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Abstract

Ghosts, resemblances, ruins, paintings, and other visual phenomena in nineteenth-century British novels often illustrate the otherwise invisible past. As new media technologies expanded the mass production of images during the nineteenth century, representing earlier time as visible helped novelists to affirm its reality, power, and difference from the present. Distinguishing between the past (prior time) and history (the representation of the past), this project relates historical apparitions in novels by Walter Scott, Wilkie Collins, George Eliot, and Oscar Wilde to contemporaneous print media, including illustration, print series, and photography. Against the backdrop of modernizing shifts in popular visual culture, these novelists depict the past as a realm of precarious reality that fiction can uphold, query, or verify by portraying it as a visible reproduction. Their novels disclose bygone events by making them available to sight in images, appearances, and serial variations between bodies that often combine biological and mechanical reproduction, thereby enlarging print-culture notions of reproducibility. These texts make readers, usually already viewers of printed pages, into spectators of fictional worlds by obliging them to agree that narrated histories can be seen. Moments when prior epochs appear before the eyes of fictional characters offer insight into values placed on memory, visual representation, and reproduction. Intimations of former eras in these novels frequently transpire as sights of
landscape and so position anterior time as another distant territory that nineteenth-century British expansionism yearned to access. The mnemonic displays in these novels inherit traditions of supernatural fiction and often stand in for fictional ghosts, even as they link print media to spectrality. The physical book itself manifests the haunting presence of earlier worlds and so represents an important symbol of visible history throughout this study. Chapters of the dissertation explore how fictional sights of reproduced time illuminate notions of illustration, Darwin’s evolutionary theory, British interests in Palestine, and concepts of mimesis in graphic representation. This interdisciplinary work of literary criticism thus situates the nineteenth-century novel in modern visual culture by examining fictional spectacles in relation to historical spectatorships, tourism, the prehistory of cinema, and the displays of print culture.
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Introduction: Imprints of the Past

[…] if we still happen today to leaf through those books of another time, it is for no other reason than that they are the only calendars we have kept of days that have vanished, and we hope to see reflected on their pages the dwellings and the ponds which no longer exist.

- Marcel Proust, On Reading Ruskin (99-100)

Victorians made the past into a vivid backdrop to be seen behind the display of their modern lives. From photography to the architecture of fake ruins, from the flourishing of the historical novel to jewellery made of human hair, new forms of representation emerged in nineteenth-century Britain and were proposed as preservations.¹ A feeling of the difference between the present and the past became stronger than ever before as industrialism seemed to mark childhood experiences as obsolete, prehistory stretched into novel reaches of sublime distance, historiography and historicism took fresh shapes, and new habits reorganized time itself.² This sense of separateness between the present and the past, which has been read as paradigmatic of

¹ Helen Groth examines how photography imbued cultural producers with the “desire to arrest time” (2), Sophie Thomas considers Romanticism and “sham ruins” (43-53), Ofek offers an account of Victorian hair memento jewelry (45-47), and Maxwell explains Scott’s “reinvention” of the historical novel (Historical 59-113). Stephen Bann argues that with Romanticism “the whole range of our contemporary concerns with the past first became available to representation” (Romanticism 5). In The Clothing of Clio, he explores nineteenth-century strategies of representing the past that had the “aim of narrowing the gap between history as it happened, and history as it is written” (165).

² On the emergence of nineteenth-century concepts of prehistory, see Gould and Stout. Suzy Anger’s edited collection, Knowing the Past, accounts for the contingencies of historical knowledge of and in the Victorian era, while Howsam investigates the publishing of history as the discipline emerged through the late nineteenth century (Past into Print). Rigney (Imperfect Histories) and Robertson examine Romantic overlaps between history and literature. Studies by Jones and McCaw investigate relations between Victorian realism and historiography. Sue Zemka connects the moment in Victorian literature to industrial technology and the durations of reading, while Trish Ferguson’s edited collection establishes the modernities and disciplines of Victorian time. Elizabeth Ermarth argues that the nineteenth-century realist novel allowed the construction of “time as history; that is, as a medium” (English Novel 67).
modernity, often manifested itself as a fascination with the visible differences of eras.3 History itself became one of the spectacles of this voyeuristic culture.4 The idea that the past could be visible attracted many nineteenth-century British novelists, and in their fiction invisible pasts frequently slip into visibility, often in the form of ghosts, resemblances, ruins, or paintings.5 The four novels I examine in this dissertation—Walter Scott’s *The Antiquary* (1816), Wilkie Collins’s *The Woman in White* (1859-60), George Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda* (1876), and Oscar Wilde’s *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891)—present the past as a realm of precarious reality that fiction can uphold, query, or verify by depicting it as a visible reproduction. Fictional visible histories represent the past as a display object rather than as a written record and thus illuminate relations between the novel, written history, and representations of the visible world in literary realism. As I argue, representing the past as visible helped novelists to affirm its reality, power, and difference from the present, while moments when history becomes visibly manifest to fictional characters offer insight into values placed on visual media, reproduction, and the past itself. Each of my chapters queries one of four terms—illustration, series, views, and realization—that depict the past in fiction by yoking verbal logic to visibility. Three important observations drive my investigation of visible history in the nineteenth-century British novel: one, the visibility accorded to the past in fiction frequently reflects or illuminates ideas about print culture and its reproducibility; two, biological and print reproduction coincide in fictional displays of the past, resulting in characters whose faces can be read like historical pictures, who embody otherwise unwritten histories, or who exist as series of variant images that indicate past experiences;6 and three, these novels make readers, usually already viewers of printed texts, into spectators of fictional worlds by obliging them to agree that

---

3 As Chapman suggests, “the Victorians had a sense of modernity, of what it meant to be of their age rather than of another” (5). Richard Barringer observes of the Pre-Raphaelite movement that its “styles combine past and present, historicism and modernity” (19).

4 In a study of a related context, Maurice Samuels interprets the rise of the commodity of a spectacular past in Romantic French culture, and suggests that it was conditioned and queried by realism, “less as a poetics than as a theory of history, one that diagnoses the dangers of a certain way of looking at the past” (12). Carolyn Arscott demonstrates how a book of lithographs of Wakefield in 1853 depicts the present as “overwritten by the past” (48).

