture to mean a recognizable representation of at least one person, place, thing or, sometimes, action. The picture must depict.

Words and letters: While words are composed of alphabetic letters, they might also incorporate decorative or pictorial aspects, especially in titles. Letters can contain or interact with pictures, and in some cases, a mark on a page can form both a letter and part of a picture simultaneously, as will be discussed in the chapter on Thackeray, “Signs as Designs.”

Illustration: I use the word “illustration” to denote those pictures of identifiable people, places, and things from the written narrative, when the pictures are meant to be viewed with, and are packaged with, the words they illustrate. As Joan Hassall stated in her 1973 address to the Jane Austen Society, “Although chapter headings and endings may be in the nature of comments, the [illustrated] incidents in the text should be specific portrayals of people, places and things” (15).

Therefore, Hogarth’s drawings are not illustrations because they do not illustrate a written text with which they are packaged. Breugel’s painting of Icarus is not an illustration to Robert Graves’ book *The Greek Myths* because the painting was not meant to be packaged and presented with the written text of that book. Likewise, a sketch of Jane Austen’s chair bound into a copy of *Pride and Prejudice* does not constitute an illustration for that novel because it does not depict any of the people, places, or events in the fictional narrative with which it is presented.

Like Othello calling for “ocular proof” (III, 3, line 365), or the truism “seeing is believing,” pictorial representation of a written narrative reinforces its believability.

However, text and image relations vary, and while one of the top definitions of illustration may be “the action or fact of making clear or evident to the mind,” (Oxford English Dictionary. Web), the goal of a picture next to words is not always clarity. Some pictures that illustrate a written text provide functions other than merely making evident what the written text describes. Various functions of illustrations will be explored throughout this dissertation.

Image: I use the word image to mean any unit of visual input, as long as it has been constructed as a unit of visual input. My discussion here deals generally with images on the pages of fictional texts – for instance, the page layout creates an image, an illustration is an image, and the word that includes a historiated or decorated initial is also an image.

As W. J. T. Mitchell asserts in his book *Picture Theory*, images can be both read and appreciated aesthetically. A letter of the alphabet, a word constructed of letters, or even a page of alphabetic writing can be appreciated aesthetically – can be “looked at” in addition to being read – in the same manner as can a picture. The capital Ws just discussed should convey that “word” is not in juxtaposition with “image” but rather that the written word is a type of image.

Text: I do not use “text” as synonymous with “writing,” but rather to mean a cultural product that can be read.⁸ This means that the unit of “text” is as mutable as the

⁸ In the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the first definition of the verb “to read” is “To consider, interpret, discern” (Web). It is the necessary combination of all these three actions that sets “reading” apart from “looking at.”

unit of “image” discussed above: a material book, a series of books, or a single book cover image could each be considered to be a cultural production that can be read. For the purposes of this dissertation, I generally use the word “text” by itself to mean a complete (illustrated) book. When I need to refer to the words in that text without the pictures, I will use the term “written text.” For instance, the text *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* includes both pictures by John Tenniel and written text by Lewis Carroll. Tenniel’s illustrations, because they are themselves cultural productions that can be read, can undergo textual analysis just as can the words written by Carroll.

Illustration Models

I argue that the situation in which the words and pictures come together for a specific text is generally indicative of the relationship the words and pictures will have in that text. Some combinations of word and picture are the product of direct collaboration between author and artist, or the product of one multitalented artist/author, while some narratives are illustrated by artists who have never even spoken to the author.

My next chapter, “Leaving Space: *Pickwick Papers* complicates assumed roles for words and pictures,” addresses the situation of an author who instructs his illustrator while he is writing. The illustrator is in a subordinate relationship to the author, but does shape the way the text will be presented to a reading audience. In the third chapter, “Signs as Designs: Thackeray’s multivalent *Vanity Fair* illustrations” I discuss the phenomenon of written and pictorial text created by the same person, and in the fourth, “Pictures and Conversations: Nuance and Neutrality in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*,” I connect the collaborative efforts of author and artist to the way the

pictures and words themselves seem to collaborate on the page. In my fifth chapter, “Drawn to the Classics: Afterlives of Victorian Illustration for *Pride and Prejudice*” I discuss the way a late Victorian edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, illustrated by Hugh Thomson, acts as a foundational text for all of the many illustrated editions of *Pride and Prejudice* that would come after it.

In each of these chapters, one Victorian illustrated book serves as my example. Since I am arguing that the way pictures and words come together in illustrated fiction affects the way the two modes of communication interact with each other in the text, that is how my chapters are arranged. Therefore, though I have found it convenient to arrange these chapters in the chronological order of the publication of the texts I discuss, historical discussions will be focused on how social forces and technology affected each cultural moment of text creation and transmission. I will not attempt to distill a history of the art of illustration, because I do not assume a teleological approach to the history of word-picture combination in fiction. Rather, I think these four models of illustration can be observed in various times and places.

The Integration Model

The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club was published serially in 1836 and 1837. In the beginning, multiple artists illustrated Charles Dickens’ written text. Once H.K. Browne (Phiz) became involved in the project, Dickens established a working relationship between them in which he provided lengthy descriptions of scenes to be illustrated – sometimes scenes not yet written – and it became Browne’s job to interpret these descriptions. In his book *Dickens and Phiz*, Michael Steig refers to Browne as

Dickens' "very first interpreter of each of the novels he illustrated" for the way his illustrations incorporate allegory and commentary (Steig ix).

Notably, not only would Dickens provide his illustrators with the subjects and captions for the illustrations, he would often give them extraneous details, explaining the event that had preceded the moment to be illustrated, what was about to happen, and the thoughts the characters were about to have. This put his illustrators in a unique situation, wherein they had the ability to shape a reading of a written text they may not have actually seen. Because *Pickwick Papers* was both written and released serially, it was also possible for reactions from readers to influence what might come next. Therefore, Browne's illustrations could have an indirect effect on what would happen in the story, through the readers' understanding of how the pictures integrated into the written text.

In what I call the "integration model," the illustrator has the task of providing pictures that will integrate with the words, and the words can even provide guidelines for how the pictures are supposed to be integrated into the text. I posit that in *Pickwick Papers*, which became paradigmatic for later illustrated serial novels, the illustrations function as a sort of running commentary on the written text. Browne's illustrations incorporate chronological and thematic elements of Dickens' work, such as the importance of interpreting visual evidence correctly, even when it contradicts verbal evidence. In their combination, Dickens' writing and Browne's illustrations complicated the idea of a division of labor between words and pictures.

The Single Creator Model

In *Vanity Fair*, written and illustrated by Thackeray a decade after *Pickwick Papers* was published, I find that Thackeray's full-page captioned plates and smaller vignettes both reinforce and add nuance to the written text, by creating tone and allegory. Thackeray also begins each chapter with a historiated initial – an illustrated capital that combines the functions of letter and picture in a way requiring readerly participation. Here, the many illustrations by the author are integral to an understanding of the novel. The reader must collaborate with the text in order to process both word and picture at the same time, and, as it seemed to be Thackeray's project to expose people's hypocrisy, the various registers of images all participate in a general denouncing of artifice. In much of *Vanity Fair* the pictures provide allegory and symbolism that make themes explicit and acknowledge unspoken motives on the part of the characters.

In texts where words and pictures have been created by one person, a multiplicity of functions for images is apparent. Thus, if an illustrated novel has a single creator, it is likely that the pictures and words will interact in multiple, complicated ways. What I call the “single creator model” of word and picture narratives is receiving a lot of attention right now because of the current evolution of the comics market into a new demand for graphic novels. The new trend toward single-creator comics seems to provide intimate access to one mind through the use of more than one mode of communication. This is also true in novels illustrated by their authors, such as *Vanity Fair*.

Interestingly, Thackeray's words are now published far more regularly than his pictures are. Because illustrations are now seen as the purview of children's literature, *Vanity Fair* and other canonized novels for adults are published without their original

illustrations on a regular basis. I argue that it is perilous to dismiss the pictures as lesser than or unnecessary to the written form they accompany, especially when the pictures and words were created by the same hand to function as multiple parts of one narrative.

The Collaboration Model

Sometimes words and pictures work together to create a powerful hybrid text even when separate people have contributed the two modes of communication. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, written by Lewis Carroll, contains 42 illustrations by John Tenniel. Because their intended audience was children, and because Carroll acknowledged Tenniel's greater experience in publishing matters, both the author and illustrator of *Wonderland* were very mindful of the effect of their collaboration. In my "collaboration model," the author and illustrator can form a product that gains an extra sense of reality through being envisioned by more than one hand in cooperation.

Carroll and Tenniel shared the goal of making the reading process, including both words and pictures, seamless for the child reader. Their pictures and words are not redundant, but rather offer the reader an affirming correspondence between forms.⁹ The result of their collaboration is a masterful combination of word and picture, in which the pictorial representation of the protagonist melds with her written representation to form

⁹ Randall McLeod discusses the way character tags and catchwords in Shakespeare's first folio often contain synonyms to the words used in the main text. He argues that the "structural redundancies are both of its text and about it" (McLeod as Clod 246). McLeod believes that a reader must be willing to overlook permutations in paratextual markers, and that the very act of eliding differences makes the text dynamic for the reader. In my collaboration model of illustration, the words and pictures must be similarly elided in order to establish in the reader the feeling of being enveloped by a text. The pictures and the words help readers situate themselves in their reading, reassuring them that they are right about the text; not by being the same, but by corresponding.

two views on one solid and realistic subject. The character of Alice, who leads the reader on a tour of a strange dream world, gains multilayered solidity through being reinforced by two forms of meaning-making. Curiously, though Tenniel's contribution to the *Alice* books is integral to the way the author designed the plot of each book, many other illustrators have approached the text, replacing Tenniel's pictures with their own. In this illustration history, we have an example of what can happen when a hybrid text is disrupted in its transmission.

The Mediation Model

The hundreds of line drawings in the edition of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) published with illustrations by Hugh Thomson in 1894, draw attention to those aspects of the novel's plot most interesting to Thomson's late Victorian readership. The subtle gloss provided by these illustrations mediates a reading of Austen's text. Thomson's illustrations affected the way Austen entered the literary canon as well as the way Thomson's audience thought about Austen's own priorities.

New illustrations added to a "classic" text generate a layer of mediation between the reader and the original text: the work of the new artist will be shaped by the history that has occurred since the written text's original publication and the knowledge that it has become a classic. My "mediation model" of illustration includes editions of classics with new pictures added. These editions often seem to emphasize the illustrator's ability and worthiness to approach a canonical text, creating a shift in the focus on the content of the book. The goals of the new artist may be varied – to update the look and feel of the

novel for the current day, to fit the text into a particular genre, and/or to suit it to a particular readership.

In the edition of *Pride and Prejudice* illustrated by Hugh Thomson, the style and wit of the illustrations suggested that it was one of the great novels – if not contemporary in 1894, at least in sympathy with contemporary thought and taste. In this edition, Thomson’s delicate late Victorian line drawings, including many pictures of happy, rounded children, were set into a book shape and layout that conformed to what the late Victorians considered a classic medieval style, with wide margins and illustrated initials at the beginnings of chapters. The combination of illustration that focused on contemporary preoccupations with a layout that connoted the medieval, made the written text from 1813 seem both contemporary and classic at the same time. Since then, *Pride and Prejudice* has been illustrated as everything from a Victorian family novel, to an academic textbook, to a status symbol of wealth and prestige, to a romantic fantasy. I argue that all inclusions of pictures in *Pride and Prejudice* following the George Allen edition illustrated by Hugh Thomson are indebted to, or in some way reacting to, that edition.

This publication history sets any illustrated edition of *Pride and Prejudice* apart from novels like *Vanity Fair*, illustrated by Thackeray in its first form; *Pickwick Papers*, illustrated by Browne while the novel was being released serially; or the *Alice* books, illustrated by Tenniel in their first editions. Novels designed to carry with them visual representations of some kind, either by the author or someone working closely with the author, have a different sort of publication history than do the novels of Jane Austen, never published with even a frontispiece during the author’s lifetime.

The Present Day

Ultimately, the four different scenarios I address – Dickens instructing his illustrator in an imperious manner while he writes, Thackeray illustrating his own written text, Carroll and Tenniel collaborating closely, and Hugh Thomson modifying Austen to suit his contemporary readership – each result in a different role for the illustrations in the narrative. Illustrations can comment on, complicate, reinforce or update a written text based on the situation in which the pictures and written text are combined. These scenarios have correlatives in the current publishing scene.

While it is certainly true that the historical considerations involved in the production of each text shape to its cultural impact and form, these models of the ways a written text can be illustrated are not bound to the Victorian era. Therefore, in my Postscript, I apply my readings of the differing relationships between author and illustrator to four current publishing situations. I provide an example of each word and picture combination in contemporary fiction in order to treat each edition as itself individual, dictated by a specific set of historical circumstances. Alan Moore's directions to his illustrator for *From Hell* provide a contemporary example of the integration model. The award-winning graphic novel *Bone* written and illustrated by Jeff Smith can be considered a contemporary example of the single creator model. Holly Black and Tony DiTerlizzi collaborated closely on their bestselling series of children's books, *The Spiderwick Chronicles*. And finally, the pervasive current practice of re-branding books by packaging them with different cover images is another way to mediate a reader's access to a narrative. In each of these contemporary examples, the functions of the words

and pictures are shaped by their interaction and the situation in which they were combined.

Theoretical considerations

Language and Literature Departments across the English-speaking world are shifting their focus away from a literary canon and towards a strategy of “reading” cultural productions, creating a decided overlap between textual scholarship and cultural criticism. Cultural criticism seeks to expose and explain the influences of historicized forces such as gender, class and race on cultural productions. Textual scholarship includes the identification and analysis of changing technologies, economics and materials in book production. These aspects of the creation of the physical book are tied to the role of editor and the effect of editing choices on how a text is read. When the “cultural product” examined is a book, these two critical lenses can be very closely intertwined. Textual scholarship focuses on the materiality of various kinds of texts, and how issues of production and transmission of texts affect that materiality. The prospectus for the upcoming *Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship* describes textual scholarship as having “itself fostered new modes of critical reading and interpretation that focus upon the materiality, production, transmission and reception of texts” making it “a domain fundamental to literary and media studies of all kinds” (Fraistat and Flanders). In other words, reading the materiality of a book should be part of cultural literacy.

Both cultural criticism and textual scholarship are at base interdisciplinary pursuits. In both cases, a sort of reader response theory is implicit, since both cultural criticism and textual scholarship deal with the effects generated by choices of production.

This dissertation employs both of these approaches, as it seeks to categorize the ways that illustrated books are produced by the methods and historical forces that shape them, addressing the technological and societal setting of publication in the production of illustrated novels. These factors shape their reception and transmission. Because I see the presence of pictures with words as part of the province of both cultural criticism and textual scholarship, in many cases I address the addition of illustrations as an editorial choice, and apply textual scholars' ideas about editing to illustrators' choices.

While some textual scholars have addressed the analysis of pictures or images as text, often because they are positing a "correct" way to edit pictures, it is rare to see an explicit, frank discussion of how illustration can itself be an editorial act, though it seems quite clear to me that approaching an existing novel to illustrate it is much like approaching an existing novel to annotate it. A similar process of selecting passages to highlight, and a similar consideration of audience is necessary to each, for instance. I posit that the inquiries pertinent to the art of editing are also pertinent to the art of illustrating.

In this dissertation, I address many of the same questions about the role of illustrations that Kathryn Sutherland poses about the role of the editor in shaping editions. It is remarkable how well her questions apply to the act of illustrating as well as the act of "editioning." If she wants to address the questions, "what is a good edition? [and] how far is editing a critical activity that shapes and forestalls subsequent interpretation?" (Freistat and Flanders); I propose to investigate, "what is a good [illustration]? [and] how far is [illustration] a critical activity that shapes and forestalls subsequent interpretation?" Furthermore, I hope that I can similarly make the claim that these are equally "some of

the field's [i.e., textual scholarship's] central and enduring questions" (Freistat and Flanders).

Essentially, I believe that the way the illustrated text was created, whether the illustrator and author worked together, at cross-purposes, or separately, has a classifiable effect on the variety and efficacy of the product. How the pictures and words come together affects the way they work together.

Chapter 2

Leaving Space: *Pickwick Papers* complicates assumed roles for words and pictures

“[A] study of the relations between Dickens’ text and the illustrations has these values: ... it suggests ways in which the artist influences the progress of the story; it enables us to identify emblematic settings, parallel actions, and common themes; it emphasizes the virtues of Christianity and comedy that provide the novel’s moral values; and finally, it contributes to our understanding of the design of the novel and its genre” (Patten 590).

The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club was the first novel in England to be issued in parts in its first edition (Sutherland 12, 21). It was released by Chapman and Hall in 1836 and 1837, the year Victoria ascended the throne. The publishers had hired young Charles Dickens to write a series of vignettes that would “write up to” a series of plates by the famous, established artist Robert Seymour (quoted in Steig 7). However, as the rest of Dickens’ career would demonstrate, he could never be part of a project without taking it over. “Dickens was evidently not even the first choice as an author, but once hired he took over the reins with great assurance and immediately reversed the intended relationship between himself and his artist, Robert Seymour” (Steig 7). The plan for a series of sporting cuts by Seymour with accompanying written text by Charles Dickens was soon inverted. “When the Seymour plan was put to him, [Dickens] insisted that he should write his own story and Seymour should illustrate *that*.” (Harvey 11 italics *ibid*).¹⁰

¹⁰ J.A. Sutherland notes that “Chapman and Hall were noticeably innovative when it came to finding new ways to market fiction. During their most innovative phase (1836-50) they pioneered the monthly shilling number (1836), the Christmas book (1843) and the cheap collective reissue of the work of living novelists (1847)” (Sutherland 4). It is worth noting that the first instance of all these publishing innovations were authored by Dickens (*Pickwick Papers*, *A Christmas Carol*, and an inexpensive re-issue of Dickens’ texts). At least in the case of *Pickwick Papers*, Chapman and Hall get credit for the innovation after the fact. While they suggested adding letterpress to Seymour’s prints, it

The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club (Pickwick Papers) was the result. It became a sweeping comic novel that told the long, interconnected tales of Mr. Pickwick, a round, benevolent, bespectacled gentleman; and his “club” of comedic friends as they traveled about the countryside for their own amusement. Dickens’ gift for pacing allowed him to create each of the “numbers,” or serial issues of the novel so that they were satisfying even as they left the reader wanting more. Often this meant that in a number, one character’s plot line would reach a resolution while another was introduced or complicated. *Pickwick Papers* ushered in the age of the serialized novel as well as the Victorian illustrated novel. In its incredible success in the marketplace, *Pickwick Papers* became the prototype for the form and function of words and pictures in fiction for the rest of the nineteenth century. While J.R. Harvey says that a successful illustrated novel has two arts that “keep their own integrity within the large integrity” and that Victorian serialized novels “show text and picture making a single art” (Harvey 2), Dickens and Browne and Chapman and Hall in many ways actually created these functions for the illustrations. The illustrated serialized novels that followed *Pickwick Papers* had a lot to live up to.

Pickwick Papers was the first of its kind in several significant ways, and part of the reason it became so influential may have been because it seemed to confirm some popular ideas about the differences between visual and written arts. While some early reviewers felt that Pickwick’s character was achieved visually as much as verbally (Harvey 8), it was clear that the pictures were supplementary to the written text. In this

was Dickens who insisted on writing an ongoing story. Really, their genius seems to have been to allow Dickens to modify their plan to suit him.

chapter I will explore the ways that the technological necessities of part publishing and Dickens' writing habits seemed to reinforce the separate functions associated with visual and written arts as posited by Gotthold Lessing in his hermeneutical text, *Laocoön*. It is my argument that the illustrations actually do much more than Lessing would give them credit for, even as their assumed role became foundational to the Victorian understanding of the functions of illustrations in later serialized illustrated novels.

Serialization helped determine the role of the illustrations in *Pickwick Papers*. Harvey notes that “with the monthly-part novel, the illustrations were not merely desired, they were needed” (Harvey 8), because of the lapse in time between numbers. The pictures serve as memory aids to a reader who has not thought about the story for a month. Though the role of the pictures in *Pickwick Papers* would become the paradigm for pictures in subsequent serialized novels, in *Pickwick Papers* the pictures' roles are not actually as straightforward as they may appear. The pictures are not merely memory aids. Illustrations can also “offer fixed visual images of the characters, ... emphasize moral meanings ... provide crucial information absent from the text [and] offer interpretations” (Steig 8) and each of these functions was fulfilled by the illustrations for *Pickwick Papers*.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the illustration process for *Pickwick Papers* was complicated by several factors. First, as I have already noted, the original project was begun by Robert Seymour, who wanted the words to be merely supplementary to the pictures. Dickens insisted on reversing this relationship. Secondly, Seymour ended up illustrating only the first two issues: he committed suicide the day after completing his sixth illustration for the project. This led to a drastic disruption in the novel's direction.

Chapman and Hall hurriedly hired R.W. Buss as a stand-in illustrator, but as will be discussed later in the chapter, he was far too inexperienced to be of any help to the project. Hablôt K. Browne was then hired to become Dickens' illustrator, which worked extremely well. This series of events makes it sound as though Dickens were re-enacting the story of Goldilocks – the first illustrator too experienced, the second not experienced enough, and the third, the 21-year-old Browne, just right. Unlike Seymour, Browne (later pseudonym, Phiz) was willing to be told what to do by Dickens, and unlike Buss, Browne could do it.

Luckily for Dickens, the result of his experience of trial and error with the illustrators for *Pickwick Papers* had a happier ending than did the story of “Goldilocks and the Three Bears.” After a rocky start, with the work of three different illustrators appearing in the first four numbers of *Pickwick Papers*, the novel grew in popularity by leaps and bounds. The working relationship between Dickens and Browne was to last successfully for several books. However, it cannot be denied that the four representations of Pickwick as a character – Seymour's, Buss's, Browne's and Dickens' – have incongruities as well as convergences and that the differences between the early visual versions of the characters and the story world depicted in the first few numbers of the novel do affect the way it begins. In later one-volume editions, Browne even addressed this problem by re-illustrating the early scenes.

Figure 2:1 contrasts the drawing style of Seymour with that of Browne in two similarly composed pictures of Mr. Pickwick. In both he is baffled, on the defensive, surprised and surrounded by hubbub. In the first, Seymour portrays Pickwick as an indignant, bulky man. His arms and face are thick and he grips his umbrella like a

weapon with one hand while using the other to fend off his comediely round-eyed and round-fisted attacker. In comparison, Browne's Pickwick on the right seems gentler and less imposing. His fatness is all in his rounded belly, and his arms are much thinner. His face has different features, and perhaps most notably, the facial expression indicated by his raised eyebrows and the body language of his splayed palms both convey a different character from the posture or facial expression in Seymour's portrayal.

In addition to the multiple illustrators who shaped the early appearances of Mr. Pickwick and his story world, the role of the pictures in this novel is also complicated by the fact that Dickens' writing in both comic and emotional scenes is itself visually descriptive. Dickens' written text expressly encourages visualization and alludes to itself as a pictorial art in a way that makes the comedy clearly physical comedy, even when unpictured, and makes the heart-wrenching pull of the sentimental scenes visually gripping. Q.D. Leavis maintains that Dickens "is indeed the Blake as well as the Shakespeare of the novel" (Leaves 355), and it seems likely that the success of Browne as Dickens' illustrator was due partly to the shared sense of the importance of visual cues and a similar approach to their meaning. In other words, "Dickens' use of imagery is often analogous to Browne's use of emblematic detail" (Steig 4). In *Pickwick Papers*, this means that Browne's pictures contribute to the comedy that often results when Dickens' characters react differently to verbal and visual cues from each other and their surroundings.

For instance, Dickens dwells on the physical appearance of his characters. In an essay that compares Mr. Pickwick and his valet Sam Weller to the letters O I, and Don Quixote and Sancho Panza to the letters I O, Juliet McMaster posits that "[i]t is, among

other things, because of the way they *look* that Pickwick and Don Quixote can sustain their mythic roles, and leap from the confines of the books that would enclose them into a hundred stage adaptations, pictures, movies, and toby jugs” (McMaster 596 italics *ibid*).

The respective shapes of Pickwick and Sam, like their looks in general, exist in the visual imagination of the reader because of both the illustrations and the written text. Any analysis of their appearance, then, must take into account “the basic construction of the human subject as a being constituted by both language and imaging” (Mitchell 24).¹¹ Therefore, if “identity is fixed through visual confirmation” (Patten 585), the first few numbers of *Pickwick Papers* must have offered readers a confusing view of the characters’ identities. Once Browne arrived on the scene, however, there was an instant and lasting convergence of representation. “If we said that Browne found himself in the Pickwick plates, we should have to add at once that the self he found was a particularly Dickensian self: there is a comic vitality akin to Dickens’s¹² own” (Harvey 110). Moreover, Browne’s arrival on the project coincided with the first appearance of Sam Weller, who would become an important and beloved character in the novel.

***Pickwick Papers* was the first new novel issued in parts**

Publishing *Pickwick Papers* in monthly parts was an innovation that revitalized the English novel. J.A. Sutherland, for one, notes that it had been so expensive to publish

¹¹ In fact, as Robert L. Patten writes in the Penguin edition of *Pickwick Papers*, the appearance of Mr. Pickwick cannot even be credited solely to the joint efforts of Dickens and his illustrators, because Chapman, the publisher, was the first to suggest to Seymour that Pickwick be rotund. Seymour had originally designed the character to be amusingly gawky.

¹² I maintain the original published punctuation and possessives of quoted material.

a three-volume novel that publishers often avoided the risk altogether when it came to new authors. Thus, readers were being offered generally unadventurous, low-risk material for a high price. Monthly parts minimized the publishing costs, and thus the risk, because the individual issues were easy to produce and the publisher could theoretically cease publication mid novel on an unpopular serial. Moreover, the individual numbers could be cheap enough for a mass audience. A mass audience had to be attracted to make the system viable, however, because the cheaper the publication, the larger the print run needed to be to make set-up time for it cost effective (Weedon 70ff).

The economic situation that led to publishing novels in parts led thereby to an actual artistic shift in the writing of books. “In the early decades of the rise of the English novel, the necessity of printing serially [for reasons of cost and availability of materials as well as reducing risk to the publisher] had spawned the practice of serial publication; authors responded to publishing in parts by composing in parts” (Dooley 148). Part composition and the knowledge that the readers would be reading in parts led to more episodic plots, and more reminders in the early pages of each issue that jogged the reader’s memory of what had happened last month. For Dickens and subsequent authors whose texts were serialized in their first editions, “[s]ince manuscripts were customarily not returned with proofs, an author’s first comprehensive reading of a work as a whole often occurred when the entire set of installments or numbers was prepared for a new edition in volume form” (Dooley 128)¹³.

¹³ Anthony Trollope, the notable exception to this rule, was proud that he never released a part of a novel before finishing the entire thing. The very fact that he notes this seems to confirm that general practice was otherwise.

The act of composing in parts had its advantages. It was possible for an author to approach a text in a similar way to how his readers would approach it. Notably, regarding *Pickwick Papers*, Feltes asserts that because “each part was discrete, while yet a segment of a larger serial issue, [the format] allowed a focused, potent ideological apparatus” (Feltes 13-14) which seems an argument for the kind of episodic nature occasioned by part publication. Also, with part publication, the author has the option of responding to feedback from the reading public about the previous part, and could adjust the themes and plots accordingly. As authors made the artistic shift to composing in parts, their products in turn affected the economy. “Pickwick’s relations of production, its format, and its literary form constituted the very commodity-text which could reach, as it produced, a mass audience” (Feltes 13).

A new novel issued in monthly parts offered people of many classes the ability to be on the forefront of the literary scene. Everybody got the new piece at once, and a mass market could afford the purchase of a novel on an installment plan, especially since it offered such immediate gratification. Readership of novels became a multi-class pursuit, and “the monthly serial in shilling numbers probably did more than anything else to open up a mass market for fiction” (Sutherland 24).

Pictures in the shilling parts had both a social and monetary value in addition to their other roles. Picture-literacy had been honed in England by appreciation of Hogarth and other print artists. Thus, the new mass market for written fiction was not new to an appreciation of nuanced printed narratives: they were just accustomed to those narratives occurring in pictorial form. In Leavis’s apologetic essay “The Dickens Illustrations: Their

Function,” the author explains that in the England of the early 1800s, literate and illiterate people alike were

accustomed to taking in ideas in a stylized art form and had an imagination formed by the tradition of moral satire independent of literacy. Thus when ... cheap part-publication was feasible to reach a larger public altogether, the parts *had* to be illustrated, and artists like Cruikshank who were caricaturists became also famous illustrators of books. (Leavis 333)

The social necessity of illustrations dovetailed with the added monetary value pictures provided. The inclusion of full-page prints at the beginning of each number of *Pickwick Papers* was a notable selling point for the inexpensive numbers.

Illustration, which was a luxury the multi-volume novel did not normally offer, was of an expensively high standard [in part publication]. Dickens illustrated by Phiz, Trollope by Millais, or Thackeray by Thackeray were at least equivalent to Smollett illustrated by Rowlandson or Sterne by Hogarth [in the preceding century]. (Sutherland 22)

Thanks to both the social and monetary value of the illustrations, the pictures added to serialized novels became an integral part of the texts themselves. Steig goes so far as to claim that “certain nineteenth-century books have been reprinted incompletely if they do not include their original illustrations in their original positions.... [T]he illustrated novel is a kind of nineteenth-century subgenre of the novel proper” (Steig ix). It is my argument that this subgenre, a hybrid of word and picture, owes its form at least in part to the precedent set by Browne’s illustrations in *Pickwick Papers*.

The first number set the precedent

The first number of *Pickwick Papers* to be released set the course for the appearance of serialized, illustrated novels in the rest of the century. On the outside, the first number of the *Pickwick Papers* established the look the rest of the numbers would

have (Figure 2:2). The blue-green of the cover was to become characteristic of Dickens' novels in parts, and the color branding would be extended into other authors' works. For instance, Thackeray's novels were issued in yellow-papered parts.

The illustration on the cover of the first number of the *Pickwick Papers* would also stay the same for the rest of the run. Seymour's cover illustration signals the origin of the project as a series of sporting vignettes to be drawn by him and "written up to" by Dickens, with a top scene of hunting, bottom scene of fishing, and the apparatus of both pursuits framing the sides. The title bears much evidence of its era, with its pseudonymous author, its multiple fonts, and its arched stick lettering. Only the number of the issue, in the top left corner, and the publication year at the bottom would change from number to number, though the contents of each number varied dramatically.

Changes in the numbers

In each number, the order of the materials presented would stay consistent. Full-page illustrations appear on pages by themselves with blank verso, and then are followed by the written text of two chapters. By its fourth number, *Pickwick Papers* had already evolved into an endeavor that prioritized the written text over the pictures. Chapman and Hall had even decided to increase the amount of written text per month when they decreased the number of plates from four to two per part. Because a series of pictures appears before the written text, the pictures serve as a kind of dumbshow, or sneak preview of what is to come in the installment. The pictures were captioned only by a reference to the page they should appear next to, rather than with a written caption that

indicated the words they would illustrate. By providing some sense of anticipation, the illustrations make the act of reading dynamic and participatory.

Imagine opening the latest number, paging through advertisements (or reading them carefully if you are that sort of subscriber) and arriving at the illustrations. Do you scrutinize each, remembering characters familiar to you and meeting new ones, speculating about the plot twists soon to be narrated that occasion these pictures? Do you flip quickly past them so as to avoid spoilers and then look at them after you finish the written text? While reading the written text, do you flip back to the illustrations, helped by the page note at the bottom of each picture plate, making each match up with the words it is supposed to accompany? All of these options are made possible by the layout of the parts. Since the order in which the pictures preceded the written text remained constant, a reader could plan how to interact with the illustrations before even opening the new part.

Though the plates always came before the written text, the contents of each number did change drastically over the run of the novel. The quantity and prominence of advertisements increased from number to number, reflecting the growing popularity of *Pickwick Papers* over the course of its serialization. Even though “the second [n]umber sold at first fewer than 500 copies” (Patten 920), looking through the stack of *Pickwick Papers* in parts is like watching the story of its success. As the novel loses its first illustrator and eventually gains one more suited to the task, each section is gradually encased with a thicker and thicker layer of advertising. There are no advertisements in the first number, but by the second, Chapman and Hall line the front cover with notices of their upcoming publications (Figure 2:3).

Advertisements for objects other than books creep in around the seventh number, and periodically appear through the end of the run. The last installment combined No. 19 and No. 20 as printed on the cover, and included a table of contents for home binding. However, some of the other numbers are almost as thick as the final double installment because there is so much advertising at the front and back. Some of the advertisements even include color ink, while the illustrations and the written text of the novel itself do not.

Along with the advertising, the other paratextual material in the pages before the illustrations sometimes includes a “Notice” from Dickens or from Chapman and Hall, in which the author or publishers communicate directly with readers. Such a Notice indicates the death of Seymour and when Chapman and Hall engaged Robert Buss, a painter, to illustrate the next number they announced his participation glowingly next to an illustration by him (Figure 2:4).

In this illustration, the problems with Buss’s work are apparent. The figures all look uncomfortable and unnatural; the lady’s legs are oddly foreshortened and both portly figures lean toward her bent awkwardly from the waist. Furthermore, the cheek of the fat boy is so unnaturally round that it appears alarmingly as though he has no facial features at all, and the suggestion of his hands’ placement is vulgar. Chapman and Hall dismissed Buss almost immediately because they were so disappointed in his work. It is possible that as a painter, he was simply not used to drawing for an engraver. As G.E. Bentley Jr. has declared that

[e]ngravers were paid so much for good reason, for theirs is an art requiring the same kinds of genius as a painter. When an author writes verbal symbols on paper it is a comparatively straightforward process to transfer them into verbal symbols in type and print them. . . . On the other

hand, when an artist composes graphic symbols on paper or canvas, the difficulties of translating them to the printed page are formidable, and the result is never more than an approximation of the artist's attention. (62-63)¹⁴

Thus, it is also possible that Buss failed because the engraver himself did a bad job, making everyone look stilted and stiff. Most critics and theorists who discuss the illustrations in *Pickwick Papers* gloss over the contributions of Buss or do not acknowledge him at all. After the publishers dismissed Buss, they engaged Hablôt Knight Browne, who stayed with the project till its completion and then went on to illustrate many of Dickens' other books throughout his career.

Before illustrating for Dickens, Browne had "progressed rapidly in the freer medium [compared to engraving] of etching" which assured that his work would not suffer the same fate as Buss (Patten 576). He sold watercolors to keep his engraving and etching business afloat. In contrast to the way that Chapman and Hall celebrated the contributions of Buss and Seymour, Browne's entrance onto the Pickwick scene went unremarked. Perhaps Chapman, Hall and Dickens were wary of noting a change in three numbers in a row, or perhaps they had their doubts that Browne would be kept on.

As it turned out, Browne was a good illustrator for Dickens for a variety of reasons:

Seymour's successor, H.K. Browne, was younger than Dickens, little known, and pliable; and the collaboration was harmonious and happy. Now Dickens's authority was secure, he unbent and would forget his own text in his eagerness to make the illustrations as comical as possible. (Harvey 11)

¹⁴ The role of engravers will be addressed at greater length in Chapter 4, concerning Tenniel's process of working with his engravers the Dalziels.

Harvey is right to consider Dickens the source of the illustrations because Browne seemed willing to submit to Dickens' desires for control. Within a few numbers of *Pickwick Papers*, Browne, who had signed the first few illustrations "Nemo," settled on a pseudonym harmonious with Dickens': He became "Phiz" to Dickens' "Boz."

Dickens' methods of writing the parts, and instructing the illustrator

For *Pickwick Papers*, the publishing schedule was so tight that Dickens often instructed Browne about what the illustration should be even before he had himself written the prose the picture would illustrate. In the Preface included in the final double number, Dickens remarks:

It is due to the gentleman, whose designs accompany the letter-press, to state that the interval has been so short between the production of each number in manuscript and its appearance in print, that the greater portion of the Illustrations have been executed by the artist from the author's mere verbal description of what he intended to write. (viii-ix)

The word "mere" may be misleading, however. Throughout Dickens' career, he would provide his illustrators with the subject and caption for the illustration and would often even give them paragraphs explaining the event that had preceded the moment to be illustrated, what was about to happen, and the thoughts the characters were about to have. Michael Steig calls Browne "Dickens' first critic" for his prowess in grappling with these potentially un-illustratable pieces of information.

In contrast to the vast quantities of written material Dickens would generate to direct illustrations later in his career, Frederic Kitton maintains that Dickens made hurried visits to Browne in person to describe what he wanted from the plates during the production of *Pickwick Papers*. Then, "from these instructions Phiz ... drew a careful

sketch, which he sent to Dickens. Dickens criticized it, suggested alterations, and sent it back; Browne then prepared the etching” (Harvey 7). Dickens would offer a critique of the drawings with comments such as, “If Minerva *tried* to look a little younger (more like Mrs. Pott, who is perfect), I think it would be an additional improvement” (quoted in Kitton 70 parenthesis *ibid*). Harvey considers this process to be an “enthusiastic collaboration” (Harvey 7) even though “Dickens at least occasionally instructed Browne in the inclusion of emblematic details in addition to giving him the topic and caption for each plate” (Steig 18). I contend that in contrast to an enthusiastic collaboration, Dickens was always in control of the process of illustration with Browne.

Browne, however, was left with the task of grappling with un-illustratable commentary. Steig notes that while “Dickens did not always take Browne fully into his confidence by explaining the sequence of the plates and what they represent” (Steig 155), he often included “details (such as colors) and events which cannot possibly be shown in the illustration, some of which are not even in the novel’s text” like what emotions of the characters immediately precede and follow the event to be depicted (Steig 78). This is the kind of situation that leads Michael Steig to declare that “Browne [is] the very first interpreter of each of the novels he illustrated” (Steig ix). In *Pickwick Papers*, Browne’s interpretation in the text provides readers with Dickens’s written text with pictorial annotations or commentary built in to each number.

The combination of the unexplained and the un-illustratable in Dickens’ instructions helps indicate why it was so necessary that he be paired with an illustrator who shared some of his sensibilities and who was willing to be led by him. In Browne, willingness to submit to Dickens was accompanied by technical ability and talent, and a

sympathetic understanding of the author's goals. "Browne, at twenty-one, possessed an artistic imagination sympathetic to that of the twenty-four-year-old Dickens... [M]ost important, in his designs he was able iconographically to point up themes the text elaborated linguistically" (Patten 577). I find it interesting here that Patten uses such different terminology for writing about Dickens and Browne's arts. Apparently visual art is able to "point up" themes while written text "elaborates" on them. This means that the very terminology for visual art is itself visual and external: "pointing" at, to, or up something is a visual gesture. It implies that the visual art itself is not the focus; one does not point at oneself. The term for the linguistic art, "elaborate," rather implies that the themes are intrinsic to the written word and the words have the task of making the themes grow or deepen. The icons point to the language, while the words add to themselves.

Browne's Contributions

The arrival of "Sam Weller, who at once achieved such enormous popularity that the sale went up by leaps and bounds, the number of copies disposed of increasing from a few hundreds to several thousands" (Kitton 65), made *Pickwick Papers* an unmitigated success. Because the arrival of the character Sam Weller coincides with the advent of Browne's illustrations, Browne enjoyed the rising success of the novel without suffering through the painful period of its beginning. Browne's first designs for *Pickwick Papers* were in the fourth number, "designs depicting events that for the first time involve Pickwick in incidents that require him to take morally responsible acts" (Steig 25). One of these is the "First appearance of Mr. Samuel Weller" (Figure 2:5), in which Pickwick is seen aiding his friend Wardle in tracking down an eloping couple. The illustration

captioned only “page 94” on its first appearance when the novel was being released serially, shows, from right to left, an unknown young man shining boots, the officious lawyer, Mr. Wardle, and then Mr. Pickwick himself, looking engaged and interested.

In the written text, Chapter 10 opens with a detailed description of an inn courtyard. A man named Sam is described in the act of shining shoes there. The written text then takes Sam into interactions with other characters and into other rooms, eventually returning him to the courtyard, where Mr. Pickwick and two other gentlemen arrive and begin to speak to him. Thus, the plate that would eventually be titled “The First Appearance of Mr. Samuel Weller,” well after Sam had become a major character in the rest of *Pickwick Papers*, is not the first time a reader encounters the character in the written text, but rather treats the first time he is pictured by the illustrator, and the first time he is visible to Mr. Pickwick, as his first appearance. The conflation of the reader’s view with Pickwick’s own is one that will have deep ramifications throughout this novel.

In this illustration, we see Pickwick standing concerned and polite, with his hat in his hand. Pickwick’s interest in his friend Wardle’s predicament is indicated by the placement of his feet and the angle of his torso as well as the hand up to his mouth. He seems to be leaning and stepping into the scene. The angles of his torso and feet also provide a contrast to the more pronounced lean of the lawyer toward Sam. The lawyer’s stance – hands behind his back and straight legs with feet together – seems condescending, as the written text indeed verifies. Sam himself considers that this gentleman must be “‘one o’ the advice gratis order,’ thought Sam, ‘or [he] wouldn’t be so werry fond o’ me all at once’” (123). Browne’s ability to capture Dickens’ characterizations and themes is perhaps most obvious in this illustration, however, in

Sam's jaunty attitude. Sam's hat is at a rakish angle, and he leans heavily on one leg. His back is straight even though he has the boot he is shining on his knee, and his shoulders are broad even though he is looking behind him. He is clearly active and self-confident. The little dog sniffing Mr. Pickwick's boots not only mimics Sam's playful attitude towards the three central gentlemen, its interest in Mr. Pickwick's boots serves as a visual balance to Sam's collection of boots and shoes in the other lower corner. The dog is an iconographic or emblematic detail that Browne uses to visually convey the motifs Dickens emphasizes in writing.

The aspects of the illustration that made Browne's style appropriate for Dickens' writing – the iconographic imagery, the character notes provided by position and posture – were part of what made the novel so successful. As I will discuss, another reason for the success of the illustrations was that they seemed to embrace traditional ideas about the separation of functions for words and pictures, while actually offering much more nuanced possibilities of what words and pictures could do.

Laocoön's division of labor between visual and linguistic arts

In 1766, Gotthold Lessing's treatise *Laocoön* set up a division of labor between art and letters that established some of the assumptions about the combination of words and pictures in illustrated texts. In *Laocoön*, subtitled "An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry," Lessing claims in the preface that he considers all the plastic arts when he speaks of "painting" (and in fact his title *Laocoön* is taken from a sculpture), and he considers all arts of letters when he speaks of "poetry." Therefore, it is problematic to apply his extremely generalized discourse on painting and poetry to reproduced black and

white prints and prose fiction published together, especially because his examples are a sculpture and an epic.

Fredrick Burwick, in his essay “Lessing’s *Laokoon* and the Rise of Visual Hermeneutics” discusses the foundational role of Lessing’s theories for British thinkers. *Laocoön*’s delineation of the separation of duties for the two arts followed the writing of Abbé du Bos who had argued in 1719 that while “the natural signs of pictures or paintings are immediately perceived, words must first arouse the ideas of which they are the arbitrary signs” (Burwick 222). Lessing “added a new, albeit questionable, elaboration, whereby natural signs are perceived as spatial, and artificial signs as temporal” (Burwick 223). Lessing’s argument was that “painting employs wholly different signs or means of imitation from poetry, – the one using forms and colors in space, the other articulate sounds in time” (Lessing 91). Therefore,

[s]ince painting, because its signs or means of imitation can be combined only in space, must relinquish all representations of time, therefore progressive actions, as such, cannot come within its range. It must content itself with actions in space ; in other words, with mere bodies, whose attitude lets us infer their action. ...[A]ctions are the particular subjects of poetry. (Lessing 90-91)

In 1826, Lessing’s treatise appeared in English, translated by Thomas de Quincey. “De Quincey is in complete accord with Lessing’s contention that the temporal moment of art must appear continuous, and that the imagination of the beholder must be stimulated to reanimate the action” (Burwick 264). In English, “*Laokoon* [the spelling of the de Quincey edition’s title] certainly influenced the course of criticism during the following decades. His [Lessing’s] distinction between the temporal attributes of poetry and the spatial attributes of painting was often reiterated” (Burwick 220). This reiteration indicates that when *Pickwick Papers* was first published, thoughts about divisions

between the purpose of pictures and written text were already being discussed. Lessing states as an absolute that

[t]he rule is this, that succession in time is the province of the poet, co-existence in space that of the artist. To bring together into one and the same picture two points of time necessarily remote ... is an encroachment of the painter on the domain of the poet, which good taste can never sanction. (Lessing 109)

The power of Lessing's text has been that it seems so self-evident and cut and dried that generations of art and letters critics and theorists have found it necessary to refute or qualify it. "Lessing developed a means of interpreting verbal and visual relationships that persisted in subsequent critical discourse, even among those who disagreed with his notion of how poetry and painting were limited" (Burwick 223). Lessing, in fact, questions the good taste of artists who attempt to include chronology in their images. He calls for apologetics and qualifications from all who disagree with him. Though Lessing's argument seems designed to contrast short oral descriptive poems with statues, it has been formative in the creation of a belief about how illustrated fiction works, combining written prose with mass-produced pictorial images.

As Mitchell has noted, the division of duties in the combination of words and pictures is connected to a hierarchical relationship between them, and a division of labor in their creation. "The 'normal' relations of image and word (in the illustrated newspaper or even the cartoon page) follow more traditional formulas involving the clear subordination and suturing of one medium to the other, often with a straightforward division of labor" (Mitchell 91 parenthesis *ibid*). A hierarchical relationship and division of labor is indicative of how the pictures and written text come together in *Pickwick Papers*. Space for the full-page plates is allotted in each number, and Dickens' extensive

instructions about how to fill that space did not seem to affect the way he continued his written narrative. However, the actual content of both the pictures and the written text of *Pickwick Papers* made the division of functions for words and pictures much more nuanced and engrossing than Lessing might assume.

Does directionality in an image imply narrative in that image?

Because Lessing's example of visual art is a statue instead of a two-dimensional drawn scene, his assessment of how temporality functions in "painting" is that the eye of the beholder chooses to focus on different parts of an arrested image, and that all parts of the image take place at the same time. However, when looking at a flat image in a book, the eye follows a path similar to looking at a page of text, meaning that the directionality of an image is culturally determined. For us, as for the first readers of PP, "time flows across the page from left to right" (Tufte 121) because that is the direction of text in our culture. In the west, we generally look at a page by starting near the top center and then progressing from left to right. Mitchell comments on the cultural expectations inherent in a picture's directionality, stating "[p]erspective is a figure for what we would call ideology – a historical, cultural formation that masquerades as a universal, natural code" (Mitchell 31), as part of his argument that visual literacy is a culturally determined way to interpret texts. For example, Mitchell discusses the duckrabbit, Figure 2:7. The optical illusion that appears to be both a duck and a rabbit requires a kind of doublethink to hold both images in the mind at once. However, Mitchell does not discuss why this optical illusion is not called the rabbitduck. It is my contention that the eye follows the same progression on the image that it does on the word. Quite simply, I believe this optical

illusion is called the duckrabbit because as the eye scans the image from left to right, the face of the duck is apparently whole before the face of the rabbit is whole, implying that the way we read images is directionally similar to the way that we read words.

The eye's movement across an image does not always result in an optical illusion, however. In *Pickwick Papers*, Browne employs the assumption that readers will start at the top of an image and then move from left to right to great effect without creating optical illusions. For instance, one of Browne's illustrations shows a winter scene of gentlemen disporting themselves on the ice while ladies look on (Figure 2:7). Mr. Pickwick forms the apex of the image, in the top center, going "slowly and gravely down the slide, with his feet about a yard and a quarter apart, amidst the gratified shouts of all the spectators" (Dickens *Pickwick Papers* Everyman 413).

To the left of Mr. Pickwick is Mr. Winkle, prone on the ice, with two gentlemen standing over him. It appears that this part of the picture illustrates the aftermath of Winkle's collision with Bob Sawyer while skating: "Bob Sawyer had risen to his feet, but Mr. Winkle was far too wise to do anything of the kind, in skates. He was seated on the ice, making spasmodic efforts to smile; but the anguish was depicted on every lineament of his countenance" (Dickens *Pickwick Papers* Everyman 412). The problem with this, however, is that Mr. Winkle falls down a page and a half before Mr. Pickwick slides. In that page and a half, dialogue is exchanged, and we learn that Sam Weller has enterprisingly helped carve out a completely separate area, apart from the skating, for sliding.

Though Browne's illustration elides two different moments of the written text that expressly take place in two different areas of the scene, it is not difficult for a reader to

understand the image. In their combination, word and picture as parts of the text must themselves be elided for readers to locate meaning in the reading and reassure themselves that they are right about it, not by being the same, but by corresponding. “The effect is evidently calculated for the reader of novels who also ‘read’ pictures” (Harvey 141) and the effect of this illustration is to display the sum of the afternoon rather than one specific moment.

It is more usual to celebrate the conflation of multiple moments in one image by artists other than Browne.¹⁵ For instance, referring to a print by Hogarth of the teeming horrors of Gin Lane, Charles Lamb argued that “Hogarth has not exaggerated, but, rather, he has consolidated the recurring events of St. Giles into a single moment” (Burwick 249). I think it can be similarly argued here that Browne has consolidated the events of the skating afternoon into one image.

Because “the plate depicts as occurring simultaneously actions that the text describes as occurring consecutively” (Patten 575), the static nature of the image allows for multiple thematic and chronological readings.¹⁶ Steig points out that in Browne’s triangular compositions, the directionality of reading can change the interpretation of the illustration (Steig 36). In “Mr. Pickwick Slides,” a clockwise reading starting at the top with Mr. Pickwick himself would lead to an interpretation in which the young lady on the right is tittering at Pickwick. Alternatively, taking the top figure of Pickwick as a header

¹⁵ Similarly, Randall McLeod argues that permutations in written paratextual material make the text dynamic (McLeod as Clod, 246).

¹⁶ Kitton notes that Browne neglected to draw skates on any of the skaters, which may have been a simple mistake made by a non-sporting illustrator, a stylistic choice, or an attempt to elide the locations of the two events by silently implying that they were occasioned by the same activity – sliding.

and then reading the figures of Winkle and the tittering lady from left to right would lead to the interpretation that the titterer's mirth is occasioned by Mr. Winkle's fall. Mr. Pickwick's position is then seen like a chapter title, the other figures occurring under his rubric: even though the scene of Mr. Winkle's fall happens chronologically before Mr. Pickwick slides, Mr. Pickwick's action is before Mr. Winkle's in importance. Mr. Pickwick's legs help the triangular composition by pointing to the other nodes of the triangle as well as framing yet another small, playful dog in the center.

Chronologically, the action of the image moves counterclockwise starting with Mr. Winkle – from left to right as the chronology of the written text did as well. Browne uses the western convention of assuming a chronology flows from left to right while playing with the vertical register to convey a hierarchy of importance. The conventions of book-reading and textual direction in the west affect how a picture is read even though the triangular composition of the image carries its own pictorial meanings.

Narratives of more than one picture

As I have mentioned, the format of the numbers dictated that the full-page plates would always precede the written text of the chapters of *Pickwick Papers*. In the series of plates before the written text of each number, the chronology is expected to flow from one page to the next, just as in each individual picture it flows from left to right. The final double number included a table of contents that indicated where the plates were to be inserted into the various chapters in order to appear opposite the written text they illustrated, “providing a running commentary, in visual language, upon the verbal text”

(Steig 34). In the original parts, however, the pictures functioned more like a dumbshow before the main act, presenting what was about to be explained.

When Browne's illustration in Figure 2:8 appears at the beginning of a new issue, it thus serves as a sneak preview of what is to come for those readers (and I imagine it was most readers) who read the number straight through, meaning that they scrutinized the pictures before reading the words. The illustration depicts the surprise of Mr. Pickwick's three friends when they see a lady reclining in his arms. Readers who read each page of the new number in the order in which they were presented would both see the scene depicted with no explanation in the illustration at the beginning of the number and then also arrive at the scene after reading all the preceding written text. With no knowledge of the events leading up to the moment depicted, readers can share the surprise of Mr. Pickwick's friends when they encounter the image before the written text. The illustration depicts the moment in the written text when, "Mr. Pickwick was struck motionless and speechless. He stood with his lovely burden in his arms, gazing vacantly on the countenances of his friends, without the slightest attempt at recognition or explanation. They in turn stared at him" (Dickens *Pickwick Papers* Penguin 232). By the time readers encounter this passage of written text, they have also read a thorough and plausible lead-up of miscommunication between Mr. Pickwick and his landlady. The first readers, therefore, had every opportunity to identify with the surprise or understanding of each character involved in the scene. Thanks to the placement of the illustration, the reader could both sympathize with Pickwick's friends, arriving on the scene with no idea of what has gone before, and sympathize with Pickwick himself because readers would become well aware of his own confusion through reading the written scene.

The written text of the scene communicates that this is one of many instances of Pickwick misreading the visual cues around him. We read that his landlady, Mrs. Bardell repeatedly blushes “up to the very border of her cap” (230) because she believes Mr. Pickwick to be proposing marriage to her. However, he fails to notice her visible reaction to his words, even though “he looked very hard at Mrs. Bardell” (231). In fact it is only her eventual verbal cue, when she calls him a “dear” that he finds noteworthy and that astonishes him (232). Throughout the text, readers know that Mr. Pickwick and his friends place more importance on verbal cues than on visual ones, and this is a consistent source of comedy. Other examples include the way Mr. Winkle’s professed sporting ability is repeatedly and strongly contrasted against his observed lack of sporting ability. Perhaps most significantly, Mr. Pickwick himself expects others to believe what they hear and not what they see of him. For instance, when frightened, his “lip might quiver, and his cheek might blanch, but no expression of fear or concern escaped the lips of that immortal man” (119). His inability to read the visage Mrs. Bardell presents in this scene leads to his unwilling participation in the scene his followers interpret incorrectly. Thus, the misreading of visual cues leads to more misreading of visual cues.

Hogarth’s Influence

Regarding serial novels generally and *Pickwick Papers* specifically, Harvey states that written “text and picture could not have combined in a closer and more lively way than they did in realizing, jointly, a climax of far-fetched comedy. The connection with the satiric print made this possible” for both Browne and Dickens (Harvey 18). Leavis similarly holds that “[t]he suitability of [Browne] for Dickens was not accidental; the

principle of convergence that novelist and artist... seem to exhibit so successfully is due to their ... belonging to the tradition of a visual-literary moralistic-satiric art with its roots in Pope and Hogarth” (Leavis 334). Hogarth, the master of the satiric print, was an inspiration to Dickens and his various illustrators throughout Dickens’ career.

Hogarth was considered the pinnacle of social commentary in reproduced visual arts of the era. By the 1820s, critics of satiric prints both in and out of the papers considered Hogarth to be their point of comparison. The artists of the satiric prints became Dickens’ illustrators. “Cruikshank and Seymour were not trained book-illustrators, but caricaturists turned illustrator” (Harvey 21).

However, the conceit that Hogarth’s prints were themselves both images and texts was also part of the discourse about his work. Charles Lamb in 1811 “contribute[d] significantly to the argument that Hogarth’s pictures must be ‘read.’ Hogarth’s visual images, Lamb insists, function as words in a text” (Burwick 248). Even if they didn’t subscribe to Lamb’s one-to-one ratio of words to images,

in the great revival of interest in Hogarth at the beginning of the 19th century, it was customary to praise his work in literary terms. [For instance Lamb wrote that Hogarth’s] “graphic representations are indeed books: they have the teeming, fruitful suggestive meaning of *words*. Other pictures we look at, – his prints we read.” (Harvey 50 italics *ibid*)¹⁷

It seems the commentary on Hogarth in the Victorian era usually focused on an individual tableau, even though many of his more famous works were series of prints, such as the *Rake’s Progress*, or pairs of prints, such as “Beer Street” and “Gin Lane.”

¹⁷ The assumption that the options are “to look at” or “to read” implies that all words require analysis and therefore pictures that require analysis in some way count as words. This assumption seems dismissive of Hogarth’s visual art even as it praises his ability to execute it.

The fact that critics chose to focus their attention on individual prints implies that they were subscribing silently to the belief that the narrative created by the images in sequence was somehow less worthy of analysis than the visual cues offered by one alone. Regardless of how the bulk of Victorian aficionados of Hogarth read the *Harlot's Progress*, analyses of Hogarth's work might, for instance, consider the first frame and discuss the order in which a viewer takes in the elements of the image, as I myself have done in the first chapter to this dissertation. Victorian critics noted the symbolic chronological progression from left to right, and the different registers from top to bottom of the frame rather than looking at the aggregate of images as creating a larger temporal narrative and analyzing that. Statements like Harvey's that when looking at a print by Hogarth, "the spectator's eye may rove as it pleases, so that the details may be 'read' in any order" are much more common than any that treat his series of prints as series (Harvey 55). Burwick notes that "[a]ttention to Hogarth's career continued unabated after the artist's death in 1764" (230),¹⁸ and the implication that Hogarth should be considered as part of the category of literary satire, with Pope and Fielding, opens the way for Dickens to follow in his footsteps.

Dickens as Hogarth's inheritor

While we can consider Hogarth's art to be literary, we must also acknowledge that Dickens' writing is visually evocative. His prose is full of the conceit that words

¹⁸ Burwick also notes that "Lessing himself contributed to the interest in Hogarth" (230). It seems counter-intuitive that Lessing would have been so interested in visual arts that formed a narrative since he deemed visual acknowledgment of chronology to be beyond the realms of good taste, but perhaps the habit of treating Hogarth's narratives as a set of individual images rather than a sequence helped his interest.

themselves are a visual art. In *Sketches By Boz*, his first great success and the precursor to *Pickwick Papers*, he writes regarding gin shops, “we have sketched the subject very slightly, not only because our limits compel us to do so, but because if it were pursued farther, it would be painful and repulsive” (*Boz* 186). Of course the conceit that words draw is begun in the title with the word *Sketches*, and Dickens is consistent throughout to the idea that he is creating pictures with written words¹⁹. He describes the speech of a parlour orator, “so just to hold a pattern one up, to know the others by, we took his likeness at once, and put him in here. And that is the reason we have written this paper” (*Boz* 239). The metaphor runs very deep indeed, if the picture drawn by the written word can be physically held up in order to recognize others of the type portrayed.

Notably, *Sketches by Boz* was illustrated by Cruikshank, who was himself often compared to Hogarth. Cruikshank was encouraged to make his pictures as close to Hogarth’s standard as possible (Kunzle 341), and he “emulated Hogarth all through his subsequent career” (Harvey 3). To complete the circle, once it was considered that Dickens had completely assumed Hogarth’s mantle of morale satire, Cruikshank would later be compared to Dickens (Harvey 175).

¹⁹ The *Oxford English Dictionary* confirms that the meaning of the word “sketch” as “[a] brief account, description, or narrative giving the main or important facts, incidents, etc., and not going into the details; a short or superficial essay or study, freq. in *pl.* as a title,” while common in the early nineteenth century, was then as now secondary to the meaning of “sketch” as

[a] rough drawing or delineation of something, giving the outlines or prominent features without the detail, esp. one intended to serve as the basis of a more finished picture, or to be used in its composition; a rough draught or design. Also, in later use, a drawing or painting of a slight or unpretentious nature. (Web).

Therefore, when Dickens writes “It would require the pencil of Hogarth to illustrate – our feeble pen is inadequate to describe – the expression which the countenances of Mr. Cotton and Mr. Septimus Hicks respectively assumed” (Dickens *Boz* 289),²⁰ the extended metaphor had several facets: it was the indulgence of a literary trope, woefully bemoaning the need to describe the indescribable; it was a continuation of Dickens’ own conceit that he was merely verbally sketching what others could more beautifully depict; and it served as an acknowledgement that what he and Cruikshank achieved together in *Sketches by Boz* could not approach what his hero could have achieved on his own. Of course, it was also a comedic moment, assuming that the expressions on these characters’ faces would be a worthy subject for Hogarth.

Dickens’ appreciation for Hogarth would continue his whole life. “Dickens had a set of [one of] Hogarth’s series hanging in his hall at Gadshill, his last home, and later removed them to the walls of his own bedroom” (Leavis 334). Over time, it was acknowledged that he was the primary heir to Hogarth’s role, albeit in a different medium. Dickens’ writing was compared to Hogarth’s prints repeatedly, and “finally, caricature was absorbed by Charles Dickens, himself the great verbal caricaturist, whose early work was illustrated by the best English comic artists in a style both amusing and decent” (Kunzle 346). Steig even compares Browne to Hogarth, writing that he “demonstrates from the outset a capacity for composing illustrations which may be ‘read’ like a Hogarth engraving, significant details and composition combining to elucidate

²⁰ Dickens is also indulging in the idea that the pen is the tool of the author and the pencil is the tool of the artist. One of the subtitles for *Vanity Fair*, written and illustrated by Thackeray, is “Pen and Pencil Sketches of English Society.” *Vanity Fair* will be discussed in the next chapter.

Dickens' text" (Steig 26), though this comparison does not appear to be nearly as common as the comparison of first Cruikshank and then Dickens, to the satirist.

Appearances and Looking in *Pickwick Papers*

In *Pickwick Papers*, Dickens' descriptions of the characters are visually exact, which may have led to Kunzle's interpretation of his strong characterization as "caricature." However, the narrative significance of his characters' appearances goes beyond caricature. Not only do the descriptions add to the comedy of misreading visual cues, as discussed earlier, *Pickwick Papers* also includes other themes centered around the act of looking that are aided by his strong visual descriptions. For instance, in the first number, Dickens' introduction of Mr. Pickwick uses the description of his physical characteristics to set up the distinction between "looking at" and "reading." Dickens' narrator states that,

a casual observer might possibly have remarked nothing extraordinary in the bald head and circular spectacles [of Mr. Pickwick, but] to those who knew that the gigantic brain of Pickwick was working beneath that forehead, and that the beaming eyes of Pickwick were twinkling behind those glasses, the sight was indeed an interesting one... What a study for an artist did that exciting scene present!" (Penguin 68-69)

The distinction drawn between a casual observer and an artist is one that emphasizes the difference between a viewer who is willing to devote energy to understanding visual cues and one who is not. Moreover, in this passage, Dickens equates the inability to see a brain inside a head with the inability to see Pickwick's eyes behind his glasses. The idea that the glasses hide Mr. Pickwick even as they allow him to see others will become a far-reaching conceit in this book, as Pickwick himself is a character who delights in being the observer and is made uncomfortable by being observed.

Mr. Pickwick's agitation when he is the focus of visual attention and his enjoyment in looking at others are each connected to McMaster's argument that much of the visual comedy in the book is occasioned by how the characters look in combination with each other. She notes that

Pickwick Papers is populated by fat people and thin people, who come up against each other and against objects in their world in various collisions productive of laughter, pressure, and pain. The burgeoning shapes, whether bulging or sticklike, whether squeezed or poking and expanding, strike the internal eye as memorable and expansive compositions. (McMaster 613)

McMaster further argues that most of the visual work is done by the words, but that Browne knows how to capitalize on Dickens' visuality. "A simple device in composition is the standard opposition of curve to line, fat to thin ... Phiz of course understands this business very well, as the immemorial convention of caricature, and makes the most of it" (McMaster 600).

One such combination is of the rotund Mr. Pickwick and the gawky Mr. Jingle. Mr. Jingle's physical description, detailed at length when Mr. Pickwick first meets him, is heralded by the phrase "Mr. Pickwick had leisure to examine his costume and appearance" (Dickens *Pickwick Papers* Penguin 77). After seventeen lines of the minute particulars of his looks and dress, including the color and state of his stockings, the description concludes with the remark, "Such was the individual on whom Mr. Pickwick gazed through his spectacles" (78). The lengthy description echoes the leisure felt by Mr. Pickwick, and the scrutiny he is able to afford Mr. Jingle because of it.

The reader's satisfaction matches Pickwick's when "putting on his spectacles he prepared himself to watch the play which was just commencing" (163). And thus lulled into the safety of an existence as an observer, looking through spectacles that do not go

both ways (remember, they hid Pickwick's eyes, but they let him see other things) various comedic situations arise when Pickwick is made uncomfortably the object rather than the subject of the gaze.

Browne's participation in the thematic importance of looking

Through the illustrations, readers are given the opportunity to participate in the theme of viewing in the novel because they can observe both the viewer and the viewed as they are depicted. Notably, when Mr. Pickwick is deposited in the pound for public drunkenness, “[p]art of the punishment Mr. Pickwick endures in the pound is being stared at” (Patten 584). The illustration provides the reader with a view of not only Pickwick's consternation at his own predicament, but the amusement of those who see him so. The reader can look at Pickwick, and can look at those looking at Pickwick. Similarly, in other scenes, Pickwick's agitation in the lawyers' office and later in the courtroom is similarly augmented by his unfortunate role as the butt of a visual joke. In each situation, he is depicted as surprised and confused in the illustrations, while his observers appear to be amused.

In the courtroom illustration in Chapter Thirty-four, Pickwick's placement in the lower left corner implies that he is alone facing the great crowd that has him cornered (Figure 2:9). His hands convey pleading and protest while he leans back in a surprised and defensive posture. Though not all eyes in the illustration are facing him, the lighting and the direction of the arms of some of the crowd suggest that he is the focus of attention. The people in the crowd seem comfortable rather than crowded, conveying vast space in the courtroom reinforced by the circular background and the impossible vanishing point. It is only Pickwick himself whose posture connotes discomfort.

While Browne contributes to the issues of the gaze that Mr. Pickwick encounters, he also provides an “artistic imagination [that] complements Dickens’. Both seize on objects or figures that emblemize a scene” (Patten 580). Just as Browne adds small playful animals as thematic markers in illustration after illustration, so too does Dickens relate moment after moment in scene after scene of Pickwick adjusting his glasses, removing his glasses, and looking through his glasses.

Browne evolved with Dickens

Browne’s willingness to be subordinate to Dickens was key to his ability to work with Dickens successfully. From his first contribution to *Pickwick Papers* through the last, and afterwards throughout the various other Dickens novels he illustrated, Browne’s talents and skill stayed linked to Dickens’ own. Dickens would always keep a tight rein on Browne’s contributions to his novels. Even several years into their working relationship, Dickens

made ‘Phiz’ supply him with sheets of drawings ... of types of faces for Mr. Dombey for [Dickens] to choose from, before the artist even started on the book’s illustrations, knowing that once fixed the appearance could not be changed, and feeling the importance of providing the readership from the start with an adequate embodiment of the most important figure in the book, the one on whom it all hinged” (Leavis 348).

For Browne, incongruity between the content of his illustrations and Dickens’ written text was impossible because “[f]or ‘Phiz’ there was no question of independence: Dickens seems to have given out the subjects as well as criticized the drawings for alteration before they went to press” (Leavis 342). Perhaps this system was for the best, as other authors did not necessarily work as well with Browne as Dickens did. Both his style of working and the style of his product suited him to working with Dickens, but not

with other authors. Browne was hired to illustrate Trollope's novel *Can You Forgive Her?*, but Trollope actually switched illustrators after the first volume because Browne was so unresponsive and his illustrations so clearly unsuited to his text.

Just as Browne behaved differently with other authors, Dickens behaved differently with different illustrators. As *The Old Curiosity Shop* was being serialized in *Clock*, Dickens wrote this to his friend Daniel Maclise, who was contributing an illustration: "if you like to put any more people in, young or old, do so at your own discretion, and I'll take care to account for 'em. When you have done it, will you let me have it, that I may take care the text and it agree?" (quoted in Harvey 117). This was a complete departure from the amount of control he always felt the need to exert over Browne's work, and Maclise wasn't the only artist to be treated so by Dickens; for instance, Dickens wrote to George Cattermole, regarding his illustrations for *The Old Curiosity Shop*, "believe me that this is the very first time any designs for what I have written have touched and moved me, and caused me to feel that they expressed the idea I had in my mind" (quoted Harvey 119). Steig observes that, "[i]n no surviving correspondence does Dickens praise Browne's work as effusively as Cattermole's" (Steig 54).

Browne's willingness to comply to Dickens' requests (as detailed by Leavis above) was in stark contrast to other illustrators of the day. For instance, Cruikshank was used to being the more celebrated member of a collaboration. Harvey explains that

so long as [Cruikshank's] authors conceded pride of place to him there was no difficulty. Authors, for their part, were very ready to concede. They wrote deferential prefaces in which they apologized for writing at all and pleaded Cruikshank's illustrations as the excuse. (Harvey 31)

This may be one of the reasons that Cruikshank's illustrations for *Sketches by Boz* were not as successful as Browne's were for *Pickwick Papers*. Browne "was ready to let Dickens's imagination work through him ... and though Browne, working in this way, produced many sensitive and functional illustrations, [Browne was] obviously not the equal either of Dickens or of Cruikshank in creative power" (Harvey 175). Browne's talent was not great enough to compete with Dickens', but rather perfectly suited to supplementing Dickens'. If Cruikshank's art competed with Dickens' written text, Browne's art offered a commentary on it.

The clash of wills between Cruikshank and Dickens that would culminate in a famous feud about the ending of *Oliver Twist* is visible at times in the disconnect between the tone of Cruikshank's illustrations and the tone of Dickens' written text in *Sketches*. For instance, Dickens' project of describing abject poverty and thus moving his readers to pity and horror in some of the stories is not borne out by Cruikshank's illustrations. In "The Broker's Man," a debt collector recounts anecdotes from his work, most of which are very sad. However, the anecdote that Cruikshank illustrates is the one fine opulent house where the broker's man had acted as a servant in a farcical manner.

Browne's illustrations, often as amusing as many of Cruikshank's, seem more integrated with Dickens' written texts. They work well together not only because of their content, but their style as well. For instance, Steig notes that "[a]lthough Browne may have been influenced by George Cruikshank's book illustrations, Cruikshank's oval or circular designs usually freeze the action rather than achieving the tension Browne creates" (Steig 72) in his more open, dynamic arrangements of the depicted material. The oval or circular border distances the reader from the depicted material. The border acts as

a frame such that looking at an illustration can feel like peering through a porthole at tiny, distant characters. Borderless designs, such as those by Browne, on the other hand, make the reader feel that he or she is in the same room or environment with the depicted characters. The round or oval frame further indicates completeness. Since the circle bears connotations of the whole, the depicted material in the oval or circle feels iconic and static rather than participatory. Dickens' conversational writing style and extensive, broad, rambling plots make it clear that in this way, Browne's stylistic choices were sympathetic to Dickens' own.

How *Pickwick Papers*' illustration becomes the norm

The first publication of *Pickwick Papers* was a unique situation, and those involved had a wide variety of interactions with book illustration following the publication of *Pickwick Papers*. However, Browne's illustrations for *Pickwick Papers* helped the novel become very successful, and the methods by which *Pickwick Papers* was illustrated conformed nicely to prevailing ideas about the separation of labor between written text and pictorial illustration. After *Pickwick Papers*, those methods became the paradigmatic relationship of words and pictures, and author and artist, in Victorian illustrated novels such that the absolute power of the author was taken for granted even in analysis of the illustrations themselves:

Dickens made the illustrations that he had to have, to satisfy traditional expectation and need, serve the purposes of an altogether new art of the novel. ... [B]esides being a visual embodiment of dramatic flash-points[,] the illustrations are frequently indispensable even to us, the highly-trained modern reader, in interpreting the novels correctly because they encapsule the themes and give us the means of knowing with certainty where Dickens meant the stress to fall (Leavis 336).

However, Steig maintains that Browne's participation in the text allowed him to act as "interpreter, offering his own comments on the meaning of the work" (3). The pictures, then, have an awesome potential: they are an intentional, integrated part of the text body, but they are also separate, segregated onto different pages from the written text. As I've noted, Dickens himself points out in the preface to *Pickwick Papers* that the illustrations were not necessarily based on the actual written text the reader would see. The illustrations, then, can shape reception of the words even when they have not been shaped by the words themselves. The division of functions for the words and pictures in *Pickwick Papers* is hierarchical; the written text takes precedence over the illustrations. However, the pictures are still granted opportunities not available to the words.

Laocoön has inspired my chapter title, because the way that Lessing grants written text the ability to represent time and visual arts the ability to represent space is echoed in the page composition of the Victorian part publication. Serial novels made similar assumptions about the unimportance of the space filled by written text and the careful planning necessary for the space to be filled by pictures, while also assuming the greater importance of the written text itself. The actual construction of *Pickwick Papers* was unusual, and as I have discussed, Browne's illustrations do sometimes include depictions of time by combining moments. Nonetheless, these assumptions about the role of illustration in fiction, as well as assumptions about interaction between author and illustrator, shaped the rest of Victorian part publication.

Chapter 3

Signs as Designs: Thackeray's multivalent *Vanity Fair* illustrations

We must pass over a part of Mrs. Rebecca Crawley's biography with that lightness and delicacy which the world demands – the moral world that has, perhaps, no particular objection to vice, but an insuperable repugnance to hearing vice called by its proper name. There are things we do and say in *Vanity Fair*, though we never speak them: ... and a polite public will no more bear to read an authentic description of vice than a truly-refined English or American female will permit the word 'breeches' to be pronounced in her chaste hearing. And yet, madam, both are walking the world before our faces every day, without much shocking us.
(Thackeray *Vanity Fair* 812)

The first issue of *Vanity Fair* by William Makepeace Thackeray was published on January 1, 1847. The illustrated novel, subtitled both "Pen and Pencil sketches of English Society" and "A Novel without a Hero," would be published in nineteen monthly parts. *Vanity Fair* tells the stories of Becky Sharp and Amelia Sedley, who had become friends at boarding school. While Amelia is a sweet, simple girl, the beloved daughter of wealthy parents, Becky is quite the opposite. She is a clever and snide young woman, who often plays up her own parentless poverty to great advantage. The girls together embark on adulthood. Their various changes of their fortunes, romances, and perspectives on the world shape the rest of the novel. In *Vanity Fair*, Amelia's and Becky's stories are woven together; sometimes intersecting, sometimes diverging, sometimes thematically parallel for long stretches. Enormous historical events such as the Battle of Waterloo come into the narrative when the main characters, now married, find themselves on the sidelines of what would later be called the Napoleonic Wars. Thus, the reader as well experiences the battle from the sidelines, along with the women waiting to find out if their husbands have survived it. That battle forms the centerpiece to the novel, and the aftermath of who survives and who does not has repercussions for the rest of the story.

This novel became very successful. John Sutherland notes that *Vanity Fair* “took [Thackeray] with one jump to the top of the tree with Dickens” (viii), the reigning monarch of the serialized novel.

Each of the numbers in the original serial publication contained full-page plates drawn and captioned by Thackeray, followed by typeset chapters written by Thackeray, the pages of which contained small vignettes and historiated initials drawn by Thackeray. If it seems as though Thackeray’s name appears unusually often in my description, this is because I wish to indicate his unusually comprehensive involvement in the creation of this text. Indeed, “William Makepeace Thackeray is the one major English novelist who illustrated his own works” (Harvey 76) and, as I am not the first to note, his almost two hundred illustrations for *Vanity Fair* are part of the text of the novel.

In each of the parts released serially, some of the illustrations appear before the written text as full-page plates, while others are printed from wood engravings onto the pages of the written text. These two methods require different techniques and produce different results. The full-page plates used intaglio printing: the picture and caption were engraved or etched with very fine lines and then wiped carefully with ink. When paper was applied, the recessed areas that had been engraved or etched away and then filled with ink left an image on the paper. The sheet containing a print from an engraved or etched plate, thus, has a three-dimensional quality in which the black lines are slightly raised because they have been pressed into recessed ink.

Conversely, the small vignettes and historiated initials printed with the written text of *Vanity Fair* feel slightly recessed into the page because printing from wood requires a different method. The woodblocks are carved so that the raised area takes the

ink, like a contemporary rubber stamp, and the woodblock is then pressed into the paper. Since this is also how letterpress is printed, the woodblocks could be printed onto the pages of the written text at the same time as the words. There are many points that could be made about the effects of the different printing styles, but for my purposes here it will be sufficient to say that the small vignettes and the historiated initials, because printed the same way and on the same page as the typescript, seem to the eye to be organically part of the typescript itself.

It was obvious to me from flipping through the very first number of *Vanity Fair* that serial publishing had become more established since the publication of *Pickwick Papers*. The first number already contains four pages of advertisements, including two small illustrations that are both diagrammatic: one about head-measuring for hairpieces, and one a demonstration of how a chest-expander crosses in the back. These advertisements are followed by two captioned full-page illustrations by Thackeray: plates facing each other on thicker paper with blank backs. It is after the full-page illustrations that the written text of the novel begins on thinner paper²¹ with a historiated initial at the beginning of each typeset chapter. Though more pictures are included as part of the type-composed page, the novel opens with a presentation of many of the multiple ways in which written text and pictorial image can interact, even before the written text of the first chapter begins.

The way words and pictures are combined in the lives of the characters, the presentation of their story, and the packaging of the book that houses their story, are all

²¹ Peter Shillingsburg notes that each part contained 32 pages of written text, that is, two gatherings of 16 pages (eight leaves) each, signed at the bottom of the first and third pages (118).

intricately interwoven. Their interactions raise questions about the very nature of text. Is the novel as a whole one text, with intrusive pieces of paratext dividing the numbers? Is each single issue a complete text to be read, composed of both words and pictures of advertisement as well as pictorial illustration and written chapter text? Are these two options for textual consideration mutually exclusive? Should we believe the text is really only the written chapters and all the pictorial material is mere packaging? Is each issue a gathering of separate texts (for instance, written chapters, captioned pictures, and advertisements) presented next to each other? Each reader may have answered these questions about the limits of text and paratext differently, but any answer would imply involvement and investment on the part of the reader. The questions' urgency requires the reader to bring the world of the novel into being; and to place him or herself into that world however that world is defined and delimited.

Overall, the captioned full plates that begin each number, along with the smaller vignettes and historiated initials that appear on the same pages as the typescript, create a reading experience that is both sprawling and immersive in that it has both breadth and depth. In *Thackeray's Canvass of Humanity: An Author and His Public*, Robert Colby notes that Thackeray had "the 'natural perversion' as he once put it that enabled him to view life as through a kaleidoscope" (14), and in *Vanity Fair*, his kaleidoscopic view is presented relatively unmediated by other hands. As Anthony Trollope put it, "a strong flavor of Thackeray" is characterized by "a certain affected familiarity" (Trollope 201), which gives the written text an appealingly personal tone complemented by the witty, engaging illustrations. The "affected familiarity" of his illustrations can be seen to be

similar to the affected familiarity of the narrator of *Vanity Fair*, in such passages as the one that begins this chapter.

Packaging

The cover of the first issue (Figure 3:1) creates the entry into the immersive experience of the story world. The cover also functions as packaging to signal the contents of the new novel. The lines at the bottom announce a connection to the weekly magazine *Punch*, implying both prestige and irreverence. A sense of this irreverence is echoed in the illustration on the cover, where “The wrapper drawing [on *Vanity Fair*] with its upside-down statue on Nelson’s Pillar and the *Punch* figure occupying the place of the Duke of Wellington ... prepared readers for a somewhat cockeyed view of history” (Colby 235). Most of the figures in the cover illustration seem to be costumed because their clothes are ill-fitting and have exaggerated details; the woman holding a baby in the foreground does not appear to be costumed beyond a minor headpiece, but her tight waist and full skirt are still noteworthy because they are indicative in shape and cut of dresses worn by Thackeray’s 1840s contemporaries, rather than the Empire waists and straighter skirts of the era in which the novel takes place.

This nod to contemporary dress implies that the story inside will be a contemporary one, and the title does nothing to suggest the era of the story’s plot. The clothing of the characters on the cover, then, signals the intended use and audience of the text rather than the characters or setting. The woman in contemporary dress, holding a baby, indicates that the story will have been crafted for modern readers, while the costumes on the other figures indicate the overall themes of artifice and pretense that Thackeray will deal with in the novel.

The cover is designed so that even if the reader were to have known the story would be a historical one, the outfits of the other figures on the cover and the contemporary dress of the seated woman imply that the sensibilities of the reader take precedence over historical fact: that a story is about to be enacted for a contemporary audience. Moreover, if the cover illustration is packaging, then a smiling girl dandling a baby promises the product inside will be a lighthearted, comfortable story, suited to families playing dress-up. Thackeray will draw upon his *readers'* priorities and experience both to entertain and to make his moral points. Thackeray saw his Victorian age as the “wholesome reaction” to Georgian excesses (Sutherland *Vanity Fair* xii), so dressing characters of the Georgian era in the clothing of his own time elided the excesses of the past with his exhortations for his current readers to take heed of the warning of *Vanity Fair* for their own futures.

Thackeray's characters are dressed in contemporary fashions inside the novel as well as on the cover. He provides an illustrated footnote near the end of Chapter VI to explain the historical inaccuracies in dress. The footnote is ostensibly made necessary by a reference to a hat: “It was the author's intention, faithful to history, to depict all the characters of this tale in their proper costumes, as they wore them at the commencement of the century”. The footnote carries to the next page, with the words, “But when I remember the appearance of people in those days and that an officer and lady were actually habited like this--” where a small vignette takes grammatical place in the sentence of the footnote (70).

The vignette in question shows a lady in a draped Empire-waisted gown and an enormous bonnet shaped like a coalscuttle, conversing with an officer in exaggerated hat

and sash (Figure 3:2). The tone of the written text in this footnote, combined with the inclusion of the picture as part of the sentence, suggests that Thackeray found the clothing of the Regency era to be unspeakably hilarious. As Trollope notes, “it is because the novelist amuses that he is thus influential” (Trollope 202). The joke of these hats can only be depicted rather than described because the humor of their exaggerated shapes is cartoonish in a way that would lose its efficacy in words. Underneath this picture, we are told that the author had “not the heart to disfigure [his] heroes and heroines by costumes so hideous; and [has], on the contrary, engaged a model of rank dressed according to the present fashion” (70). The author’s grave tone, considerate of his characters’ sensibilities, matches the serious gestures of the depicted lady and gentleman. The foolishness of the clothing is here met with the foolishness of taking the clothing seriously: the aspects Thackeray objects to are exaggerated, as is the author’s fastidious dislike of those aspects of dress.²²

Here, the written text clearly requires the embedded picture. It therefore announces that in the previous six chapters, and for the rest of the novel to come, the illustrations are generally integral to the text. Readers are informed by this illustration that sometimes the words will have to give precedence to the pictures for representation of things that are in some ways unspeakable.²³ The subtitle “Pen and Pencil sketches of

²² Thackeray’s explanatory footnote about dress seems of a piece with his own “alleged remark that he had no head above his eyes” (Colby 7). In each, the author disclaims any kind of moralizing or analytical motive for his decisions by declaring them to be solely aesthetic.

²³ Amazingly, Thackeray’s footnote about the foolishness of Georgian costume has been echoed recently in order to mock the sartorial choices of the 1830s. Sydney Padua, in a commentary on her own webcomic *2D Goggles* (Figure 3:3), explains why she dresses her characters in slightly anachronistic clothing. Her comic is about the construction of

English Society” implies that the coupled talents of narrator and draughtsman will be brought to this tale, as the conceit of the day was that the pen was the tool of the author, the pencil of the illustrator.²⁴ The use of the picture here indicates the necessity of both words and pictures for the way Thackeray’s story needs to be told. If *Vanity Fair* were only “Pen Sketches,” it would be a very different book. This footnote, with its embedded illustration, conveys to the reader that visual representation in this novel has complicated relationships with the written text, and with the composition of the page itself.

Vanity Fair offers the reader access to an integrated textuality, the reading of which is incomplete if the pictures are not present. In Thackeray’s full-page plates, it is noteworthy that the captions are printed from the same plate as the picture. The words of the caption thus form part of the image. With his smaller vignettes, the woodblocks are laid out in the page composition with the type. The shared printing methods for words and pictures in both these cases makes it literal that the words and pictures in *Vanity Fair* “work in the same way to produce meaning, as designs that are signs” (Miller 95).