5 Vision in Western culture is, as Martin Jay demonstrates, both fundamental to the rhetoric of knowledge and denigrated as hopelessly suspect. I gather my approach to cultures of visibility and visuality from his comprehensive philosophical treatment, while W. J. T. Mitchell’s theories of the relations between words and images ground my interpretations of visual signification in literature (see in particular *Iconology* and *Picture Theory*).

6 In my approach to the overlaps between biological and printed reproduction that work to iterate the histories of characters I am indebted to Deidre Lynch’s exposition of how in eighteenth-century literature “character was conceptualized as reading matter in the most emphatic way” (*Economy* 5, italics original).
narrated histories are visible. In pursuing these claims, each chapter of this project relates the visible history in one monument of the nineteenth-century British novel to an aspect of visual print culture. Together they expose the visible and reproducible past that appeared in this century of British fiction.

While this dissertation investigates the nineteenth-century British novel within the framework of English studies, the investments of the project are interdisciplinary and its methods include approaches from scholarship on visual culture, cultural studies, and book history, as well as literary criticism. My inquiry probes the intersection of two common theories about the modernity of Victorian culture, whose relation to each other has yet to be fully examined: first, the idea that an intense attraction to visibility precipitated a devotion to the reifications of display, from the museum, to the multiplication of printed images, to the department store; and second, that Victorian culture experienced a newly defamiliarized sense of its own relation to history. The dissertation proposes one way of regarding how these cultural traits coincide in the nineteenth-century British novel. My study of this intersection is governed by Michel Foucault’s theories of the disciplines of sight and history and therefore regards gazes and representations of visibility and the past as enactments of knowledge and power. As a result, the project situates

---

7 In considering the reader as a spectator participating in literary representation, I am indebted to Jonathan Crary’s interest in “the productivity of the observer” (9), and his questions regarding “how the individual as observer became an object of investigation and a locus of knowledge beginning in the first few decades of the 1800s, and how the status of the observing subject was transformed” (16). Reading itself has ineluctable ties to sight and spectatorship, though not all readers are viewers of text. Louis Braille’s 1830s development of a tactile reading and writing system (see Weygand 283-88) can be read as an intervention in an excessively spectatorial literacy culture that had needlessly excluded the blind. Many nineteenth-century people also encountered fiction by listening to others read. Ivan Kreilkamp explains the significance of vocal performance for Victorian novelists, while Mayhew’s famous account of reading among costermongers emphasizes their pleasure in listening (24-27).

8 Kate Flint documents the Victorian fascination with visibility (Victorians). Black considers museums and cultures of exhibition in Victorian England, Isobel Armstrong illustrates the cultures and fetishizations of visibility opened by new Victorian uses of glass and the social impact of display cases, and Friedberg examines the relation between such windows and printed images. Thomas Richards explains how the Great Exhibition of 1851 reorganized vision and consumer spectacle in Victorian England, so that “the commodity became and remained the still center of the turning earth, the focal point of all gazing, and the end point of all pilgrimages” (18). Rachel Teukolsky similarly observes that the “overriding goal of art commentaries at the Exhibition […] was to harness sight in the service of capitalism” (70).

9 Describing the “memory crisis” that characterizes modern orientations to the past (3), Richard Terdiman writes that “[t]he “long nineteenth century became a present whose self-conception was framed by a disciplined obsession with the past” (5). In a recent account of how this preoccupation manifested in the law, Ayelet Ben-Yishai demonstrates the relation between the realist novel and the Victorian legal reliance on precedent in the establishment of a continuous common past to authorize the present.

10 For Foucault’s expositions of the collaborations of sight, thought, and control see Discipline and Punish, Birth of the Clinic, and The Order of Things, as well as Rajchman on “Foucault’s Art of Seeing.” Mark Poster explains that
the reader as a key spectator in visual culture and aligns the visual protocols of book illustration with the fictional sights, scenes, perspectives, and acts of looking that I refer to as the visibilities of novels. Using the nineteenth-century British novel as an archive of visual practices, these chapters position such fictional representations of visibility and the gazes of novel readers within the history of spectacle and spectatorship. At every stage, this investigation of visual culture and literature is in conversation with scholarship on book history and print culture, and so privileges the object of the book and other material settings of fiction, such as the serial journal, as integral to literary interpretation. The physical book gives a haunting visible presence to past worlds, and so stands as an important symbol of visible history throughout this work. Exposing Victorian perspectives on the past, this dissertation uses book-history methods to integrate print-culture contexts in literary analysis while also demonstrating the potential for historicizing visual culture through the combined study of fiction, cultural history, and popular book objects.

Concepts of the distinction between the present and the past are pervasive in nineteenth-century thought: they are essential to notions of modernity and generate the visible histories that concern me here. Marshall Berman explains that “the nineteenth-century modern public can remember what it is like to live, materially and spiritually, in worlds that are not modern at all. From this inner dichotomy,” he writes, “this sense of living in two worlds simultaneously, the ideas of modernization and modernism emerge and unfold” (17). This feeling of the visible difference between eras originates partly in the work of Victorian essayists. As Suzy Anger notes, John Stuart Mill and Thomas Carlyle were preoccupied by the difference between the past and the world. While much of Foucault’s own scholarship is historical, it also radically reconfigured notions of the conditions and intents of historical knowledge and inquiry, exposing historiography as a practice of control over both the past and, as a result, the present: “For Foucault, history is a form of knowledge and a form of power at the same time; put differently, it is a means of domesticating and controlling the past in the form of knowing it” (119).

11 On the parameters of visual culture studies, see Mirzoeff. Collections edited by Christ and Jordan, Schwartz and Przyblyski, and Brosch and Pohl, offer important overviews of nineteenth-century visual culture studies. Gillen D’Arcy Wood examines “encounters between canonical Romantic writers and the visual culture they inhabited” (7). Judith Stoddart describes the values of nineteenth-century spectatorship in arguing that sentimentality “offered important strategies for mediating the relationship between emerging ideas of an embodied viewer […] and the traditional claims of art’s special social status” (“Pleasures” 74). Pamela M. Fletcher examines the “problem picture” in the British fin de siècle as key to the emergence of modern visual culture. Linda M. Shires regards the relation between words and images in nineteenth-century culture by using perspective as a unifying epistemological metaphor (2).