In fact, because many of the historiated initials that begin chapters feature letters formed by objects or people in the illustrations, the pictures even create the written text in some cases. All of these combinations complicate the relationship between letter and picture, and present different functions for illustrations. Any reading that does not acknowledge and analyze the pictures cannot be said to address the novel as a whole.

Yet, many modern editions of *Vanity Fair* are printed without any of the illustrations at

the Difference Engine, and part of her rationale for the anachronistic dress is that her characters, Ada Lovelace and Charles Babbage, must surely have horrified by the scandalously ugly clothing of their own time.

²⁴ See my discussion of Dickens’ assessment of his pen in relation to Hogarth’s pencil in Chapter 1, “Leaving Space.”

all, or with only a few of the full-page plates. For example, in the introduction to the Penguin mass-market paperback, an edition with no illustrations, the editor, J.I.M. Stewart, is called upon to mention one of the illustrations to support a reading of one of the text's ambiguous moments.²⁵ Stewart, like many others, seeks to answer the open question of Becky's role in a death near the end of the novel. After many years on different life paths, Becky is reunited with an old flame – her friend Amelia's brother, Jos Sedley. He dies in mysterious circumstances, with the clever Becky at his bedside.

Most critics who attempt to address this ambiguous moment in the text refer to the illustration of Becky in Figure 3:4, interpreting the visual evidence in various ways to support their reading of Thackeray's implications in the written text. Stewart refers to this illustration without reproducing it, and it is the only illustration he mentions. If he recognizes that he needs textual evidence from an illustration to support his belief that Becky killed Amelia's brother at the end of the novel, why doesn't he include the illustrations in his edition? Or if reproducing the illustrations for this edition would have created an unsupportable publishing cost, he could perhaps have mentioned this fact in his introduction. Not to do so seems tantamount to silently abridging the novel.

Furthermore, Stewart is dismissive of the illustration he calls upon to support his reading (he calls it "amateurish," 19), and he may be misreading the illustration itself: he believes Thackeray has depicted Becky holding "what can only be a phial of poison" (20). However, because the picture is not reproduced, there is no way for a reader to draw

²⁵ Though Stewart includes none of Thackeray's pictures in his edition, he uses the metaphor of a vast painting to describe Thackeray's novel. His visual metaphor is to describe *Vanity Fair* as "an enormous canvas, not perhaps organized with any exceptional severity, but in which the major forms exist with an *ambiance* of extraordinary density, and every inch of which has been brilliantly animated by a fast and freely moving brush" (italics *ibid* 10).

his or her own conclusions based on the (pictorial) text itself in Stewart's edition of the novel.

John Sutherland, on the other hand, in his discussion of the same ambiguous issue in various publications, presents a much more convincing argument that Becky is not a murderer because he takes into account more than one illustration, and reproduces the pertinent ones (for instance, Sutherland *Murderer* 66ff). In other words, quoting the images in *Vanity Fair* is just as necessary as quoting the words to support a reading.

Of course the pictures are just as likely to be ambiguous, deceptive, or ironic as the words are, and so this chapter will discuss the nuanced ways that illustrations and written text interact in *Vanity Fair*. The interactions between the words and pictures represent a sliding scale of sign-signification made explicit by the fact that the same hand both drew and wrote: the plates have written captions engraved onto the same plate as the pictorial image, the smaller vignettes are sometimes allegorical, referenced directly in the written text of the novel, and the historiated initials actually comprise both word and picture. All of these combinations complicate the relationship between letter and picture, and present many functions for illustrations other than those employed by Dickens and Browne.

Since the pages of the written text in *Vanity Fair* are composed with images built into the structure of the page, the visuality of the words and the textuality of the pictures work together on each page where both appear. In some cases, particular arcs and lines and shapes pressed with ink into the page serve double duty, as the historiated initials that begin each chapter can be at once picture and alphabetic letter. The reader must elide the

significance of pictorial signification with an understanding of alphabetic text to read both realities of a historiated initial at once.

Reviewers and theorists have been generally dismissive of Thackeray's skill as a draughtsman because his human figures are often "out of drawing"²⁶ and his facial expressions and features were generally imprecise and inconstant. Harvey is among the most generous of commentators on Thackeray's drawing skill when he declares, "Thackeray drew casually out of a little knowledge" (Harvey 81) and Thackeray's good friend Anthony Trollope declared that "everyone knows how incorrect were his delineations" (Trollope *Thackeray* 7).

However imprecise his drawing style was, it is generally accepted that Thackeray's skills and talent as a draughtsman were well-suited to tiny, allegorical figures. He was best able to suggest scale and proportion appropriately at a very small size, and his line work and lack of shading was suitable for the drawings in the historiated initials. Furthermore, in the creation of allegorical figures, often functioning as both picture and historiated initial, accidents of anatomical inexactitude were forgivable: readers are more likely to notice and judge the correctness of the depiction of human limbs in a full-page plate, than the correctness in the proportions of a tiny imp on a page of written text, grinning from the inside of the letter O (Chapter XXXIX, 498). This means that when Thackeray is illustrating well, he is also writing: that is, his best pictures are parts of words.

²⁶ Thackeray's figures were depicted with incorrect anatomical proportions. Patrick Maynard defines "out of drawing" in *Drawing Distinctions: The Varieties of Graphic Expression* as "an expression in figurative drawing for a wrong start that leads to increasing distortion, like a mislaid course of bricks that ruins an entire wall" (61).

For instance, Chapter XII, “Quite a Sentimental Chapter,” begins with the phrase “We must now take leave of Arcadia.” The initial W of this chapter, reproduced in Figure 3:5, is formed by the branches of a tree, underneath which an Arcadian couple sets out on a journey. The branches lead us from one setting to another, from one set of characters to another, as the plot literally “branches off” into a new scene for the new chapter. As Herbert Tucker mentions in his article “Literal Illustration in Victorian Print,” the reader is expected to see those lines as simultaneously forming the letter W and forming the branches of a tree in a tiny scene that satirically allegorizes the movement of the plot from one locale to another. It should be noted that while the narrator employs the language of the ideal, he does not seem to believe it. The preceding chapter, dealing with a cruel, grasping family in the countryside, had been titled “Arcadian Simplicity,” for instance. At the beginning of Chapter VII, then, the reader must be engaged, processing word and picture at the same time, in order to appreciate the fact that the figures in the small scene, like the characters in the story, are being employed by the author to expose artifice. Their very existence is in service to satire.

Since Thackeray’s illustrations show figures that are costumed, allegorical, or habited in modern dress, it seems to be the case that in *Vanity Fair*, he is more interested in exposing the behavior of people in certain types of situations than he is in telling a history of people’s interaction with historical events. In fact, his characters’ behavior seems to be indicative of his own era. Thackeray’s present, the representation of the war and its aftermath,²⁷ and the mythical past implied by the costumed or allegorized figures

²⁷ Thackeray was born in 1811, the year George became Regent.

and references to Arcadia all operate in tension with each other in a pastiche of eras, printing techniques, and modes of signification.

A Division of Labor among the Illustration Types

There are many different types of illustration in *Vanity Fair*, all by the author's hand but created in various ways and with different relationships to the written text. Because of those different relationships, the captioned full-page plates, the incidental vignettes, and the historiated initials can each fulfill different functions of illustration in this book.

Thackeray's full-page plates are generally fairly simple in composition and uncomplicated in line, depicting characters performing actions described in the written text. The captions to the full-page plates provide irony in a similar manner to his chapter titles. Like the chapter titles, the captions are drawn from the written text of the chapter proper, which is often self-contradictory because it deals with the pretense of people living lives of hypocrisy. The captions sometimes jar against the depicted action in a way that suggests strongly that the characters' representations of themselves are not to be trusted. The disjunction between written caption and depicted action reinforces the disjunction between the professed moral motives of the characters and their selfish, cowardly actions.

The vignettes, on the other hand, can reinforce Thackeray's points about his characters' motivations and behavior easily because they are printed the same way and on the same sheets as his written text. The vignettes in this novel include tiny flourishes at

the end of chapters as well as larger third- or half-page illustrations. For the small vignettes, there is no demarcation between the location of the image and the written text it illustrates, and there are no separate captions like the ones for the full-page plates at the beginning of each number.

The words and the pictures next to each other on a page do not necessarily reinforce each other, however. There are incongruities between what is depicted in some of the vignettes and what is described in the written text next to those vignettes, just as there are ironic disjunctions between caption and plate for the full-page illustrations. It is important to recognize that the incongruities between the vignettes and the written words nearby can be just as necessary as the reinforcements in the creation of meaning. For instance, when Thackeray's written text tells us the scene is happening in 1813 and the clothing worn by the characters is that of the 1840s, he deliberately creates one such incongruity that must either be accounted for or elided by the reader. The disjunctions between illustration and written text, like the self-contradictory sarcasm in the written text itself, call for participation from the reader to make sense of the ways the characters in the novel are lying to themselves and each other in word and deed. For instance, Miss Crawley is horrified that her brother has proposed to Becky Sharp, but once "she is mollified by the girl's refusal," she remarks "Becky would have made a good Lady Crawley after all" because, as Thackeray tells us, she becomes "very liberal and generous now there was no call for her sacrifices." (Thackeray 183). Miss Crawley may be fooling herself as much as those around her.

The historiated initials provide yet another register of illustration in addition to the full-page plates and the small vignettes. The initials often contain mythological or

allegorical figures that can be interpreted as depicting the characters *enacting* the allegorical roles, or as separate representations that merely comment on the behavior of Thackeray's characters in addition to depicting the characters. For instance, the couple in the tree W discussed earlier do not necessarily represent two specific characters. In fact, they may even represent readers moving on from one chapter to the next, or personify the act of moving into a new chapter just as easily as they may represent specific characters play-acting at an Arcadian ideal.

However, some of the historiated initials do certainly depict specific characters. For instance, in the historiated initial that begins chapter XLIV, "A Roundabout Chapter Between London and Hampshire," the mermaid in Figure 3:6 is generally thought to depict Becky because her facial features are consistent with other pictures of Becky in the novel. In the written text of this chapter, Becky re-insinuates herself and her husband into the good graces of her husband's wealthy family.

As Tucker alleges, this depiction symbolizes the ways that Becky is charming on the surface and a monster underneath, and indeed Thackeray alludes to Becky later in these terms. Thackeray's narrator protests that he has not crossed out of the boundaries of propriety with his subject matter. He comments, "[i]n describing this siren, singing and smiling, coaxing and cajoling, the author, with modest pride, asks his readers all round, has he once forgotten the laws of politeness and shown the monster's hideous tail above water? No!" (Thackeray 812). Of course, Thackeray is mildly duplicitous in this passage, since he has shown Becky's tail in pictorial form several chapters ago in this historiated initial. Readers who notice this discrepancy must understand that in both cases – picture and written text – Thackeray is speaking allegorically, and though we have seen, visually,

a depiction of Becky with a tail, we understand that in this passage Thackeray is protesting that he has never “shown” us the events which prove she is a monster.²⁸

The mermaid is mythological, and thus not historically specific to any given period. Becky’s duplicity is timeless. It is also noteworthy in this historiated initial that the O necessary for beginning the sentence “Our old friends . . .” serves as the moon under which Becky’s allegorical aspect lures sailors to the watery depths with her harp. The allegorical commentary of the historiated initials combines with their ability to conflate pictorial and alphabetic elements to differentiate them from the small vignettes and offer another register of word-picture combination in this novel. The conflation of word and picture in the initials is one of the many ways in which *Punch* may have influenced *Vanity Fair*.

A Diplomat of the *Punch* Empire

The appearance and near-instant rise to prominence of *Punch* in 1841 gave Thackeray a suitable sphere in which to publish his particular brand of moralizing satire. In the decade after *Pickwick Papers* began the age of serialized novels, Dickens had risen meteorically to prominence in the world of letters, and Thackeray, who had unsuccessfully applied for the position of illustrator to *Pickwick Papers*, had published various written character sketches of personality “types,” short stories, and pictures. For instance, he had published a series of vignettes on snobs (later to be gathered into *The Book of Snobs*) in *Punch*, and after planning *Vanity Fair* for several years, went to

²⁸ Thackeray also elides the appearances of his characters in words and pictures when he captions a picture “Becky’s Second Appearance in the Character of Clytemnestra” since her first appearance as Clytemnestra, in a game of charades, had been described in words but not depicted in illustration.

Bradbury and Evans, the *Punch* publishers, seeking a publisher for it as well. Thackeray was justifiably satisfied with the deal he made with Bradbury and Evans; in addition to being pleased to gain the automatic recognition of *Punch*, he was glad to have a publisher for the project at all. He needed the income a serialized novel would bring. As a contemporary noted, Thackeray

reckoned the [writing] at no more than five and twenty shillings a page, the two etchings at six guineas each, while, as for the few initials at the beginning of the chapters, he threw these in. Such was Mr. Thackeray's own estimate of his commercial value as an author and illustrator (Henry Viztelly, quoted in Sutherland ed. *Vanity Fair* xxxvi).

It was clear from the first issue of *Vanity Fair* that the publication was part of the *Punch* Empire. *Vanity Fair* was not serialized in *Punch*, but the publishing line on the distinctive yellow wrapper proclaimed that *Vanity Fair* had been “published at the *Punch* Office²⁹,” and the costumed person speechifying in the cover illustration is a *Punch* figure. The references to *Punch* on the packaging for *Vanity Fair* were a kind of branding comparable to the way a movie trailer today might declare that a new film is from the producer of a blockbuster series.

The ubiquitous and influential presence of *Punch* in Victorian minds and households cannot be underestimated. As Richard Noakes mentions in his article “Science in Mid-Victorian *Punch*,” it was one of “the most successful and respected comic journals in nineteenth century Britain ... far outselling rivals” (1). As Frankie Morris discusses in her biography of John Tenniel, *Punch* was everywhere, satirizing multiple sides of political arguments, and always conscientiously patriotic. The contents of each weekly edition of *Punch* provided British subjects with a way to see themselves,

²⁹ The covers of *Punch* Annuals themselves merely noted that they were “Published at the Office.”

and a means of exporting British thoughts and ideas around the world. Any association with *Punch* would be likely to boost sales of Thackeray's new novel, and it was likely that it influenced the contents of many far-reaching novels simply because it was a vital part of British cultural literacy.

The influences of *Punch* on *Vanity Fair* certainly didn't stop with the branding on the front cover of the wrapper. The art style, satirical humor, and puppetry conceit of the paper were all present in the novel as well. At the time Thackeray was writing *Vanity Fair*, the main illustrator for *Punch* was John Leech, one of the many political cartoonists for the paper who are remembered now primarily as book illustrators.³⁰ Trollope remarks that Thackeray always held Leech's work in high regard (Trollope 43). The style of Leech's drawings for the paper and the fact that they generally had political satire as their aim were both influential on Thackeray's style as an illustrator.

Punch used humor to offer a moral judgment on current events and issues in Victorian society. While Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* illustrations are influenced by the satire and allegory of *Punch*'s political cartoons, political cartoons generally become obsolete soon after the political situation changes. Conversely, book illustrations carry with them their own context. The particular brand of political satire in *Punch* furthered the evolving art of caricature and I find it interesting that while Dickens was compared to Hogarth far more often than was Thackeray, Thackeray's moralizing satire and his layers of symbolism in images seem very Hogarthian. Thackeray's connection to picture stories and satirical prints was explicit. In addition to the sketchbooks Thackeray created with

³⁰ George Cruikshank and John Tenniel are others.

picture stories in them, his association with satirical prints was due partly to his connection with *Punch*.

Some of *Punch*'s political cartoons were even housed in historiated initials, making timely visual jokes as they formed the letters that would begin articles. Harvey notes that "*Punch* had many illuminated capitals [and also] may have suggested to Thackeray the uses to which a puppet play could be put in a novel" (Harvey 89-91). Indeed, in addition to allegory and costume, puppetry is one of the main conceits of *Vanity Fair* through which Thackeray condemns the artifice of his characters. Thackeray refers to himself as a puppet master and to his characters as his puppets repeatedly in the novel.³¹ His illustrations sometimes even show his characters as toys, which, frankly, put the somewhat stilted quality of his delineation to good use. He finishes the novel by concluding the puppet play: "Come, children, let us shut up the box and the puppets, for our play is played out" (878). It is possible that the decided prominence of this extended metaphor was occasioned by the material connection between *Vanity Fair* and *Punch*.

Punch's title was taken from the inept husband and father puppet in *Punch and Judy* shows. The Punch figure himself graced the pages of the paper often, his costume recalling his ancestry as Punchinello in Italian *commedia dell'arte*. The weekly paper employed the ongoing conceit of a puppet stage, declaring in its very first issue in 1841 that "pantomime may be considered as the natural form of the visible language, – literature being taken as the artificial" (quoted in Colby 251). The image in Figure 3:7, from an advertisement for *Punch* inserted into one of the numbers of *Vanity Fair*, shows

³¹ The only conceit in *Vanity Fair* that is equally prominent to the extended metaphor of puppetry, is the equation drawn between romance and siege. Becky's seductions and coy insinuations, as well as Amelia's less self-aware charms, are often described in terms of military advances.

Punch himself playing with the world; his nose, smile, clownish cap and body all at a rakish, precarious angle. Similarly, one of the small vignettes in *Vanity Fair* is a little image of Thackeray himself, holding a jester's stick and a mask very like this *Punch* image (Figure 3:8). Thackeray had a "delightful habit of intruding himself into the illustrations of his books from time to time [so that he] impinged upon his readers' consciousness in subliminal and elusive ways" (Colby 5). In this case, the picture intruded not just a small instance of authorial self-consciousness and presence, but also a connection with *Punch*. The mask he holds also connects his role as narrator to the roles his characters play for each other, which brings an additional layer of significance to the idea that Thackeray's narrator is a puppet-master, constructing a plot out of dumb figures he can employ for the entertainment and education of the audience. The mask suggests that he, too, has been performing.

Context and Format

Thackeray's "performance" as a narrator could shift with public reaction to his characters because Thackeray would publish one section of the novel while still working on the next. Thus, the novel itself evolved as it was written, and continued to be revised later, as it was published in different editions. As the "revolution in printing technology during the nineteenth century changed the relations of authors to the printed texts of their works" (Dooley 3), publishing serially seemed particularly suitable for authors like Dickens and Thackeray, who wrote quickly and extensively and did not feel great anxiety about the need to explain away inconsistencies later. Thackeray was notorious for being slapdash in his writing and was not a careful proofreader (Dooley 23) so he was obliged

to address his own inconsistencies as they became apparent. Justifications appear in the serially published numbers of the first edition, and were revised further in later editions.

The printers as well as the author introduced changes into the written text of *Vanity Fair* as it was reprinted. In fact, Thackeray's illustrations are much more consistent than his written text when comparing different early editions of the novel. The pictures, therefore, provide much needed continuity. Individual readers might have encountered several different printings of the serially published numbers, and discussed the novel with friends who had any combination of different versions. The pictures help the story stay readable in light of the unavoidable differences in the written text. Of the 2,100 variant readings that Peter Shillingsburg identifies within the "first edition" of *Vanity Fair*, he notes seventeen that are

the addition, deletion, or substitution of passages ranging in length from three to seventy five words ... [and] most copies of *Vanity Fair* as wholes represent hybrids or mixtures of sheets from different printings – as a natural result of the methods of manufacturing and marketing the book. (Shillingsburg 120-21)

The methods of manufacturing and marketing the numbers of *Vanity Fair* were quite similar to the methods for printing *Pickwick Papers* I discussed in the previous chapter, and an examination of the stack of original issues of the novel as released serially allows us now to see the way the pictures and written text were presented to the first readers and in what context.

As I sat in the library, working my way through the numbers that made up the first edition of *Vanity Fair*, a rhythm of expectations arose. The text of each installment was sandwiched between advertisements in a predictable order, packaged always in a cover of the same yellow paper with the same cover illustration. As I opened and

examined one number after another, the similarity of the layout of each made me notice small changes in the format: when an advertisement for tea gave way to one for eyeglasses, for instance. I imagine that for Thackeray's first readers, who probably reread the installments while waiting for the next, these otherwise insignificant changes in packaging were noteworthy. The advertising was part of *Vanity Fair* as readers encountered it.

The first number concludes with sixteen pages of book advertisements, including ads for both *Punch* and works by Dickens, on various types of paper. The back cover, inside and out, has advertisements for items other than books. Even if one does not consider the pictorial and written references to *Punch* on the front cover as themselves containing a kind of advertisement, the opening number of *Vanity Fair* is placed squarely in a commercial context, presenting the beginning of the novel visually and physically surrounded by ads. This layout remains standard in the following numbers, providing continuity through the redundancy of the packaging and reminding readers that they are consumers.

The novel itself is concerned with both self-advertising and material possessions, and the way that it is framed here by advertisement calls into question where the paratext leaves off and the text itself begins. For instance, we are informed that Becky draws caricatures adeptly. She sometimes includes drawings in the letters she sends to Amelia. The drawings she includes in her letters are, of course, the very vignettes Thackeray includes in the typeset pages of the novel. Furthermore, Becky sometimes gives her caricatures (as well as, it is hinted, other favors) to Lord Steyne, who is delighted with them and gives Becky jewels. The exchange of images and favors and money in the

reality of Thackeray's London as well as in the story world he creates were bound up inextricably in the titling and content of *Vanity Fair*: "*Vanity Fair*, the old May Fair and metropolitan Mayfair thus mingle in one, complex, saturnalian image" (Sutherland *Vanity Fair* xxxix). While I cannot assume that all of Thackeray's first readers saw a connection between May Fair, Mayfair and Vanity Fair, it is likely that they did realize Thackeray was intentionally complicating the simple allegory of Bunyan's version of Vanity Fair in *Pilgrim's Progress*.

By the thirteenth number, the commercial context of the frame around the text of the novel includes *Vanity Fair* itself, as the book is advertised in its own advertising pages. The novel as a material object has become a self-referential artifact in the same way that the content of the novel is self-referential because it sometimes equates Thackeray's illustrations with Becky's sketches. The concluding double number, published July 1, 1848, also advertises *Vanity Fair* by touting its suitability for binding. This advertisement uses the same written copy as the earlier internal ads for the novel, and offers prices for having the flimsy numbers in which it had been issued bound together handsomely, by booksellers or by Bradbury and Evans directly. The way the advertisements function as consistent paratextual material for each number makes it noteworthy that there are internal ads for the novel itself: the world of *Vanity Fair* becomes a world in which *Vanity Fair* exists as a novel and an advertise-able object.

Thackeray's Comedy and Morality

Today, Thackeray is generally considered a comic writer, remembered most for his snideness and the masterful depiction of the adventuress Becky Sharp. He is often

even assumed to have deep sympathies with Becky, akin to Milton's sympathy for the devil according to William Blake. However, in Thackeray's own time, it was understood that *Vanity Fair* had a deeply moralizing project in its satire. Trollope, for instance, believed Becky Sharp to be a direct reaction against Dickens's saccharine heroines (Trollope 25), and I believe it is the particular sympathies of our own time and culture that lead us now to sympathize with Becky's seeming rebelliousness. All Thackeray's investigation into the motives of the adventuring Becky or the cowardly Joss or roguish George was condemnatory rather than celebratory. Even when Thackeray sympathizes with difficult situations, in which the characters feel they must be self-serving, he condemns the vanity-driven society that leads them to this belief. Similarly, when Thackeray elides Becky's arts with his own, such as in the credit for the sketches, this has the tone of self-condemnation rather than condoning Becky.

Colby asserts that "[w]hat the great reading public needed, as far as [Thackeray] was concerned, was not more and more professions of the good and the right, but more insight into the insidious sources of evil" (11). Thackeray routinely exposes the inmost thoughts of his despicable characters, whether those thoughts justify their actions or not. In fact, it is when the thought does not match the deed that Thackeray is most likely to reveal it in all its hypocrisy. Not all characters' inmost thoughts are revealed at all moments. For instance, the narrator tells us not to eavesdrop on Amelia's prayers. The narrator claims that as "secrets" they are "out of the domain of *Vanity Fair*" (Oxford 321). Because the reader knows that not every secret is off limits to the narrator's probing, he or she can realize that it is the sanctity of earnest prayer rather than a respect for privacy that Thackeray's narrator here acknowledges. If Thackeray's project was to

parody sentimental and conventional works (Colby 10-11), that entails exposing and displaying evil, not mocking a genuinely pious moment. As Trollope noted, Thackeray “was no cynic, but he was a satirist” (Trollope 60).

His satire did not necessarily lead to comfortable reading. Thackeray’s caustic treatment of his characters, even Amelia when she is foolish or selfish, meant that the novel was not immediately appreciated by readers (Colby 268). Sutherland agrees with Gordon Ray that “Thackeray labours in *Vanity Fair* to raise the tone of mid-nineteenth-century fiction and with it the status of the novelist” (*Vanity Fair* ix), but not all readers long for a higher tone in their leisure-time reading. First readers were offended that Dobbin, “so shamefully ugly,” and Becky and Rawdon, so objectionable, “seemed to the readers to have been addressed almost to themselves” (Trollope 93). Sutherland notes that what especially annoyed Thackeray’s first reviewers were Dobbin’s “big clumsy feet” (*Vanity Fair* xxvii) because they felt Dobbin’s foolishness to be a personal affront. Whether or not Dobbin’s feet were particularly intolerable, it was widely recognized that Thackeray did, in some ways, intend the depictions of his characters to be pointed affronts to his readership. Thackeray’s goal was not to bemoan the deplorable state of human motives and behavior as inevitable, but rather to expose poor justifications and shoddy actions so that they could be avoided.³²

As discussed earlier, the dress of his characters in contemporary fashion helps make it clear that Thackeray’s depictions are indeed warnings directed to his readership. These characters looked like his readers and thus could be identified by and with his

³² *Vanity Fair*’s serialization began around the time that *Jane Eyre* was published, and Charlotte Brontë dedicated her second edition of the novel to Thackeray. Calling him “the satirist of *Vanity Fair*,” she urged those he addressed to “take his warnings in time” (6).

readers as peers. If it is Thackeray's project in *Vanity Fair* to show insidious evil, he does so in order to provide his readers with negative examples of how bad motives may lurk unattractively beneath even the most innocuous-seeming actions that they themselves might take. The depictions of these characters in the illustrations convey that their representations in the written text are not meant to be flattering. For instance, whether or not she is a murderer, the image of Becky discussed earlier, when she is suspected of poisoning Jos, is not sympathetic.

Functions of the Full-page Captioned Plates

In the captioned plates that begin each of the serialized numbers, differences between the characters' motives and self-representations are often shown by an incongruity between the pictorial depiction and the caption. In some sense, it would be misleading if the pictures and captions presented no incongruities: the picture and the written text cannot be consistent, because the representation of the characters is multivalent, revealing how they see themselves, how they wish to be seen, how the narrator sees them, how they see each other – all these things cannot be depicted together in one image without irony because the characters are fooling themselves and each other. The written text, the pictorial illustrations and the characters' ever-revising visions of themselves and others all combine to give multiple, dynamic views of the same subject.

Furthermore, Thackeray uses both visual and written allegory to create characterization. For instance, in the illustrations of Becky Sharp, such as the one captioned "Mis Sharp in her School-room" (Figure 3:9), Becky is depicted with a low

brow over slanted eyes and her sharp mouth results in a pointed smile.³³ None of these facial features were considered particularly attractive in Victorian England, though in the written text, many are attracted to Becky. Thus, a character other characters find physically appealing is shown, in the illustrations, to be less physically appealing than one might expect. As Trollope notes, “There may be details of evil painted so as to disgust, – painted almost too plainly, – but none painted so as to allure” in Thackeray’s work (Trollope 107). Becky’s actual appearance serves as a kind of shorthand character description for her. Becky is almost always depicted smiling, and her amusement is taken to be snide.

These aspects of Becky’s appearance would also have raised racial connotations for the phrenologically-minded Victorians, since Becky is often described in terms of a foreign element in a domestic scene, a newcomer, possibly malignant. In the same vein, it is also noteworthy that Becky speaks French beautifully. In a British novel of the 1840s, impressive mastery of the French language during the Napoleonic wars seems a good indication of the kind of subtle, cultured (and cultural) threat Becky might pose to the other characters; at the time of Thackeray’s writing, the melding of French and English sensibilities was suspect.

Colby notes that Thackeray himself exhibited a melding of French and English approaches to novel creation: “by allowing himself French license in subject matter, but

³³ In our society now, each of these descriptors for Becky’s features, such as “lowbrow” or “pointed,” have gained derogatory meanings. The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists “stinging penetration” as one of the meanings of “pointed” in the 1840s, which also reflects Becky’s last name, Sharp. The other aspects of Becky’s appearance, however, would not have unpleasant connotations until the next century. Today, vulgar humor is called lowbrow, looking at things aslant indicates a warped sense of perception, a sharp mouth makes cutting remarks, and a pointed smile is generally considered sarcastic and judgmental.

employing English reticence in treating it, this ‘manager’ in effect obtains the best of both worlds” (Colby 261). In other words, the written and pictorial text of *Vanity Fair* implied the presence of subject matter that would have been contrary to Victorian mores to include outright. Colby characterizes this suspect subject matter as French.

Thackeray’s ability to suggest rather than represent this morally questionable material is helped by the illustrations, since he is able to imply or allegorize ugly thoughts and deeds in the pictures without actually depicting them. In the case of the full-page plates, the written caption serves as framing material and it is often quite explicitly condemnatory of the action depicted.

Sometimes the captions are positively ironic in the same way that the chapter titles are. For instance, the plate captioned “Miss Crawley’s affectionate relatives” for chapter XI, “Arcadian Simplicity,” is concerned with relatives who are not actually affectionate, just as the chapter is concerned with a location neither Arcadian nor simple. This is a wry, satiric humor that rewards scrutiny because the main written text contradicts the idealized tone of the paratext. Without the captions or the chapter titles a reader would miss much of the narrator’s tone; ignoring the main written text will lead to a misreading of the paratext.

The captions, written in an English Roundhand script much more flowing than the typefont of the regular written text of the novel, are etched or engraved with the pictures. The captions are, in fact, part of the illustrations themselves. By providing commentary and tone rather than strict identification, the captions create a dialogic relationship between word and picture that is different from the other word-to-picture relationships in this text. To further complicate the matter, in their condemnation of artifice and

hypocrisy, the captions sometimes provide commentary rather than description. For instance, the full-plate illustration for Chapter XXXII, “In which Jos takes flight and the war is brought to a close,” depicts Jos riding a horse along a road, his face grave (Figure 3:10).

The caption to this picture is “Mr. Jos Shaves Off His Mustachios” which is clearly not the actual moment depicted by the illustration. Thus, while Harvey laments that “[t]he inadequacy of Thackeray’s draughtsmanship frequently poses problems at just those places where an illustration is most appropriate” (Harvey 79), it is noteworthy that in the case of his full-page plates, the representation of the character or action in the caption contributes to the representation of the character or action in the picture such that Thackeray’s draftsmanship is not the only method through which his illustration conveys meaning. Rather, the combination of caption and picture links the two moments in the written text thematically.

In the case of “Mr. Jos shaves off his mustachios,” the reader knows that Jos had been vain of his rakish moustache precisely because he felt it made him look soldierly. However, fearing the approaching enemy in this chapter, he has his valet shave off his moustache because he worries the French army “will mistake [him] for a military man” (345). He cultivated the moustache because he believed his outward appearance would be completely changed by it; he shaves it off for the same reason. He furthermore dresses in the least warlike manner possible, intentionally so that “you would have fancied he was a flourishing, large parson of the Church of England” (346). The depicted action and the action referred to by the caption, that is, shaving his moustache and leaving town, are indicative of his character in the same way. The previous chapter was titled “In which Jos

Sedley takes care of his Sister,” a post he is abandoning a scant few pages later. Not only does each action reveal his hypocrisy and cowardice, each action also reveals Jos’s somewhat delusional sense of himself as the focus of attention. He considers himself important enough to be in danger if he stays in town, and important enough to have his face examined by the enemy. He is neither. Thus, the captioning of this plate also allows the moustache to become a signifier for all the ways in which Jos abandons his ineffective attempts to appear brave and confident, the moment trouble looms.

In *Illustration*, Miller addresses the potential power of captions through Mark Twain’s famous analysis of the painting, “The Last Meeting of Lee and Jackson,” by Everett Julio. Twain refutes the argument that “the picture presents something, makes it more present than any words can, and does this more economically” (Miller 61) by pointing out that in this painting, the caption is necessary for an understanding of what is pictured. If there were no words to designate this as a parting, Twain maintains, there would be no way a viewer, presented with a painting of two men on horses looking at each other, would be able to tell it was a leave-taking, much less a significant one. The words provide context for the picture by indicating that the depicted moment takes place in an existing chronological narrative. If Twain was right that the picture is meaningless without the words, it is certainly also true that in this painting of Lee and Jackson, the words would be uninteresting without the picture.

In *Vanity Fair*, because the engravings and letterpress could not be printed at the same time on the same paper, the full-page plates preceded the pages with written text. Therefore, the captions, which share the plate page, appear as obscure titles below the

images. The captions would not explain or situate the illustration in the written text for a reader who had not yet read the chapter. Rather, the captions foreshadow the chapter text.

The Function of the Small vignettes

As noted, the full-page plates were not the illustrations best-suited to Thackeray's drawing ability. John Sloan observes in his introductory remarks to the Heritage Press edition of *Vanity Fair* that,

the drawings on the steel plates, which were possibly bitten with acid by another craftsman, do not show the loving delight of the artist to the same degree as the drawings made on the woodblocks, which appear directly in the text. I think that Thackeray felt this too, since the only signed drawings are among the woodcuts. (xiii)³⁴

The small vignettes set onto the pages of the written text seem to offer intimate reinforcement of the content of the written text rather than commentary on it.

For instance, in a rare example of simple, kindly action, the woman nursing Becky's son is shown to truly care for the child (Figure 3:11). In this illustration, the smiling nurse with her clasped hands is depicted in a similar way to the young boy in her charge. They both have their hands in front of them and their feet together, and they are both drawn with similar arcs and rounded curves. Even the brims of their hats are similarly rounded. Both are complacent looking, both in poses that connote simplicity and honesty. They each seem to fit into their surroundings well. This vignette is surrounded by written text that provides a juxtaposition to this peaceful, homey scene –

³⁴ I am indebted to Dr. Patricia Mainardi in the Art History Department of the CUNY Graduate Center, who pointed out to me that Gordon Ray offers information about the etching, engraving, and carving of the illustrations for *Vanity Fair* that contradicts Sloane's. Apparently, Thackeray's involvement in the technological side of the reproduction of his images is a vexed question, and may have varied drastically from edition to edition.

the words describe Becky's distaste for interacting with her own child. Thackeray makes the point that though the child's father often visited him, happy his son was being raised to be hearty, "Rebecca did not care much to go and see the son and heir. He had spoiled a new dove-coloured pelisse of hers" (400). The nurse, with her round eyes and full-frontal stance may look a bit foolish, but that is preferable to Becky's absentee parenting. The depiction of a sweet, mothering figure in the illustration is all the more noteworthy because of its contrast with the written, condemnatory representation of Becky herself.

In an illustration about a hundred pages later, Becky is shown in her own natural habitat – not with her child in the mud of the countryside, but richly dressed in a richly dressed room, offering insincere flattery to Pitt Crawley about his appearance, after which, she "made a caricature of his figure, which she showed to Lord Steyne when he arrived" (501). The accurate, though unflattering depiction of her character in this illustration (Figure 3:12), and the written text that surrounds it, can be valued by the reader just as much and in the same way as the caricature of Pitt Crawley can be valued by Lord Steyne for its likeness. We, the readers, can sanction Becky's act of drawing him so unflatteringly, because we recognize that flattery for him is false – he is an unsympathetic character. In a similar way, we can condone Thackeray's depiction of Becky because she too is presenting a façade that does not represent her inner self.

The caricature of Pitt Crawley drawn for Lord Steyne's amusement is meant to be authentic to attitude rather than conveying a strict anatomical likeness. In *Vanity Fair*, the illustrations printed on the page with the written text are not necessarily any more accurately proportioned than the full-page plates, but they seem better composed and have more spirit. Even though Thackeray's drawings are often imprecise, Trollope notes

that, “as illustrations they were excellent [because they] managed to convey in the picture the exact feeling which he has described in the text” (Trollope 7). As usual, Trollope’s assessment is apt. These vignettes reinforce the mood and tone of the written text while sanctioning the good in human nature and exposing the bad. A reader can value the depiction of Becky without wanting to be her. For these purposes, the facial expressions and body language of the characters depicted seem much more important than accuracy of proportion or detail.

Historiated initials elide functions of letter and picture

The historiated initials that begin each chapter are printed the same way as the small vignettes: they, too, were carved out of small woodblocks that were then set up with the type by the compositor. They, too, are inked like the individual letters of type and press their image into the paper. Some of them are as large as some of the small vignettes. However, they serve a distinctly different function in the novel, since they are, in fact, also part of the written text. W.J.T. Mitchell seems to have gotten at the heart of their multifunctionality when he coined the term “imagetext” in his book *Picture Theory*. Mitchell uses this term to mean anything that can be analyzed as a visual form and also has content that can be read in some way. He describes this as “double coding” or using a “double-coded system” of creation and/or representation (Mitchell 69, 192). Thackeray’s historiated initials are literally double-coded as two kinds of representation: pictures and alphabetic letters. Harvey, among other critics, has noted that these historiated initials (which he calls “pictorial capitals”) are the “one type of illustration in which Thackeray consistently succeeds, and where his actual linework often seems apt and right” (82).

Perhaps Thackeray's success with the capitals is due to their iconic function, providing signposts that will direct the reader's understanding of the chapter to come. Because the historiated initials have this function, the initials join the ongoing conceit of puppetry, and the games of charades the characters play, in the motif of performativity and artifice so prevalent in this novel. While it is possible to see the figures in the historiated initials as Thackeray's puppets, posed for effect rather than realism, the people in the historiated initials also sometimes seem to be playing the very elaborate charade games played by the characters themselves. In a game of charades, such as the one in which Becky appears as Clytemnestra and other figures to great acclaim, a curtain is erected and behind it carefully costumed people create a tableau that connotes a word or syllable to the viewers. The figures in the historiated initials similarly seem to be indicating a meaning rather than going about their regular lives. Sometimes, such as in the mermaid initial discussed earlier, they display for the readers the hypocrisies of the characters that will be exposed in the chapter to come.

Some of the historiated initials feature a decorated letter carved with the picture, but not integral in the pictorial depiction of the woodblock. Many others, however, such as the tree W and moon O mentioned earlier, incorporate the letterform organically into the pictorial representation, making the lines forming the capital letter starting the chapter also part of a depicted scene. It is for this reason that Miller has noted that a historiated initial can become "a sign that is also a design" (Miller 77).

The historiated initial that begins Chapter LVIII, "Our Friend the Major," shows the honest, gangly Dobbin (he of the offensively large feet) being led by a cherub (Figure 3:13). His hands are clasped before him as he follows close behind the symbol of love; he

seems simultaneously meek and eager. The cherub hoists its bow with a grin, looking pleased. They walk by an oval window that functions as the capital O to begin the sentence:

Our Major had rendered himself so popular on board the Ramchunder, that when he and Mr. Sedley descended into the welcome shore-boat which was to take them from the ship, the whole crew, men and officers, the great Captain Bragg himself leading off, gave three cheers for Major Dobbin, who blushed very much, and ducked his head in token of thanks.
(635)

Here the picture tells us what the words of the first sentence do not: Dobbin's reason for departing is love. His meekness in the picture is endearing, and the reader can understand why Captain Bragg and his men were so fond of the Major. The oval window, which suggests a porthole, acts as the letter O. The window connotes a widening and opening of the scene for both Dobbin and the reader. The reader must go through that window in order to read the sentence beyond.

The functions of the historiated initial here are multiple: first, to set the thematic tone of the chapter about to take place, as a sort of visual analogue that directs reader reaction; second, to form the letter "O;" and third, to make readers complicit in processing multivalent signification, thereby requiring them to participate in the methods of representation of the novel.³⁵ The historiated initial elides the functions of letter and picture: readers must actively process both the alphabetic and pictorial meaning. If they avoid doing so, they will not understand the whole novel. Unpacking everything offered

³⁵ Referring to the historiated initials as "capital letters with symbolic drawings in them," as Harvey does (77), seems to privilege the importance of the written text over the pictorial. Critics who use this sort of phrasing imply that the literal function of the historiated initial is primary, while the illustration also present is merely a kind of picture code, something contained by the alphabetic function.

by this “O” all at once can be exhausting to contemplate. Tucker grapples with the dual function of the historiated initials when he writes,

Thackeray embeds the alphabetic shape in the image, whence the reader must disentangle it in order to complete the written text, or whither the reader must restore it in order to preserve the integrity of the graphic ...[which] renewed, as an option exercised on the reader’s pleasure, an agreement to collaborate on literature (Tucker 170-171).

However, I do not see the readerly participation in processing both word and picture as problematic. Far from requiring the reader to disentangle a letter from a picture, or ignore the function of a letter to restore a picture’s integrity, I think the beauty and efficacy of Thackeray’s historiated initials is that readers are led to collaborate in meaning-making: Thackeray’s first readers understood, in fact, that the sign and design were *both to be processed at once*. In *Eye and Brain*, Gregory notes that when viewing any image, “the perceptual ‘decision’ of what is figure (or object) and what ground, is similar to the engineer’s distinction between ‘signal’ and ‘noise.’ It is basic to any system which handles information” (Gregory 21). That decision about what is ground and what is object will be layered in a historiated initial.

In other words, the historiated initials in *Vanity Fair* are not optical illusions. In optical illusions, there can be multiple ways to interpret an image, but viewers of an optical illusion cannot see both at the same time. Rather, they must concentrate to see one instead of the other. Optical illusions are “multistable” in the way W.J.T. Mitchell describes images with dual functions. They need to be in constant flux, prompting an actual neuro-physiological oscillation between ways of understanding the image.