12 See Leah Price’s essay “Reading Matter” for an overview of the relations between book history and textual studies.
present, and ways of becoming aware of its essence (“Introduction” 3). Carlyle especially makes rhetorical use of visible history to argue for the distinction between eras. For example, in *Past and Present* (1843), he suggests that his editor will, “from the Past, in a circuitous way, illustrate the Present and the Future” (42), and he writes that “The Past cannot be seen; the Past, looked at through the medium of ‘Philosophical History’ in these times, cannot even be not seen: it is misseen; affirmed to have existed, —and to have been a godless Impossibility” (239). While Carlyle critiques the inadequacies of the present in the face of a relentlessly visible past, Rachel Teukolsky suggests that Ruskin’s admiration for medieval aesthetics helped define his social critique of the present (25). Ruskin’s socialism was driven by a desire to redeem the present and future in light of past models, and, like Carlyle, he presumes a past whose spectre passes judgment on the present.  

Pater and Morris also retrieve critical models for the present from the aesthetic visibilities of the past, while Morris’s graphic resurrection of medieval and renaissance styles in the works of the Kelmscott Press can be read as a material rather than rhetorical deployment of visible history in the elaboration of a modern print culture.  

Christopher Shaw and Malcolm Chase suggest that impressions of modernity rely on nostalgia because “[t]he counterpart to the imagined future is the imagined past” (9). The experience of modernity these Victorian writers navigate is evident in their sense of flux, their feeling that the future will be recognizably different because the present is so clearly—visibly—distinct from the past.

This notion of temporal distance has a counterpart in the geographic distances that British imperialism endeavoured to overcome, and novels enable the appropriation of a visible past that frequently comes into being as a landscape, as a seen space.  

13 Judith Stoddart explains that “both Ruskin and his critics filtered modern experience through their particular histories of national life […] to be judged “authentic,” modern life had to be presented as the coda to an inevitable historical movement” (*Ruskin* 106).

14 Carolyn Williams argues that “it is precisely Pater’s historicism that distinguishes his aestheticism from other versions of aestheticism in English” (47) and shows Pater’s insistence on “a sharp distinction between modern thought and ancient” (49). Teukolsky observes the origins of William Morris’s aesthetic socialism in his nostalgia (152). Peterson demonstrates that Morris gathered this longing for medieval culture partly from Ruskin (43), and that he was “convinced that only by rediscovering the older traditions […] could he rebuild the decayed social foundation of art” (45). Pevsner explains how Morris’s historicism helped define modern graphic design.

15 For a comprehensive analysis of nostalgia in Victorian culture, see Ann C. Colley.

16 In regarding the visible past in nineteenth-century fiction as a landscape, a space implying a set of social practices, I follow Lefebvre’s demonstration that “(Social) space is a (social) product,” both “a means of production” and a “means of control” (26). I also rely on W. J. T. Mitchell’s suggestion that landscape represents the “‘dreamwork’ of imperialism,” and “disclose[s] both utopian fantasies of the perfected imperial prospect and fractured images of
and Scott, the spatial dynamics of regarding landscape feature in my interpretations of visible histories. Charles Dellheim explains that contrasts between past and present became most visible for Victorians as they looked at landscapes that had been altered by industrialism (37-45). Seeing the past in landscape suggests that it might have a location, allowing geographic separation to become a figure for chronological distance. This literary latching of space and time recalls Bakhtin’s notion of chronotope (84), but also what Margaret Cohen describes as Benjamin’s effort to “locate the apotheosis of modernity in Paris” (200), a move that implies that the past, too, might have a location. Spatial sights of the past in nineteenth-century literature also stand in relation to what scholars have read as imperial extensions of visibility. While colonialism broadened British notions of visible territory overseas, electric lighting, shop windows, and museum displays all dilated the field of the visible at home. Like a form of geographic expansionism, the nineteenth-century hunger for visibility also cast light on the landscape of the past, which, as David Lowenthal reminds us, is “a foreign country.” The past is a shimmering landscape to be seen through the pages of nineteenth-century books that reflects colonial depictions of faraway landscapes and represents a way of toying with, examining, and performing triumphs over distance.

unresolved ambivalence and unsuppressed resistance” (“Imperial” 10). For a recent account of Victorian imperialism or the “British world-system,” see John Darwin’s The Empire Project.

17 He writes that “industrialization certainly affected the vision of history in at least two ways. By finally destroying many of the social structures and material remains of “olde England,” it indirectly led to the idealization of the vanishing past. In so doing, it dramatized the distinctiveness of historic towns and relics. And by opening a huge chasm between the unprecedented world of the nineteenth century and the pre-industrial world, it shattered the chain of historic continuity and heightened the awareness of change” (37).

18 Comolli explains the nineteenth-century “geographic extension of the field of the visible and the representable: by journeys [sic], explorations, colonisation, the whole world becomes visible at the same time that it becomes appropriatable” (122-23). Barbara Maria Stafford offers an account of how printed illustration collaborated with the expansion of the visible world through travel, while Mary Louise Pratt explains the gaze of the traveller in this period.

19 David Livingstone observes that a passion for collecting mirrored Victorian colonial ambition, and that the imperial motive of museums “ultimately reduced universal geography to the cabinet-sized exhibit and file-sized archive” (32). Chris Otter offers a political history of Victorian visual culture in his study of nineteenth-century illuminations of space, arguing that the “cultural history of light and vision […] becomes inseparable from two political histories, those of discipline and of capital” (2). On the increasing presence of glass in Victorian shop windows, see Isobel Armstrong (134-39).