The window O I have just discussed does not conform to the idea that a trick of the mind can let the viewer acknowledge seeing the image in two different incongruous ways, rather, the image is multivalent: fully a window and fully an O at the same time. In the case of the historiated initials in *Vanity Fair*, it is possible to understand the two modes of signification simultaneously, so they do not interfere with each other. Rather, they reinforce a readerly interaction with the text. In many ways, this is a relief, since the ironic juxtapositions of depiction and description seem to call for so much work on the part of the reader in almost every other aspect of the word-picture combinations in *Vanity Fair*. For instance, a caption like “Miss Crawley’s affectionate relatives” seems to almost require a kind of Orwellian doublethink to process all of the ways Thackeray makes meaning from that captioned plate. Compared to that, it is positively relaxing that the roles of the historiated initials, while still thematically rich, are not syntactically complicated.

In the historiated initials, the necessity of processing both letter and picture at once (rather than letting the separate functions of the image flicker back and forth in the reader’s comprehension as Tucker seems to argue) can be understood as an instance of what Rudolf Arnheim calls active perceiving. Arnheim, who theorizes visual perception, argues a difference “between passive reception and active perceiving” (14) that can be understood as the difference between inactive “seeing” and engaged “looking at.” While the former requires merely awareness of visual input, the latter requires intention and attention. To understand a multivalent image such as an alphabetic letter that is also part of pictorial representation, a reader’s active perception must collaborate with the

intention of the author, giving life and nuance to the static image and making the reading experience dynamic.

In *Vanity Fair*, historiated initials that engage the letterform in pictorial representation create repercussions for the modes of representation in the novel overall. The reader must be willing to invest in a collaborative attention to the novel not just for advanced and interested analysis but also for actual literacy – for the text as presented to be legible to the reader, the interplay of elements in the multivalent image must be engaged. A W of tree branches must be *both* tree and W.

Integrated Textuality

Arnheim modifies Charles Peirce's categories of icon and symbol when he differentiates between methods of representation by declaring that a picture depicts, a symbol stands for something to which it is related, and a sign stands for something arbitrarily. If we agree with him, we can see instances of depiction, symbolism and signification in both the written text and the illustrations that make up the total text of *Vanity Fair*. In this novel, there are intricate relationships between words and pictures as they each fulfill many functions simultaneously. The written text of the novel incorporates both the regular paragraph and dialogue structure of the chapters and self-conscious paratext in the form of chapter titles and captions to the full-page plates. In serialized fiction the pictures on the plates act, as I have argued elsewhere, as a sort of preview of the chapters to come in the rest of the number. The small vignettes can fill grammatical space in the written text – for instance, in the footnote on anachronistic dress discussed earlier in this chapter, the long dash is followed by a picture that finishes the

sentence begun in words. Finally, the historiated initials create images that act as both letters and pictures, reminiscent of ideograms from other cultures. In these initials, the multiplicity of meaning present is neither subtext nor gloss, but rather integral to the image itself; when assigning multiple functions to Thackeray's historiated initials, we are not "reading into" them, we are just reading them.

Though illustrated novels are often described as a kind of partnership between sister arts – pictures and letters – that doesn't have to be the case. In *Vanity Fair*, the interactions between the words and pictures represent a sliding scale of sign-signification made explicit by the fact that the same hand both drew and wrote. There is not just one kind of written text and one kind of picture in this novel. Rather, the different uses for different types of illustration and the varieties of written text (caption, chapter title, etc) all exist in one larger overarching textual category of legible material. The overlapping of functions along the various registers of word-picture combination makes the story world of *Vanity Fair* engrossing and persuasive precisely because it engages in so many modes of representation.

Chapter 4

Pictures and Conversations: Nuance and Neutrality in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

In *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Charles Lutwidge Dodgson's³⁶ words and John Tenniel's pictures together present Alice and her dream world as fully realized creations. Alice begins the book by wondering, ““what is the use of a book ... without pictures or conversation?”” (Carroll 25), and boredom with her sister's pictureless, conversationless book leads Alice to fall asleep outside and dream of falling down a rabbit hole into Wonderland where she meets several strange characters. I have modified her question for my chapter title because I will here address how the masterpiece status of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* results from a conversation between the pictures and words themselves.³⁷ In other words, because Tenniel and Dodgson corresponded so rigorously and took part in each other's decision-making about both words and pictures, their thoughtful collaboration resulted in a product in which words and pictures themselves collaborate. Unlike Thackeray's multivalent sign-signification in *Vanity Fair*, discussed in my previous chapter, the words and pictures of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* present a fairly explicit partnership between sister arts.

³⁶ Charles Lutwidge Dodgson used the penname Lewis Carroll when he wrote stories and poems for children. I will refer to Dodgson by his real name when discussing him as a man, but attribute quotations to his penname.

³⁷ Zohar Shavit writes that “[h]istorically speaking, texts considered as a turning point (or ‘masterpieces’) are not the first to admit a new model to the system, but rather gain their status by manipulation of existing models” (82). Shavit attributes to the *Alice* books a manipulation of the fairy tale model to eliminate didacticism.

Though Tenniel and Dodgson never became personal friends, they engaged in an exchange of ideas that was clearly based on mutual respect for each other's talents. They offered each other suggestions about both the words and the pictures. Just as Tenniel and Dodgson worked together to create the character of Alice, so too do their arts work together to make a reading of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in which fantasy's blend with reality is paramount. In this book, the character of Alice needs to be believable and solid despite her changes in shape and size; she needs to be a character readers want to follow through Wonderland.

Because of the collaboration between author and illustrator, the *Alice* books transcend the model of the illustrated novel that I discussed in my first chapter, in which the illustrator's role is merely supplementary. As I argued in my first chapter, Dickens' interactions with his illustrators indicate that he did not see them as collaborators, but rather as "the help," people who provided services for his written text at his bidding. He would send them wordy missives, full paragraphs describing what he would want from the next illustration. He had often not yet written the chapter in which the illustration would be inserted. Dickens' illustrators were generally writing to his specifications, and though they were often informed in serial publishing by the previous numbers, they sometimes had no information beyond what Dickens wrote to them about where the story was going. A Dickens illustrator thus generally didn't see the words his picture was to accompany until the illustration had been completed and published (Steig).

This process, while no doubt convenient for the author, and well suited to the rush of publishing serially, cannot be considered collaborative because the author and artist did not work together. Rather, the illustrator had to blindly follow instructions given by

Dickens without being allowed to format his own nuanced interpretation of the actual written text to be published. He was drawing at a remove, responding to Dickens' plans for the next novel installment, rather than responding to a part of the story that would be published next to his picture. To continue my conceit, this was a one-sided conversation.

The product was therefore one in which their separate words and pictures were published together but did not necessarily dovetail with each other or lead to the same reading of the text. Indeed, Henry James had complained that “for him when he was a child Dickens's *Oliver Twist* meant more the powerful etchings by Cruikshank than Dickens's text. The illustrations, for him, obliterated the words” (Miller 70). James's anxiety over obliterated words occasions my analysis that instead of working together, Dickens's and Cruikshank's arts competed for attention. For illustrations to obliterate the importance of the words from the mind of the reader, they must in some way be in competition.

James was right to be wary – as I have argued throughout, the combination of written words and drawn pictures is a powerful thing, integrating two modes of communication to engage the reader's participation in the text. If the pictures and words work against each other, both sides must suffer. Alternatively, in the *Alice* books, the pictures and words augment one another rather than manipulating or contradicting.

It may be helpful to think of the collaboration between Tenniel's illustrations and Dodgson's written text in terms of an analogy with vision theory. In *Visual Thinking*, Rudolf Arnheim asserts that one view of an object is not enough to determine its character. It is only through multiple viewpoints that a circle is revealed to be a cone, or a nose on a profile is revealed to be crooked on a three-dimensional face. The construction

of a fictional narrative can likewise benefit from multiple views, such as those provided by words and pictures, as long as those views can be recognized as different angles on the same object. If the combination of Cruikshank's pictures with Dickens' words was sometimes jarring, perhaps the two men offered perspectives that were not easily reconciled as views of the same thing. With the original collaboration between Dodgson and Tenniel, the views are manifestly of the same object.

The Tenniel illustrations for the *Alice* books do not obliterate the words. Instead, the presence of both words and pictures is requisite for the text to be complete. In combination the pictures and words create an immersive experience for the reader/viewer. They combine to create a hybrid viewing and reading which makes the viewer/reader a participant in the process of world creation, moving back and forth between two modes of perception.

Tenniel and Dodgson's separate arts fused to create a whole text greater than the sum of its parts. Tenniel and Dodgson's success in the creation of a text that merges words with pictures – a kind of hybrid itself – is due to similarities in their habits and personalities as well as the complementary styles in which they realized their subjects. These two men had many attributes in common with each other; they were both very meticulous, both interested in the pantomime and theater, both novice Medievalists, and both amused by puns. In fact, Frankie Morris argues in her Tenniel biography *Artist of Wonderland*, that these shared interests resulted in a compatibility of affect and tone in their work, which account for much of the imagery in the *Alice* books. Their shared interests also account for some of their unity of representation. For instance, Dodgson, according to Martin Gardner, meant the Tweedles to be read as mirror-twins, and

“Tenniel’s picture of the two ... indicates that he looked upon the twins in the same way” (*Annotated Alice* 231) because the two men were prepared to look on the task of representation similarly. Gardner’s phrasing here, as throughout, indicates that he sees the author and illustrator working in a partnership instead of one working *for* the other: they saw things independently and they saw things the same way.³⁸

Perhaps unsurprisingly, after their collaboration on *Wonderland* Dodgson seemed to consider Tenniel’s work the standard against which the work of other illustrators should be measured. For instance, Dodgson thought that although Henry Holiday could “rival Tenniel [in] grace and beauty,” he fell short of an ideal illustrator because he couldn’t draw grotesques (Gardner *Snark* 17). On the other hand, Dodgson felt that William Schwenck Gilbert was flawed as an illustrator for the opposite reason: he was unable to “draw anything pretty and graceful” (Cohen 63), even though Schwenck Gilbert was able to create amusing grotesques. Tenniel combined the two qualities in his pictures just as Dodgson did in his writing. In *Wonderland*, the combination of realism and fantasy is essential to its representation: the dreamscape is one that combines realism and fantasy, beauty and grotesques, and Alice is our guide to that world as she explores it.

The only complaint I have encountered about Tenniel from Dodgson was a letter to another illustrator in which he states that Alice was out of drawing:

Mr Tenniel is the only artist, who has drawn for me, who resolutely refused to use a model, & declared he no more needed on than *I* should

³⁸ They also both integrated aspects of intertextuality into their art, Dodgson by creating parodies of popular songs and moral rhymes, and Tenniel by parodying existing visual art in his illustrations – for instance, Quentin Matsys’s painting “A Grotesque Old Woman” in his depiction of the Duchess in *Wonderland*, and his own portrayals of Gladstone and Disraeli in the Lion and Unicorn of *Looking Glass*, among others.

need a multiplication-table to work a mathematical problem! I venture to think that he was mistaken, and that, for want of a model, he drew several pictures of 'Alice' *entirely* out of proportion – head decidedly too large, & feet decidedly too small.” (quoted in Ayres 163, all punctuation and italics *ibid*)

Perhaps this was one small instance in which Dodgson felt Tenniel was on the wrong side of the interplay between grotesques and beauty, making Alice look like a caricature instead of a character. Or perhaps this was merely a way for Dodgson to convince his new, less experienced, artist to use a model. In any event, Alice does seem realistic in the illustrations and the written text.

Dodgson's obvious goal of making Alice a practical, engaging child, someone with whom a Victorian child could identify, was reinforced by Tenniel's illustrations. “Tenniel gave a perfectly believable physical embodiment to this unreal world. His firm delineation of the various characters in the [*Alice*] books gave them the form they have preserved over the years, so perfectly did he capture the spirit of Carroll's texts” (Whalley 81). The spirit of Dodgson's written text is one in which amusing the reader is more important than presenting a moral, and in which constant play with scale and bodily changes are grounded by a solid, believable personality. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* heralded a change in the children's books of Victorian England precisely because of Alice's believable normality and the amoral aspects of her exploration of Wonderland.

Alice's Place in Publishing History

By 1865, the year *Wonderland* was published, Victorian England had developed distinct views about childhood. Being a child meant not only being under the age of

majority, but also embodying sweetness and innocence. Victorian adults felt it their duty to protect this innocence, while also shaping children's morals. Children were dressed in specially designed clothing to differentiate them from adults; before the nineteenth century, most children's clothes in England were merely miniature versions of adult clothing. Similarly, "at the beginning of the 19th century, the prevailing norms of English children's literature continued to be didactic and realistic," intended only for education and Christian betterment (Shavit 81). Child characters were written as though they were small adults, oddly more susceptible than real adults to spiritual and bodily harm. The illustrations in children's books before the nineteenth century, generally rough woodcuts, had mirrored the representation of children as small adults, showing them as physically smaller compared to their surroundings but with the same dress, expressions and poses. Children's book illustration started treating the depiction of children as distinct from small grown-ups around 1840 (Whalley 53). Childhood, to Victorian adults, was a time to be treasured, venerated and idealized.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, then, the Victorian intelligentsia and Victorian children's book authors and illustrators were often the same people. For instance, *Punch* artist Dicky Doyle illustrated *The King of the Golden River*, an 1841 children's book by John Ruskin. This book did not make Ruskin's or Doyle's fortunes, and was even originally published anonymously, a Victorian convention. However, it is indicative of the high visibility of, and sanctified societal use for, children's stories that while Ruskin was setting aesthetic and literary taste for decades to come with his lectures about craft, he was also amusing British children with a fairy tale; while Dicky Doyle was producing political and social imagery for *Punch* that would be seen by most of the

policy-makers and subjects of the island, he was also drawing cruel brothers and fair children for Ruskin's tale.

Children's publishing boomed, and illustrations were important to the genre. "By the second half of the century, it was not uncommon to find the artist's name featuring more prominently on title pages than that of the writer" (Whalley 56). There were several reasons for the high status of illustrations in children's literature at this time. To begin with, a pride in visual literacy, being able to read images, was still paramount (Lynch) as textual literacy was on the rise through the nineteenth century. Illustrations were popular in adult forms of literature as well and giving the artist a prized place on the title page was probably also influenced by the gift book economy that raged in the mid-century.³⁹

As with publishing for adults, economic forces affected the inclusion of illustrations in children's books. While paratextual factors definitely contribute to the intellectual and social value of a produced text, it is also true that the costs associated with book production serve to aim the text at a particular target market (Weedon). Choices like gilding the pages or binding in a higher quality leather as well as the number of illustrations and the fame of the illustrator affect the cost and therefore the status of the book in the market. In addition to the social forces that drove the importance of illustration in children's books, many technical innovations had made printing illustrations a better proposition – clearer, faster, in more numbers – by the middle of the century.

³⁹ The Christmas gift-book economy had begun with Chapman and Hall's publication of *A Christmas Carol*, by Charles Dickens in 1843. Christmas gift books were small, complete in one volume, and generally bound in red with gold embossing, released in time for the Christmas market – all of which descriptors fit *Wonderland* as well.

In fact, the woodblocks for the illustrations to the *Alice* books were used only to create electrotypes of the images and printing was done from these. This process allowed the images in thousands of copies in multiple editions to stay sharp because the woodblocks themselves never wore down: more electros could be taken easily from the still-pristine woodblocks whenever they were needed. When *Wonderland* was published in 1865, it was at the height of the concurrence of these economic, social, and technological forces. Timing allowing Dodgson, a math professor with a stammer and a pseudonym, to team up with Tenniel, a famous political cartoonist, to create one of the very first books for children that didn't preach to them, or represent them as entirely constructed of sweetness and light.

A Turning Point in Children's Literature

Because Alice herself is not an angel, and because many of the jokes and asides are ones that amused the author and artist personally, sometimes the *Alice* books are not even considered to be children's books at all. For instance Gilbert Chesterton argued that, "It is not children who should read the words of Lewis Carroll [but rather] sages and grey-haired philosophers" (Gardner *Snark* 15). And Shavit claims that "the child appears to be much more an excuse for the text rather than its genuine addressee" (79). However, children loved them, as staggering numbers of fan letters to Lewis Carroll attest, and both *Alice* books "broke sales records" (Cohen 28) as they were read by adults, children, and adults *to* children. Now, as Shavit points out, some histories of children's literature even divide the eras of publishing into "Before Alice" and "After Alice" (82).

Richard Kelly has collected contemporary reviews as an appendix to his edition of *Wonderland*, and it is apparent that the initial critical response was generally favorable. While the *Athenaeum* speculated at first that “any child might be more puzzled than enchanted by this stiff, over-wrought story” (273), the *Spectator* considered the story “very funny” and enjoyable to both children and adults, and Tenniel’s illustrations “charming” (274). The *John Bull* also had complimentary things to say about the book on its first publication, commenting that *Wonderland* “effectually dispels the notion that first-rate mathematical talent and ability are inconsistent with genuine humour and imagination” (278). Six months after the publication of the first edition, when *Aunt Judy’s Magazine* gushed that “the exquisite illustrations only do justice to the exquisitely wild, fantastic, impossible, yet most natural” written text (281), it seems the magazine is not refuting a prevailing claim to the contrary, but rather confirming an acknowledged fact of the book’s greatness. Many other periodicals follow suit and praise the book whenever there is a reprint (270-283).

The freshness of Alice’s normality as well as the non-linear dream plot helped to make the text so loveable. “In [the *Alice*] books we discover the final emancipation of children’s literature, when all morality and learning was turned upside-down, yet given an air of reality such as was acceptable in the world of dreams” (Whalley 81). Dodgson was later able to claim about both *Alice* books “that the books have no religious teaching whatever in them – in fact they do not teach anything at all” (quoted in Shavit 83). To create this amoral dream world, Dodgson and Tenniel carefully wove together fantasy and reality in their descriptions and depictions of Alice and the world in which she found herself.

Alice is not a perfect child rewarded with an eternity in Heaven, nor a wicked child punished with an eternity in Hell. Her imperfections are numerous and stated both explicitly and early on in the book. Within the first three pages of the book Alice has been bored to sleep and “burn[s] with curiosity” (2); the narrative makes it clear when she thinks “Why, I wouldn’t say anything about it, even if I fell off the top of the house!” (3), that Alice is willing to be deceptive; we learn also that Alice is prideful and desirous of showing off, when the narrator informs us that “Alice had learnt several things of this sort in her lessons in the schoolroom, and though this was not a *very* good opportunity for showing off her knowledge, as there was no one to listen to her, still it was good practice to say it over” (3 italics *ibid*). In the didactic children’s stories of an earlier century, any of these moral failings might have been a death sentence for a character. Alice, a deceptive, curious, bored, prideful child, continues her story exploring a new land, maintaining these shocking flaws while being quite likeable, safe, and self-reliant throughout.

Child readers could identify with her precisely because they were not being didactically instructed to emulate her. Furthermore, she seems to have no interest in teaching her readers their ABCs or manners, though she herself “had read several nice little histories about children who had got burnt, and eaten up by wild beasts and other unpleasant things, all because they *would* not remember the simple rules their friends had taught them” (Carroll 17 italics *ibid*). This passage posits Alice as a child who has read the same books as the intended readership of *Wonderland* had read. Because Alice is being raised on the same texts as the children reading *Wonderland*, she shares with her readers a sense of cultural literacy and aspects of socialization. While Alice is no goody

two-shoes, she has probably read, or had read aloud to her, *The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes*, in which the financial hardships of the title character are eradicated in reward for virtue. Instead, a child reader could see herself in Alice's shoes. In fact, her moral imperfections are necessary to the story because it is Alice's curiosity that drives the plot as she explores the new world in which she finds herself.

Textual Origins and Contributions

Alice's believability was partly due to the fact that Charles Dodgson based her character on a real person. He originally told the story that would grow into *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* on a boating trip with his Dean's three daughters, including Alice Liddell. As the three girls clamored for a story, he invented an impromptu dream narrative about a little girl who falls down a rabbit hole and has adventures. Thanks to much encouragement from both his adult and child acquaintances, Dodgson expanded the story in writing and eventually explored the possibility of its publication.

When Dodgson finally approached Tenniel and asked him to provide illustrations for a children's book, Tenniel was already a famous political cartoonist, providing the weekly main cut for the influential paper, *Punch*, with which his name and persona were linked inextricably during his lifetime. One of Tenniel's gifts was the ability to maintain identical characteristics in different drawings of the same person; for instance, no matter at what angle John Bull is shown in Tenniel's political cartoons, he is still recognizable as the same character. This suited his role as a political cartoonist and also enabled him to create a narrative out of multiple pictures, as he would do with great success for the *Alice* books.

Dodgson asked Tenniel to do the illustrations for *Wonderland* on January 25, 1864, with a letter of introduction from a common acquaintance. Tenniel insisted on reading the manuscript before agreeing to do the pictures because he refused to draw from a description as Browne and Cruikshank had done for Dickens and others (Frankie Morris). While some Victorian illustrators were willing to subordinate their decision-making status to the author's, Tenniel was not one of them. He finally agreed to illustrate *Wonderland* by early April of that year, and had the first picture, of Alice with the Dodo, ready to show Dodgson by May.

The chronology of *Wonderland's* production is complicated by the fact that Dodgson wrote out a manuscript he titled *Alice's Adventures Underground* in 1863 at the urging of Alice Liddell. This manuscript itself expanded on the oral tale he'd constructed for the girls on the boat trip. *Underground* was circulated in Dodgson's circle, and finally given to Alice Liddell as a Christmas gift in 1864. Before that, the manuscript, which contained sketches by Dodgson himself, had been loaned to George MacDonald and read aloud to the MacDonald children. Their enjoyment of the story was integral in Dodgson's decision to publish the story at all. It is assumed that this manuscript was also the one loaned to Tenniel.

Tenniel kept some of the layouts for the pictures from Dodgson's sketches in *Alice's Adventures Underground*, such as in the illustration of Alice swimming in the pool of tears (Figure 4:1). Though Alice's appearance is different in *Wonderland* and *Underground*, the overall mood and composition are similar in Tenniel's finished engraving for *Wonderland* and Dodgson's sketch here reproduced from *Underground*.

However, not all the pictures in *Wonderland* correspond with those in *Underground*. *Underground* contains pictures by Dodgson of textual incidents that Tenniel would leave un-illustrated in *Wonderland*; conversely, several characters and scenes in *Wonderland* do not appear in *Underground* at all, such as the chapters with the Duchess and cook, and the mad tea party. Evidently, Tenniel and Dodgson both saw the manuscript as a starting point for the construction of the novel rather than a finished written text in which pictures should be inserted, since both words and pictures evolved and grew from it. Therefore, the Tenniel illustrations must be considered the original illustrations for the *Alice* books as we know them even though the original manuscript Dodgson loaned Tenniel had some sketches by Dodgson in it. Each man's work was shaped by the other as they corresponded while Dodgson expanded the written text and Tenniel drew the pictures. Dodgson saw the illustration as collaboration rather than supplement and it is fair to say that the words were influenced by the pictures as well as the pictures influenced by the words.

Tenniel was open to suggestions about the illustrations from Dodgson during their correspondence.

There is good reason to believe that Tenniel adopted a suggestion of Carroll's that he draw the Hatter to resemble one Theophilus Carter ... The Hatter, Hare, and Dormouse do not appear in *Alice's Adventures Underground*; the entire chapter was a later addition to the tale (Gardner *Alice* 93).

Perhaps Tenniel affected the creation of these characters in much the same way that Dodgson affected both the appearance of some characters and seems to have inspired the layout for some of Tenniel's illustrations.

Years later, when the men were at work on the sequel to *Wonderland*, titled *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There*, Tenniel convinced Dodgson to remove an entire section of *Looking Glass*, saying, “I can’t see my way to a picture. If you want to shorten the book, I can’t help thinking – with all submission – that this is your opportunity” (quoted in Gardner *Alice* 221). Comments like this were possible because Dodgson would generally wait to do much of the final wording until his first proofs were back from the publisher. Therefore, it is likely that the various lines directing the reader to the illustrations in *Wonderland*, such as his injunction to the reader to “look at the frontispiece if you want to see how” the king wore his crown over a judge’s wig (128), were written after some conversation between Dodgson and Tenniel about the illustrations for these lines.

Perhaps part of the reason Dodgson and Tenniel were able to take each other’s suggestions to such effect was the dual nature of each of their respective arts. Tenniel and Dodgson were both what Joyce Irene Whalley has termed book artists: “the true book artist” was “conscious of the relationship between text, picture, and page, [and his] line could in itself become a substitute for text, revealing mood, action or humour just as the artist wished” (Whalley 109-110). Whalley is here describing Randolph Caldecott, contrasting his deft narrative imagery with pictures by Walter Crane, which Whalley finds merely decorative instead of illustrative. However, I would like to posit that this description of a book artist fits both Dodgson and Tenniel as well. Not only did they share an artistic sensibility, their definitions of what each of their texts could do overlapped. Tenniel was well versed in creating pictures with narrative functions because

of his facility with the political cartoon, and Dodgson carefully employed the aesthetics of his written text in many cases.

The narrative function of Tenniel's art is observable in the sequence of illustrations in which Alice goes through the mirror in *Looking Glass* (Figure 4:2). As the book was originally published, these two illustrations appeared on the recto and verso of the same sheet. Alice appears first from behind and then from the front so that as the reader turns over the page Alice is seen to go through the three dimensional book space as she goes through the mirror.

Also a book-artist, Dodgson was willing to play with the visual textuality of his words and punctuation. The Mouse's tale takes the form of a mouse tail in *Wonderland* (Figure 4:3) and the repetition of three lines of dots indicate the streams which separate chessboard squares in the landscape of *Looking Glass*. These are both indications that Dodgson could draw with words as well as Tenniel could narrate with pictures.⁴⁰ In these cases, the typography can be read as pictures. The ability to think of these arrangements of words as also pictures is not subtext, but rather an understanding that is essential for a correct reading of the *Alice* books. If the mouse tale, for instance, were published out of its curly line, the preceding passage and its pun would cease to make sense:

“Mine is a long and a sad tale!” said the Mouse, turning to Alice and sighing.

“It is a long tail, certainly,” said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's tail; “but why do you call it sad?” And she kept on puzzling about it while the Mouse was speaking so that her idea of the tale was something like this: – [Figure 4:3] (36)

⁴⁰ In 1868, at work on *Looking Glass*, Dodgson even speculated that the backwards Jabberwocky poem could be engraved and set as a picture (Cohen 59). Amusingly, this would mean carving the poem so that it was the right way on the block so that it would appear backwards when printed.

Here, the written text itself is arranged so that it also functions as an image. As with Thackeray's footnote on the clothing in *Vanity Fair*, the implication of a convergence of text and image carries through to the rest of the book: the mouse tail tale may be the most explicit example of the convergence between word and visual in *Wonderland*, but the rest of the book, too, must be read with this convergence in mind. If a reader is unwilling or unable to acknowledge this, Dodgson's words will no longer be intelligible. A breakdown in the transmission of the hybrid form will lead to a breakdown in comprehension.

The typesetters had to be complicit for the mouse tail to work as an image. In fact, in addition to the explicit interaction between Dodgson and Tenniel, other silent partners participated in the building of *Wonderland*, and by so doing, influenced the access to the world it contained. "As Jerome J. McGann and others have pointed out, writing and publishing books is a subtly collaborative effort" (Dooley 34), because even un-illustrated texts have a visual aspect in their physical manifestation. Page layout, font choices and binding all affect the appearance of the book. Thus, the publisher, Alexander Macmillan, and the printer, Clay, were both instrumental in the creation of *Wonderland* in the form in which it was to be read. However, even before the text was brought to page, the Dalziels, as illustration engravers, had an impact on how the book would look.

Tenniel drew on paper with pencil and then transferred the drawing to woodblocks, where he cleaned up the composition (Hodnett 167). Then he sent the block to the Dalziels, who were the premier engravers of the day. They engraved the block and

sent Tenniel back a proof, which he would edit, sometimes through multiple iterations, by marking the proof and writing technical notes.⁴¹

The Dalziels signed their engravings as well as transferring Tenniel's name to the woodblock. The differences between the Dalziel signature and the JT monogram can be taken as an allegory for the differences between their roles. Tenniel's stylized JT is generally surrounded by white, in a corner of the picture. It is part of the balance of the overall composition, and sometimes plays a role in the actual subject of the illustration. For instance, in the mirror sequence of illustrations in *Looking Glass* I just discussed, when Alice emerges on the other side of the mirror, having passed through it to the looking glass world, Tenniel's monogram is among the many things that have been reversed in the composition (Gardner *Alice* 186).

Besides being a clever conceit, the inversion of Tenniel's monogram is a reminder that all prints created from wood engravings are mirror images to how they were carved. This kind of interplay between word and picture in the physicality of the book and depicted story-world was employed to much effect in both *Alice* books, such that even the monogram, an identifying symbol that Tenniel was the creator, could be modified to suit the tone of the written text. In contrast to Tenniel's monogram, the Dalziel signature is easily overlooked. In all caps, the signature usually extends the cross-hatching of shading at a bottom corner of the picture, blending in with existing lines of shadow. Like his visibility as a contributor to the text, Tenniel's bold symbol is foregrounded.

⁴¹ The Dalziel contribution to the *Alice* illustrations was technologically comparable to that of the type foundry without whom the words could not have been printed, but the individual care the Dalziels spent on each of Tenniel's images was clearly far beyond the care spent for each letter of type. And the type could be used in a variety of books, while the woodblocks could not.

Similarly, like their contributions to the text, the Dalziels' scrawl is backgrounded, but still part of the composition.

While Tenniel corresponded with his engravers, Dodgson maintained a relationship with the House of Macmillan, his publishers. The two Scottish Macmillan brothers had founded the House of Macmillan in Cambridge, because they saw a niche in the academic publishing market. Until this point, Cambridge academics had had to be published out of Oxford. Though the two brothers were self-educated, their ties to academic life were strong and they were later appointed Oxford University's official printers (Cohen and Gandolfo). Dodgson had met Alexander Macmillan while getting a printer acquaintance to print some poems from Blake's *Songs of Innocence* on large paper, presumably to send to friends (Cohen 2). He stayed with the Macmillans as his publishers for the rest of his life.

The involvement of the publisher in the production of the *Alice* books was largely in an advisory capacity, counseling the author on market forces that would affect his sales as well as marketing the book itself after it was printed. "Dodgson was to bear all the publishing costs, the cost of illustrating the book, and even of advertising it; Macmillan was simply to sell it – on commission" (Cohen 14). The publisher also served as mediator between people involved in the book production, and advised the author as to what was possible in terms of paper costs, printing costs, binding, etc. Dodgson "determined the size of the book, the quality of the paper, the size and style of the type. He selected the binding; engaged the printer, the engraver, the illustrator; and he paid them" (Cohen 15). But he did all of this with help and advice from the Macmillans. For instance, Alexander Macmillan wrote to Dodgson saying that he didn't "like ornamental type in title pages.

Mr. Tenniel's drawings in the book need no such meretricious help" (quoted in Cohen 11). Considering the highly wrought title pages of many other books around mid-century, such as the Dickens craze for letters formed of sticks and crawling with the characters of the novels they topped, Macmillan's taste for simplicity here was influential in the overall style of the book.

Despite his interaction with the House of Macmillan, it is conventional wisdom that Dodgson was uninterested in publishing concerns. He is often described as a "shy don" and that, combined with the fact that he was a stutterer who was so absentminded that he once accidentally signed someone else's name to a letter (Cohen and Gandolfo), has helped enforce an erroneous impression that he was uninformed about the very things for which he became famous. It is true that Dodgson's home, Oxford, was far removed from "the claustrophobic literary 'world' of London where critics, authors, publishers and readers were thrown promiscuously together" (J.A. Sutherland 69). Therefore, the lack of constant, enforced interaction with literati may have influenced his work. However, the aesthetic elite formed its own circle, and Oxford intersected with it at several points. Tenniel, in London, spoofed a Millais drawing in *Looking Glass*, and Dodgson visited Millais. John Ruskin visited with Dodgson and discussed illustrators with him. He also socialized with the Liddells and was just as charmed by their daughter, Alice Liddell, the inspiration for the character of Alice, as Dodgson was. The Oxford of the nineteenth century was a small world. Dodgson was not a genius in seclusion, but rather sought criticism, took it very seriously, and revised accordingly.

He was extremely invested in, and informed about, the physical appearance of his texts, which had a direct bearing on how well his words and Tenniel's pictures integrated

on the page. “Lewis Carroll, often misrepresented as detached or indifferent to the details of everyday life, was very well informed about printing” (Dooley 155). Nonetheless, he ceded authority to Tenniel about the printing of the pictures, reinforcing the idea that Dodgson saw Tenniel as a partner rather than an employee. Dodgson shared the duties of proofreading and approving printed copy with Tenniel, writing to his publisher Alexander Macmillan on August 30, 1866, “I should like a specimen sheet to be sent to Mr. Tenniel as soon as possible, as I shall certainly not consent to its publication unless he approves of the effect” (Cohen 44).

Decades later, the situation seems to have remained unchanged, as in 1896, Dodgson reports to Macmillan that he had “asked Sir John Tenniel whether the sheets of [later editions of] the 2 *Alice* books may be sent, as fast as they are made up for working off, to *him* instead of to *me*. [Tenniel replied], ‘Certainly – I will do what you wish, in regard to supervising the pictures, with much pleasure: of course everything will depend on the *printing*’” (Cohen 341, all italics *ibid*). Tenniel’s pleasure in supervising the pictures may have been relief, since he had greatly disapproved of the first printing of *Wonderland*.⁴²

Dodgson may also have been relieved to pass the responsibility of approval on to Tenniel, since in 1867 he had written that he did not know whether the printing or the paper was at fault for what he considered a poor impression “very roughly and imperfectly done, hardly doing justice to Tenniel” (Cohen 51). In addition to seeming at a loss to pinpoint the source of the difficulty with this printing, which certainly indicates that Tenniel himself would be better at so doing, Dodgson here is also implying that he

⁴² Tenniel’s belief that everything depended on the printing will be explored later in this chapter, when the recall of the poorly printed first edition is discussed.

really sees that the text as a whole cannot be read correctly if the pictures do not appear correctly; a pictorial misprint is as bad as, or worse than, a misprint of the words.

Dodgson felt the visual quality of the text was important not just to him as the author and Tenniel as the illustrator, but also to any discerning reader. For instance, Dodgson's letters to his publisher imply that as far as American piracy was concerned, he took comfort in the poor printing of the unauthorized editions. He felt they could not affect the legitimate sales of the book since the legitimate copies were so superior-looking (e.g., Cohen and Gandolfo 47, 65, 73, 97), and says, possibly disingenuously, "As to how many copies we sell I care absolutely nothing: the only thing I *do* care for is, that all the copies that *are* sold shall be artistically first rate" (quoted on Cohen 97 italics *ibid*).

There is some disagreement about whether Dodgson was successful in achieving "artistically first rate" books. For instance, James Sutton and Alan Bartram, the authors of *Typefaces for Books*, feel the typographical choices made for the *Alice* books result in a "joyless uninviting page ...so absurdly inappropriate for the subject that it is almost as if it were deliberate" (28-29). This verdict is based on the largeness of the letters and the wide spaces between words and lines. The layout they object to would help the child reader read the text by him or herself, or follow along when the story was being read aloud. I believe the layout is appropriate to the book: the print is big enough for children to read quickly, but not so big that it makes the delicate crosshatching of the illustrations look spindly. The careful attention from both Dodgson and Tenniel pays off and contributes, no doubt, to the success of the *Alice* books in the marketplace.

Alice's Normality and Neutrality

In Tenniel's illustrations, Alice "is not as pretty or expressive as we would expect her to be.... Alice...is a symbol of normalcy. The signals...to child readers are reassuring" (Hodnett 172). The normality of Alice's appearance is aided by the fact that her face is drawn simply and neutrally. Alice smiles in none of Tenniel's illustrations for *Wonderland*. Her neutrality of expression may have been reassuring to child readers as Hodnett suggests because her expression indicates calm when confronted with the strange experiences she has in Wonderland. Of course, there were good practical reasons to have Alice's face be simple. The more complex an engraved image was, the more lines existed that could be misprinted, and the more easily those misprinted lines could seem intentional. The more detailed an image, the more easily it could become corrupted at some stage of the printing process, and corruptions on an illustration of a human face would be less easily overlooked than any other. However, the simplicity of Alice's face has implications beyond the ease of printing. As I mentioned in my first chapter, in a black and white drawing, the white becomes suggested space, while the black becomes (literally) delineated detail. Ruskin wrote in *The Elements of Drawing* that "your having made the white in your picture precious, and the black conspicuous" is an indication of success in a picture (228). In a book illustration, the white space is precious because the bare page is not only light, it is also undefined.

In the case of Alice's features, then, the lack of detail and the abundant "white space" of the drawing is blankness to be filled in by the reader/viewer's interpretation – blankness both in the sense of undelineated white space on the page, and in the sense of neutrality of expression. In Tenniel's illustrations, Alice's face is drawn with very few

lines. As I will discuss at greater length in the next chapter, it is easier for the human eye (and mind) to project detail than to remove it, which can help explain why the fewer lines to make up the representation of a face, the more interpretations it can be said to offer.

Figure 4:4 shows an illustration from Chapter 2 of *Wonderland*, in which Alice is talking to a mouse in a pool of her own tears. We learn from the written text that she is upset because she has just offended the mouse, but her closed mouth, wide open eyes and smooth facial expression all indicate calm. Alice is worried that the mouse may be her only possible ally in this strange new world, but her face is not reacting visibly to her perceived peril. Therefore, the reader is invited to participate with Dodgson and Tenniel in combining her representations in the written text and the picture to inform a reading of her character and the event.

While Tenniel often uses neutrality of expression and an economy of lines in the face to show Alice's calm, he sometimes achieves the same effect in Alice by not showing her face at all. Almost half of the illustrations in *Wonderland* do not picture Alice at all, and seven of those that do have her in the foreground looking "upstage" giving the effect that we are looking with her, instead of at her. In these illustrations, her expression is not blank, but rather unpictured.⁴³ As discussed, an illustration without a face has a practical expediency because a face will be more prone to scrutiny than anything else printed; it should also be noted that an illustration without a face can become a thematic gesture towards universality. In *Wonderland*, when Alice's face is

⁴³ In *Looking Glass* as well, seventeen of the illustrations do not show Alice at all and, again, seven of those that do show her, show her looking away from the reader. In each book, only two illustrations show Alice full-front.

turned upward, the reader gets the impression that he or she is following Alice throughout her adventures.

Alice Guides Us Through a Land of Blended Fantasy and Reality

Tenniel's lines are carefully wrought and arranged, and his figures and objects definitively placed. His illustrations aggregate into a series, in which the viewer/reader can observe Alice traveling through a land of mixed realism and fantasy. In this blended world, Alice encounters mythological creatures such as a gryphon, in addition to realistic personalities like the worried court official (the White Rabbit). The rabbit's ability to speak and wear clothes may be fantastic, but given such attributes, it seems sensible that his words and clothes would be what they are. If a rabbit had a house, wouldn't he also have a cucumber frame? The internal, punning, homely logic of *Wonderland* makes its fantastic elements seem solid and real. Alice's role as explorer in this land offers readers a key to understanding it, and her role as tour guide offers readers access to it. After all, it is her dream world – who better to lead us through it?

In the illustrations where Alice looks away from the viewer, the depth of field is partially determined by Alice gazing upward. Tenniel was blind in one eye. Even if “the limitation to his depth perception and peripheral vision had always been offset by an excellent visual memory” (Morris 86), necessary because he would not work from a model, his blindness in one eye may have had an impact on his unique stylized forms. Tenniel's lack of depth perception may have also improved his ability to play with scale, so important to the plot of *Wonderland*, since a lack of depth perception makes it difficult to distinguish between size differences and distance differences.

The importance of size and scale differences in the depth of field can be observed when Alice is three inches tall and discovers a giant puppy (Figure 4:5). She wants to play with it and pet it, but she worries that it might try to eat her. Alice is caught between her impressions of puppies based on her lived experience at her normal size, and the knowledge that new threats exist for her at her current size of three inches. In the illustration, Alice is positioned in a lower corner of the picture, looking up and back through the thistle, holding a stick for the dog. The size of the stick in relation to Alice is juxtaposed against the size of the stick in relation to the dog. What for Alice is the size of a drummer's stick is a mere twig for the dog. In this picture, as in many of Tenniel's illustrations, the reader's eye is directed by Alice's pictured gaze toward the subject of the illustration. The viewing angle from the reader to Alice reinforces the feeling that Alice is leading us through Wonderland. Alice's eye directs the reader's eye to where Tenniel's and Dodgson's eyes have created focus: on Alice's journey through a dreamscape. This illustration helps reinforce the belief that she serves the double function of an explorer and a tour guide – showing us Wonderland while discovering it herself.

Alice and the reader both eventually realize that sometimes what will make sense in Wonderland is not what makes sense when awake. To take part in this world, Alice must act rather than merely react to other's rules. The dreamscape is made real by Alice's journey in it, and its internal logic (such as that Alice will grow larger or smaller when she eats or drinks, but the presence of such magical food requires no explanation) needs to be believable. Dodgson and Tenniel melded representations of beauty and grotesques to make Wonderland believable. As a dreamscape, Wonderland combines elements of the

real with elements of the imaginary, such as pantomime or invented animals, in fresh, unexpected ways.

Pantomime was a popular London stage experience in which Tenniel and Dodgson shared an interest. It can act as an example of the blend of fantasy and reality in *Wonderland*. In pantomime, actors wearing large papier-mâché heads would portray the broadest comedic characters. Just as some of the characteristics of the inhabitants of Wonderland are mundane and some are fantastic (for instance, Bill the lizard is realistically drawn and has believable human attributes while the Duchess's character seems overblown in both the pictures and the words), some of Tenniel's animals are drawn with strict attention to anatomical detail, like the White Rabbit and Dinah's kitten in *Looking Glass*, while some are drawn as bobble-headed characters, like the March Hare and Cheshire Cat.

These examples, in Figures 4:6 and 4:7, can offer juxtapositions for each other since they show different ways Tenniel depicted similar animals. The careful ear placement and vertical pupils of the kitten in *Looking Glass* are therefore especially noteworthy when contrasted against the striped rounded eyes and sharp teeth of the Cheshire Cat (Figure 4:6). Similarly, the White Rabbit and the March Hare do not seem to be near relatives on an evolutionary scale (Figure 4:7). While the illustration of the White Rabbit that tops Chapter 1 of *Wonderland* has carefully rendered, realistic rabbit legs, in the illustration where the Hatter and Hare attempt to stuff the dormouse in a teapot, it is revealed that the Hare seems to have human legs and shoulders. Frankie Morris argues convincingly that this is because some characters, such as the March Hare, Cheshire Cat and the Duchess, are pantomime characters. That is, they have been drawn

as grown men or small children in large papier-mâché heads. It is certainly true that Dodgson and Tenniel's intended readers would be familiar with the conceits of the pantomime.

The motif of real animals interspersed with pantomime representations is also an example of how Dodgson needed an artist who could provide a balance of grotesques and beauty to match his own sensibilities. For instance, the picture of the gryphon looks as if it could be a picture out of a natural history book even though it is an image of an animal that does not exist. It seems to be drawn to show anatomy rather than individual character. Similarly, the mouse can talk, but is still afraid of cats. The mock-turtle, himself a pun, makes many puns. Bill's realistic worry that he is out of his depth understanding court proceedings and the White Rabbit's realistic worry that he will be late to work for a demanding boss are melded into the absurdity of their situations: a lizard on a jury and a rabbit employed by a playing card. Both depictions and descriptions melded fantasy and reality in most cases.

Therefore, it should be noted that it is not necessarily the invented creatures that are drawn as pantomime characters. Rather, the character notes supplied in the written text offer a blend of fantasy and reality that is also represented in the illustrations; if it is true that "Tenniel's precise, literal style was just right for bestowing believability on Carroll's fantasies" (Hodnett 195), then I can here add that Tenniel could bestow elements of fantasy as well.

Alice's Shifting Surface and Constant Core

Like Wonderland itself, Alice's appearance also blends elements of realism and fantasy as her expression stays fairly neutral throughout her changes of size and shape. In each illustration, Alice's propensity to neutral facial expression, in addition to her clothes, and to a degree, her physical attitudes, such as the angles of her ankles and wrists, identify her. However, in some ways, when the written text alerts us that her character changes size, her depiction also changes in the illustrations. Tenniel's pictures provide a visual representation of what about Alice stays the same and what shifts at different points in the text. Her distinctive dress, with its knee-length bell-shaped skirt, and her expressive wrists and ankles stay the same, and because there are so many illustrations without Alice's face at all, it seems even more important to have these key features of her appearance that can be observed from other angles.

Interestingly, Alice's bodily presence in the text of *Looking Glass* is more consistent than it is in *Wonderland* since she doesn't change size or shape in the second book as she had in the first. Both written and pictorial representations of her are more consistent in the second book, when the "Alice Band" in the hair and the striped stockings appear. The visual identifiers seem less important than they had in *Wonderland*, however, precisely because Alice does not change shape. The importance of scale is not stressed in the same way in the second book: both Alice's appearance and the appearance of the landscape can be more standardized because the plot is not concerned with shape shifting to the same degree. In both books, the concerns of the written text are echoed in the manner of the illustrations.

While there are elements that say the same, it needs to be addressed also that Alice's face in the illustrations of *Wonderland*, like her size in the written text, morphs

through her experiences in Wonderland. In some illustrations she looks older, graver, with a larger forehead, and in some she looks younger, with more eyelash and round lip. Her body type changes as well. In one of the pictures near the end of the book, the illustration where Alice upsets the Jury Box, she looks shapelier than in the previous illustrations; her face, too, looks mature here. The combination of shape shifting in words and pictures enriches a reading from multiple perspectives.

Different aspects of Alice's character come into play in different situations; thus, Alice is depicted differently in the illustrations in different situations. The two illustrations paired in Figure 4:8 show two of the different scenes in which Alice can be seen to be one unified character even though Wonderland's perspective on her shifts from situation to situation. These changes in the appearance of Alice show shifts in her relationship with the world around her: her size, for instance, helps determine others' reactions to her. When Alice is talking to the caterpillar, she is too short and must stand on tiptoe, looking up to an adult figure. When she upsets the jury box, however, she is too large and must look back and down to the tiny animals she has upset. As her character grows back to her human size at the end of the book, right before she wakes up, she looks more like a grown-up than she had throughout the preceding text.

The changes in Alice's relationship to the world around her are addressed in the written text when Alice wonders, "Who in the world am I? Ah, that's the great puzzle! And she began thinking over all the children she knew that were of the same age as herself, to see if she could have been changed for any of them" (24). Though Alice herself expresses uncertainty about her identity, a reader can see that the character still has her own personality in this passage and throughout the written text, just as someone

looking at the pictures can see that she maintains visual characteristics through the different illustrations, regardless of her size or the angle at which she is viewed. At her core, Alice seems to share the reader's certainty about her identity. Merely a few pages after she has begun wondering if she has been switched for someone else, she is put out when the rabbit mistakes her for his servant, Mary-Ann. She thinks to herself, "[h]ow surprised he'll be when he finds out who I am" (40). Obviously, here she knows exactly who she is. The world around her and her relationship to it seems to be in constant flux, but she has a core of identity that stays constant.

Alice's Identity in the Hands of the Printers

The correct level of ink in the printing job allows subtle changes in Alice's relationship to her dream world to be seen in the illustrations, while over- or under-inking can remove nuance or, perhaps worse, create new delineations where none existed before. While the correct inking is most important in depiction of the protagonist, under- or over-inking can also change the way Wonderland appears. For instance, the first picture in the book in which Alice appears is when she is uncovering the tiny door to the garden in the first chapter. If the printing is too heavy, this illustration can make it look as though Alice is uncovering a frightening void instead of pulling back a curtain that had provided shadow. If under-inked, the illustration of Alice swimming with the mouse (Figure 4:4) could fail to show her lower half under the water, making it look as though she is swimming in something opaque. Conversely, when the illustrations are all superbly inked, as they were in the approved first edition of the novel, the reader can even notice the effect of environmental changes on Alice's appearance. For instance, it is observable

that Alice's hair gets wet in the pool of tears in Chapter Two because in the illustration with the mouse her hair is noticeably darker and flatter. Her hair stays wet for a while in a subsequent illustration and then dries off again and returns to being lighter and fluffier as it was before Alice fell in the pool of tears. However, when these illustrations are inked incorrectly, these subtle differences that help ground the dream narrative in time and causality are sometimes obliterated.

Unlike the Dalziels and Macmillans, the printer had no voice in decisions about the appearance of the text, but the print shop was the last stop for the text between the author and illustrator and the public, and obviously the way the text was printed had an influence on how it would be viewed and read. The first edition of *Wonderland* was cancelled at great expense to Dodgson, apparently because the printing job was so deplored by Tenniel. Dodgson reports in his diary that Tenniel "is entirely dissatisfied with the printing and the pictures, and I suppose we shall have to do it all again" (quoted in Cohen 38). Tenniel himself wrote, "I protested so strongly against the disgraceful printing, that he cancelled the edition. Clay is now doing it for Christmas" (quoted in Ayres 86). Clay's Christmas edition met with the approval of both Tenniel and Dodgson. This is, of course, further proof that Dodgson did not see the illustrations as supplementary, but rather instrumental to the reading of the text as a whole. The fact that he was willing to scrap the entire printing so far and redo it at enormous cost to himself implies that he considered the pictures to be part of the text. If the pictures couldn't be seen correctly, how could the text be read?

It has been a matter of debate what Tenniel particularly objected to in the printing of the first edition. Stephanie Lovett Stoffell in *Lewis Carroll in Wonderland* maintains

that the main problem was that the images were marred by bleedthrough from the text on the opposite side of the page, while Sidney Herbert Williams *et al* in *The Lewis Carroll Handbook* posit *under-inking* as a problem with the first edition. It is certainly true that under-inking can be a problem for these illustrations. When under-inked, areas of black can appear to be areas of grey, continuing shadow or shading instead of delineating difference. For instance, the White Rabbit in the head for the first chapter, earlier compared to the March Hare, can appear disturbingly eyeless if the black pupil is under-inked to the extent that it appears merely as shadow. When that is the case, the white arc above can appear to be some abstract shape instead of the white of an eye.

However, after examining various copies of the cancelled and approved first editions, I agree with Martin Gardner that the main problem was not bleed-through or under-inking of the pages, though those issues sometimes occur in the cancelled edition, but rather over-inking of the images themselves. Harry Morgan Ayres also notes that in the approved edition, “the illustrations have been reproduced a little lighter, the effect being to make Alice rather prettier, her eyes and hair lighter, and her countenance brighter” (Ayres 157).

There are many surviving copies of the cancelled edition because Dodgson eventually consented to having them sold in the American market where he apparently considered aesthetics to be less refined. “The first American edition is the first suppressed English edition, with a new title-page” (Ayres 161). It is true that the surviving copies of the cancelled edition are not printed as well as the approved first edition. In the cancelled edition, everything is much more heavily inked. As far as the written text is concerned, the effect of over-inking is slight. The words look boldfaced, but the meanings of the

words are not changed. In the pictures, however, the effect is more dire. There are extra lines in places, and in some places fine cross-hatching becomes a single thick line. New shadows are created, and nuances are lost in the shadows.

In a text that plays so carefully with matters of scale as well as blending reality and fantasy, and one that relies on the delicacy and neutrality of depictions of its protagonist to such a degree, changing or destroying details of the pictures can throw the whole text off kilter. For instance, in the finest printing, such as that of the approved first edition, you can see where eyelashes end and crosshatching to shade the cheek begins on Alice's face. The fine lines and shading that make up her face become strange wrinkles or overblown features when the printing job is poor.

These differences change the way Alice can be read as a character. Since black and white drawings use black to denote both outline and three-dimensionality, when the level of inking is poorly managed, the uses of the black slip. Different ink levels in two modern printings of the "Drink Me" illustration are contrasted in Figure 4:9. In the over-inked version on the right, too much ink on Alice's face gives her a haggard expression. She is given extra lines on her cheek and forehead that make her appear wrinkled and worried. When these wrinkles are combined with her large child's head and small feet and hands, the effect is bizarre. In the properly inked version on the left, she looks merely grave. In the written text, Alice is an intelligent, thoughtful child, but she does not seem to be particularly anxious or old before her time as she appears to be in the over-inked version of this illustration. In the properly inked version, she appears merely serious and focused.

In the illustration where she cradles a pig in her arms, different modern inkings of which are contrasted in Figure 4:10, the excess ink fulfils the other role black ink can – not creating shadows that affect shape, but delineating areas differently. The white of her face is still unmarked in the over-inked example, but the intentionally black areas are too black, to the extent that they mean different things by their blackness. In the over-inked example, the outline of the lips spills over to fill in the lips, making it look as though Alice is wearing dark lipstick, and the shading of the eyes loses its crosshatching to make it look as though Alice is wearing false eyelashes. She looks like a heavily made up silent film star. In the correctly inked version of this illustration, Alice looks three-dimensional. Not so in the over-inked version, in which too much black obliterates the delicate shading near her ear, making the perimeter of her face one bold line instead of shaded fine delineation.

Perhaps most importantly, the over-inked haggard child in Figure 4:9 and the over-inked made-up doll of Figure 4:10 have only their clothing in common, while the properly inked versions of these illustrations in these two figures are two pictures of the same little girl in two different situations. There is a fine but important line between a character's look evolving as the plot progresses and several different pictures of seemingly different girls in the same dress. If the idea is that Alice is one unified individual whose depiction evolves with her relationship to the world around her, this idea is lost when the printing is bad, to the extent that her representations could be seen as a collection of examples: "here are different ways to be a child." The didactic literature that Dodgson sought to refute rears its head.

It is reasonable to assume the over-inking of the first cancelled edition, though it was nowhere near as bad as the modern editions I have used as examples, was enough to make Tenniel deplore the printing. It is evident from various letters Tenniel sent to the Dalziels that he was always pushing for lighter, airier composition. He is almost constantly calling for more light, finer lines, more delicate rendering through the removal of some of the crosshatching, less black. He urged his engravers to “reduce the dark.” This indicates that an over-inked page would have been anathema to him in *Wonderland*, especially if it made the main character, a child, look haggard, or his own finely rendered work look stylized and crude. Tenniel was painstaking about the quality of the engraving and printing for *Alice*. He must have seen this bookwork as wholly different from his drawings for the weekly edition of *Punch*; his political cuts, rushed through the engraving process by Swain and printed quickly with cheap ink on bad paper, could not have been nearly as fine as the “bad” printing of *Alice*.

Tenniel Subsumed into Cultural Property

The weekly *Punch* cuts were always society’s main point of reference for Tenniel during his lifetime. When Tenniel was knighted in 1893, it was considered a compliment to *Punch*. It is also significant that when engravings from *Punch* were reproduced elsewhere, they would be credited with the artist’s name and “*Punch*,” however, when Tenniel’s work from the paper was reproduced it would be credited only “*Punch*” (Morris). His work was so closely associated with the paper that to many, the names *Punch* and Tenniel were interchangeable. The size of the audience he reached through *Punch* was staggering. As one American newspaper declared after his death, “As the

power of a cartoonist is gauged by his ability to interpret his time and his country, then Tenniel is much greater than his more sophisticated rivals on the Continent. He *was* England – the embodiment of the mid and late Victorian epoch” (quoted in Morris 101 italics *ibid*).

Just as Tenniel’s name was elided with *Punch* during his lifetime, his name now is elided with the images of the *Alice* books. Tenniel’s role in the creation of the *Alice* books has been generally disregarded commercially in the years since *Wonderland’s* publication, regardless of the attention paid to Tenniel’s artistic contribution on initial publication. I feel it is noteworthy that when expressing concern over the piracy faced by British publishing from the hands of American print shops, there seemed to be no corresponding concern for images. When American print shops would re-engage the *Wonderland* illustrations, they would understandably leave off the Dalziel signature. More surprisingly, sometimes they also left off Tenniel’s monogram. A lack of concern with crediting Tenniel’s images in the *Alice* books continues today. Tenniel may have sold his illustrations outright, and if so, it doesn’t seem that anyone else was interested in preserving a copyright on the images. They were reproduced uncredited on various objects in various ways throughout the century to the delight of all children who got an Alice tea set or paper toy, but apparently without the gratification of credit or pay to Tenniel.

Perhaps because of the nigh-instant cultural saturation of these images, it has been easy to see Tenniel’s *Alice* illustrations as everyone’s. Harry Morgan Ayres refers to them as “emblems” (54) and Whalley considers both Dodgson’s words and Tenniel’s images “part of our folk memory” (81). The pictures’ influence, however, is still often

uncredited, such as in Robert Sabuda's pop-up version of *Wonderland*. The cover of this handmade edition proudly declares the text to be adapted from Lewis Carroll's, but nowhere does it say that the images are adapted from John Tenniel's, though they obviously are.

Figure 4:11 juxtaposes a page from Sabuda's pop-up book with the corresponding illustration by Tenniel.⁴⁴ The very things that make Alice's appearance consistent throughout Tenniel's depictions also identify Sabuda's images as based on Tenniel's. Not only the layout of this picture, but the shape of the skirt and the angles of the hands and feet, the strapped shoes and the long, blonde hair swept off the forehead are all aspects of Tenniel's depiction of Alice. Though Sabuda acknowledges no debt to Tenniel, he has obviously internalized the way that Alice and her dream world "should" look from the original illustrations.

Later *Alice* Illustrators

Several abridgements and translations of the text exist, including Dodgson's own abridgement, the *Nursery Alice* (1890). For the *Nursery Alice*, twenty of Tenniel's original illustrations were enlarged and colored by the artist. Dodgson wrote new words for the revised edition that function more as a guide to the images than as a coherent narrative. This text has a unique place in the history of Alice's publication because it has a modified written text and modified pictures by both the original collaborators.

Unsurprisingly, other abridgments and translations often include new artwork drawn by different illustrators. With translations and abridgements, it is always possible that the

⁴⁴ No illustration for this scene exists in the manuscript *Alice's Adventures Underground*, so it cannot be argued that Sabuda's image was inspired by that.

new illustrations are meant to correct a deficiency created by lessening or translating the written text, so that they appear to be in collaboration as well. Among these, particularly interesting are a Pitjantjara edition from Australia and a Swahili edition from Africa, the new illustrations for both of which make Alice a native black girl instead of a white British girl. In editions like these, Alice as a character is being translated to a new cultural milieu in both words and pictures.

Perhaps more surprisingly, many full-text, un-translated editions of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* have also been published with different illustrations. When the entire written text appears in its original language, however, it is more likely that the pictures included will be seen as part of the story, rather than part of a collaboration to change the story. When the words are unabridged and un-translated, there is less of an inherent distance between the reader and the original work. This leads to an eliding (or an intention to elide) new pictures with the original words.

Part of the reason it seems necessary to me to offer a defense and analysis of Dodgson and Tenniel's partnership is the lengthy illustration history of the *Alice* books following Tenniel. Over the years, many different artists have replaced Tenniel's illustrations with their own in both *Wonderland* and *Looking Glass*. New illustrations to *Wonderland*, if they replace Tenniel's illustrations, are removing some of the original text and supplanting it. Adding illustrations to an un-illustrated text can certainly do that text a disservice, but removing the original illustrations of a hybrid text actually does the text a violence akin to abridging. In each case – abridging a written text and removing original illustrations – the new edition claims authenticity by maintaining the author's name and the text's title, but delivers content with disquieting gaps. I am interested in

asking, if the creation of the first edition of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was a collaborative effort, what does it do to the text to remove one person's contribution and replace it with the work of another person? Why illustrate what has already been illustrated? Why modify the representation of something already represented?

Asking these questions is like asking the question, why did Bowdler modify Shakespeare? We can see the act of replacing original illustrations in a later edition as analogous to the editorial act of emending a written text: "Emendation threatens to erase the critic's superiority to the careless reader, to humiliate and abase the expert. ... there is only danger and pleasure" (K. Sutherland 284 paraphrasing Johnson on Shakespeare). The act of "correcting" a canonical text carries with it both the lure of prestige and the taunt of audacity. To remove Tenniel's pictures and then add new ones offers an illustrator the chance for a similar kind of editorial emendation in which original material is removed and replaced. The new illustrator can thus claim an authorial level of authority and control over the new edition.

Replacing Tenniel's illustrations makes a claim for the worth of the new illustrator, not just by placing his or her work with a canonized written text, but also by asserting the ability of the new illustrator to put his or her work where Tenniel's was – to *replace* a canonized pictorial text. That is, the cachet for new illustrators of *Alice* is complicated by the fact that these books became prestige-makers partly because of the illustrations by Tenniel, not just because of Dodgson's words. In the new editions, the level of cohesion between the (original) written and (new) pictorial texts varies greatly.

New illustrations can accommodate new audiences and targeted readings, as well as bestow prestige on the new artist. Imagine, for instance, the different readings of

Dodgson's text which would result from editions wherein Alice is depicted as variously tan, smiling watercolor, abstract blocks of bright, dynamic color, or still and grave engraving (Figure 4:12). While the bare arms and flyaway hair of the Oxenbury illustration connote freedom and sweetness, the McGraw illustrations favor a focus on style and composition over characterization, while, as discussed, the Tenniel Alice connotes composed neutrality. The Oxenbury illustration reinforces a child readership while the McGraw situates this as an art book.

Novels that have been illustrated multiple times present various trajectories of publishing intent. They imply different societal uses for the novel in different eras and for different reading audiences. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* has been claimed by many different sectors of society. These different societal claims for it can be observed in different editions' illustrations since examining the appearance of a received text helps "demystify claims of art to 'universality,' unmasking instead the social contingency of its production and reception" (Bornstein 165). In *Wonderland's* case, two disparate groups almost immediately claimed the book: educated adults, since Dodgson was an academic and Tenniel a political cartoonist; and children, Dodgson and Tenniel's primary intended audience. These two readerships for the *Alice* books have been joined since by various counter-cultures, such as drug and Goth communities who now also claim Alice as their own based on textual clues that have been interpreted and received as metaphors for drug use or the depression that is born of living in a "mad" world. However, most new illustrators for *Wonderland* seem to be trying to suit the written text to a contemporary child readership, as Oxenbury does, through adding sweetness to the illustrations.

However, because *Alice* is not just a children's novel but also a canonized masterpiece of English literature and culture, some of the new illustrated editions seem to highlight the illustrator's skill without necessarily suiting it to the tone of the written text itself. In either case, there is a shift in the focus on word and image, and an extra layer of mediation between the reader and the original text is created: regardless of the new artist's motives, they will be shaped by the history that has occurred since the text's original publication and the knowledge that it has become a "classic."⁴⁵ And in this case, the Tenniel illustrations are part of what made *Wonderland* a classic in the first place.

Notably, Sabuda is not the only artist to silently pay homage to Tenniel's work on the *Alice* books. In the full-text editions as well, even when drastic changes are made, such as adding color, fitting hundreds of illustrations into the book instead of Tenniel's 42, and even when Alice beams a big smile from all the new pictures, there seem to be many choices made by Tenniel that are absorbed and repeated by later illustrators with no acknowledgement that they originated there. These include the choice of which textual moments to illustrate, Alice's mannerisms, especially in the arms and legs, and the line and shape of a full skirt, even when the updated outfit of a new visual version of Alice doesn't seem to call for that kind of stiffness.

Perhaps it is partly this very stillness and unsmiling gravity that led so many subsequent illustrators to re-envision Tenniel's work. As Frankie Morris points out, "we miss the grotesque in the reillustrations, as most lack Tenniel's realism ... for Tenniel's well-observed characterizations, many [later illustrators] substitute a new element – twentieth-century 'cuteness'" (Morris 96). Many of these later artists gave Alice

⁴⁵ I will discuss the mediating function of adding new illustrations to canonized texts at greater length in the next chapter.

exaggerated facial expressions in a bid for the cuteness Morris laments, as well as more expressive gestures.

How are later versions of Alice like those of Oxenbury or McGraw to be read by first-time readers of Dodgson's words? The illustrations might be trustingly internalized as part of the overall text, or they might be perceived as incongruous. A reader could be thrown off by the disjunction between the written Victorian mores and the carefree, contemporary style of Oxenbury's character's dress, mannerisms and hair, or the modernist abstractions of McGraw. Since these illustrators seek to modify rather than reinforce Dodgson's written text, the new pictures cannot work with that written text as well as pictures that did not seek to modify it.

In the original book, a thoughtful child leads the reader on an exploration of a dream world of melded grotesque and beauty. Tenniel's illustrations for the first chapter of *Wonderland*, "Down the Rabbit-Hole," do not include any picture of Alice or her sister, reading, suffering from boredom or discovering a rabbit hole. The first Tenniel illustration of Alice does not come till Alice has fallen, landed, and is exploring a hallway. This is very late in the chapter, and it effectively means that Alice is not shown to us, the readers, until she is already in a world unfamiliar to her. The attempts of later illustrators to create an idyllic scene of Alice with her reading sister are therefore intriguing – that was a scene that bored Alice to sleep. Why depict it as an enjoyed peaceful pastoral? The artists who choose to include visual evidence of this scene are choosing to make the dream world less all-encompassing in the narrative. This can have the effect of making Wonderland itself safer, less exciting, by providing first ocular proof of a mundane base for Alice.

Despite the frequent illustration of this scene, un-depicted by Tenniel, not every inch of written text has been illustrated by various artists over the years. Rather, each illustrator's new *Wonderland* illustrations fit into part of a heritage – a narrative that starts with the collaborative production of Tenniel's art and Dodgson's words. After viewing several illustrated editions of *Wonderland*, I observed that the same few lines of text have been illustrated again and again by different hands. Taking the first chapter of the book as an example, I found that from a chapter of about 160 lines of words, a total of 16 lines in the first chapter, "Down the Rabbit Hole" are generally illustrated, and those *ad nauseum*. Thus, while the illustrations vary in style, they do not vary much in their subject matter.

The illustrations different artists have provided for *Wonderland* seem to be different renditions of the same tune – while they vary in tone and attention to detail, they seem to share a core of meaning that is elaborated in different directions. For instance, the "little three-legged table, all made of solid glass" Alice discovers in the hallway maintains various qualities in the work of all illustrators, even when not adhering to Dodgson's words (15). Illustrators make the table round or rounded, shiny and not matte, legged and not stalked, clear and clean, and when Alice is at her original height, the table comes up to her ribs. There would be no reason to predict that everyone's idea of a glass table would follow these guidelines, but they do. The Platonic, Carrollian/Tennielian view of a glass table is constant.

In *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and in *Through the Looking Glass and what Alice Found There*, even though the original words and pictures seem to collaborate on the page, we can see firsthand how a history of illustration can obliterate a text. James's

anxiety is borne out by the afterlife of the text even though it was not realized in its first inception. What's left is not a story, but merely a collection of set scenes, waiting to be enlivened by different illustrators. The illustrators come after each other, not to re-envision the words of Charles Dodgson, but to re-envision the scenes as already represented pictorially.

W.J.T. Mitchell describes the responsibility of the literary critic as “[m]aking sense of representations and publishing that sense, proclaiming it publicly as truth: that is our profession” (422). Illustrators who approach a finished written text must also attempt to make sense of its representations, and proclaim their assessment of the text to be true by publishing their depictions. In the case of the *Alice* books, new illustrators seem to be responding to each other's representations more than they are responding to the written text itself. Removing half the collaboration of Dodgson and Tenniel is unsuccessful. True collaborations like the *Alice* books can only show their meaning when they include both well-printed original pictures and unabridged, correctly printed words – when the collaboration of the artist and author is visible through the collaboration of their arts.

Chapter 5

Drawn to the Classics: Afterlives of Victorian Illustration for *Pride and Prejudice*

Three years after Victoria's death, a book called *Tales of the Canterbury Pilgrims* was published with illustrations by Hugh Thomson. Figure 5:1 reproduces an illustration from this book depicting Chaucer telling his stories to a group of wholesome-looking children, who sit with their ankles together and their hands clasped with Victorian propriety. A picture like this seems glaringly incongruous to most of the readings we now consider appropriate to Chaucer, but at the time the publishers found it obvious that such a picture would be welcome to the readers for whom the edition was intended. This volume neatly sums up many assumptions of late Victorian publishing: that children are important, that Chaucer is important, and that the two should be represented visually together. The children's clothing, like Chaucer's, is evocative of the past without being distractingly detailed, and Chaucer's smooth, rounded cheeks look like the children's own, allowing his image to connote both age, as a founding member of English letters, and the youth of the England in which he wrote.

As I have argued in the previous chapter about *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, different readings of a text can be facilitated through different presentations of the text. The prevalence of children in late Victorian illustrations, even for books where they are not featured in the written text, is an example of a Victorian presentation of a text that influences the way the text will be read. Just as queer theorists now can do a queer reading of Chaucer, and create and publish an edition with their glosses in the annotations, so too could Victorian illustrators be said to be doing a Victorian reading of

Chaucer. This illustration of Chaucer telling his stories to children can be seen as a gloss: “finding” the important subject matter (in this case healthy, mannered children and a kindly literary patriarch) in a text where the Victorian reader would want it to be found. While this example is taken from a text that offers a retelling of Chaucer’s tales, illustrations in this style were also added to existing, canonized written texts. These new illustrations mediated the written texts to which they were added.

I am concerned in this chapter with republication: how the presentation of an edition can package and present the text in a new way. Decisions about the presentation of the text have an impact, not only on the career of the editor, not only on the sales of the new volume, but also on how the text itself is read and received, and how editions to follow will be shaped. Texts housed in new editions are like palimpsests: they can never fully erase their history. As is true for new illustrators of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, although an edition may purport to be entirely new, it still bears the influence and evidence of previous incarnations, for instance in the list of earlier editions on the copyright page, or silently adopted “corrections” by previous editors.

These choices can convey an ideology on the part of the editor or publisher. When Randall McLeod argues in “Information upon Information” for a facsimile edition of the *First Folio*, he claims that a facsimile edition can avoid many of the either/or editing decisions occasioned by setting a seventeenth century text into modern types. However, the creation of a facsimile edition is still a choice. It still expresses an ideology, just as an inexpensive clear text paperback or a heavily annotated jacketed hardcover edition with introductions and afterwards by eminent scholars, or a gilt-edged presentation copy with glossy photographic plates of the Globe theater would each connote the ideologies of

their separate circumstances of publication. Each of these choices makes a claim for how the text of Shakespeare's plays should be read, and not only read, but also purchased, carried and displayed; the financial cost and academic weight of an edition can imply the intended readership of that edition. A facsimile of the *First Folio* may be useful for textual scholars because it is a series of pictures of the text as it was first read, but a facsimile does not make a text more approachable for first time, non-scholarly readership. A facsimile edition, especially of the *First Folio*, says, "this is a simulacrum of a privileged object. You may not be able to read the long f-like S or the word compressions as they stand, you may not understand the conventions of the catchwords. If that is the case, this text is not for you." In other words, the facsimile edition teaches the reader to venerate the historical circumstances of the text's production, and promotes an elite and scholarly readership of the text it contains.

The facsimile edition does, however, help avoid the lack of bibliographic codes that George Bornstein finds so problematic in new editions. Bornstein posits that new editions tend to isolate the linguistic code from the bibliographic code, making the text an aesthetic rather than a historicized object. He argues that "studying texts only in our contemporary reprintings erases the original historicized meanings... and renders even meanings that aspire toward the historic or political only a back-projection of an illusory politics fantasized in the present" (Bornstein 31). Divorcing the text from its visual codes in favor of verbal ones eradicates the circumstances of first publication. While Bornstein uses the term "aesthetic," I think he would agree that the editors of the editions he discusses do not always consider the appearance of the text important since they are removing the possibility of visual analysis from a consideration of the text as art object.

However, the way a text looks has a distinct effect on the way that text is to be read, and when the text includes pictures, those can be the easiest entrée into the ideology of the text's presentation. The subject matter, style, and number of illustrations in a new edition of a book can be part of what determines the tone of the edition along with other choices about its presentation.

Even the placement of new illustrations can be fraught with connotations. Are all the new pictures on photo glossy paper inserted into the middle signature of the book? Or are the new pictures small black and white images printed with the words, and with line thickness similar to the font of the printed words? Are the pictures meant to interrupt the written text, or even supersede it, or are the pictures meant to be read along with, as part of, the written text? If the argument can be made about annotation that "maintaining the spatial distinction between text and commentary is both an ethical choice not to identify the two and a caution against stabilizing that element which is bound to change – interpretation" (Kathryn Sutherland 284), then it can also be argued that the same issues of space-sharing arise from the combination of word and picture as from primary text and commentary. The images an illustrator adds to a pre-existing pre-published written text can themselves function as commentary.

The illustration history of *Pride and Prejudice* can serve as an example of the ways pictures can take part in the versioning of a canonical text. In fact, I believe that one late Victorian edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, illustrated by Hugh Thomson, led to many of the ideas that shaped Jane Austen's place in the English canon as well as establishing *Pride and Prejudice* as a text suitable for illustration. Differently illustrated editions of *Pride and Prejudice* have been published variously ever since, in England and elsewhere,

reinforcing, commenting on, or vitally changing the idea of a Jane Austen Look as conceived and realized almost eighty years after the death of the author, in the Thomson illustrations. Thomson's careful, delicate lines received vast critical acclaim (Jerrold and Spielmann) and were emulated more or less successfully by other illustrators around that era. Charles Brock, for instance, illustrated *Pride and Prejudice* with just as much of a late Victorian feel, but without the wit or depth of the Thomson illustrations.

Jane Austen has been presented, read and used in different ways in different eras and different cultural settings, such that it would be specious to argue now for one correct way to present, read or use Jane Austen. Claudia Johnson, in "The Divine Miss Jane" comments that, "Jane Austen always seems to inspire radically contradictory appeals to self-evidence" (144), and Kathryn Sutherland says that the definition of a classic is a book that rewards rereading. Taken together, the illustrations in several different editions of *Pride and Prejudice* can be seen as supporting different kinds of claims for self-evidence, and as enabling and encouraging different kinds of rereadings. Like Shakespeare's plays, Jane Austen's novels can be reworked in different eras and by different groups to reflect or embody differing worldviews. Jane Austen is a moveable signifier, and thus all illustrators of her novels can be assured of their illustrations' plausibility in their society's view of and uses for Jane Austen.

Pride and Prejudice has an extensive illustration history, and each illustrator's work, accompanying the same text, shapes the reading experience of that edition. An originally un-illustrated text can be changed or manipulated by pictures added to it over time, as illustrators absorb, recreate or repudiate the illustrators' work that came before them. The publication and illustration history of Austen's novels can form a sort of

timeline of societal uses for Jane Austen, in which the blockbuster edition illustrated by Hugh Thomson in 1894 has pride of place, and enables R. W. Chapman to create a heavily annotated edition after World War One, situating Austen in a conservative role as keeper of part of England's history.

Published in 1923, the same year that Kipling wrote "The Janeites," Chapman's edition is a signal that thoughts about Jane Austen were in flux. The question was: What does it mean to read Austen? That you are a member of an Old Boys Club, as assumed in "The Janeites?" or that you are acknowledging Austen's role in England's history, and learning about the Regency, as posited by Chapman's new edition of *Pride and Prejudice*? Chapman's editions of all Austen's work were "illustrated" with the inclusion of historical ephemera, such as diagrams of buildings, and images culled from clothing advertisements from the years when the novels were originally published. With my definition of "illustration" necessitating that the pictorial content depict characters or events from the written text, Chapman's inclusion of visual media does not make his edition "illustrated" in the sense I have discussed so far. Like Thomson, Chapman produced an edition of each of Austen's novels, beginning with *Pride and Prejudice*. Chapman's editions are regularly seen as the canon-making editions of Austen's novels but I am here interested in the ways those editions, as well as those that follow it, are indebted to the Thomson edition's previous canon-making work.

After Chapman's edition, the publication history becomes less linear as the editions which follow Chapman's thematically as well as chronologically are joined in bookshops and libraries by editions which seem to promote very different readings and uses for Austen, such as costly limited-edition presentation copies of the novel that can

function as status symbols, and inexpensive mass-market paperback editions with illustrations that emphasize either the romantic plot or the comedic, satirical qualities of the novel.

***Pride and Prejudice*, un-illustrated**

While all my other chapters explicitly discuss first editions, I am here arguing that the Thomson illustrations of 1894 give the George Allen Press edition of *Pride and Prejudice* first edition status in their capacity to remake and re-present the novel. Martin Heidegger has asserted that, “Whenever art happens – that is, whenever there is a beginning – a thrust enters history, history either begins or starts over again” (Miller 55). I believe that the George Allen edition created just such a new beginning, and had a foundational role in the publication history of *Pride and Prejudice*.

It is particularly intriguing to analyze the late Victorian influence on ideas about *Pride and Prejudice* because though the novel was written and published before the reign of Victoria, all illustrated editions that followed Thomson’s are in some way indebted to the Victorian mores it evokes. Thomson’s pictures made the novel seem truly illustratable. *Pride and Prejudice* was not even given a frontispiece during the lifetime of the author; there can be no authentic orthodox look for *Pride and Prejudice* because the author was unable to respond to any illustrator’s work.

In *Pride and Prejudice*, readers learn that Elizabeth Bennet’s fine eyes attracted Mr. Darcy, and Mr. Collins was a “tall, heavy-looking young man of five and twenty” (Austen 44). And of course, Jane Bennet is very beautiful. That is the extent of description of the characters’ appearances in the written text. Austen herself apparently

had a strong sense of the physical appearance of each of her characters, since she wrote to her sister Cassandra in 1813 bemoaning the fact that she'd never seen a portrait of Mrs. Darcy, but declaring that a certain portrait she had encountered looked just like Mrs. Bingley.

I was very well pleased – particularly (pray tell Fanny) with a small portrait of Mrs. Bingley, excessively like her.... size, shaped face, features & sweetness; there never was a greater likeness. We have been to both the exhibition and Sir J. Reynolds' and I am disappointed, for there was nothing like Mrs D at either. I can only imagine that Mr D prizes any picture of her too much to like it should be exposed to the public eye. (Le Faye 212-213)

Austen's clear mental image of these characters, however, did not lead to much agreement about how to illustrate them in subsequent years. Even the small portrait Austen thought looked like Mrs Bingley has never been identified from the exhibitions Austen visited. All of the illustrators of Austen are, as it were, engraving into a void as far as the wishes of the author are concerned. Whether Elizabeth is a blonde or brunette, whether the ingénues are curvaceous or slender, whether noses point up or down changes from edition to edition. Various hands – the illustrator, the editor, and ultimately, the publisher, have shaped each illustrated edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.

While there are no published illustrations to *Pride and Prejudice* from the lifetime of the author, there is a specific visual commentary about the novel from the author herself. Austen famously complained, “[t]he work is rather too light & bright & sparkling; – it wants shade” (LeFaye 203, all punctuation *ibid*). How can illustrators process this? Should they draw pictures to accompany the text that agree with the author's offhand assessment, and fill a book with light and bright and sparkling images? Or should the illustrator attempt to correct the (questionable) over-sparkle with pictures

that play up the darker, duller, murkier undertones of the novel? Perhaps more to the point, how many of them bother to grapple with the implications of Austen's visual commentary on her own art at all? Even if we assume that most illustrators did not consciously address Austen's assessment of the novel, each illustrated edition can be assessed according to how the layers of visual meaning are expressed in it.

The first reviewers of *Pride and Prejudice* after its 1813 publication focus on the novel's ability to accurately depict people and situations. The reviewers:

stress the representative nature of scenes and characters while remarking at the same time on the curiously exemplary nature of these same elements...[and attest to the] accuracy of the observation itself, subordinating any exemplum to the pleasure inherent in the novel's representation. (Galperin 62)

It is Austen's accurate observation and representation that make her notable to these reviewers, and it is the ability to accurately represent that makes her work pleasurable. In "The Picturesque, the Real, and the Consumption of Jane Austen," William Galperin quotes Whatley's diary, which, in 1829, "brings up the analogy of painting to describe Austen, [saying,] 'There is a truth of painting in her writing which always delights me. [Austen's novels] do not it is true get above the middle classes of society. But there she is inimitable'" (Galperin 75).⁴⁶ Decades later in 1834, Austen was still being credited for "her ability to paint scenes that are not only familiar to her but also thoroughly English" (Galperin 77). The equation of novels with depiction was not confined to Austen. Tobias Smollett had claimed in 1753 that "a novel is a large diffused picture, comprehending the characters of life, disposed in different groupes [*sic*], and exhibited in various

⁴⁶ Whatley's "truth of painting" must refer to the picturesque, which, as Galperin points out, was the leading aesthetic theory in Jane Austen's era. A picturesque painter sought to create a natural narrative out of a view.

attitudes for the purposes of a uniform plan” (Lynch 86). Austen had described her subject matter as “the little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory on which I work with so fine a Brush” (LeFaye, 323) commenting on the scale of her painting. We can think of Austen’s claim to be applying brush strokes to a tiny piece of ivory as part of the evolution of the novel itself: Austen changed the scale of depiction. Even Charlotte Brontë’s famous dismissal of *Pride and Prejudice*, that it is an “an accurate daguerreotype of a commonplace face” (quoted in Benedict 63), is one that alludes to portraiture as it stresses appearance over interiority.

If Jane Austen’s writing was considered to be itself a visual art – the creation of accurate pictures of characters or cultures, that may be part of the reason her novels were not fully illustrated until long after their initial publication. Why add pictures to what already functions as a picture? I believe it is not until Jane Austen’s literary acumen was appreciated separately from her ability to “draw” a scene, that Thomson can fruitfully illustrate her work in 1894.

Eventually, the novel was a literary act separate from the act of description and depiction. The novel was no longer comparable to a travelogue, chronicling things seen, but rather it became assumed that the novel would present a protagonist with a multifaceted character who experienced personal growth and change. Austen’s “little bit (two Inches wide) of Ivory on which I work with so fine a Brush” can be seen as the staging ground for this shift because it is a focus on a smaller scale while still maintaining a visual conceit.

In the years between the first editions of Austen’s novels and those illustrated by Thomson, illustration played a big part in shifting ideas about British novels, as discussed

in my chapters on *Pickwick Papers*, *Vanity Fair*, and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The few publishers who tried to add pictorial elements to Austen novels, however, did so rather perfunctorily and uninterestingly. For instance, though Richard Bentley was an innovator of book form (Weedon), he merely adds an easily overlooked frontispiece and half title page illustration to his edition of *Pride and Prejudice* in 1833. While the addition of a frontispiece doubtless added to the market value of this edition, it need not receive much attention as the inception of the illustration history of the novels. Bentley's frontispiece (Figure 5:2) shows an image of a lady gesturing near a gentleman, in the sleeves of 1833. The library, vase, and billowing curtains in the background place the lady and gentleman in a well-to-do home, and as a frontispiece it helps frame *Pride and Prejudice* as a domestic novel. There is no attempt here at historical correctness, which is understandable, since the original publication had been only twenty years earlier. Not enough time had elapsed to make the clothes of 1813 evoke a time long past; they would rather merely seem out of date. The frontispiece of Bentley's edition is part of the packaging, declaring the contents to be a contemporary domestic story. There are no internal illustrations, I believe, because Austen's writing was still considered to be pictorial during this era.

The Moment of the Hugh Thomson Edition

It was only near the end of the nineteenth century that Jane Austen's novels began to be published with interior illustrations. Her writing could now bear pictorial illustration because it was no longer assumed that her written text itself functioned as an illustration of society. There are a few illustrations in cheap editions of 1887 and 1892

respectively, and while the poor quality and small numbers of these illustrations make them unimportant in the overall story of how the novel was illustrated, they do indicate that Jane Austen's cultural cachet was shifting. These editions of *Pride and Prejudice* helped set the scene for the deluxe George Allen edition with hundreds of illustrations by Hugh Thomson to be published in 1894.