20 In this famous label, Lowenthal addresses the exoticism of the past in the nineteenth century, rather than the issue that most concerns me here, the way conceiving of the past as a location inflects notions of its visibility.
The landscape of the past is often visible in these novels, but it is also haunted space, and spectres are integral to nineteenth-century visible histories. Strung as they are between the “rise” of supernatural fiction that E. J. Clery locates in the late eighteenth century and Benjamin’s phantasmagoria, these fictional displays can be read as part of what Terry Castle describes as the “spectralization” of thought since the eighteenth century, which, she suggests, has led Western culture “to figure imaginative activity itself, paradoxically, as a kind of ghost-seeing” (141-43). Fictional ghosts and the spectral uncanny thus limn the visible pasts I read, and all the novels I examine position themselves in relation to the Gothic. By figuring the body as a locus of mystery and disruption, visible history furthers both the Gothic defamiliarization of the domestic and the physiological investments of sensation fiction, while anticipating the excavations of psychoanalysis.

Indeed, the rhythm of return that would prove so crucial to psychoanalytic notions of repression is essential to themes of haunting in literature, and to my concept of visible histories: like a ghost or a memory, the past either returns or ceases to exist. Dickens’s most famous ghost story exemplifies the visible history of the spectral return. While Audrey Jaffe demonstrates that “A Christmas Carol” (1843) says “the world is an image […] in which spectators seek to see themselves” (“Specular” 334), the story crucially figures the past as the image that returns as a spectacle. The Ghost of Christmas Past points Scrooge’s gaze to spectacular visible history that reproduces his former experience, so that he might at last learn what he missed at first (106-16). Explaining Freud’s accounts of traumatic returns, Cathy Caruth writes that “What returns to haunt the victim, these stories tell us, is not only the reality of the violent event, but also the

21 Julian Wolfreys’s *Victorian Hauntings* directed my first inquiries into literary spectrality, while Srdjan Smajić demonstrates the complex entwinement of vision and the uncanny in nineteenth-century literature (*Ghost Seers*), and Lynda Nead observes that “the haunted world of visual media” during the fin de siècle “involved a temporal scrambling of past and present” (3).

22 In identifying the Gothic in these works, I do not intend to foreclose their participation in other genres, including realism: I follow Martin Willis’s suggestion that in observing Gothic elements in Victorian realism, critics need not be concerned with generic categorization so much as with questions about why the Gothic appears in fiction, “what it is employed to do, and under what conditions” (17).

23 On the disrupted relation between domestic ideology and the Gothic, see Kate Ferguson Ellis. On the embodiments of sensation and detective fiction, see Ronald R. Thomas, who writes that “in most sensation novels, the privilege of representing the truth is achieved through a bitter struggle that pits one textual representation of the body against another” (*Detective* 59). I rely on Jill Matus’s historical model for considering antecedents of psychoanalytic notions in Victorian literature.

24 In her book on the return of the traumatic in psychoanalytic theory, Cathy Caruth explains that “the story of trauma is inescapably bound to a referential return” (7).
reality of the way that its violence has not yet been fully known” (6). Whether a reappearance is figured as a ghost, a revenant, or as a memory, and whether it represents a past made meaningful by violence, guilt, or simply nostalgia, the return signifies a lapse in knowledge as well as a reminder. Likewise, the history that returns in a visible display may represent the depths of the past that remain unknown and unknowable at the same time as it resurrections information at risk of being forgotten. While the spectral return of visible history in fiction can thus be read as an alternative to the narrative device of the ghost, it also serves as a metaphor for the repetitions of print reproduction. Ghostliness attends print itself, and its spectrality inheres in its habit of returning.25 “A question of repetition: a specter is always a revenant,” Derrida writes. “One cannot control its comings and goings because it begins by coming back” (11, italics original). Likewise, the print begins by coming back and is always already a repetition, a revenant, and a reproduction. These returns give print the spectral symbolism that nineteenth-century novelists often use in place of “actual” ghosts to represent the apparition of the past.

My title, “Visible Histories,” registers an irony, since history is not generally a sight on display: only in fictional representation can the events of past time be visible. In focusing on visual displays of the past, I examine contrasts between written fiction, visual representation, and historiography, distinguishing between the past (prior time), and history (the representation of the past). Having characters discover the past through sight rather than through writing enabled nineteenth-century authors to imagine alternative modes of accounting for historical truth. In representing the past as visible, novels make claims for its meaning and reality that would be unavailable to prose histories, since images and appearances invite different standards of interpretation and authority than writing does.26 Three important tendencies distinguish the representational abilities of written and visible histories in the works I consider here. First, visible displays of the past may seem to lack authors: while historiography always comes with an historian (and her implied biases), a ghost that displays past events to terrified inhabitants of a house may seem to present an “unauthorized” yet persuasive version of the past. Second, visible

---

25 In considering the spectral quality of books in nineteenth-century culture, I am indebted to David Simpson’s demonstration of the ghostliness that attended Wordsworth’s conception of books and the market forces that legislated their circulation (14).

26 For a comprehensive survey of the history of visual truth, see Martin Jay (in particular 21-83). Daston and Galison explain the pressure modern sciences put on images to shore up the semblance of objectivity. Tagg’s Burden of Representation historicizes ideas of photographic evidence. Much of W. J. T. Mitchell’s work regards the complex relations between words and images (see in particular Iconology 47-151).
histories may seem less debatable than written accounts, since the presentational value of visual media allows it to make statements that are less easily controverted than verbal truth claims. Third, visible history may appear in many forms other than writing: a painting may illustrate a past, or a body may appear in a plot and in its presence suggest a particular version of prior events, offering up a history in flesh. Visible history allows a character’s body to attest to a past she might not know, a past that might even alter her identity: Scott’s Lovel, Collins’s Anne Catherick, Eliot’s Daniel Deronda, and Wilde’s Dorian Gray are all characters whose identities are reconfigured by the histories their bodies display. By “returning” in visual formats, visible histories communicate information that written history might not transmit and so open new vantages and possibilities for the representation of the past.