Thomson was one of the leading illustrators of his day, known for his elegant pen-draughtsman style. His pictures employed careful outlines and very little cross-hatching. He had moved from Ireland to London in 1883 where he was employed by Comyns Carr to illustrate for Macmillan and Co. on the basis of some *Vanity Fair* drawings and washes he had produced. While turn-of-the century illustrations were considered his specialty, the contemporary authors whose works he was engaged to illustrate also had great appreciation for his work (Spielmann and Jerrold 29-30). He was particularly noted for his illustrations to Elizabeth Gaskell's *Cranford*, and in fact, saying a novel had been 'Cranfordized' is a reference to the addition of Thomson's sweet, clean-lined illustrations.

Though Thomson had initially protested to his regular publishers, the Macmillans, that he did not feel Austen's novels were suitable for illustration, George Allen, Ruskin's publisher, eventually convinced him to illustrate *Pride and Prejudice*. The style of Thomson's illustrations particularly embodies the edition's high status, affecting the way Austen's novels entered the English canon.

As I mentioned in my first chapter, Charlene Garry has remarked that the goal of the Arts and Crafts presses of the late nineteenth century was "to create a suitable stage set for the words. The presses are striving for a kind of visual onomatopoeia in which the

appearance of the book says as much about the intention of the author as can a written commentary by a scholar or editor” (124). This idea is a fitting counterpart to Ruskin’s tenet that in the literary arts, “retrospective narration is then the retracing of a spatial design already there. ...For Ruskin, writing or making a picture are material acts, acts inseparable from the most fundamental events of life” (Miller 79). Ruskin believed that the act of writing evoked the visual; consequently, the housing of the written word in a visual medium, like a book, was serious business. The role of illustrations in Ruskin’s idea of book design was supposed to be a seamless continuation of the visual onomatopoeia Garry describes. William Morris, Ruskin’s influential disciple, was wary of the tendency to see illustrations and ornament as works of art separate from the overall book design. He admonishes,

We must remember one thing, that if we think the ornament is ornamentally a part of the book merely because it is printed with it, and bound up with it, we shall be much mistaken. The ornament must form as much a part of the book as the type itself, or it will miss its mark, and in order to succeed, and to be ornament, it must submit to certain limitations and become architectural ... a book ornamented with pictures that are suitable for that, and that alone, may become a work of art second to none. (Morris 20)

Morris considers the book as a whole to be a work of art, and the illustrations, illuminations, and miniatures inside are only pieces of the artwork that compose some of its more decorative parts. Therefore, he sought to publish books that formed a coherent aesthetic whole, not books in which small artworks were framed by written text, or in which written text was augmented by separate art pieces. Canonical authors’ words, regardless of their subject, were often found to have very similar “stage sets” deemed suitable by the Arts and Crafts presses, because the idea of a visual connotation of worth for this movement was rooted in Ruskin’s very specific conceptions of beauty.

The Arts and Crafts Movement sought to beautify and celebrate not just books, but all visual aspects of a gentle lifestyle. To Ruskin, all aspects of design and ornament were part of “a complex argument involving the technical aspects of making a certain kind of artwork, the morality of art, its economy and its relation to ultimate truth” (Miller 88). The care that goes into the creation of an end table, or the creation of a manuscript, should be obvious through the materials used, the proportions of the elements and the intricacy of the design. Effort and individuality connote worth; there is a beauty inherent in things made by hand. While William Morris wanted George Allen to be a founding member of his company, “with the responsibility of designing and producing fine furniture, he declined the invitation in favor of becoming Ruskin’s full-time assistant” in his publishing concern (Dawson 1). The sensibility and taste that would have led George Allen to be successful creating furniture for Morris was directly translatable to creating books for Ruskin. They formed Ruskin’s publishing house in George Allen’s name in 1871.

The Publisher’s seal for the George Allen Press, Ruskin House (Figure 5:3) neatly encapsulates many of the prevailing aesthetic choices of the Arts and Crafts movement. The seal was a highly decorated square, in the center of which is a large, intertwined double initial covered in vine flourishes. The letters G and A wrap around a white knight on a white horse slaying a small dragon that cowers beneath. The words that provide information about the publishers have been relegated to the border.

Beautiful well-crafted books fit into the kind of life of beauty Ruskin and Morris conceived as a means of escape from the industrial age in which they found themselves. Arts and Crafts style also had an effect on readers’ ideas about the texts they encountered

in this setting. The form of the book influenced how it was read. The specific look of these texts helps form not only the English canon, but also the function of literature in the life of its readers. Authors, if their work was good enough, could transcend the historical period in which they wrote to join a timeless canon.

In bookmaking, as in other types of craft, the Arts and Crafts sensibility dictated that the process should be a joyful one – that is, made by hand by a craftsman who took pride in his individual product. Ruskin’s aesthetics, especially for book crafting, was rooted in the symmetry of his vision of the Middle Ages. The Arts and Crafts publishers of the late nineteenth century firmly located their vision of the Middle Ages in the ideal. They had a very specific view of what the medieval era could do for them, not much minding that a scribe writing out a book, or a bookbinder of the medieval era very likely had goals other than beauty for his product. For instance, piety, durability, legibility, and accuracy may have each or all been prized above beauty for a finished book in the Middle Ages. Moreover, in the Middle Ages, the creation of a book was the creation of a space to interact with the content of the book, through readerly additions of marginalia, etc. Manuscripts and incunabula had a life after their creation. We can note that textual scholars have posited that one reason medieval book margins were so wide was so that book owners could annotate texts freely in this space. This kind of use would be anathema in the Arts and Crafts idea of a life of beauty.

The Arts and Crafts Movement was, for all its Medievalism, not interested in the historical reality of the Middle Ages. To William Morris, an early medieval manuscript or a late medieval printed book would be seen as manifestations of the same ideal. Morris

stated in “The Ideal Book,” an essay that Kelmscott published posthumously as a slim volume of its own,

I think you will seldom find a book produced before the eighteenth century... [in which it is not true that] the hinder edge (that which is bound in) must be the smallest member of the margins, the head margin must be larger than this, the fore larger still, and the tail largest. (Morris 15)

The “medieval,” then, becomes an idealized aesthetic rather than a designation for a particular historical span of years. The Middle Ages were not, to Morris, some part of a timeline, but rather a coherent mindset. Ruskin stated that for the people of the British Middle Ages, “all that they admired was tender, bright, balanced, enclosed, symmetrical – only symmetrical in the noble and free sense” (Ruskin 311-312). For men like Ruskin and Allen, the ideal of the Middle Ages provided a comparison to their industrial (and thus, unsatisfactory) present.

As the Arts and Crafts publishers were concerned with the beauty of the proportions in a medieval manuscript rather than the use to which it was put, so too were they concerned with the timeless aspects of books that would form the canon rather than any specific historicity of the works. In fact, the proportions Morris cites as ideal are indeed the proportions of the borders in the large page edition of *Pride and Prejudice* as published by George Allen even though the author obviously wrote it after the eighteenth century mark Morris declares. The literary canon fits into an Arts and Crafts lifestyle in the same way a beautiful lamp does. The ideal Arts and Crafts reader could turn on a lamp William Morris designed, sit in a chair Gustav Stickley designed, and read a book George Allen published against a backdrop of wallpaper Walter Crane designed. A connotation of the beautiful past was more important than the fact that the design

elements Ruskin and his colleagues employed, or the texts that they printed, were originally written into specific historical situations. Philip James, in his book *English Book Illustration 1800-1900*, remarks that, “in the nineteenth century the subject was more often than not the romantic past, a past peopled by Dante, Arthur, Chaucer and other figures of chivalry whose world contrasted so strongly with the prevailing industrial ugliness” (James 12). The Middle Ages are not historically bounded, but rather replaced with the “romantic past,” and the “romantic past” becomes a location of its own, one populated by legendary kings and historical authors alike.

Since the Arts and Crafts vision of the Middle Ages influenced book production in the late nineteenth century, the particular manner of Arts and Crafts Medievalism in turn influenced the canonization of the books they published. Because Ruskin and his compatriots saw the Middle Ages as an aesthetic and ideological choice rather than a historical period, a look of worth could be given to any text, regardless of that text’s historical origin, by publishing it to look “medieval.” Like putting a sculpture on a Grecian pedestal implies it is fine art rather than implying that it was carved in Ancient Greece, so too putting a novel in gothic-inspired types, with wide margins, and with populated initials⁴⁷ implied it was fine literature rather than implying that the written text had originated in fifteenth century western Europe.

A page of George Allen’s large-page printing of *Pride and Prejudice* (Figure 5:4) can be taken as an example of Arts and Crafts book production. The populated initials,

⁴⁷ The populated initials I will discuss in this chapter serve many of the same functions as the historiated initials employed by Thackeray in *Vanity Fair*. I have chosen to use a slightly different term to designate them, however, since in the George Allen edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, Thomson does not employ pictorial elements to form the letter to the same degree Thackeray had done, and thus, the capitals that begin his chapters seem to house small illustrations rather than participating as illustrations themselves.

the large number of small illustrations, and the lavish, wide borders embellish this novel and serve to venerate the written text by Austen. Austen was not a medieval author, but her novels can still be given the “stage set” of medieval book construction. Even though the aesthetic choices of this edition cross historical periods, Arts and Crafts scholars would still consider it to be a “visual onomatopoeia” because the gestures toward Medievalism connote veneration for the written text rather than a claim of historical accuracy. The timelessness evoked by this edition would be in direct contrast to later editions, such as the 1923 edition of *Pride and Prejudice* edited by R.W. Chapman, in which, I will argue, he works to resituate the novel into the specific era in which it was published. In the George Allen edition, the style and subject matter of the illustrations themselves also mark this edition for canonicity. Philip James, who proves to be a wealth of traditional ideas about Arts and Crafts publishing, describes Hugh Thomson’s work as illustrating,

standard novels by Jane Austen ... where old-world scenes were recreated with an accurate representation of all the period accessories of architecture, costume and furniture. Much of their charm relies on the seeming fineness of line, which makes their vignettes harmonize so pleasantly with the printed page. (James 51)

Though he alludes to “all the period accessories of architecture, costume and furniture,” James still categorizes Jane Austen’s Regency England as charming “old world scenes.” It is my belief that the “standard”-ness of the written text and the charm and harmony of the illustrations seemed far more important in the George Allen edition than any historical accuracy. James has internalized Thomson and Allen’s focus on the charm of yesteryear without focusing on the specific year itself.

Hugh Thomson's Illustrations

Pride and Prejudice, as published by George Allen and illustrated by Hugh Thomson, was a precedent-breaking edition in many ways. For Thomson personally, it was the first project for which he was paid largely in royalties, (Spielmann and Jerrold 86) as well as the first time he worked with George Allen. The edition was very successful. As Kathryn Sutherland notes in *Jane Austen's Textual Lives*, "within a year of publication over 11,600 British copies were sold, totaling more than the lifetime sales of all Austen's novels put together" (9). The dust jacket on my Dover reprint of the George Allen edition, with its reproductions of all of Hugh Thomson's illustrations, declares, "So perfectly matched were the style and sensibility of Thomson's illustrations to Austen's elegant comedy of manners that he remains today the foremost illustrator of her works." When it was originally published, J. Comyns Carr told Thomson in a letter that he felt *Pride and Prejudice* to be the best of Thomson's work so far (Spielmann and Jerrold 93). This assessment may have been influenced by the fact that Thomson dedicated the volume to him – "To J. Comyns Carr in acknowledgement of all I owe to his friendship and advice, these illustrations are gratefully inscribed – Hugh Thomson."

The men's mutual appreciation in this case is politically loaded, however, since Thomson illustrated *Pride and Prejudice* for the George Allen press and not for Macmillan and Co, where Comyns Carr had gotten him his job. Macmillan had wanted Thomson to illustrate *Pride and Prejudice* before, but Thomson had informed them that he "doubted its suitability for illustration" (Spielmann and Jerrold 86). After illustrating the novel for George Allen, however, Thomson agreed to illustrate all of Austen's other

novels for Macmillan and Co. His illustrations for those novels also led to commercial success, but they did not reach the cultural status of his illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice*.

It was Thomson's embodiment of Victorian priorities as well as his talent and technical skill that made his illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice* so popular. For instance, in his captioned chapter head for Chapter XXVII (Figure 5:5), the Gardiner children all have abundant healthy hair in late Victorian styles and clean and tidy faces and clothing. They exhibit a kind of coyness more familiar from Kate Greenaway pictures than from Jane Austen novels. The Gardiner children are also pictured in the chapter heads for Chapters XLVII and XLII despite their relative unimportance to the plot of the novel. The editor Austin Dobsen wrote to Thomson that his illustrations were "full of invention, fancy, and clever characterizations, charming in [their] glimpses of landscape and pictures of children, and everywhere loyal to [the] text." (Spielmann and Jerrold 58). Dobsen's inventory of virtues here not only describes Thomson's style, but also indicates what late Victorians felt to be virtues in book illustration. For instance, while we might now still prize invention and loyalty to the text, it is unlikely that we would consider charming pictures of children to be assets in a book in the plot of which charming children did not feature heavily.

For the "large page edition," a limited printing of *Pride and Prejudice*, Thomson's illustrations were printed onto very fine paper that was later glued to the much thicker paper on which the words were printed. The effect is like that of a collage. When the different kinds of paper are combined on one page, it is apparent that the pictures have been added by different means long after the words in order to gloss the

written text. Edward Hodnett points out that “[e]ven without borders, solid rectangular designs convey a feeling of alienation from the text. Broken rectangles and irregular vignettes seem to associate with the printed text most intimately” (Hodnett 21). As is observable in the chapter head in Figure 5:5, Thomson’s illustrations are generally meant to be irregularly shaped vignettes, so the deluxe edition’s fine paper overlays do not do a service to the art they venerate. Instead, the act of pasting fine paper over thick breaks up the composition of the page that, in the standard printing, is carefully balanced with word and picture.

In the deluxe edition, in addition to the imposed rectangular borders on the pictures, there’s an automatic juxtaposition between the strong bold written text on its thick, hearty paper and the fragile tissue paper of the illustrations as is observable in Figure 5:4. This turns the page itself into a composite of possibly mismatched elements as the delicacy of the paper and the delicacy of the lines of the art contrast with the bolder lines of the printing press and stronger paper of the text.

Together with the layout of the pages, with their wide borders, this juxtaposition of elements echoes the juxtaposition of the three periods of English history evoked in this large-page edition: Jane Austen herself wrote during the Regency; the subject matter chosen for the illustrations embraces a late Victorian sentiment, and the book production methods are evoking the aesthetic choices that the Arts and Crafts movement identified with the Middle Ages. The illustration style puts Austen in the same category as Dickens or Thackeray, great Victorian novelists, and the book production puts Austen in the same category as Chaucer or Malory. Presenting a Jane Austen novel in this style makes a claim about the worth of her novels – it is saying that her novels deserve a place with the

other British greats. It is saying that her writing is deserving of a large-page edition. The composite nature of this edition was extremely influential in Jane Austen's ultimate place in the English canon since the reader is required to elide the disparate historical periods being evoked in order to see them all as indicating one thing: that the text itself is a timeless classic.

The lines of the illustrations and the lines of the text are more harmonious in a standard printing than in the deluxe edition. It becomes simpler to elide the interactions of characters in the pictures with the interactions of characters in the written text, when both are printed in the same way with the same materials. When the eye doesn't need to transition between the border of the picture and the paper of the written text, it is easier to see the relationship between the subject matter and tone of each. Printed on the same paper and sharing space more equally with their margins, the line drawings with their limited shading replicate the weight of the typeset letters. Thomson's style of showing the human figures at comfortable distances from each other against an implied background, the whiteness of the page, lends the illustration an air of completeness (Figure 5:6).

When an illustration has a detailed background, there must be a border acknowledged between the page as background to the picture and the drawn background to the figures in the foreground of the image. Figure 5:7 contrasts one of Thomson's illustrations for the George Allen edition of *Pride and Prejudice* on the left with an illustration by Charles Brock on the right. Brock illustrated an edition of *Pride and Prejudice* for Macmillan and Co. in 1895, a year after the George Allen edition. In the Brock illustration, a tree provides the background to the characters and a boundary is delineated between the composition of the image and the page on which it is printed. The

effect is much like the unintended border of the tissue paper overlay in the large page edition with Thomson's illustrations. In many of Thomson's compositions, such as his illustration for the head of chapter XXIV, shown to the left of Brock's frontispiece in Figure 5:7, the background to the figures and the background to the written text are intended to be one and the same.

Hugh Thomson's style as a pen-draughtsman was to use the black markings almost solely for outline and not shading. Consequently, his work has a flat quality that lends itself to details of pose rather than intricate three-dimensional space. Furthermore, when there is a suggestion of background in Thomson's pictures, the objects in the background do not serve to situate the novel in a historical period. Instead, they serve to place the interactions of the characters in a particular kind of social setting rather than a particular year or location. The focus is on the simple faces, and the pose of the characters' bodies underneath the generous folds of fabric. The clothing and furniture, instead of situating the characters, merely connote the charm of the past, as do the populated initials.

Thomson's art is like Austen's in that the fine treating of perspective leads to a feeling of completeness. Austen's handling of the Gardiners, for instance, is deft though slight. The reader is not presented with the details of their courtship but they are fully realized characters even without that background information. Similarly, Thomson's drawn people are often standing on merely the blankness of the page (for instance in the tug of war in Figure 5:7), but the lack of background does not detract from this image because the focus is on the manner and action of the figures. Just as the feet of the characters in Thomson's illustrations are well drawn enough to appear to be standing on

something even when no ground is depicted, the Gardiners are well-written enough that readers can assume their background. In each case, written and pictorial, the characters can be assumed to have a solid textual base without the supports of textual proof.

In the preface to the George Allen edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, George Saintsbury alludes to Austen's writing in terms of visual art – a comparison that was, by 1894, standard in discussion of Austen. In doing so, he foregrounds the character creation and description in Austen's work as paramount. He writes that “[i]f her world is a microcosm, the cosmic quality of it is at least as eminent as the littleness. She does not touch what she did not feel herself called to paint; I am not so sure that she could not have painted what she did not feel herself called to touch” (xv). Saintsbury's analogy to painting is a telling one. It echoes Austen's own disclaimer that her novels are mere bits of ivory, thus participating in the long-held assumptions about the intended use for her novels. It also implies that Austen's particular gift was for painting group portraits. Saintsbury goes on in this vein some pages later when he states “the greatness of Mr Collins could not have been so satisfactorily exhibited if his creatress had not adjusted so artfully to him the figures of Mr Bennet and of Lady Catherine de Burgh” (xvii). Saintsbury felt that Austen's genius was not just in portraiture, but in an arrangement of characters, each set to throw the others into the most illuminating light.

Thomson's illustrations, then, are like Austen's writing also because Thomson focuses on interactions between people. Austen's own priority of setting a scene to emphasize interpersonal arrangements is often quite obvious. For instance, in a scene near the end of *Pride and Prejudice*, Lady Catherine de Bourgh's visit to the Bennet household is described with a wealth of situating detail, highlighting the physical

placement of each character as well as the expectations of polite society in their interaction. The scene opens,

as [Bingley] and the females of the [Bennet] family were sitting together in the dressing-room their attention was suddenly drawn to the window, by the sound of a carriage; and they perceived a chaise and four driving up the lawn. It was too early in the morning for visitors. ...[Lady Catherine de Bourgh] entered the room with an air more than usually ungracious, made no other reply to Elizabeth's salutation, than a slight inclination of the head, and sat down without saying a word. (228-229)

The reader knows which characters were together in the room, can picture their sedentary surprise at the unexpected visit, and then marvel at the nuanced rudeness that Lady Catherine perpetrates on the room.

This emphasis on the arrangement of characters is echoed in Thomson's style of illustration in this edition. Of the Thomson illustrations, well over half of those in *Pride and Prejudice* show pairs or groups of people, in which the whole figure of every person is shown, head to foot, unless there is something in front of part of the person, and in that case the entirety of the blocking object (for instance, a table) is shown. There are also many depictions of people alone, especially in the populated initials, and even there the entire figure is almost always shown.⁴⁸ In Thomson's illustration of the Bennet family at home reproduced in Figure 5:8 for example, the five girls, all dressed in similar dresses and with their hair up in the same way, are framed by their two parents. The entire figures are shown, from head to toe, and shadows and furniture in the background appear only enough to situate the figures.

⁴⁸ In fact, only five illustrations do not feature complete human forms; of these, two have faces, one has tiny sketchy torsos seen in a distant carriage, and only two have scenes with no human element at all. All five of these are in the populated initials.

The illustrations in this edition show a remarkable devotion to the characters as preferred subjects, and also to maintaining scale: since the entire figure is nearly always shown, there is no cinematic effect of a close-up, but rather the reader is granted a consistent gaze as if always across the room from the depicted characters. This focus provides a kind of primness and propriety: not only the correct distance between characters, but also a regulated distance between reader and character depiction is maintained. In the words of the narrator of “The Janeites,” three decades later, Thomson’s illustrations support a reading of Austen’s books as not “adventurous, not smutty, nor what you’d call even interestin’” (Kipling, 5).

Most of the Thomson illustrations seem to reflect and celebrate “the gentler virtues of a civilized social order” that Harding claims is a misreading of Austen’s text (Harding 296). The ideas about Jane Austen embodied in his edition were directly linked to the Janeite sensibility, and in fact, George Saintsbury coined the term “Janite” in his introduction to this edition. As an example of the Janite/Janeite sensibility, Claudia Johnson cites a new use for Austen’s novels after WWI – they were recommended to returning soldiers because “Austen’s fictional world could feel rehabilitative” (154). Since Hugh Thomson was thanked in a letter from Joseph Grego for ““the restorative effects on impaired vitality, etc, found in your illustrations to Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*... you have revived the gently humorous Jane and given her a new lease of life,”” it seems the humor gently present in his illustrations of human interaction was probably partly to account for the idea that Austen’s novels could be restorative after the war (quoted in Spielmann and Jerrold 98).

Spielmann and Jerrold celebrate Thomson's "[o]bservation of men and women... reflecting on their faces with the most delicate variations of the most subtle expressions: and not on their faces only, but in their attitudes, and indicated in the suggested movement of their limbs" (xviii). I see in this warm praise for Thomson a more complimentary version of Charlotte Brontë's opinion of Jane Austen: that she cared less about the heart of her characters than about the "eyes, mouth, hands and feet" (Lynch 256). Part of what made Thomson's late Victorian style intersect so well with Austen's novel was a shared affinity for the delineation of human attitude and behavior.

Spielmann and Jerrold assert that "the artist may be said to have lived in those social circles so delicately and humorously set forward by the novelist and to have depicted them with a delicacy and humour akin to her own" (100-101). Thomson's style of showing the whole figure with more attention paid to the dress than the expression is reminiscent of fashion plates of the era. Therefore, the illustrations in this edition have an air of advertising. However, they demonstrate not what to buy, but rather how to stand, where to look, and when to smile, depending on the situation. The Bennet girls are generally drawn as expressionless but lovely, the readers' diagrams of right action, while Mr. Collins and Mrs. Bennet, on the other hand, since they can offer only negative social examples, are drawn like caricatures.

In fact, even though his illustrations seem very sweet to us now, Thomson was celebrated at the time for the comedy in his illustrations. And indeed many of his illustrations are quite witty, but the wit is often tied directly to the written text in a way the sweetness is not. That means that an extremely naïve reader, or a casual potential buyer flipping through the book, would notice the large pictures of happy children but

might not notice the visual puns in some of the small chapter heads or populated initials. For instance, the head to chapter XV (Figure 5:9) shows a row of the Bennet girls with Mrs. Bennet on one side and Mr. Collins on the other. In this illustration, it is only through knowledge of the written text that a reader will realize that Mrs. Bennet is arranging her girls for Mr. Collins' consumption in the marriage market, and Jane, who Mrs. Bennet believes has already snagged an even more eligible bachelor, is marked 'NOT FOR SALE.' Similarly, directly below this chapter head, a populated letter 'M' includes a hot air balloon filled with Mr. Collins' head. This M begins the sentence,

Mr. Collins was not a sensible man, and the deficiency of nature had been but little assisted by education or society; the greatest part of his life having been spent under the guidance of an illiterate and miserly father; and though he belonged to one of the universities, he had merely kept the necessary terms without forming at it any useful acquaintance. (89)

As the picture in the M helps convey, Mr. Collins is full of hot air. Both of the illustrations on this page are clever and critical, but they require a careful reading of the written text for their meaning to be intelligible. They reward the careful reader without offending the casual reader. Thomson's humor is most explicit in his initials, many of which take the form of puns. In Thomson's captioned line drawings, humor most often takes the form of stylized caricatures, presenting specific characters as those who can be laughed at. For instance, in Thomson's illustration of Mr. Collins protesting he never reads novels (Figure 5:10), his expression, pose, and the size of his feet all combine to make him risible. His face is much more detailed than the faces of Jane or Elizabeth ever are in his illustrations, and his surroundings are also more detailed, grounding him more specifically and subtly connecting him to the desire for material things.

In fact, in Thomson's illustrations, it seems that individuality and unflattering pose are signals that the subject is laughable: the details in the representations of Mr. Collins and Mrs. Bennet make it obvious to the reader that these are comic characters. For the size of their characters' roles in the novel, Mr. Collins and Mrs. Bennet are represented by the illustrations to a disproportionate degree, and furthermore, many lines go into creating the facial expressions of the laughable characters. Harding condemns an interpretation of Mrs. Bennet that assumes "Mrs Bennet, according to the Austen tradition, is one of 'our' richly comic characters about whom we can feel superior, condescending, perhaps a trifle sympathetic, and above all heartily amused and free from care" (297). Harding's complaint is not with Austen's writing, but rather with the reader and with the critical reception of Mrs. Bennet. Harding disapproves of trivializing Mrs. Bennet, but, through Thomson's style of drawing Mrs. Bennet as a careful caricature, he does real work to distance her from the reader.

While it may be difficult to tell whether a given illustration is Jane or Elizabeth, neither of them could be mistaken for any of the comic characters. As a counterpoint to the ridiculous appearance of ridiculous characters, Thomson draws the ingénues in a way that makes them easy to emulate. In both styles of depiction, the emphasis is on the overall appearance of the character rather than action or interiority. Though the manner of presentation is different, it is as true for pictures of Mrs. Bennet as it is for pictures of Miss Bennet that the whole figure represented, and the interaction between figures is foregrounded.

In most styles of depiction, pretty girls are drawn with fewer details than are ugly or comedic caricatures. It could be that ingénues and their ilk are less interesting for the

artist to represent overall, and that the choice to devote less page space and less actual ink and time to their representation is a reflection of an artistic preference to dwell on more caricature-like characters simply because comedic things are more interesting to draw. Many critics have said the same thing about Austen's writing. Galperin says that Austen's writing is more imbued with urgency when it concerns the characters to be "looked down upon" than it is when it concerns "characters who are merely praiseworthy" (80), and Harding says that

Caricature served Jane Austen's purpose perfectly. Under her treatment, one can never say where caricature leaves off and the claim to serious portraiture begins.... And [Darcy,] finally, although to some extent a caricature, is near enough natural portraiture to stand beside Elizabeth Bennet, who, like all the heroines, is presented as an undistorted portrait (298).

Austen herself seems aware that praiseworthy characters need fewer lines of description, since in *Northanger Abbey*, Eleanor Tilney marries "the most charming young man in the world. Any further definition of his merits must be unnecessary; the most charming young man in the world is instantly before the imagination of us all" (210). If Austen did not want to write him, why would Thomson want to draw him? Perhaps it is more rewarding and amusing to devote your lines – whether written or drawn – to caricatures.

However, there is another possible explanation for the dearth of detail in the descriptions and depictions of Austen's praiseworthy characters. Raymond Williams posits in "Three Around Farnham" that Austen was interested in exploring "personal conduct: a testing and discovery of the standards which govern human behavior" (113) in her novels. I believe the Thomson illustrations approximate this interest by depicting a humanized space. Furthermore, I believe Thomson's illustrations use the focus on

personal conduct to facilitate identifying with the protagonists and distancing the distasteful characters.

The caricature that Harding notes in Austen's writing seems to carry directly into Thomson's style of illustration, and seems to be an effective means of distancing the reader from identifying with Mrs. Bennet or Mr. Collins. The rest of Harding's continuum between caricature and realism is more problematic, however. For instance, if Elizabeth is an undistorted portrait in Austen's written text, is that accurately reflected by the few lines Thomson devotes to the depiction of her face? In other words, can a less-detailed representation in art actually be said to convey an "undistorted portrait?" Detail is individualizing, not distorting. Lack of detail, therefore, may be said to be universalizing. Scott McCloud addresses this issue in *Understanding Comics* by declaring that,

[w]hen we abstract an image through cartooning [i.e., render an image with very few lines], we're not so much eliminating details as we are focusing on specific details. By stripping down an image to its essential 'meaning,' an artist can amplify that meaning in a way that realistic art can't. (30)

In Thomson's illustrations, the comparative sketchiness of the faces of the ingénues is a universalizing gesture, and the details amplified are those that emphasize affect and conduct. Because his composition uses white space so elegantly, the white space between an individual character's facial features draws as much attention as the white space between the depictions of the characters in an illustration. Because Elizabeth in Thomson's drawings is merely an outline, readers can offer their own attributes to fill that outline.

McCloud believes that simple “cartoony” drawings are appealing because we can see ourselves in those lines. He says that when we look at other people, we have a sense of our own appearance at the same time,

but this mind picture is not nearly so vivid [as our view of the other person]; just a sketchy arrangement.... a sense of shape.... a sense of general placement. Something as simple and basic – as a cartoon. Thus, when you look at a photo or realistic drawing of a face – you see it as the face of another. But when you enter the world of the cartoon – you see yourself. (36, all punctuation *ibid*)

Thomson’s style of illustration allows us as readers to insert ourselves into the characters we are “supposed to” identify with, because they are drawn the way McCloud asserts we see ourselves. This schema of representation dovetails with Austen’s writing style, in which free-indirect discourse blurs the “white space” between the narrator, the protagonist, and the reader. For instance, when Elizabeth’s aunt and uncle first contemplate a visit to Pemberley as a tourist, Elizabeth’s “mind could not acquiesce. The possibility of meeting Mr Darcy, while viewing the place, instantly occurred. It would be dreadful!” (158). Here, the third person narration of Elizabeth’s mental reaction blends into a subjective statement with an exclamation point, indicating that the narration itself has been taken over by Elizabeth’s current thought process. By blending the narrative with the narrated, Austen allows the reader access into the protagonist’s mind.

The corollary to an ability to envision ourselves in the protagonist’s shoes is a related ability to dissociate ourselves from the characters we want to avoid being like; to McCloud’s way of thinking, this is because those distasteful characters are individualized and therefore easily perceived as other. This is a convincing rationale for Thomson’s illustration style – if not actually the motive of his illustration techniques, certainly the effect of the illustrations themselves.

Therefore, Thomson's illustrations in the George Allen edition were not just important because they were the first instance of the novel being fully illustrated; they also shared qualities with the written text itself. Charles Edmund Brock's 1895 illustrations, in contrast, were much less successful, though the phenomenon of merely suggested facial lines of the ingénues versus detailed, individualized faces for the comedic characters continues in the Brock illustrations. Brock illustrated the novel for Macmillan and Co. because Thomson had agreed to do it for George Allen, and in many ways his illustrations are similar to Thomson's. Brock employed a style of artistry similar to Thomson's in its thin line work and careful attention to detail. Once more, Jane and Elizabeth are fairly expressionless, while many of the smaller roles have been caricatured. The figures in Brock's illustrations have a posed look, carefully rendered backgrounds, and his costumes and hair are generally fairly historically accurate.

Without the gentle wit of the Thomson illustrations, however, Brock's lines seem overly pretty, and his figures, especially the young women, have a tendency to bow their heads so frequently they appear to be constantly ashamed. The figures in Brock's pictures are also generally standing closer to each other than in Thomson's illustrations. Brock's figures are also larger in the composition, removing the feeling that the reader is consistently across the room from the characters. Because Brock puts the characters in frillier, fussier clothes and more detailed surroundings full of intricate shading, the effect is not, as with Thomson, one of looking at human figures to emulate, but rather of looking at an entire scene, the way someone would look at a snapshot of strangers in a landscape. The fact that so many of Brock's compositions have borders and fill all the space within the border adds to this feeling.

In contrast to Brock's illustrations, Thomson's fine-line drawing style lent itself well to combining harmoniously with the type on a page and his backgroundless vignettes used the page similarly to the way the words did. His gestures toward historical accuracy, combined with his predilection for showing the whole figure, made the Regency novel relevant in the late Victorian era in which it was published, while the setting of the text in a whitewashed Medieval aesthetic framed it as a timeless classic.

The eliding of historical specificity into the gentle past was due in large part to the subject and style of Thomson's illustrations. Instead of presenting themselves as an interpretation of or commentary on the novel, the new illustrations were presented as part of the text, integral and assumed. Chapman's edition a few decades later would challenge the insidious nature of late Victorian illustrations presented as part of the text. The George Allen edition with Thomson's illustrations was a necessary precursor to Chapman's new situating of Austen's text as firmly based in a specific part of England's history.

Chapman's Edition

In *Jane Austen's Textual Lives*, Kathryn Sutherland explains that R.W. Chapman's editions of Jane Austen's novels mark the beginning of Jane Austen's canonical status in academia. Chapman situated Austen's novels among the classics translated from Greek and Latin he also edited. Chapman's editions of Austen's novels, however, owe their existence to the canon-making gestures of the Thomson edition, which had been published at the apex of "the biggest upturn in Jane Austen's critical reputation, at the end of the nineteenth century" (Sutherland 335).

When Chapman returned to England from WWI, he created a series of editions of “classics” for Oxford University Press. Sutherland discusses the ways in which Chapman’s edition of Austen novels – and his choice to include her novels in his “classics” – is informed by war, both by the editor’s experiences and Austen’s own (Sutherland 34). Jane Austen was the only novelist to be included in Chapman’s set of classics, which was to embody, in many ways, the literary canon in England for decades to come. *Pride and Prejudice* was the second volume in this series, following *Sense and Sensibility*. In his editions of Austen’s novels, Chapman attempted to rectify the wrongs Victoriana had done to Austen as an author. It is Sutherland’s opinion that the Chapman edition of *Pride and Prejudice* is a response not just to the Janeite sensibilities of the upper crust of his time, but specifically to the late Victorian sweetness ascribed to the novel.

Sutherland dismisses the cultural importance of the George Allen edition, perhaps because of the major role played by Thomson’s illustrations in that edition. She states that “book illustration . . . throughout the nineteenth century . . . prioritizes or amplifies some elements over others and directs us towards the significance we discover in the work as a whole,” a role that was “later usurped by textual annotation” (Sutherland 345). However different from the ways Victorian illustrators and publishers went about creating a version of Austen, the manner in which Chapman chooses to “illustrate” his edition is indicative of the role illustration can play as annotation. As such, Chapman’s annotations affect Austen’s literary and societal cachet.

Chapman’s edition is not abridged or bowdlerized, and it seems at first glance to offer only editing in the additive sense, with its various apparatus, such as indexes,

annotations and historical ephemera. However this edition might present itself as full-text, the very definition of full-text may here be misleading. Unabridged is not the same as unedited. Chapman's edition, like many of those that follow, is normalized in terms of spelling and chapter numbering, with the typos and out-of-date grammar from earlier editions cleaned up. Chapman refers to these changes as "obvious and minor corrections" (Chapman xiii).

However, unabridged editions purport to be complete, and readers assume they are getting the Real Thing. For instance, I find it particularly noteworthy that the catchwords at the bottom of each page of Chapman's edition of *Pride and Prejudice* are not the catchwords at the bottom of the pages in the original first edition of the novel as published during Jane Austen's lifetime. None of the catchwords are the same because the font in Chapman's edition is about half the size of the type in the first edition. Roughly twice as much text fits onto one of Chapman's pages as fit onto a page of the first edition. Furthermore, the catchwords are included only to give a "Regency feel" to the page, since their use was unusual and technologically unnecessary by 1923. What was in the Regency a necessity of typesetting is here reproduced as though for verisimilitude. They are there to further the immersive feeling of authenticity and historicism that is Chapman's goal. They present the page as unedited since the first edition. These kinds of choices on the part of the editor act as counterpart to the decision to illustrate the novel with pictures from advertisements and instruction manuals from the era of the novel's initial publication.

Like the catchwords, the visual ephemera Chapman includes as “illustrations” elide appearances with intentions. Instead of hiring an illustrator for his editions, or leaving them un-illustrated, Chapman:

sourced and reproduced authentic period illustrations to embellish the new edition and drive out the sentimental visuals of the later years of the previous century such as Hugh Thomson’s illustrated *Pride and Prejudice* of 1894. The effect of this apparatus is to structure the act of reading and persuade of its difficulty. (Sutherland 13)

With its theory of “authenticity,” Chapman’s goal is totally different from the “suitable stage set” the Arts and Crafts presses sought. Chapman chooses to include pictures that were authentically produced at the time of the novel’s first publication rather than authentically produced to illustrate Austen’s written text itself. Of course, because the novel was not illustrated during the lifetime of the author, illustrations for it could not be authentic in both ways at once.

Chapman’s edition of *Pride and Prejudice* contains eight full-page images, all of which were originally published in different contexts between the years of 1792 and 1817. Of these, three were originally fashion plates or images from advertisements, three were engravings after landscape paintings, one was a blueprint, and one was reproduced from an instruction manual. For example, the drawing of a carriage in Figure 5:11, inset in the Chapman edition endnotes to *Pride and Prejudice*, was originally used as part of an advertisement for the carriage, and as such it is diagrammatic: a strict side view with detail but little shading. Not only is it a picture removed from its original context for inclusion in this volume, it is one devoid of human figures or referents.

The fashion plates and carriage advertisements along with the detailed study of dates in an appendix make Chapman’s edition into a book about how to read *Pride and*

Prejudice as information rather than narrative, while the landscape plates make the volume feel like a guidebook. They are not even printed vertically on the page so that a reader can engage them on the same terms as the text. Instead, one must physically turn the book sideways to look at the landscapes right side up. The book feels like something to consult rather than something to read.⁴⁹

Chapman's edition makes a claim that reading Jane Austen's text is like studying history. With this claim, the editor attempts to remove her text from the purview of mannered fine society. Chapman's intended readership was not only his fellow scholars, who would, we can assume, need no referent for what carriages had looked like in the early 1800s, but also a broader readership of Englishmen who wanted to read the canon and would respect his expertise. A reader of Chapman's edition might very well benefit from a picture of bonnets of the early 1800s, so different from the bonnets of 1923. The pictures included in his edition demonstrate his mortification at the Janeite sensibility. Sutherland implies that Chapman's work was masculinist and corrective, seizing Austen's texts from the Janeites and affirming an academic readership in their stead.⁵⁰

The title page of Chapman's edition (Figure 5:12) indicates the way in which he is making a claim for Jane Austen's texts. Austen's name has migrated from authority to

⁴⁹ Like the George Allen edition, Chapman's was also released in a "large page edition" on initial publication (Sutherland 37). The status ascribed to Austen by this edition was just as elite as Thomson's, albeit with different interpretive goals.

⁵⁰ It is interesting to reflect that in order for Chapman to "masculinize" the act of reading Austen, there must first have been a sense that George Sainstbury, George Allen, Hugh Thomson, Charles Brock – all men – had somehow feminized a reading of Austen.

subject. No longer the author, she is part of the title.⁵¹ This kind of shift is noteworthy for Chapman's edition because of the importance he placed on paratextual materials. For instance, he concludes his volume with several appendices of notes, addenda, and indexes. Chapman even lists the husbands of Kitty and Mary Bennet in his index of characters, citing a report from Austen's nephew that she had revealed these characters' marital fates privately to her family. If Chapman considers a secondhand account of extratextual material to be fit for inclusion as "facts" in his index, then he considers the book world to extend beyond the words the author used to create it. It seems clear that to Chapman, indexes and notes and title pages were an important aspect of reading the novel itself. He sees his own role as providing paratext and thus structuring interaction with Austen's text. It is plausible, then, that he was deeply affected by Thomson's manner of illustration.

Moreover, as I have noted, according to my definition of the term, the plates in the Chapman edition are not really illustrations of the novel at all. They appear interspersed with the text of the novel itself as well as mixed in to the appendixes and indexes Chapman provides but they do not depict the characters or created world of the novel. Chapman's plates collapse any idea of a sense of creation or interpretation of the text (other than his own) having any part of his edition. Chapman seems to be presenting these plates as merely a careful display of what was already there – already in the consciousness of the first readers, that is.

⁵¹ I am interested in the conflation of an author's name with the texts he or she produced: phrases such as "doing Shakespeare," "Jane Austen in five volumes," and "loving the Brontës," are all marks of familiarity that are tied to a bid to share in the cultural cachet of the name of the author by purporting its interchangeability with the author's works, thereby asserting the reader's close connection to the author him or herself.

An editor can argue that his annotations, or the inclusion of historical ephemera as “Illustrations from contemporary sources” as is claimed on the title page, merely clarify factual points already extant in the main text. However, by their selection and inclusion in a 1923 volume, these materials shift meaning for readers. The effect is of reading a kind of anthology of historical items from the time of initial publication, which have been removed from their own original contexts to appear with the novel. The book Chapman produces is a collection of reproduced Regency pop culture materials, of which the text of *Pride and Prejudice* takes up the most page space. Novel, advertisement, manual – each is given new meaning by the act of their combination. The accompanying historical documents serve to make the text itself a historical document, for study and scholarship rather than for empathy or emulation. George Bornstein’s discussion of art museums seems apt, here:

Shearing away the iconic semantics of the original contexts and sites such as museums strengthen the aesthetic aspects of the objects at the expense of their historical and social ones. That is the tendency of all anthologies, whatever their ideological and political orientations (though an anthology of facsimiles might struggle against that tendency).” (52-53 all punctuation *ibid*)

This style of coupling pictures with written text can mediate a reading of that text by directing thematic focus just as Thomson’s pen drawings had done. For instance, in Chapman’s edition, a blueprint of a vicarage becomes the frontispiece for Volume 2, which directs the focus of the reader. Volume 2 thus becomes about the vicarage, and the assessment of its attributes.