Using the term “visible histories” to describe this recurring theme allows me to reference not only the nonfictional category of written historical representation, but also the fictional histories broadcast by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels. Whereas eighteenth-century novelists often categorized their works as “histories,” by the end of the nineteenth century the designation of a novel as a “portrait” of a character was common. The display of character in portraiture thus became a corollary for the genre of the novel. This turn could be read as a triumph of the Gothic, a genre that, as Kamilla Elliott points out, has been uniquely suffused with portraiture since its inception: “no other literary period or genre is so perversely, didactically and obsessively concerned with it” (6). Yet the nineteenth century also saw visual culture wax in power with a massive increase in printed images, a context that also inflects the relations that Victorian novels enact between fiction, history, and the visible world.

Novels have longstanding investments in both historical and visual representation. The realism that is common in nineteenth-century novels retains an unavoidable relation to historiography. In his influential account of the rise of the novel, Ian Watt notes the indebtedness of eighteenth-century realism to “the rise of a more objective study of history” (24). Scott’s historical novel

27 The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling (1749), The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews (1742), and Clarissa, Or, The History of a Young Lady (1748) among other novels titled as histories in the eighteenth century, meet, for example, the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century portrait fictions, The Portrait of a Lady (1881), The Picture of Dorian Gray (1891), and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (1916). On the trend of portrait titles, see Kelvin.

28 William St Clair documents the rise of the illustrated book through the early nineteenth century, while Patricia Anderson charts the overwhelming increase in and influence of illustrated printed matter in England between 1790 and 1860. On the mass photomechanical reproduction of images in the 1890s, see Beegan.
also helped to define realism. In *The Historical Novel*, Lukács shows that by seeming to present the historical past in their fiction, Scott and other historical novelists opened new possibilities for the representation of contemporary realities. Modern notions of the novel as a mirror for the present coalesced in narratives of the past. While literary realism emerged in relation to history, concepts of the genre have also informed critiques of historiographical writing. Hayden White’s demonstration of the realist literary strategies underpinning historiography contributed to the reorganization of history as a discipline but also reframed the historical efforts of realist novelists. Despite the solidification of the novel as a distinct literary mode, writers’ continuous attraction to the historical novel maintained the essential collaboration between history and fiction as genres of writing. On the mutual constitution of these prose genres in the early nineteenth century, Ian Duncan explains that “[t]he scientific and disciplinary hardening of history—it’s separation out of the literary field—assists the dialectical clarification of the rejected term, fiction, which thus comes to characterize the “literary” itself” (*Scott’s Shadow* 126).

According to this account of its history, nineteenth-century realist fiction can be read as the residual of historiography. Ever since realism established a relationship between fiction and reality that was brokered by history as a category of nonfictional written representation, history and the novel have been twinned.

While the status of literary realism as a mode of prose representation is linked to written history, the genre also has a place in visual culture. The notoriously abundant details of realism often reference visible objects, even as realist plots deal and trade in implied visibilities. From Odysseus’ scar to Esther Summerson’s ravaged face, readers of realism find themselves obliged

---

29 Maxwell explains Lukács’s argument that innovations in early nineteenth-century deployments of the historical novel meant that in the work of later realists, “it is the present rather than the past that is treated historically” (*Historical* 66).
30 See Macherey on the “mirror” of literature in Tolstoy’s historical work (133-51).
31 Michael I. Carignan explains how White’s recuperation of a nineteenth-century view of history as a “branch of literature” destabilized the foundations of history as a scholarly discipline (396-97). In examining White’s intervention in the realisms of historiography in relation to history in George Eliot’s fiction, Carignan concludes that while “[b]oth White and Capra point to Henry Adams as an example of a historian who respects the realist’s ironic condition. Eliot is another” (415). In a study of the relations between Romantic literary and historical writing that offers a counterpoint to White’s, Mark Salber Phillips explores “how the cluster of genres most closely associated with historiography was constituted in the eighteenth century and how it changed over time to admit new genres or to acknowledge the power of other, competitive literatures” (11).
to witness and attest to telling sights. Peter Brooks argues that “realism is almost by definition highly visual, concerned with registering what the world looks like,” and he suggests that “[a]ny honest accounting for the real, in the sense of the appearances of the world, needs to call upon visual inspection and inventory” (16). Nancy Armstrong confirms this account of the visuality of realism. Suggesting that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and similar works are classed as fantasy precisely because of “their violation of the visual standard,” she argues “that these novels, as emphatically as any scene from Dickens, defined what was real in terms of what could and would eventually be depicted by a photographic image” (11). Likewise, the novelists I discuss here make the past real by giving it fictional visibility, by making it into something that might indeed be photographable. Armstrong’s account of the photographable objects of realism demonstrates not only the cult of visibility in the nineteenth-century novel, but also its relation to the history of visual technologies, its involvement in visual culture. This dissertation furthers this investigation of the visuality of nineteenth-century realism in considering the position of the novel between written history and visual culture.

In studying visual print culture and the past in nineteenth-century British novels, my goal is not to examine illustrations of fiction or history, but rather how novelists frame historical visibility through reproduction. Reproduction is ever-present in Victorian culture, from notions of the

---

32 On the realism of Odysseus’ scar, see Erich Auerbach’s famous reading in *Mimesis* (3-24). Carolyn M. Dever reads the rhetorical significance of Esther Summerson’s altered face in Dickens’s *Bleak House* via Paul de Man’s theories of autobiography and defacement (58-60). While these examples show the uses realism makes of visible marks on the bodies of characters, Cynthia Chase argues that Daniel Deronda’s own sight of himself affects the structure of Eliot’s realism: “For Deronda not to have known he was Jewish until his mother told him means, in these terms, “that he never looked down,” an idea that exceeds, as much as does magical metamorphosis, the generous limits of realism” (222).

33 Brooks’s point that, as a term, realism is “resolutely attached to the visual” because it “comes into the culture, in the early 1850s, to characterize painting […] and then by extension is taken to describe a literary style” (16) is upheld by Linda Nochlin’s detailed account of realism in visual art, though she dates its ascendance to 1840 (13).

34 For a recent study that builds on Armstrong’s theory of the relation between realism and photography, see Novak (*Realism*). In a related reading of Victorian culture via the psychoanalytic theories of vision put forward by twentieth-century theorists Merleau-Ponty and Lacan, Lindsay Smith argues that photography reorganizes nineteenth-century concepts of “the relations between the visible and the invisible, the empirical and the transcendental” (3).