Chapman’s inclusion of advertisements and diagrams as “authentic” illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice* structures the act of reading toward a goal of authenticity. By their presence, they imply that their presence is necessary for a correct reading of the

novel. The inclusion of plates from other sources serves to distance the reader, because their inclusion interrupts the novel world with intrusions from the world in which the novel was first read. The plates in the Chapman edition do not participate in the narrative flow of the novel's events. The effect on the reader is one of distance. By interspersing the plates with the written text of the novel, Chapman has provided checks on the possibility of a reader's immersion in the story world in favor of a detached appreciation for it. No longer can a reader identify with the characters through the illustrations because there are no longer any illustrations of the characters. If any self-insertion is to occur on the part of the reader, it must work *against* the distancing effect of the illustrations.

Intriguingly, the plate Chapman uses as the frontispiece for the novel (Figure 5:13) features a drawing style very similar to Thomson's own – there is a lack of detail in the faces, as compared to the clothing, and there are slight situating shadows that are also extant in some of the Thomson illustrations. In this diagram, showing the correct foot placement for a number of dance steps, the full figure is shown, with detailed affect and clothing, yet sketchy, universalized facial features. The diagram, in its original intended use, openly invited self-insertion since the purpose of the diagram was to enable viewers to emulate the dance steps it depicts. When it is removed from that context in order to serve as a frontispiece for *Pride and Prejudice*, instead of teaching the viewer how to dance, it now signals to the viewer that people in the past were the intended audience for this novel, just as people in the past were the intended audience for this diagram. By “accompanying” Austen's novel instead of “illustrating” it, the plates make the novel strange.

They tell the reader, you may think you know the novel but you do not, because you do not know the world into which it was written. Instead of an invitation for the self-insertion into the story world, Chapman's edition can be seen as inviting identification with the first readers of Austen's novel rather than her characters. In his "Notes on the Illustrations," at the end of the volume, Chapman describes the print of Gilpin's *Dove-dale*, inserted into the novel when Elizabeth sees Pemberley for the first time, Chapter 1, Volume III. Chapman notes that,

[t]his view of Dove-dale represents that beautiful scene in a more naked state, than it is described. The bare rock only here is represented; which the spectator's imagination must cloath with wood, to give it compleat beauty. – The fact is, a little gain unluckily arises from dismantling it periodically of it's wood ; and this drawing was made, just after the axe had been at work. (398-399, all punctuation and spelling present in the original)

This passage, and its connection with the scene of Elizabeth viewing Pemberley for the first time, is indicative of Chapman's treating of the novel as a historic artifact. He equates this real (though fictionalized in art) outcropping with one in *Pride in Prejudice*, implying that the novel can be read to learn about England.

Because the pictures Chapman includes are so obviously disparate from the written text of *Pride and Prejudice*, it is easy to see their selection and placement in the novel as editorial acts. They seem of a piece with his other apparatus, like the indexes and notes he explicitly manufactures. However, all the pictures in any edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, whether they follow Chapman's artifact-collecting style or not, can be equally editorial. This example can help illuminate the fact that other instances of illustration of already canonical texts can also be seen as annotating acts.

Chapman's Followers

After the publication of Chapman's edition, there was a boom in the illustration of Austen novels that scattered the uses for Austen across the societal spectrum. At this point, illustrating Austen became not so much a bid for determining the overall meaning of what it meant to read Austen, but rather participation in one of several various readings of Austen available at the time – readings that I will discuss in the following pages.

There were certainly editions of *Pride and Prejudice* published with pictures that indicated the book should be read as part of an appreciation of England's history, but there were also illustrated editions in which the pictures stressed the romantic fairytale aspects of the plot, or the satiric and laughable. There were also luxury editions that could display an owner's wealth and refinement. Editions in all these strains were published at the same time, in the same places, simultaneously, repeatedly, and successfully for many decades.

The editions that followed Chapman's in theme as well as in chronology took British nation-building into account in their inclusion of Jane Austen in the canon, and made their pictures accompany the novel in ways that explicitly annotated the words. The pictures included in these editions of *Pride and Prejudice* support the view of Austen as a national treasure of "England's green and pleasant land" (Blake *Jerusalem*), historicizing her novels as examples of a great nation's literary output. Not all these editions are meant for classroom reading, and not all were published by a major university as Chapman's Oxford edition was. However, these editions all share the characteristics of a book meant to teach its readers to be mindful and celebratory of the historical circumstances of the novel's inception.

In 1945, for instance, Dodd, Mead and Company released an edition of *Pride and Prejudice* in the Chapman vein, “with illustrations of the Jane Austen country.” I think it is noteworthy that by 1945, this method of artifactualizing the novel by inclusion of historical ephemera is so naturalized that there is no editor credited in this edition. The frontispiece of the 1945 Dodd, Mead edition (Figure 5:14) presents a prettified and expanded version of a sketch of the author purportedly drawn by her sister, Cassandra Austen. The new version of the portrait sketch is labeled with Jane Austen’s signature. The reworking of Cassandra Austen’s sketch, coupled with the signature on this page offers the same kind of revisionist anthologizing feel that Chapman’s new catchwords and inclusion of carriage advertisements had created in his edition. Both editions move toward authenticating a new version as a historicized object.

In the 1945 Dodd, Mead edition, a few family sketches and silhouettes of the Austens accompany the text, along with several engravings of empty or near-empty rooms where Jane Austen was said to spend much of her time. Besides the frontispiece “portrait” of the author, there are no detailed faces in any of the plates, and the empty rooms connote nostalgia for Jane Austen’s time rather than an embodiment of the novel-world or characters. In the pictures of empty rooms, they are rooms ostensibly just vacated by the author, rather than rooms vacated by the characters of *Pride and Prejudice*. The plate facing page 80 of this edition shows the room, the desk, the chair, where Jane Austen wrote (Figure 5:15). The writing of the novel rather than the world that it creates is evoked.

Editions that emphasize the historical aspect of the novel’s creation were joined in the marketplace by illustrated editions in which the pictures help place the novel in a

psychological literary context by providing serious works of visual art to accompany the written text. These editions boast illustrations that offer overt commentary on the literary importance and worth of the novel.

In 1929, a mere six years after the first Chapman edition, Peter Davies in London published an edition of *Pride and Prejudice* with illustrations by Vera Willoughby that attempt to resituate representations of gender and sexuality in the novel. Partly because Willoughby was so influenced by Futurism, her illustrations are a departure from the Arts and Crafts inflections of Thomson's lines. In other settings, Willoughby has been praised for "giving complete sexual power to the female figure" (Lodeski 1-2). I do not think she makes the world of *Pride and Prejudice* revolve around female sexual power, but I do think she is presenting sex and sexuality as the motivating factors for the events in the novel. This edition embodies a Futurist reading, as Thomson's edition embodied a late Victorian one. Willoughby's illustrations are not always pictures of the events the characters encounter in the written text, but rather pictures of a subtext. While Chapman's edition and those that follow it enforce a reading of the novel as artifact, Willoughby's illustrations treat it as a psychological novel to be interpreted for a hidden meaning.

The clothing in Willoughby's illustrations is elided with the exposed body parts underneath in a manner reminiscent of the way Futurist art celebrated the human form, by representing bodies made of "muscular surfaces [that] were not only impenetrable and invincible, [but] were also a reassurance of the integrity of the body, a wholeness that defies any threat of metaphoric castration" (Rogoff and Van Leer, 754). For instance, in Willoughby's illustration of the first ball (Figure 5:16), the lines of the men's bodies blur

with the lines of clothing so that muscles and jackets are both essential – and essentially visible – parts of the characters. Willoughby’s human figures, especially the men, are entirely composed of planes. Gone are the delicate outlines reminiscent of fashion plates as offered by Thomson and Brock, or reproduced by dance instructions in Chapman.

Where Thomson’s style was almost entirely outlines, with a minimum of chiaroscuro, Willoughby’s illustrations are basically outline-free. They are, rather, blocks of differently gradated grays, forming musculature and attitude. As J. Hillis Miller posits, “any illustration for the purpose of understanding the invisible idea or ungraspable nature by way of something that may be seen is an abstraction from the whole” (Miller 141).

The Willoughby illustrations abstract the text by trying to make visible an undercurrent of sexuality in the novel. By making the text titillating and suggestive through exposing the characters’ bodies in illustration, the edition with her illustrations makes the novel one about the various necessities of heaving human bodies as they clash against social niceties. Willoughby’s illustrations can be seen as a physical manifestation of baring the psychological interior, since they elide exterior with interior musculature and form. What Gilson calls “a curious, formal style,” in his bibliographical entry on this edition, is one that I see commenting on the sexuality of all the characters, most notably the virility of the men (Gilson 304).

Willoughby combines physicality and physical belongings in the depiction of virility and the motivations of the characters. In Willoughby’s illustrations, there is barely any background at all, and the people seem almost suspended in space. They crowd each other, and the frame of the picture. Furthering the focus on the body, while clothing is made part of the male form, the only setting represented is that which physically touches

a person, for instance when a character is leaning against a mantel or sitting on a bench, only the part of the bench or mantel touching the character will be sketched in. This is not the Victorian “fully humanized space,” but rather humanity at the expense of space.

While the people in Thomson and Brock’s illustrations are slim (even the portly are presented as skinny, but with potbellies) not so in the Willoughby illustrations, where every character is broad – the men huge with muscle and the women rounded and stocky. Bodily display and strength are foregrounded. In her illustration of Lady Catherine telling Elizabeth not to marry Mr. Darcy (Figure 5:17), the size, body type and clothing of the two women are similar. There is little perspective besides that on the curves of the bodies, and foreground and background do not really enter into the composition of the art. In this illustration, for instance, the only indication that the characters are outdoors is the small, abstract leaf pattern in the upper corner. There is no differentiation between caricatures and realistic depictions, no level of detail or size to measure between the faces or bodies of these two characters. There is no universalizing aspect in the vague face of the ingénue for the reader to identify with. Therefore, there is less of a distinction for readers between characters to identify with and characters to hold at a distance, as the bodies of all characters carry the same weight, and the faces of them all seem similarly grave. Rather, the physicality of every character is foregrounded, since Elizabeth, in shadow, is balanced by standing in front of Lady Catherine’s well-lit seat.

The fact that all characters are presented as similarly crowded and similarly structured creates homogeneity within the book world, identifying all of the characters with each other, but none with the reader. This distances the reader in a different way from Chapman’s artifactualizing. These illustrations assert that all the characters are

moving in the same world imbued with sexuality. While Sutherland is no doubt right that written annotation superseded the role of illustration as commentator after the Victorian era, illustration could still serve this purpose for readings like Willoughby's.

Playing Dress-up

Austen started to be read and produced as a popular and canonical author from the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, coinciding with the institutionalization of English studies in British universities. However, it was not until the 1940s that Austen's status as a canonical writer was fully established. Leavis promulgated her canonicity in the literary institution, at a time when Austen's wider cultural popularity was also gaining ground, so it was at this point that Austen was being consolidated as the 'crossover phenomenon' of the literary and popular classic. (Tuite 4)

As Clara Tuite indicates through her use of scare quotes, Austen's role as a crossover phenomenon is problematic. While Jane Austen's popularity may include wildly disparate sectors of society, it is not because those sectors of society agree on what it means to read Jane Austen. In addition to those editions that seem to follow a linear progression from Chapman's artifactualizing tendencies, there were also many editions published in the 1920s and after which did not treat *Pride and Prejudice* as a novel that required study or commentary, but rather as a vehicle for entertainment. I characterize these editions as playing dress-up with the novel. As the rise of cinema challenged the social role of the novel in the early twentieth century, many illustrated editions of *Pride and Prejudice* sold the text as an experience of entertainment on par with the entertainment and glamour of the cinema.

'Jane Austen' signifies as a cultural marker, in addition to connoting both a historical figure and a body of texts produced by that historical figure. Therefore, "[a]ny

reading of Austen is necessarily an encounter with previous readings and with the larger cultural text that is ‘Jane Austen,’” (Tuite 1). This means that a current reader of Jane Austen’s novels has preconceived notions by the time she actually gets to the book, and those notions might be wildly divergent from those of another current reader. While some are prepared to see Jane Austen as a subversive proto-feminist, others assume she is a champion of traditional women’s roles; some see her as a writer of delightful pop culture romance and others as a serious psychological author who revolutionized free indirect discourse. In editions that contain pictures, the illustrations can be an indication of which assumption about Jane Austen that edition is embracing.

Illustrations in different editions of *Pride and Prejudice* bear implications about the changing stakes of the illustrated novel as a form as well as the changing stakes of the author. Illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice* after the 1930s offer much less historical accuracy in the clothing, for instance. This indicates to me that the focus was on amusement and entertainment in some editions, and also that illustrations overall were decreasing in cultural importance. As an appreciation for visual literacy waned, book illustrations were considered less to be comparable to annotations and more to be the purview of children’s literature or coffee table books.

There was historical inaccuracy in the illustrations of the earlier editions. Bentley’s edition of 1833 dressed its Elizabeth and Darcy in the clothing of 1833 for its frontispiece, and Chris. Hammond’s illustrations from 1900 set the clothing around the 1880s. Even Thomson and Brock’s hems are generally a bit too long even though these illustrators were attempting some level of historical accuracy. In a speech to the Jane Austen society, Joan Hassall points out that some anachronism on the part of the

illustrator is unavoidable. She claims that it “is most often to be seen in the ladies’ hairstyles and a general flavour to the type of figure” (Hassall 15). In other cases, the historical inaccuracy can be seen as indicative of a complete lack of interest in illustrating *Pride and Prejudice* as the product of another era, such as in Bentley’s contemporary frontispiece of 1833.

In the post-Chapman era, historical inaccuracies in the illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice* fall into a different category from these earlier examples, however. While earlier examples sometimes seem to be “correcting” the fashions of the Regency era as Thomson’s seem to do, or making the novel contemporary as Bentley’s frontispiece does, the illustrated editions of the 1930s and after generally do not have these goals. They are playing dress-up. In terms of historical accuracy, they acknowledge the Regency era and make it fantastic through their representations – not only their representations of hair and clothing, but also of character and situation.

In an edition from 1962, Bernarda Bryson’s line drawings feature pupil-less eyes on the characters, hats from no known era, and carriages suspended in space. Bryson’s illustration of two ladies in a carriage (Figure 5:18) appears in the novel when Mr. Bennet informs his family that Mr. Collins will be coming for dinner at the beginning of Chapter 13. Both the back wheel and the seating in the carriage seem unsupported. Moreover, this picture has nothing to do with the text next to which it appears, nor could I figure out any event in the novel of which this could ostensibly be an illustration. Rather, Bryson’s pictures attempt merely to evoke a sense of Austen-ness, in this case, a sense of the countryside. The fact that her people have pupil-less eyes, and the carriage seems to float, is not meant to imply that the novel is science fiction, but it does seem to succeed in

placing the novel in an ambiguous utopia: this never could have happened. This edition seems to fulfill Edward Tufte's warning about "content indifference" (Tufte 88) against seeing textual material as merely an aesthetic object and thus losing the sense of it.

Bryson's pictures seem to be interesting, though uninformed, folk art published with the novel, rather than illustrations to it.

In another instance of using Jane Austen to evoke the idea of the countryside, Tuite cites an advertisement for a Navajo print sweater that evokes the experience of curling up with a Jane Austen novel as "a little bit country" (Tuite 15). The Navajo print sweater is somehow supposed to evoke the same kind of country feel as the idea of curling up with a Jane Austen novel. Though obviously worlds away from the intelligent recasting of Austen in a canon-making edition that Thomson and Allen achieved in 1894, The Bryson illustrations and the sweater advertisement each also claim Austen connotes the gentle past in a timeless way.

Fairytale Romance Editions

A 1951 edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, published by the London firm of Macdonald and Co., has seven full-color, full-page plates by Philip Gough. The colors are deeply saturated and the composition of the plates fills all available space. Though the illustrations are lush, the edition itself is modest – it is small, and it is not a presentation copy or a limited edition. The format of the illustrations (filling the whole page, saturated color, swirling lines) makes this edition seem luxurious while scrimping on the cost of other publishing details.

Gough's frontispiece is captioned "I take my leave of you Miss Bennet" in swirling, poorly punctuated letters (Figure 5:19). The frontispiece shows Lady Catherine leaning out of her carriage to tell Elizabeth goodbye, a scene that occurs near the end of the novel. Her carriage is so close to the front door of the house, which is apparently at street level, that she can almost lean into the hall, where Elizabeth stands in a gown with long sleeves and a train even though it is daytime. Elizabeth's hair is down underneath her large bonnet. Two giant pink feathers on Lady Catherine's hat are as long as Elizabeth's torso. These unlikely features serve to set the novel not in the Regency, in fact, in no known era at all, but rather in a fantasy. The scene as pictured is totally implausible in terms of architecture, indoor bonnet wearing and the laws of gravity. The goal of this frontispiece, and of Gough's interior illustrations following it, is not to connote plausibility. The swirling letters and flourishes of the caption and the streaming soft light of the scene add to the feeling of an elaborate dreamscape, which carries over into the reading of the novel itself. It is only the deep saturation of the colors and the wealth implied by the costumes that sets this unreality apart from the fantasy "countryside" of the Bryson illustrations.

Gough's lush illustrations present the characters as living in a timeless fantasy world; thus the reading of the novel in this edition is positioned as escapist entertainment. Illustrations in editions like this one create a focus on the characters' emotions and the romance plot. The lack of referents to a historical period in favor of the appearance of a dreamscape makes it seem like the characters themselves are playing dress-up. No one wears feathers like this, so the lady in the picture must be playing dress-up, and the reader can imagine herself playing dress-up, too. While Thomson's illustrations encouraged

self-insertion on the part of the reader as well, Gough's images make no gesture towards emulating social propriety. Rather, the very fantasy aspects of these editions, which set off the novel from reality, place the characters in a realm of imitate-ability.

Satirical Editions

Another way that editions of *Pride and Prejudice* can present the characters as playing dress-up is by presenting the novel as a comedy of manners, or outright farce. The fairytale style of presentation and the satirical style of presentation often share the characteristic of a disregard of historical markers because illustrating the novel as either fantasy or farce seems to imply that the novel's purpose is escapism. However, the editions that present the novel as a satire or farce remove the likelihood of self-insertion by making all characters laughable.

A particularly snide example of this type of illustration occurs in a 1946 edition published by the World Publishing Company in New York and illustrated by Edgard Cirlin. The Cirlin edition has an introduction by May Lamberton Becker, a children's book reviewer. Becker's introduction says that during the Depression, Cirlin "had a series of experiences ... that seem very amusing now but weren't at the time" (8). She posits that, "from this tough and difficult experience has emerged the delicate, polished, haughty and high-mannered style that distinguishes his book decorations and drawings" (8). This is a type of humor very different from Thomson's gentle wit.

Figure 5:20 shows Cirlin's illustration of Mr. Collins proposing to Charlotte next to his depiction of Elizabeth holding a shocking letter from her sister Jane. While in the written text, Mr. Collins is clearly a fool for considering Charlotte to be a reasonable

substitute for Elizabeth, in Cirlin's drawings, the two women are, in fact, almost interchangeable. Both have the same hairstyle and decoration, the same plucked brows with the original brow line visible, and both wear incredibly similar dresses. Both are made more foolish by their facial expressions, Charlotte's overly bowed smile and Elizabeth's dumbfounded "o".

The dresses are Empire-waisted, and the sleeves are short, but the historical accuracy ends there. The cleavage is pointed and separated and the waists of the skirts are anachronistically clingy, leading to the suspicion that these characters are modern people, playing dress up for fun, probably in fabrics that didn't exist in the Regency. There is even a suggestion of negligée about this kind of bust line attached to the clingy fabric below, especially since it looks like nothing is being worn underneath the skirts.

Cirlin presents all the characters in *Pride and Prejudice*, leads and secondary alike, as caricatures. The reader can feel superior to everybody in the novel world since no characters are portrayed flatteringly or as blank slates. There is no difference between the presentation of characters to identify with and characters to laugh at, as none of them are prettified nor abstracted through a dearth of lines. It seems evident that the goal of this edition is to encourage amusement at the expense of self-insertion. As many lines go into making Elizabeth look silly as go into making Mr. Collins look silly, and all the characters are smiling, almost all the time. The effect is to render the text amused as well as amusing. Cirlin depicts the characters of *Pride and Prejudice* as almost universally amused by their own plot, and the way he draws their clothing seems to support a theory that the characters are play-acting for their own amusement.

Status Symbol Editions

When the edition is extremely expensive, or part of a limited edition, or signed by a famous artist, or all three; then *Pride and Prejudice*, and the ownership thereof, can become a mark of social status. This style of book is often called a presentation copy, and it owes its physical attributes both to gift books of the Victorian era and large, impressive coffee table books of our era.

These editions are not meant to venerate the historical specificity of the novel's first publication, but neither are they meant to provide escapist entertainment. They are meant for display. In presentation copies of *Pride and Prejudice* historical accuracy is employed to serve as part of a status symbol for the owners (I would hesitate to use the word 'readers') of these editions. In these editions of *Pride and Prejudice*, the illustrations often seem influenced by Thomson and Brock for their focus on the figures at the expense of the faces. However, their technical skill is not always matched by a close association between the images and the written text they purport to illustrate. Their characters look healthy, posed, well dressed and interested, but not always emotionally invested in the plot they are supposed to be enacting.

For instance, a blue leather-bound, gold-embossed limited edition of *Pride and Prejudice* has every copy signed by the artist, Robert Ball. It is part of the Doubleday Doran series of limited editions, "illustrated by famous American Artists," as announced on an endpaper. Most of the illustrations in this edition are deeply saturated color plates of single standing figures.⁵² The idea of illustration as portraiture adds to the feeling of the book itself as status symbol. In fact, I have placed Robert Ball's 1945 plate of

⁵² These plates are also accompanied by some very detailed black and white line drawings printed on the pages with written text.

Elizabeth next to a fashion plate from the 1810 edition of Ackermann's Repository in Figure 5:21. The clothing is different, but the head-tilt and foot position, and the implied lighting source are all quite similar. Instead of proposing self-insertion in human interactions, as Thomson's illustrations do, the Ball illustrations propose self-insertion in a fashion plate. This edition presents *Pride and Prejudice* as a book of refined people doing beautiful, wealthy things – things that display their wealth just as the owners of the volume can display their own wealth through their ownership of this volume. The presentation copy itself is an accessory, since the owner of the copy can carry it, display it or refer to ownership of it in the real world.

The use of Jane Austen for a limited edition like this depends on her canonicity, but it also depends on a willingness to subvert the primacy of the written text in the deluxe edition. An edition like this upsets the general theory of illustration as supplemental material, secondary to the written text. Phillip James, writing in 1947, believed that publishers of his era, when deciding to produce an illustrated edition, would,

choose familiar texts on which the publisher and the professional typographer [would] build a book in which pride of place is given to the illustrations ... [which] makes for a large format more suited to the lap than the pocket, and so it becomes a picture book to be looked at rather than read. (James 9)

The edition of *Pride and Prejudice* with Robert Ball's illustrations is certainly a book "built" from a familiar written text to showcase illustrations. Indeed the ungainly size of the book and the font size chosen for the written text each indicate that this presentation copy is not for reading, but instead for looking at the pictures, and for owning. In status

symbol editions, the written text is even sometimes in double columns, while the pictures are well spaced on much finer glossy inserted paper.

The experience of looking at the book becomes like the experience of flipping through a glossy fashion magazine – the words can be assumed to cover standard, known topics, while the pictures convey the fresh, interesting information to the reader. Both pictures and words reinforce identification with the genteel aspects of the content of the written text, on the part of the owner of the book. In other words, the assumption may be that this book will be flipped through fondly, the pictures dwelled upon, and the written text used merely for reference.

The Field Now

The editions of *Pride and Prejudice* I have examined suggest to me that the directions in which a reading of *Pride and Prejudice* may be led are legion. While the Chapman edition emphasized the time that had passed between the initial publication of the novel and his 1923 edition by treating it as a historical artifact, other editions collapse the time between Austen and now by playing dress-up in the illustrations instead of historicizing. The snide Cirlin edition (1946), the historicizing Dodd, Mead “Jane Austen country” edition (1945), and the deluxe artist edition with illustrations by Robert Ball (1945), were all published in the United States, and all within two years of each other. Yet, these are three very different ways to illustrate Jane Austen. The disparate modes of illustration in these editions convey the need for different readings of Jane Austen in that moment.

The variety of illustrated editions makes the versatility of *Pride and Prejudice* manifest; *Pride and Prejudice* exists in both heritage and history: actual past events cannot be changed, but the cultural past (remembered and alluded to) can evolve to suit the needs of the present generation. Not only in different choices of subject, but in different styles and modes of inclusion, illustrations can modify readings of the novel. As Kathryn Sutherland argues about annotations, so too can be argued for illustrations: “[d]ifferent annotations produce different texts because they make the ‘same text’ (only ever in illusion the same) available in different ways, to different readings” (Sutherland 47). The publication history of illustrated editions of *Pride and Prejudice* is itself legible, and it can be arrayed to show strains of publishing intent (Appendix 2), embracing the many possible readings of, and uses for, Jane Austen starting with George Allen and Hugh Thomson’s impressive illustrated edition of 1894.

Postscript

The four illustration models applied to the present day

In the last century, illustrations in fiction have become increasingly the purview of children's literature. This may be because as literacy became more widespread, visual or picture literacy started to be seen as a stepping stone to written literacy, or a crutch for those not fully literate. Thus, instead of seeing the ability to read images as a sister art to the ability to read words, picture literacy of the kind necessary to truly read Hogarth's prints became discounted. In the twentieth century, picture literacy has been considered suitable primarily for children who did not yet know how to read words particularly well, or as a poor substitute for reading long written texts. Charles Hatfield notes that comics, the supreme narrative combination of words and images in our society, have suffered the brunt of this lack of respect. In the 1970s,

teachers began guardedly endorsing comics as a means of reaching the 'reluctant' or disabled reader; this is an endorsement still founded on the assumption that comics' visual/verbal nature makes them easier to read ... and that the images in comics function either as crutches or distractions to the novice reader and are of little value in themselves. (Hatfield 363-364)

However, the last few decades have witnessed a rise in the clout and quality of literary graphic novels intended for readership of all ages. Thus, the status of pictures and words in literary combination is no longer univalent. On one hand, extremely advanced levels of visual literacy may be necessary to negotiate the pages of a graphic novel by Alan Moore or Grant Morrison, but on the other hand, pictures may still be discounted as a crutch for reluctant readers if they appear to be merely supplementary material in young adult novels. Sherman Alexie's award-winning *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-time*

Indian, for instance, has a protagonist who draws cartoons. Some of the cartoons ostensibly drawn by the character appear as illustrations for the book. The School Library Journal review for the book declares that “[r]eluctant readers can even skim the pictures and construct their own story based exclusively on Forney’s illustrations” (quoted on fallsapart.com).

Because of the ambivalent status of illustrations in current publishing practice, the image on the book cover is now often the only image associated with written fiction (unless there is a movie version), and the cover image acts as both marketing and packaging in addition to encouraging a specific reading. While the technologies associated with book production have changed at least as much as the market factors that shape the inclusion of illustrations, it is still the case that pictures associated with a written narrative can affect that novel differently depending on the relationship of the author and the illustrator. The models of illustration I have proposed in this dissertation – integration, single-creator, collaboration, and mediation – can be applied to current graphic novels, children’s books, and book covers as well as illustrated novels of the Victorian era. In this postscript, I will briefly examine the integration model as it applies to the way that Alan Moore worked with Eddie Campbell on the graphic novel *From Hell*; the single creator model as it applies to Jeff Smith, author and artist for *Bone*; the collaboration model as it applies to the partnership between Holly Black and Tony DiTerlizzi for all aspects of the creation of their children’s series *The Spiderwick Chronicles*; and the mediation model as it applies to the work of various artists and designers of book cover illustrations on current editions of *Pride and Prejudice*.

Integration Model

Today, most mainstream comics creators follow the integration model of word and picture combination. Like a movie, comics start with a script, and after the author produces the script it is passed off to an illustrator, who houses the words in images. In mainstream comics creation, the script might go from the author to the publisher, who supplies it with an artist who lays out the page and sketches out the images in pencil, then to an inker, who traces and finalizes the pencil work, and finally to a letterer who provides the visible version of the written text indicated several steps ago by the author. Comics authors vary in how much direction they give artists in their scripts, and the artists approach the completed script and give the words the pictorial housing they are intended to fill.

Alan Moore, the award-winning author of *Watchmen*, *V for Vendetta* and many other graphic novels and comic books, is particularly detailed in his instructions to the artists he works with. Reminiscent of Dickens' instructions to his illustrators, the scripts Moore passes on to his artists are full of lengthy description and possibly un-illustratable nuance. This style of script writing puts Moore's artists in the role of graphic interpreter. They must translate the descriptions in his script, a private written text, into visual comic book panels. The reading public will see the public written text of the words in the comic as part of the image the artist creates from the private written text. The act is one of translation: the pictures are directed in the author's words and the visual artist must turn those words into a picture. The reading public is then presented with the visual version of the words of the author.

From Hell is an apt example of the integration model, not because I believe its creation was markedly different from other graphic novels begun by Moore, but because it offers meticulously documented correspondence with commentary from both the author and artist.⁵³ *From Hell* tells the story of Jack the Ripper, combining the conspiracy theories expounded by Stephen Knight in *Jack The Ripper: The Final Solution*, with details supplied by other Ripperologists. In *From Hell*, physician William Gull is the culprit, and the murders of several prostitutes serve the dual purpose of covering up a royal scandal and performing dark ritual magic linked to Gull's Masonic order.

This graphic novel had a clear political goal in its inception. In her essay "Postimperial Landscapes 'Psychogeography' and Englishness in Alan Moore's Novel *From Hell: A Melodrama in Sixteen Parts*," Elizabeth Ho notes that "[t]he nineteenth century depicted in *From Hell* is a deliberate attempt to intervene in [Thatcherite] celebratory misreadings of the Victorian" (Ho 107). Moore had been concerned with the co-opting of Jack the Ripper as an entertaining part of British culture and history. In *From Hell*, he seeks to undo some of the whitewashing of history apparent to him in his contemporary England. The issues of appearances and reading addressed by the graphic novel are connected to the project of exposing the underbelly of revisionist history.

As Mary Olson has noted in her study of manuscript illuminations, the events in a narrative are imbued with a kind of causal importance just by being included in that narrative. The creation of a national heritage can be seen in a similar light. The events a

⁵³ The process of creating *From Hell* was also more streamlined than comics creation is generally because instead of working with a publisher who coordinated all aspects of the product, acting as an intermediary between "talents," the author approached and corresponded directly with the artist. In this way, their interactions were like Dickens' instructions to Browne.

culture chooses to highlight in its own history will be the ones that people will associate with a chronological, cause and effect teleology for that culture's advances or decline. In *From Hell*, Moore and Campbell make visible and legible the particular aspects and moments of English history and heritage they wish to highlight, through emphasizing issues of reading and appearances.

For instance, Moore makes the ability to read London itself the crux of understanding the crimes. In the scene where Gull appropriates control over his coachman, Netley, in order to get his help in committing the murders, he does so by touring London landmarks with Masonic importance with Netley. In this part of the story, Gull is literally teaching Netley to read the city around him, and Moore has documented the difficulty he faced in finding buildings at the appropriate distances on the real map of London to accommodate the geographical formation of a Masonic star (Figure 6:1). Netley and the reader both learn that the ability to read the city in this way is not indulging in subtext but rather participating in a particularly elite form of cultural literacy. London's map is visible to all, but only interpretable by a select few.

Reading the city itself is not the only form of cultural literacy foregrounded in *From Hell*. Moore and Campbell also incorporate historically significant reproduced images, such as prints by Tenniel, Hogarth and Blake. These prints sometimes appear on the pages of the graphic novel as entire panels and therefore part of the narrative, sometimes framed on the walls behind the characters as part of the setting of the narrative. Chapter 5 of *From Hell* opens with Tenniel's "The Nemesis of Neglect" from *Punch*, September 29 with full credit attributed. The print and its border takes up the entire page that opens the chapter and the caption of the image seems to place it as a

historical document sharing space with the main narrative, turning the main narrative into a sort of historical document itself.

Unlike the historicizing plates inserted into Chapman's edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, however, this is not the only way reproduced images are used in *From Hell*. In contrast to this use for a reproduced image, the bottom panel of page 15 in Chapter 9 is a detail of a sketch by William Blake, un-remarked, but undoubtedly in his style. The same image is later used narratively in Chapter 14 on pages 16 and 17, as William Blake appears in the narrative, sketching the image of which we have already seen a detail. Similarly, the bottom panel of Chapter 9 page 16 is a detail of a print by Hogarth, that later appears in its totality framed on the wall behind some of Moore's characters on page 17 of Chapter 12. The inclusion and repetition of cultural signifiers of reproduced art saturates the story with "authentic" visual input and historically accurate references, while it also marks a rhythmic repetition that reinforces the patterns of the occult rituals important to the story.

As becomes clear from the records of both Moore and Campbell, the inclusion of these images was meticulously planned and considered. The publication process of *From Hell* offers a rich and dense record of the interactions between the two men. Moore provides two appendices to the bound volume version of *From Hell*, which detail the research and verifiability of the contents of each page, and his thoughts and experiences of Ripperologists. He also includes some notes about his interactions with Campbell as the book grew, for instance remarking that "[t]he character and temperament of Victoria here is entirely my own interpretation, and has indeed been the subject of debate between myself and the otherwise genial and agreeable Mr Campbell of Brisbane, Australia"

(Appendix 1, page 4). Later in the same appendix, he writes, “I have decided to ignore the increasingly surly protests of my co-author, Brisbane’s own Mr Campbell, and make Victoria herself the instigator of events” (Appendix 1, page 9). Referring to Campbell as his co-author is merely a conceit, since Moore can so summarily dismiss Campbell’s objections to the portrayal of Queen Victoria. Ho’s assessment of *From Hell* as “Moore’s version” of the Jack the Ripper killings, with “Eddie Campbell’s illustrations” (Ho 99) seems appropriate, regardless of Moore’s own word choice to describe the combination of their work.

Campbell, himself the author as well as the artist for many successful graphic novels, actually took on the publishing duties for *From Hell* for a time. These varied professional experiences give him a unique outlook on working with Moore, interpreting Moore’s ideas from verbal to visual form. Campbell discusses his experiences of illustrating and publishing *From Hell* in his blog, *The Fate of the Artist*. Several years after the initial publication of *From Hell*, Campbell posted several pages of Moore’s raw script, with Campbell’s own commentary on how he translated Moore’s private written text into visual, publishable public form. Campbell notes that page descriptions from Moore often went on for more than a thousand words of description for a few panels.

Campbell writes of his “favorite” of Moore’s panel descriptions, “[w]hy is it my favorite? Not because it inspired great drawing, but perhaps because so much of it is beyond illustration.” (*Artist* 9 Jan. 2007) – and this observation is hardly unique to that one favorite panel. Consider an excerpt from another panel description from Moore, reminiscent of Dickens’ instructions to Browne:

CHAPTER 5 PAGE 22 PANEL1⁵⁴

... WE RETURN TO GULL AND NETLEY, THE LAUREL AND HARDY OF SERIAL MURDER, AS THEY PROGRESS THROUGH THE EAST END. ... IN THIS FIRST SILENT PANEL WE HAVE A LONG SHOT OF THE DARK BULK OF THE COACH AS IT CREAKS AND RATTLES THROUGH THE MIASMAL BLACKNESS, ONLY JUST DISCERNABLE TO US AS A RECOGNIZABLE HORSE AND CARRIAGE. OTHERWISE, IT IS JUST A VAGUE AND THREATENING MASS TRUNDLING AWAY FROM US THROUGH THE NARROW STREETS. A SINGLE COACH LAMP BURNING DIMLY AND BALEFULLY INSIDE IT

No dialogue.” (Posted in *Artist*, 11 Feb. 2007)

Of course Campbell realizes the impossibility of indicating that a lamp is burning balefully, as well as the impossibility of making the coach creak and rattle in a silent panel. In his blog series on working with Moore, he documents the ways in which he struggled with these un-depictable instructions, and justifies his decisions about how to depict characters in order to convey a specific tone and theme. For instance, regarding the placement of a character in another panel, he notes: “I asked Alan to let me try putting her square in the picture, albeit with her back to us, and trust the reader's intelligence to figure it out. I was happy with the results and so was Alan.” (*Artist* 20 Dec. 2006) He also ruminates on his own fitness for illustrating such an unusual graphic novel. He writes, “[i]n retrospect I think the loose way that I draw is perhaps what made me the ideal artist, if I may say so, for the depiction of so many people walking about only in the realm of hypothesis” (*Artist* 20 Dec. 2006). In addition to Campbell’s willingness to work with the impossible illustrating tasks set him by Moore, the thematic appropriateness of his drawing style also suited him to this book.

Readers see the results of his labors to depict mood as well as content by employing different artistic methods throughout the story. In addition to incorporating

⁵⁴ Moore writes his scripts with descriptions in all caps, and dialogue in lowercase.

historically significant images, Campbell himself uses a variety of different drawing styles to emphasize different thematic elements at play. For instance, pages 4 through 9 of Chapter 5 alternate between two morning scenes in long silent panels (Figure 6:2). William Gull wakes in a soft bed while a bedless prostitute wakes from where she has been suspended with rope to allow her to sleep upright. In this sequence, Campbell has used a stylistic contrast that emphasizes the different lives of the two people waking up and then going about their morning routines. Each aesthetic is consistent with an illustration style of the 1880s. The soft and smooth world of Gull, full of comforts, is depicted in the style of a darkplate, evoking impressionistic watercolor. Conversely, the hard alleyways of the other end of London are depicted in the style of a scratchy steel plate, emphasizing hard and sharp angles and a lack of blending. The different styles of depiction are appropriate to the different content, though in both cases evocative of styles current to the time depicted.

A notable difference between Moore and Dickens in their interactions with their artists is that Moore seems to respect the decisions of Campbell much more than Dickens did Browne. Sometimes Campbell diverges from Moore's instructions:

Alan asks for eight panels and I made it nine; he also asks for an intercut of an earlier image from chapter two of the boy Gull holding the dead rat in his hand and dissecting it with his pocket knife, but I felt that offering an escape from the oppressing horror of the moment, whether as a flashback or into the mind of the murderer, might weaken the scene.
(*Artist* 21 Apr. 2007)

In fact, sometimes Moore himself cedes authority over the inception of the images (though, not, we imagine, over their final form) to Campbell:

[regarding Chapter 4, page 23]
"I DON'T KNOW IF THIS RELENTLESS AND LIMITED SERIES OF IMAGES (LONGSHOTS OF THE COACH, FRONT REAR AND

PROFILE; CLOSE UP OF GULL AND NETLEY FRONT REAR AND PROFILE) IS ENOUGH TO HANG THE STRIP ON VISUALLY, AND I SUPPOSE I WON'T KNOW UNTIL YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO READ THE THING AND GET BACK TO ME. BASICALLY, IF THERE IS ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK MIGHT WORK VISUALLY, THEN TRY IT. (Posted in *Artist* 19 Jan. 2007)

The level of decision-making responsibility that Moore grants to Campbell, then, does not seem out of line with the freedom Dickens allowed some of his illustrators, such as Cattermole or Maclise. Though the level of autonomy for the artist might shift from situation to situation, Moore's method of instructing his illustrator as the written text is being produced makes the construction of *From Hell* an example of the integration model of illustration.

Single Creator Model

There has been a recent rise in respect for graphic novels, as evidenced by a sudden boom in books and journals about comics and graphic narrative in and out of academia. Personal narratives written and drawn by one person have been at the forefront of the increase in cultural cachet for comics. Graphic novels such as *Fun Home* by Alison Bechdel, *Persepolis* by Marjane Satrapi and *Blankets* by Craig Thomson each tell autobiographical coming of age stories in the graphic medium. Graphic memoirs are often breathtaking in their seeming ability to offer perfectly formed windows into a personal narrative and they have been essential in moving associations of graphic narrative away from superhero comics. However, unfortunately, as memoirs they do not really fit into my discussion of how pictures and words can combine in the creation of fiction.

Fictional narratives in single-creator comics are actually much rarer than memoirs.⁵⁵ The award winning graphic novel *Bone* by Jeff Smith is an exception – a complete, coherent fictional narrative in graphic form, created entirely by one person.⁵⁶ Originally published by the author himself, the story has seen print in various incarnations, including single issues, different combinations of issues as collections, a single volume of over 1300 pages, and then a reformatted series of nine books, smaller and with the addition of color. Like *Vanity Fair*, *Bone* was released serially, and the author was writing it as it was being released. Smith commented on the particularities of publishing serially in an interview with *The Onion*'s "AV Club" section in 2000:

the interesting thing about doing comic books that come out as a serial [is that e]very time an issue comes out, there's this communal discussion of the issue on the Internet and in the letters, and it's a very different way of progressing in your story than just doing a novel and putting it out.
(Smith)

Thus, though Smith was the single creator, he acknowledges a wide range of influences while he wrote. Circulation of the single issues grew quickly. *Bone* and Smith both won several industry awards. In 1994 alone, "*BONE* won four Eisner Awards, and three Harvey Awards" ("*Bone* History," *Boneville*). Overall, *Bone* and Jeff Smith together have

⁵⁵ The exception to this rule is in webcomics. The comics-creation field online is different from the field on paper. There are now several webcomics by single creators that tell long-running, fictional narratives. In fact, I would venture to guess that single-creator webcomics vastly outnumber webcomics created by more than one person in partnership.