35 Other important accounts of the visuality of realism include Yeazell’s explanation of its relation to Dutch painting, and Rignall’s theory of how the spectatorship of the literary *flâneur* informs relations between characters, readers of realism and the “historical world” (2).

36 Maxwell’s edited collection, *The Victorian Illustrated Book*, offers an influential set of studies of visual accompaniments to texts in this period. Roy Strong and Andrew Sanders offer accounts of the life of British history in Victorian painting, while Rosemary Mitchell explores the Victorian apprehension of the national past in printed
family, gender, and evolution, to economic, industrial, and aesthetic thought. By exploring what I call the reproducible past, I offer one line of synthesis to concepts of nineteenth-century reproduction. As they depict the past in these novels, bodies, texts, and images carry the ideological freight of a reproducibility that is often linked to print. My use of the term “reproducible” owes a debt to Walter Benjamin’s influential essay, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” Benjamin reads reproducibility as integral to the meaning of images in modern visual culture, observing that, after photography, “to an ever greater degree the work of art reproduced becomes the work of art designed for reproducibility” (224). His essay on reproduction reveals his sense of the eagernessness of an emergent mass culture to deny distances: “contemporary masses,” he argues, aim at “overcoming the uniqueness of everyday reality by accepting its reproduction. Every day the urge grows stronger to get hold of an object by means of its likeness, its reproduction” (223). Following Benjamin’s framework, the fiction of a reproducible past brings it closer to the present, while upholding the aura of its “original.” As he suggests, “technical reproduction can put the copy of the original into situations which would be out of reach for the original itself” (220). Imagining the past as a print, a reproduction, helps to minimize its inaccessibility while maximizing the semblance of authority and authenticity—the reality—of the original past itself.

The visible histories in the novels I discuss reflect this Benjaminian reproducibility, but they can also be understood through his ideas about the phantasmagoria of historical memory. For Benjamin, the phantasmagoric proliferation of printed images in consumer culture, tourism, cinema, and dreams came to define modern specular consciousness, and, as a symbol, helped him to illustrate his concepts of collective historical knowledge. In his “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” he writes that the “[t]he past can be seized only as an image which...”

---

images. Julia Thomas argues that unstable relations between words and images define the meaning of painting and illustration as both pictorial and narrative modes in Victorian culture (15).

37 On Victorian fertility, gender, and the family, see Szreter. Bizup explains the relations between nineteenth-century industrial reproduction and aesthetic theory.

38 Benjamin distinguishes between technical reproduction, which steals the “aura” of artworks (221) and manual reproduction, which allows them to stay rooted in ritual and tradition (“Work” 220).

39 See Susan Buck-Morss on the relation between reproducible images and Benjamin’s ideas of the “dream world of mass culture” (253-56). On his concepts of modern phantasmagoria, see Margaret Cohen. On modernity and history in Benjamin’s work, see Andrew Benjamin.
flashes up at the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again” (255). He continues, “every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably” (255). Like a poster seen in passing, the historical memory Benjamin describes, as in the novels I discuss here, is an image of the past, a phantasmagoric reproduction. The fictional visible pasts these novelists imagine do the Benjaminian work of, in Susan Buck-Morss’s terms, rejecting the “legitimating, ideological function” of linear history in favour of “discovering that constellation of historical origins which has the power to explode history’s “continuum”” (x). Visible histories, like a jumble of actual printed images, create the past as one such constellation of origins, an unauthorized way to reframe the present. As a result, this project connects Benjamin’s notions of the phantasmagoric past and the reproduced image in modernity.

The images and scenes reproduced with the photographic technologies that emerged through the nineteenth century figure prominently among the examples of visual print culture that this dissertation considers. The new medium encouraged Victorians to regard the past as something that did not always need to be described in words because it could be seen. In *Camera Lucida*, Barthes considers the impact of this new historical visibility on the interpretation of the past: “A paradox: the same century invented History and Photography. But History is a memory fabricated according to positive formulas, a pure intellectual discourse which abolishes mythic Time; and the Photograph is a certain but fugitive testimony” (93). Both written history and photography are systems of representation prompted by a nineteenth-century desire to preserve prior time, but for Barthes, the photograph is more trustworthy and seems to open more immediate access to a past realm. While Armstrong demonstrates that what passes for the real in nineteenth-century realism is that which is photographable, the visible histories in the novels I discuss let the past endure as it might seem to in a photograph. In other words, the realist pose of

---

40 While the innovations that led to the daguerreotype and photography in the 1830s opened public knowledge of photographic reproducibility (see Sandler 7-23), the 1880s appearance of photographs in books and newspapers (see Carol Armstrong) and the simultaneous rise of amateur photography (see Edwards) also caused significant shifts in culture.

41 Green-Lewis observes that “The daguerreotype, and later the photograph, was often hailed as the great equalizer. The process provided everyone with the possibility of a visual link with the past which had previously only been available to the aristocracy through its paintings” (73).

42 Whereas written history is open to interpretation, vision of the photograph, Barthes writes, “is certain—contrary to the text or to other perceptions which give me the object in a vague, arguable manner, and therefore incite me to suspicions as to what I think I am seeing” (106).
photography spurs the literary fantasy of a visible past. As Jennifer Green-Lewis shows, the deceptions and exposures of the new medium disrupted its relations with realist signification: “photography’s power,” she writes, “lay in its potential to be identified either as validation of empiricism in its surface documentation of the world or, conversely, as proof that any visual account inevitably represents the world inadequately” (2). Like visible histories in novels, with the ability to seem either more authentic or more fictional than other sights, pasts “captured” in photographs might be unexpected or unplanned, lacking the authorizations of written history. While photography promotes the spectre of a visibly reproducible past, painting, printed illustration, and literature itself all produced visible histories before and throughout the nineteenth century. In this study, therefore, I regard the impact of photography as one stage of a broad cultural trend towards imagining the past as a reproducible display.

By imagining that histories are visible, the novels I address oblige readers to see along with them, since acquiescing to fiction implies concurring with the visions authors create. These moments of agreement interpellate the reader as a spectator in an ideology of the visible past, and so offer another angle on what, borrowing from film theory, might be called the social apparatus of literary realism.43 This cinematic model of specular relations underpinning readership has the potential to synthesize concepts of the visual and social appeals of realism in the nineteenth-century British novel. As in viewing cinema, in a pose of literary faith, the reading subject, the spectator of fiction, is created by and acquiesces to the ideology of the genre by suspending belief through an acceptance of the fictional analogy for the real.44 This claim can be applied to literary realism via Ermarth’s argument that the “consensus of realism […] produces in literature a rationalization of consciousness analogous to the rationalization of sight evident in realistic painting” (Realism 4), thereby involving the reader in networks of connection among characters and narrator (70). Based here, too, on the dynamics of aesthetic spectatorship, Ermarth’s reading of realist consensus implies that the reader participates in a social field of

43 Apparatus in film criticism theorizes the social construction of cinema through the interpellation of the viewing subject and suggests that ideological positioning enables the mutual constitution of spectator and cinematic technology. For an account of the emergence and critique of 1970s apparatus theory, see Rosen (281-375).

44 Accounting for the seemingly analogical reproduction of the world in the apparatus of cinema, Comolli writes, “However refined, analogy in the cinema is a deception, a lie, a fiction that must be straddled—in disavowing, knowing but not wanting to know—by the will to believe of the spectator, the spectator who expects to be fooled and wants to be fooled, thus becoming the first agent of his or her own fooling” (139, italics original). “In other words,” he suggests, “the spectator, the ideological and social subject, and not just the technical apparatus, is the operator of the analogical mechanism” (138).
perspective created by fiction. This rhetorical sociability is upheld by the primary material context of literary realism in the nineteenth-century—serial publication. In consuming nineteenth-century fiction, whether in the space of the text or in its marketplace, the reader is inevitably involved in a social field of spectatorship. Whereas Wolfgang Iser suggests that “the novel is the genre in which reader involvement coincides with meaning production” (xi), this project considers how the reader’s participation as a spectator conditioned by historical visual culture contributes to the production of novelistic meaning. This dissertation thus endeavours to situate fiction within the history of visuality by connecting the nineteenth-century spectatorships of looking at pictures or places, staring at the spectral past as a character in fiction, and the act of gazing, in private or on a park bench, at a novel world through the pages of a book or periodical—that is to say, reading.

Indeed, one outcome of this project is an exposure of a prehistory of cinematic spectatorship in the modalities of reading the nineteenth-century British novel. Ever since Sergei Eisenstein’s essay on the cinematic visuality of Dickens’s style and its relation to Griffith’s filmmaking, many scholars have observed that a genealogy of cinema can be found in the Victorian novel and that filmmakers inherit the time-based dreams of literature. The visibly evident and reproducible past in nineteenth-century novels should be counted among the antecedents of the cinematic display of time passing. In addressing relations between literature and cinema, I am most concerned with the ground they share in the ideological history of visual and print

---

45 In examining “active audiences” of serial fiction, Jennifer Hayward argues that serial fiction creates a social field of interpretation as well as serving “important social functions” in everyday life (31). Tom Keymer observes the significant participation of readers in defining duration in eighteenth-century serial narrative. The social context of serialized fiction relates to contemporary social media, including blogs, as made clear by Susan Bernstein’s website Serial Readers.

46 Just as Batchen shows in Burning with Desire that the desire to photograph is evident in writing from before 1839, Galperin likewise argues for discerning a prehistory of cinema in the Romantic “return of the visible” (31-33). Foundational studies of historical reading habits and nineteenth-century novels include Nicholas Dames’s The Physiology of the Novel, Garrett Stewart’s Dear Reader, and Kate Flint’s The Woman Reader. Leah Price offers a helpful overview of the field in “Reading: The State of the Discipline.”

47 In his 1944 essay, “Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today,” Eisenstein investigates the cinematic visuality of Dickens’s style, and argues that “Griffith arrived at montage through the method of parallel action, and he was led to the idea of parallel action by—Dickens!” (205). Joss Marsh suggests that “it was from fiction that film inherited its mass audience, its social function, its plots, and its techniques of narration” (“Dickens” 204), and she plots how “the cinema reveals itself as descended from Charles Dickens” (“Dickensian” 336). Graeme Smith argues that “Dickens anticipates in images the medium that would only come into being after his death” (1). For a recent analysis of Dickens’s and Griffith’s similar use of montage, see Timothy Johns. Dianne F. Sadoff and Liora Brosh examine the ideologies driving twentieth-century film adaptations of Victorian novels.
In a widely influential essay, French film-theorist Jean-Louis Comolli explains the origins of cinematic realism in a late nineteenth-century culture that “live[d] in a sort of frenzy of the visible” as a result of “the social multiplication of images,” the “ever wider distribution of illustrated papers, waves of prints, caricatures” (122). The spectator-readers of print culture and realism prefigure cinema’s audiences, while both visual and literary print series foreshadow the setting of incrementally different images in succession so as to display the passage of time. The cinematic animation of time passing can be read as a response to the reproducibility of print, the repetitions of which, as I argue here, also contributed to the equally cinematic idea of visible history in Victorian narrative.

My first chapter initiates this study of the visible past in nineteenth-century fiction by investigating Sir Walter Scott’s illustration of history in *The Antiquary* (1816). One of the most self-consciously historicist of his historical novels, *The Antiquary* imagines the past as irrepressibly returning in visible displays in landscape and in individual bodies. Invoking “illustration” as a mode of representing the past in fiction and in images in books, Scott’s work proposes historical apprehension as a visual process and presents the past with a heightened realism by giving it narrative visibility. Seeing the past in this novel often entails regarding it as a spectacle, positioning would-be historians as tourists, and contributing to the Romantic establishment of Scotland as a visible past to visit. In this sense, these visible histories make the past into the consumerist object Debord describes in *Society of the Spectacle*. History also returns in “ghosts” and displays of dubious reality, projections that, when read through Derrida’s *Spectres of Marx*, invoke the past in battles over property and capital. Together, the alternative vantage points on the past offered by these spectral and spectacular visible histories provide a counterpoint to the national historiography that Scott’s novel otherwise engages. Scott’s

---

48 As Garrett Stewart explains, “the coming of cinema might properly be seen to promote a cultural disposition—a whole epistemic regime—rather than just to machinate further a previous visual device” (*Between* 226). In this field of discussion I follow Audrey Jaffe’s suggestion that “the idea of a continuity between literature and film may thus be significant less for what it reveals about the genealogy of cinema than for what it tells about the role of visuality and its literary evocations in defining, reinforcing, and disseminating some of Western culture’s dominant values* (*Scenes* 28).