⁵⁶ Though *Bone* was never a webcomic, it did profit from new internet technology. As mentioned on the robust fan site *Boneville*,

[g]rass root support for *BONE* started on the Internet. It was one of the first comics to benefit from the new network of comics web chat rooms that were springing up all over the globe. For the first time in history, 'word-of-mouth' could spread around the world at the speed of light.
(*"Bone* History," *Boneville*)

won industry awards “totaling 44 so far; including 10 Eisner Awards and 11 Harvey Awards, more than any other comic in history” (“*Bone History*,” *Boneville*).

Bone presents many similarities and parallels with *Vanity Fair*. It uses different styles of art to create an immersive world,⁵⁷ and it blends a small domestic story with a large world-changing war. Charles Hatfield calls *Bone* “an acclaimed blend of humor and epic fantasy” (Hatfield 362), and Jeff Mason, the publisher of *Indy Magazine* notes that *Bone* has “all of the emotional and psychological heft of Ingmar Bergman’s masterpiece *The Seventh Seal* with the flight and whimsy of *The Wizard of Oz*” (“Reviews,” *Boneville*). In *Bone*, it is clear that Smith considers the blend of humor and epic, and the blend of heft and whimsy to be the merging of two different styles of story. In their combination, the two provide layer and nuance to the larger story, and context to the smaller one. *Bone* could not exist without this interaction, and the differences between the types of stories he tells, shape the art styles he combines.

When the story opens, readers meet the three Bone cousins (Figure 6:3), who have been tossed out of Boneville. When they get lost and separated, they end up in a lush valley full of monsters, dragons, talking animals and mysterious humans who turn out to be on the eve of a massive war with an unseen satanic figure. The evil overlord wants to claim the valley, which, we learn, would turn the entire world into a nightmare earth. The Bone family ends up helping to defend the valley, and thus helping to save the world for humanity. After meeting the Bone family, readers are introduced to many

⁵⁷ Unlike, the production of the images in *Vanity Fair*, Smith uses the same methods to produce his different styles of images. He notes that his materials are “[t]wo-ply Bristol board, plate finish, pencil, and [...] a Number 1 horse hair brush dipped in India ink: I just use that one size brush. Pretty straightforward when it comes to that.” (Smith Interview. *Sardinian Connection*) He also does his own inking.

animals and monsters. The Bone creatures are rounded and unrealistic. They have expressive eyebrows and doughy hands. Like early Disney cartoons, they can pull apples out of unseen pockets, and their jaws can drop comic distances to indicate reactions to events. Of the three Bone characters, one wears a shirt, one a vest and one nothing at all unless he is in costume. It becomes a running gag that Smiley, who wears the vest, feels naked and exposed without it.

The story goes on for several issues before we meet a human character. When Thorn is introduced, readers realize that the drawing style of the Bone family is not indicative of humanity per se in this epic (Figure 6:8). In contrast with the Bone characters, even though the human protagonist Thorn has improbably large hair and slightly exaggerated features, her appearance is very human, as is that of her family and villagers. Her nose is in proportion with her eyes; her hands and feet seem appropriately sized. She is clothed unless bathing. She can only produce objects she is visibly carrying, such as in a backpack or attached to her belt. Apparently, the rules of her depiction are different from those governing the Bone family.

Though they follow different rules of cartoon depiction, the interactions between the human characters and those from Boneville also remain consistent. Smith has commented that that he looks

at the world of *Bone* as one that's in motion. I don't think of it as a separated-out, drawn-frame-by-frame comic. I think the characters are really moving. When I want to set the timing up, I try to make it look like the frames are just little boxes up above that we're looking through into the world, and they just have to move. So the timing has to be the same comic timing you would have comic actors use. It's not funny if it doesn't snap, you know? (Smith, AV Club)

Smith's perspective indicates that the Bone characters and the human characters really are two different types of people in the narrative, rather than mere differences of representation.

There are other examples of comics artists using different illustration techniques to depict characters in different ways. For instance, in the Japanese comic style manga, sometimes characters will be displayed as smaller, rounded "chibi" versions of themselves, to convey a strong emotion hidden in the main drawing (Figure 6:5). Alternatively, in some western contemporary comics, depiction is used to signal differences of perception. For instance, in *Bottomless Bellybutton* by Dash Shaw, the youngest son in a human family appears to have the head of a frog. It is very late in the story when he explains to his girlfriend that this is how he feels his family sees him. Readers realize only then that he has been depicted in the image he feels he presents to others.

In *Bone*, the Bone cousins are different characters rather than perceived self-identities or chibi versions of the more realistically drawn characters (Figure 6:6). In fact, in Smith's epic, different drawing styles indicate different styles of narration and different types of narrative intersecting. In the panel reproduced in Figure 6:7, the smooth, bold lines of the Bone cousins depict a simple sadness that seems out of place in the detailed room, where Thorn is comforted by her friend Lucius. Notably, the humans here have the same level of markings as the room they are in, while the Bone family do not. The Bones are part of a small, domestic, local story that actually seems fairly modern: Phoncible P. Bone is a con man who got run out of town with his cousins after his bid for mayor goes awry. Thorn and her grandmother, however, are the heroes of a

massive world origin story, fighting a war to defend humanity itself, incorporating a spiritual belief system, magical objects, and dragons. The Bone cousins get caught up in this larger tale, where they feel out of place, just as their depiction seems out of place in their surroundings in this panel.

Smith has remarked that he originally thought of the Bone characters when he was in kindergarten, as “these three little Warner Bros./Disney-type characters who had adventures in their little world. They had relationships with each other that are pretty much the same relationships they have now.” (Smith AV Club). The larger war story, including the more realistically drawn characters, grew around the Bone cousins much later. When he started actually writing *Bone*, Smith approached the introduction of the characters to the readers in much the same way that he had conceived of them:

If I'd started *Bone* and said, "This is going to be a giant epic," people would be like, "Do I really want to get into that?" So I intentionally backed up and said, "I'll start with just the Bones, with simple Disney- and Uncle Scrooge-type adventures. We'll just proceed and let the characters fall into the adventure, just the way you fall into your adventures in real life. (Smith AV Club)

Smith's use of different styles of depiction to connote the intersection of different types of narrative means that his method of story-telling does not adhere to the separation of functions for words and images. Rather, the pictures can function on several different registers at once and he can employ both signs and designs in several multivalent ways to make meaning.

Collaboration Model

While graphic novels have been gaining prestige over the past few decades, other styles of book illustration, such as wordless pictures coupled with paragraphs of written prose, are generally now considered to be “kids’ stuff.” There are now even publishing guidelines for illustrated texts aimed at different ages of readers. Children are first introduced to books with few or no words, in which pictures comprise the sole focal point. Then they are graduated to “chapter books,” the designation for easy to read books with limited vocabulary, in which the written text is divided into chapters. From then on, illustration is supposed to decrease in importance.

Holly Black has informed me that at one point during the publishing process of the *Spiderwick Chronicles* series, she had been asked to change the words in one of the *Spiderwick* books to account for a discrepancy between word and picture. It was explained to her that these books are targeted towards children ages six to ten. At this age, children are weaned away from dependence on pictures for plot, and learn instead to rely more on words. A discrepancy between word and picture would be confusing and inappropriate in an illustrated chapter book for this age range. In a picture book for very young readers, however, the readable content of illustrations is seen as vital supplemental information to the sparse written text because the ability to accurately observe makes the new reading experience a rewarding one.

In the English-speaking world, an author of a children’s book will generally hand over his or her manuscript to a publisher and may have no say at all in whether (much less how or by whom) the written text gets illustrated. For instance, author J.K. Rowling has noted that the illustrations by American Mary Grand Pre are her favorites out of the

many Harry Potter illustrations to all the various national editions. However, Rowling had no input in assigning Grand Pre to this job.

Conscious deliberate collaboration between author and illustrator is rare, and to be celebrated when it occurs. Illustrator Tony DiTerlizzi and author Holly Black conceived the contemporary bestsellers *The Spiderwick Chronicles* jointly. Richard Helm notes that Black's "collaboration on *Spiderwick* with DiTerlizzi, an award-winning artist, seems all but preordained. At their first meeting, the two found they had a mutual weakness for Dungeons and Dragons and fantasy folklore." (I12). The two became good friends and developed the premise of the *Spiderwick* series jointly because they were actively seeking a project on which to collaborate. They worked with each other closely at every step of the process, to the extent that DiTerlizzi's name appears above Black's on the cover of the books, and reviewers consider their collaboration to be co-authorship (Helm I12).

DiTerlizzi describes the book series as "an experiment in true collaboration. Holly and I would discuss in detail the best way to tell the story, and, at the end of the day, she would go off and actually write the story and I would draw the illustrations" (Interview Simon & Schuster. Web). Consequently, the words and pictures work together beautifully, as both DiTerlizzi and Black are masters of their crafts and good at working with others.

The five-book series tells the story of the Grace children, who move to a crumbling family estate in New Jersey with their mother after their father leaves the family. There they discover an old manuscript book titled *Arthur Spiderwick's Field Guide to the Fantastical World Around You*, detailing the faerie presence in the neighborhood. The main character, Jared, is a troublemaker. He; his twin brother, the

gentler, animal-loving Simon; and Mallory, their fierce fencer older sister; must defend each other and their mother as the various faerie populations in the area – goblins, elves, dwarves – try to remove the book from human influence. The series culminates with a battle against Mulgarath, a shape-shifting ogre who wants to use the information in the book to destroy other faeries as well as humans. The Grace children and their few faerie allies win this battle, and the elves decide that rather than destroy the *Guide*, they will entrust the Grace children with keeping it safe. The series addresses issues of interpreting visual evidence, both of human and faerie activities. DiTerlizzi refers to his own illustrations as “windows for me to create pictures and visuals to help the reader become immersed in the world and understand what's happening in the story,” and Black notes that “the strength of fantasy is that it allows you to take something that's going on — something that you're feeling or experiencing — and look at it from a different direction” (Interview with *Scholastic Parent and Child*).

In the *Spiderwick Chronicles*, Jared takes the lead with his sister and brother in dealing with the faeries that threaten them or bargain with them for the book. His leadership role is determined by his powers of observation and interpretation. In fact, he has the ability to look at his situation from a different direction that Black characterizes as the strength of fantasy. It is Jared who first observes that the home of a brownie in their walls is “too weird” to be simply a squirrel’s nest when the children find it in the first book (*Black Field Guide* 22). Over the course of the five books, Jared starts to practice drawing so that he can add his new discoveries to the field guide himself, and his troublemaker status is replaced with that of a responsible leader.

The theme of correct looking and seeing is made even more overt in the second book, *The Seeing Stone*, when a monocle-like contraption featuring a rock with a hole in it allows Jared to see the faeries that are generally invisible to human eyes. As the one with the most knowledge about the faerie world, he wears the lens, even though his older sister Mallory is armed with her fencing sword and could help defend the siblings better if she could see the threats to them (66). Later in this book, a hobgoblin spits in the eye of all the Grace children, granting them faerie sight. As Lewis and Kahn note in “Exopedagogies and the Utopian Imagination: A Case Study in Faery Subcultures,” any attempt to engage with fey on their own terms is an effort to “legitimate indigenous and mythical forms of knowing the world” (Lewis and Kahn, no page numbers). Jared Grace becomes a character who is celebrated and respected for his ways of knowing differently.

In the third book, *Lucinda’s Secret*, the children start to doubt Arthur Spiderwick’s character when they learn that he had suddenly abandoned his wife and child, never to return. Armed with this knowledge, Jared starts to interpret the portrait of Arthur in their home differently:

Jared glanced over at the painting of Arthur hanging on the wall. He didn’t even *look* nice to Jared any more. The Arthur in the painting was thin-lipped with a crease between his brows that Jared now figured was annoyance. He was probably thinking about leaving his family even then. (56, italics *ibid*)

The picture DiTerlizzi provides of Jared looking at Arthur’s portrait echoes the one that opens the first book of the series. The face of Arthur does not look different in the two illustrations, which are shown side by side in Figure 6:8. Rather, it is the context in which Jared is looking at the portrait that has changed his interpretation. Jared and his siblings eventually discover that Arthur had not meant to abandon his family. Instead, he had been

held against his will by the elves for several decades. In this series, drawing conclusions about human actions is as fraught with possible error as drawing conclusions about faerie evidence.⁵⁸

The paratext of the *Spiderwick* series also encourages active perceiving of the images in the book. Facing page 13 of the fourth book, *The Ironwood Tree*, DiTerlizzi has included depictions of Black and himself in a crowd scene. The small figures are instantly recognizable to those who know author and illustrator, but the book series sold over a million copies, and it is likely that not all the readers would recognize the line drawings of Black and DiTerlizzi. Luckily, this bit of authorial insertion is repeated overtly at the very end of the fifth book *The Wrath of Mulgarath*, where there appear labeled author portraits. The labeling of the portraits at the end of the series means that rereading as well as preliminary scrutiny of the illustrations will be rewarded. Below Black's picture, extra paratextual material extols the virtue of learning more about the faerie world: "So keep your eyes open./And when you see it, do choose it!/Because knowledge is good. ... /Just beware how you use it" (unnumbered).

The books have been wildly successful, and the successes build upon each other. The vast and growing paratextual apparatus surrounding *The Spiderwick Chronicles* provides multilayered ways for the stories to integrate into a child's life. The books were originally published in small hardbacks with waxed covers in rich dark colors, and

⁵⁸ In another scene that emphasizes the importance of scrutinizing visual evidence, the last chapter of the last book, *The Wrath of Mulgarath* opens with a scene of the family reading letters and cleaning up after the faerie destruction of the battle that has just occurred. "All that might have seemed normal" Black notes (119), if it were not for the fact that a hobgoblin and a brownie were also in the room, playing checkers. Clearly the message is that you need to look at the whole picture.

ragged-cut pages. This packaging, partially designed by DiTerlizzi himself, was both attractive and classic feeling.

The conceit for this book series is that the Grace children contacted Black and DiTerlizzi after a book signing in order to tell them about their strange experiences, to warn the rest of the world about the threats posed by the faerie world to humans. The front matter of the first book contains a glossy frontispiece of the house where the story occurs, and a letter from Black explaining how the Grace children approached DiTerlizzi and her, setting the story in the real world. A “reproduction” of the letter from the Grace children to Black and DiTerlizzi follows. The letters are joined by other plates that purport to offer documenting evidence, such as a map of the Spiderwick Estate and surrounding areas, and in later books in the series, both a sketch by Jared himself, and a copy of the expulsion letter Jared receives.

The framing paratextual material in the story world itself creates a narrative frame that shapes how readers see and understand the book. All of these “documents” in the space of the first edition of *Book 1: The Field Guide* reinforce the world building aspects of the story, and all have been joined by a much wider paratext in society at large. Since the book series’ initial success, there has been a movie version, a Playstation 2 game, MacDonald’s’ happy meal toys based on the characters, and “[t]o date, the *Spiderwick* canon has been translated into 32 languages” (Helm I12). Black and DiTerlizzi have also collaborated on various tie-in products, such as journals, and now, they have co-created a second series of four books, *Beyond the Spiderwick Chronicles*. The book series that deals with observation, and about applying knowledge, has grown and become a cultural

signifier itself. This is fitting, since the conceit was that the Grace children wanted to world to know about the faeries they encountered: now the world knows.

Ultimately, the books argue that magic is just another aspect of life. Faeries exist, Black argues, not as a sweet respite from the world, but rather as a way of interacting with its troubles. “There are no foxholes, or even faery portals . . . in which one can find shelter from today’s perpetual war and be liberated from life’s contradictions” (Lewis and Kahn). In the *Spiderwick Chronicles*, Black and DiTerlizzi’s arts work together in collaboration to convey that when Jared’s life gets better, it is not because magic exists, but because he learns to read it correctly.

Mediation through Packaging

Perhaps the simplest contemporary example of mediating an established text by use of images is the book cover, an image that serves to both package and advertise the text within. While the image on the cover might mediate expectations of the book, it cannot mediate the actual reading experience with the same consistency granted to the interior illustrations. However, the interplay between word and picture that happens in interior illustrations can happen on the cover as well. Today, the look of the packaging is often the most calculated aesthetic choice in book production. The pervasive current practice of re-branding books by packaging them with different covers is indeed a way to mediate a reader’s access to a book through images.⁵⁹ The book cover presents the book as a commodity, creating implications for the book as an object. A book can be bought

⁵⁹ The other common way that canonical fiction becomes associated with images is through movie versions. The “Now a Major Motion Picture” declaration on book covers links these two phenomena nicely.

and sold, held, borrowed and displayed as well as read, and the style and subject matter of the cover art will signal to different reading audiences to what use the book can be put. For instance, if a book's cover bears a sticker declaring it to be a "selection of Oprah's book club," that indicates a specific social status for the book, an implied social status for someone reading the book in public, and a distinct social use for the book: discussing it with other followers of Oprah's book club.

Words and pictures are generally combined to create the book cover image, since any picture must interact with the title, the author's name, a back blurb, and often, quotes from reviews and other authors. Designing book covers is big business, partly because the cover design not only markets the contents of the book, but also brand awareness for a publishing house. As Phil Baines notes in his book *Penguin by Design*, covers can perform many marketing functions simultaneously. They can color-code by genre (13), evoke historical periods through type or pictorial choices (124-127), display the logo of the publishing house prominently, and be easily changed for different markets.

There are now several blogs that exist specifically to track and critique the field of book cover design. *Caustic Cover Critic*, *The Penguin Blog*, and the *New York Times Book Design Review* are each devoted to this topic, and other style and design blogs, such as *Design*Sponge* and *Making it Lovely* weigh in on particularly interesting cover designs when they occur. These blogs each address the artistry of the covers as well as their effectiveness in signaling the appropriate readership. Publishers and book marketers

must use the interplay of word and image on the book cover to package the text in a way that will appeal to its intended audience and signal what that intended audience is.⁶⁰

As I mentioned in my discussion of Eddie Campbell, authors too now have the opportunity to use their blogs to comment on the publishing process of their texts. Lately, many authors have noted the anxiety caused by their lack of influence in the process of book cover design. Young adult author Cassandra Clare has described this anxiety thusly on her blog:

For authors, getting the cover of your book in your inbox is one of the most exciting and terrifying parts of the process — authors don't decide what their cover looks like, so it's sort of the equivalent of being assigned your brand new house by lottery — someone just dumps you in a car, drives you around for a while, and finally comes to a stop in front of a house: "Here's where you'll be living for the next six to ten years! Hope you like it!" (Clare 11 Mar. 2010)

Of course not all authors have the opportunity to publicly sanction or condemn new packaging for their texts, since classic texts by canonized authors are regularly housed in new editions as well. Jane Austen's novels, for instance, continue to be republished in different editions for different audiences.

Figure 6:9 contrasts three different current covers of *Pride and Prejudice* that market the novel to different target audiences. Each of these covers contains the same unabridged written text, yet one edition markets the novel as a sleek and contemporary film tie-in, one as a serious academic pursuit, and one as an anachronistic young adult Edwardian romp. These three editions are merely a sampling of the many different ways

⁶⁰ The fact that the cover image signals the intended audience for a text is well understood by readers. When I teach Children's Literature as a college course, I have many students who make plain book covers for the children's books they read for my class because they are embarrassed to be seen reading the books in public. This is precisely because they are aware that the pictures on the covers of these books make the books look as though college students should not read them.

Pride and Prejudice is currently packaged. These three examples of contemporary cover images imply different readerships and connote different societal uses for the book, but they cannot match the regulatory function of internal illustrations that can use visual literacy to continuously reinforce a specific reading of the written text of the novel.

I have chosen to end the discussion with cover images because they open up an exciting new avenue of inquiry: they indicate that the role of pictures in fiction has changed, moving away from a form of internal annotation towards a focus on external advertising, packaging, and marketing. However, the recent rise in prominence of graphic novels, as evidenced in part by the advent of an academic journal solely about graphic narrative (Figure 6:10), and the recent popularity of children's literature for an adult readership, may herald a return to more complicated relationships between word and picture in fiction.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, R. ed. *Ackermann's Repository*. London: Ackermann. 1810. Print.
- Alexie, Sherman. *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-time Indian*. Illus. Ellen Forney. New York: Little, Brown. 2007. Print.
- Antal, F. "Hogarth and His Borrowings." *The Art Bulletin* 29.1 (1947): 36-48. *JSTOR*. Web. 01 May 2010.
- Arnheim, Rudolf. *Visual Thinking*. Berkeley: U of California P. 1969. Print.
- Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. 1817. Afterword Elizabeth Hardwick. New York: Signet. 1965. Print.
- . *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. Illus. John Procter. London: John Dicks. [n.d., 1887 according to Gilson.] Print.
- . -. 1813. Illus. Hugh Thomson. London: George Allen. 1894. Print.
- . -. 1813. Illus. Chris. Hammond. 2nd ed. London: Blackie and Son Ltd. 1904. Print.
- . -. 1813. Illus. Charles Brock. 2nd ed. London and New York: MacMillan and Co., Limited. 1907. Print.
- . -. Illus. Lex de Renault. London: Collins' Clean Type Press [n.d., 1908 according to Gilson.] Print. [Note: With *Jane Eyre* and *Cranford*]
- . -. 1813. Ed. R.W. Chapman. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923. Print.
- . -. 1813. Illus. Vera Willoughby. London: Peter Davies. 1929. Print.
- . -. 1813. Illus. Helen Binyon. Harmondsworth: Penguin Illustrated Classics. 1938. Print.
- . -. 1813. New York: Grossett and Dunlap. 1940. Print. [with stills of the MGM film].
- . -. 1813. Illus. Helen Sewell. Preface Frank Swinnerton. Boston: The Limited Editions Club, Marymount Press. 1940. Print.
- . -. 1813. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1945. Print. [with illustrations of the Jane Austen Country].

- . –. 1813. Illus. Robert Ball. New York: Doubleday Doran Limited Edition. 1945. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Edgard Cirlin. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company. 1946. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Douglas Gorsline. Ed. W. Somerset Maugham. Philadelphia: John C. Winston. 1949. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. B. Gordon Smith. London: Avalon Press. 1949. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Philip Gough. London: MacDonald & Co. 1951. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Carabine. Abridged, as part of the Cameo Classics series. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1954. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. [wood engravings] Joan Hassall. Intro. Richard Church. London: The Folio Society. 1957. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Bernarda Bryson. Afterward Clifton Fadiman. New York: McMillan. 1962. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Lily Harmon. Forward Carl Van Doren. New York: Books, Inc. Publishers. 1966. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Sandra Archibald. Intro. Carole Fahy. London: Heron Books. 1968. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Isabel Bishop. New York: Dutton and Co. 1975. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Anne Rodger. Ed. and Abr. Norah Woolard. London: Collins. 1977. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Jenny Thorpe. London: Purnell. 1977. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Lynette Hemmant. Kingswood and Surrey: The Windmill Press. 1980. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Ian Beck. London: Hutchinson. 1985. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. John Ward. The Godmersham Edition. London: Nottingham Court Press. 1985. Print.
- . –. 1813. Illus. Gene Sparkman. Afterward Katherine Hill-Miller. London: The Reader's Digest Association, Limited. 1991. Print.
- . –. 1813. Ed. Donald Gray. 3rd ed. New York: Norton. 2001. Print.

- . –. 1813. Illus. Hugh Thomson. 1894. London: Shoes and Ships and Sealing Wax. 2006. Print.
- . *Pride and Prejudice as told by Joan Macintosh*. [With reproductions of the Brock ill.] New York: St. Martin's Press. 1962. Print.
- Ayres, Harry Morgan. *Carroll's Alice*. New York: Columbia UP. 1936. Print.
- . "Carroll's Withdrawal of the 1865 *Alice*." *The Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (1934): 53-163. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 June 2008.
- Baines, Phil. *Penguin By Design: A Cover Story 1935-2005*. London: Penguin. 2005. Print.
- Bechdel, Alison. *Fun Home: A Family Tragicomic*. New York: Houghton Mifflin: 2006.
- Bell, C.F. "Three Sketches by Hogarth." *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 41.232 (1922): 11-17. *JSTOR*. Web. 05 Jan. 2010.
- Benedict, Barbara M. "Sensibility by the Numbers: Austen's Work as Regency Popular Fiction." *Janeites: Austen's Disciples and Devotees*. Ed. Deidre Lynch. Princeton: Princeton UP. 2000. 63-85. Print.
- Bentley, G.E. Jr. "The Great Illustrated Book Publishers of the 1790s and William Blake." *Editing Illustrated Books*. Ed. William Blissett. New York: Garland. 1980. 57-96. Print.
- Black, Holly and Tony DiTerlizzi. "A Conversation with Holly Black and Tony DiTerlizzi, Creators of the *Spiderwick Chronicles*" Interview. Simon & Schuster, simonandschuster.biz. Web. 02 Feb. 2010.
- . *Living a Fantasy*. Interview by Rachel Taafe. *Scholastic Parent & Child* 15.6 (2008): 56-58. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 27 Jan. 2010.
- Bornstein, George. *Material Modernism: The Politics of the Page*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2001. Print.
- Brewer, David A. "Making Hogarth Heritage," *Representations* 72 (2000): 21-63. *JSTOR*. Web. 05 Jan. 2010.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. Intr. and Notes Michael Mason. London: Penguin. 1996. Print.
- Burwick, Fredrick. "Lessing's Laokoon and the Rise of Visual Hermeneutics." *Poetics Today* 20.2 (1999): 219-272. *JSTOR*. Web. 01 Dec. 2009.

- Camille, Michael. *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 1992. Print.
- Campbell, Eddie. *The Fate of the Artist*. eddiecampbell.blogspot.com Web. 03 Apr. 2010.
- Carroll, Lewis. *Alice in Wonderland*. 1865. Intro Brian Sibley. New York: Harry Abrams. 1988. Print.
- . *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Illus. John Tenniel. Cambridge: Macmillan. 1865.
- . -. Illus. John Tenniel. Cambridge: Macmillan. 1866.
- . -. Illus. Mervyn Peake. Intro. Will Self. London: Bloomsbury. 1946. Print.
- . -. Illus. Michael Hague. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1965. Print.
- . -. Illus. Michelle Wiggins. New York: Knopf. 1983. Print.
- . -. 1865. Illus. John Tenniel. New York: Viking. 1984. Print.
- . -. Illus. Peter Weevers. New York: Philomel. 1989. Print.
- . -. Illus. Abelardo Morell. Intro. Leonard S. Marcus. New York: Dutton. 1998. Print.
- . -. 1865. Illus. John Tenniel. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth. 1999. Print.
- . -. Illus. Helen Oxenbury. New York: Walker. 2000. Print.
- . -. 1865. Illus. John Tenniel. Ed. Richard Kelly. Buffalo: Broadview. 2000. Print.
- . -. Illus. Justin Todd. New York: Crown. 2000. Print.
- . -. Illus. DeLoss McGraw. New York: HarperCollins. 2001. Print.
- . -. Anthony Browne. New York: Gardner. 2003. Print.
- . -. Illus. Michael Foreman. New York: Sterling. 2004. Print.
- . -. Illus. David Hall. Afterward Brian Sibley. New York: Simon and Schuster. n.d. Print.
- . -. Illus. John Spiers. New York: Julian Messner. n.d. Print.
- . *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass*. Illus. John Tenniel. New York: Yearling. 1992. Print.

- . *The Annotated Alice: Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* [1865] and *Through the Looking Glass* [1871]. Illus. Sir John Tenniel. Ed. Martin Gardner. New York: Wings Books. 1998. Print.
 - . *The Annotated Snark: The Hunting of the Snark*. Illus. Henry Holiday. Ed. Martin Gardner. New York: Viking. 1962. Print.
 - . *The Complete Illustrated Works*. New York: Gramercy. 1995. Print.
 - . *The Nursery Alice*. Illus. Sir John Tenniel. 1890. New York: Mayflower. 1979. Print. [A facsimile of Macmillan 1890.]
 - . *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There*. Illus. John Tenniel, colored Fritz Kredel. New York: Random. 1946. Print.
 - . *The Wasp in a Wig*. Intro., Preface and Notes Martin Gardner. New York: Clarkson N. Potter. 1977. Print.
- Cartoon Books. *Boneville*. Cartoon Books. N.p. 31 Mar 2010. Web. 3 Apr 2010.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Chaucer's Works*. London: Kelmscott. 1896. Print.
- Chute, Hillary, "Decoding Comics" *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 52.4 (2006): 1015-1027. *Project MUSE*. Web. 05 Feb. 2010.
- Chute, Hillary and Marianne DeKoven. "INTRODUCTION: GRAPHIC NARRATIVE" *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 52.4 (2006): 767-782 *Project MUSE*. Web. 05 Feb. 2010.
- Clare, Cassandra. "Clockwork Angel cover reveal and ARC giveaway ." *Cassandra Clare's Blog*. livejournal.com, 11 Mar 2010. Web. 3 Apr 2010. <<http://cassandraclare.livejournal.com/36011.html>>.
- Cohen, Morton N. Ed. *The Selected Letters of Lewis Carroll*. New York: Pantheon. 1982. Print.
- Cohen, Morton N and Anita Gandolfo, eds. *Lewis Carroll and the House of Macmillan*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2007. Print.
- Colby, Robert. *Thackeray's Canvass of Humanity: An Author and His Public*. Columbus: Ohio State UP 1979. Print.
- Crane, Walter. *Of The Decorative Illustration of Books Old and New*. 1896. London: Bracken. 1984.

- Dawson, Paul. *The People's Ruskin: The George Allen Editions of the Reprinted Works of John Ruskin*. London: Oxenbridge. 1999. Print.
- Dickens, Charles. *The Haunted Man and the Ghost's Bargain*. 1848. *Charles Dickens: Christmas Books*. Illust. Tenniel et al. London: Oxford UP. 1954. 313-399. Print.
- . *The Pickwick Papers*. [1836-1837] Ed. Robert L. Patten from the 1847 edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1977. Print.
- . *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club*. 1837. Illus. Seymour and Phiz. New York: Random. 1998. Print.
- . –. *No.s I-XX*. London: Chapman and Hall 1836-1837.
- . *Sketches by Boz*. 1836. Illus. George Cruikshank. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1957. Print.
- DiTerlizzi, Tony and Holly Black. *The Spiderwick Chronicles Book 1: The Field Guide*. New York: Simon. 2003. Print.
- . *The Spiderwick Chronicles Book 2: The Seeing Stone*. New York: Simon. 2003. Print.
- . *The Spiderwick Chronicles Book 3: Lucinda's Secret*. New York: Simon. 2003. Print.
- . *The Spiderwick Chronicles Book 4: The Ironwood Tree*. New York: Simon. 2004. Print.
- . *The Spiderwick Chronicles Book 5: The Wrath of Mulgarath*. New York: Simon. 2004. Print.
- Dooley, Allan C. *Author and Printer in Victorian England*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia. 1992. Print.
- Feltes, Norman N. *Modes of Production of Victorian Novels*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. 1986. Print.
- Fraistat and Flanders. "Prospectus for the Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship." N.d. TS. Collection of David Greetham. New York. Print.
- Galperin, William H. "The Picturesque, the Real, and the Consumption of Jane Austen." *The Historical Austen*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P. 2003. 44-81. Print.
- Garry, Charlene. "Illustrated Books as Original Works of Art: Form as Complement to Content." *Editing Illustrated Books*. ed. William Blissett. New York: Garland. 1980. 113-124. Print.

- Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. 1987. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Foreword Richard Macksey. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1997. Print.
- Gilson, David. *A Bibliography of Jane Austen*. Oxford: Clarendon. 1982.
- Gregory, Richard. *Eye and Brain: The Psychology of Seeing*. 4th Ed. Princeton: Princeton UP. 1990.
- H. P. R. "Hogarth's Satires." *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts* 28.166 (1930): 30-32. *JSTOR*. Web. 05 Jan 2010.
- Harding, D.W. "Regulated Hatred: An Aspect in the Work of Jane Austen." *Pride and Prejudice*. Ed. Donald Gray. 3rd Ed. New York: Norton. 2001. 296-298. Print. Excerpt from *Scrutiny* 8 (1940): 346+.
- Harvey, J.R. *Victorian Novelists and their Illustrators*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson. 1970. Print.
- Hassall, Joan. "On Illustrating Jane Austen's Works. Address given by Miss Joan Hassall at the Annual Meeting." *The Jane Austen Society Report for the Year 1973*. 1973. 15-22. Print.
- Hatfield, Charles. "Comic Art, Children's Literature, and the new Comics Studies." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 30 (2006): 360-382 Johns Hopkins UP. *Project MUSE*. Web. 05 Feb. 2010
- Helm, Richard. "A Love for Fantasy Folklore." *Gazette (Montreal)* 8 Mar. 2008, final ed.: I12 *Lexis Nexis*. Web. 27 Jan. 2010.
- Ho, Elizabeth. "Postimperial Landscapes 'Psychogeography' and Englishness in Alan Moore's Graphic Novel 'From Hell: A Melodrama in Sixteen Parts.'" *Cultural Critique* 63 (2006): 99-121. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Jan. 2010.
- Hodnett, Edward. *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustrations of English Literature*. London: Scolar. 1982. Print.
- Hogarth, William. *Marriage A La Mode And Other Engravings*. New York: Lear. 1947. Print.
- "Illustration." Def. 3. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. 7 Apr. 2010.
- James, Phillip. *English Book Illustration 1800-1900*. London: King Penguin. 1947. Print.
- Johnson, Claudia. "The Divine Miss Jane." *boundary 2* 23.3 (1996): 143-163. Print.

- Katchor, Ben. "Rodolphe Töpffer & the Word/Image Problem." Message to conference attendees. 02 Mar. 2008. E-mail.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The Janeites." *Debits and Credits*. 1923. Web. 05 Apr. 2010.
- Kitton, Frederic G. *Dickens and His Illustrators*. 1899. Honolulu: UP of the Pacific. 2004. Print.
- Kunzle, David. "Between Broadsheet Caricature and 'Punch': Cheap Newspaper Cuts for the Lower Classes in the 1830s." *Art Journal* Winter (1983): 339-346. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Dec. 2009.
- Le Faye, Deirdre, Ed. *Jane Austen's Letters*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1995. Print.
- Leavis, F.R. & Q.D. *Dickens The Novelist*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP. 1979. Print.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoön: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. 1766. Trans. Ellen Frothingham 1898. Mineola: Dover. 2005. Print.
- Lewis, Tyson and Richard Kahn. "Exopedagogies and the Utopian Imagination: A Case Study in Faery Subcultures." *Theory & Event* 12.2 (2009): N.p. *Project MUSE*. Web. 27 Jan. 2010.
- Lodeski, Lisa. "The Harem as a Site for Sexual Fantasy in the Work of Vera Willoughby: An Artist's Feminine Interpretation of a Classical Genre." Web. 17 Apr. 2006.
- Lynch, Diedre. *The Economy of Character: Minds, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. 1998. Print.
- Mainardi, Patricia. "Thackeray's drawings." Message to the author. 29 Mar. 2010. E-mail.
- Maynard, Patrick. *Drawing Distinctions: The varieties of graphic expression*. Ithaca: Cornell UP. 2005. *Google Books*. Web. 6 Apr. 2010.
- McCloud, Scott. *Understanding Comics: the Invisible Art*. 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins. 1994. Print.
- McLeod, Randall [Random Clod]. "Information Upon Information." *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 5 (1991): 241-248. Print.
- McMaster, Juliet. "Visual Design in Pickwick Papers." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23.4 (1983): 595-614. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Dec 2009.
- McMurtrie, Douglas. *The Golden Book*. New York: Covici Friede. 1927. Print.

- Miller, J. Hillis. *Illustration*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 1992. Print.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. "Representation." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, ed Lentricchia and McLaughlin. 2nd Ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P. 1987 Print.
- . *Picture Theory*. Chicago: U of Chicago P: 1994. Print.
- Moore, Alan and Eddie Campbell. *From Hell*. 1989. Marietta: Top Shelf. 1999. Print.
- Morris, Frankie. *Artist Of Wonderland: The Life, Political Cartoons, And Illustrations Of Tenniel (Victorian Literature and Culture Series)*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P. 2005. Print.
- Morris, William. *The Ideal Book*. London: Kelmscott. N.d. Print.
- Noakes, Richard. "Science in Mid-Victorian Punch" *Endeavour* 26.3 (2002): 92-96. eric.exeter.ac.uk. Web. 6 Nov. 2009.
- Olson, Mary C. *Fair and Varied Forms: Visual Textuality in Medieval Manuscripts*. New York: Routledge. 2003. Print.
- Padua, Sydney. *2D Goggles*. N.p. N.d. Web. 04 Apr. 2010
- "Read, v." Def. 1. The Oxford English Dictionary. Draft rev. Mar. 2010. Web. 7 Apr. 2010.
- Patten, Robert L. "Boz, Phiz, and Pickwick in the Pound." *ELH* 36.3 (1963): 575-591. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Jan. 2010.
- "Pointed." Def. 5b Date Chart. The Oxford English Dictionary. Draft rev. Dec. 2009. Web. 7 Apr. 2010.
- Punch*. Volume 67, 1874. London. Print.
- Republic of Pemberly. "Notes and illustrations on Regency Clothing Styles, (with 1895 Charles E. Brock illustrations for *Pride and Prejudice*.)" *Republic of Pemberly* N.p. 1999. Web. 5 Apr. 2010.
- Rogoff, Irit and David Van Leer. "Afterthoughts... A dossier on Masculinities." *Theory and Society* 22 (1993) 739-762. Print.
- Ruskin, John. *The Art Criticism of John Ruskin*. Ed. and Intro. Robert L. Herbert. Garden City: Anchor. 1964.
- . *The Elements of Drawing*. New York: Wiley. 1888. *Google books*. Web. 6 Apr. 2010.

- Sabuda, Robert. *Alice's adventures in Wonderland: a pop-up adaptation of Lewis Carroll's original tale*. New York: Simon & Schuster. 2003. Print.
- Satrapi, Marjane. *Persepolis*. New York: Pantheon. 2007.
- Shavit, Zohar. "The Ambivalent Status of Texts: The Case of Children's Literature." *Poetics Today* 1.3 (1980): 75-86. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 June 2008.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York: Norton. 2091-2244 Print.
- Shaw, Dash. *Bottomless Bellybutton*. Seattle: Fantagraphics. 2008
- Shillingsburg, Peter. "The Printing, Proof-reading, and Publishing of Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*: The First Edition." *Studies in Bibliography* 34 (1981): 118-145. Web. 26 Aug. 2009.
- Shoemaker, Chris. Rev. of *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, by Sherman Alexie. *School Library Journal* August 2007. Web. 6 Apr. 2010.
- "Sketch, *n*." Def. 1 and 2. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. Web. 7 Apr. 2010.
- Smith, Jeff. *Bone*. Cartoon Books: Columbus: 2004. Print.
- Smith, Jeff. Interview. Transcrip. Antonio Salinas. "JEFF SMITH interview." *Sardinian Connection*. 9 Feb. 2010. Web. 7 Apr 2010.
- Smith, Keith. *Structure of the Visual Book: Book 95 The Expanded Fourth Edition*. Rochester, NY: keith smith BOOKS. 2003. Print.
- Spielmann, MH and Walter Jerrold. *Hugh Thomson: His art, his letters, his humour and his charm*. London: A&C Black. 1931. Print.
- Steig, Michael. *Dickens and Phiz*. Bloomington and London: Indiana UP. 1978. Print.
- Stoffel, Stephanie Lovett. *Lewis Carroll in Wonderland: The Life and Times of Alice and Her Creator*. New York: Harry Abrams. 1997. Print.
- Sutherland, J.A. *Victorian Novelists and Publishers*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. 1976. Print.
- Sutherland, John. *Is Heathcliff a Murderer? Puzzles in 19th Century Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1996. Print.

- Sutherland, Kathryn. Untitled in "Prospectus for the Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship." n.d. TS. Collection of David Greetham, New York. Print.
- . *Jane Austen's Textual Lives: From Aeschylus to Bollywood*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2005. Print.
- Sutton, James and Alan Bartram. *Typefaces for Books*. New York: New Amsterdam. 1990. Print.
- Telgemeier, Raina and Dave Roman, writers. *X-Men: Misfits*. Art by Anzu. Lettering by Michaelis/Carpelis Design. Vol. 1. New York: Del Rey. Print.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The Book of Snobs*. Project Gutenberg. N.p. 25 May 2006. Web. 1 Dec. 2007.
- . *Vanity Fair*. 1848. ed. John T. Winterich. New York: Heritage. 1940. Print.
- . -. 1848. ed. & intro. John Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1983. Print.
- . -. 1848. ed. & intro. J.I.M. Stewart. London: Penguin. 1985. Print.
- Thompson, Craig. *Blankets*. Portland: Top Shelf: 2003
- Trollope, Anthony. *Autobiography of Anthony Trollope*. 1883. Gloucester: Alan Sutton. 1987. Print.
- . *Can you Forgive Her?* 1864. Ill. Browne, Hablôt K. and E. Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1972. Print.
- . *Thackeray*. 1879. Detroit: Gale Research. 1968. Print.
- Tucker, Herbert F. "Literal Illustration in Victorian Print." *The Victorian Illustrated Book*. Ed. Richard Maxwell. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia. 2002. 163-208. Print.
- Tufte, Edward. *Visual Explanations: Images and Quantities, Evidence and Narrative*. Cheshire: Graphics Press. 1997. Print.
- Tuite, Clara. *Romantic Austen*. New York: Cambridge UP. 2002. Print.
- Weedon, Alexis. *Victorian Publishing: The Economics of Book Production for a Mass Market 1836-1916*. Burlington: Ashgate. 2003. Print.
- Whalley, Joyce Irene and Tessa Rose Chester. *A History of Children's Book Illustration*. London: John Murray with the Victoria and Albert Museum. 1988. Print.

Whitlark, James. *Illuminated Fantasy: From Blake's Visions to Recent Graphic Fiction*. London: Associated University Presses. 1988.

Williams, Herbert Sidney, et al. *The Lewis Carroll Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford 1962. Print.

Williams, Raymond. "Three Around Farnham." *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford UP 1973. 108-119. Print.