49 In a study of visual media, Lynda Nead argues that “[b]y 1900 it would have been very easy to conclude that all images and the act of viewing itself involved some form of motion” (12).

50 On the constitution of spectatorship in consumer culture, Debord writes, “In societies where modern conditions of production prevail, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation” (1, italics original).

51 Derrida explains the spectrality of social relations created by commodity culture (194-95).
inheritance of the visible histories of ghost fiction, the contingencies of seeing the past and the displays that make it real in his work, lay the ground for the visible histories in the later novels I study.

In my second chapter I investigate concepts of serial reproduction in print culture to demonstrate how two texts from 1859-60, Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* and Wilkie Collins’s *The Woman in White*, both use visible history to account for biological pasts. Produced almost simultaneously, both works rely on theories of reproduction to narrate the histories implied by resemblances between bodies. Darwin’s inheritance of print culture connects biological and Benjaminian discourses of reproduction, since he retrieves an explanation for the current of resemblance from the “impressions” of print. Whereas Darwin describes a sublime past in the similitude between animals of a breed and their related species, Collins implies a common history in the extreme facial resemblance between Anne Catherick and Laura Fairlie. Seriality, the print culture idea of reproductive repetition with slight difference, contextualizes the visible histories of identity that concern both authors and the visibilities of the past in both books link biological and print reproduction. Relating Darwin’s reproductive investments to the preoccupation with print in Collins’s novel, this chapter demonstrates Mr. Fairlie’s queer counterargument: anticipating Dorian Gray’s transference of the physical conditions of embodiment to a painting, Mr. Fairlie’s aesthetic objects offer him alternatives to heterosexual procreation. Whether in bodies or prints, the return of the past in these books is always the result of a visible reproduction.

My third chapter examines how Victorian fiction and illustrated books collaborate in the imaginative constitution of a place as a historical artifact. I argue that the British colonial vision of Palestine implied by the Balfour Declaration of 1917 is evident in the gazes on the region enacted in George Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda* (1876) and in nineteenth-century illustrated travel books. These perspectives imagine Palestine as a sight from the past. Complicit in this field of visualizations is a changing visual culture, affected by photography as well as by new printing techniques. While Deronda is influenced by Mordecai’s mystic vision of the land to the East, many Victorian authors and illustrators travelled to Palestine only to see historical illustrations of the Bible. Revealing another angle on the elisions of Arab experience in Victorian culture
described by Edward Said, these works reflect the Victorian view of Palestine as the spectre of a real location, rather than a place with an intractable reality of its own.\textsuperscript{52} Eliot’s novel and the illustrated travel books demonstrate that the region itself was frequently thought of as being already a reproduction of the past, rather than an “original” with its own reality and authenticity, a fantasy that helped open Palestine to British legislation.

In my last chapter I read Oscar Wilde’s concept of realization as a practice of visualizing history. Wilde’s frequent uses of the word “realization” in \textit{The Picture of Dorian Gray} and other texts express his notion that readers and viewers can generate history through acts of looking. The term also describes the reader’s imagination of Dorian’s past in his portrait. By allowing the reader to fill in what his text leaves blank—that is, Dorian’s portrait itself and the tales it tells—Wilde’s realization offers a novel expansion of realism. Since the reader realizes Dorian’s past by imaginatively “looking” at his portrait, I situate this Wildean form of spectatorship within visual culture. I argue that Wilde’s realization of visible history in Dorian’s portrait corresponds to contemporary trends in literary portraiture and to the modifications of photography in Victorian impressions of the visibility of the past. While it originated partly in response to photography, Wilde’s realization also affects later habits of interpreting printed images. I cap this study of Wildean realization by demonstrating its afterlife in interpretations of a false photograph of the author that was printed and reprinted many times in the late twentieth century. Wilde’s realization, a practice of seeing the past reproduced in portraits, endures in both literary and visual culture.

These four novels reveal that the proliferation of printed images informed and helped to create the recurrent idea of a visible and reproducible past in nineteenth-century British literature. With Scott we imagine the historical novel as the illustration of a visible past in a lineage with actual illustrated books, whereas in Wilde’s image-saturated \textit{fin de siècle}, pictures themselves have autonomous power to realize their own historical narratives. The visibility of the past in these fictions enhances its social utility and meaning by reifying the essential immateriality of past time, thus making history easier to buy and buy into: like a book, a visible past can be bought,

\textsuperscript{52} On the nonexistence of Arab life in George Eliot’s work, see Said’s \textit{The Question of Palestine} (68). Said also addresses Western blindness to Middle Eastern experience in \textit{Orientalism} and \textit{Culture and Imperialism}. 
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sold, bequeathed, read, disputed, revised, circulated, and reproduced. Throughout this study, my intention is not to suggest that all visual returns of the past in nineteenth-century literature were new, a claim that literary revenants from Homer to *Hamlet* would quickly destroy. Rather I demonstrate that Walter Scott’s historical illustration begins a century of fiction that peers at and returns to a modern idea of the past as a ghostly, irrepressible, and unauthorized visible reproduction.

---

53 On the uses of books in the nineteenth century, see Leah Price on “Victorian representations and perceptions of, and fantasies and illusions about, the circulation of books” (*How to Do Things* 36).
Chapter 1
Scott’s Illustration: The Spectral and Spectacular Past in The Antiquary

Among Walter Scott’s many historical novels, The Antiquary (1816) offers a particularly telling example of his techniques of representing the past: not only is it an historical novel about an Antiquary, an historical hobbyist, but its plot turns on the belated acknowledgement of past events. The novel projects an Oedipal contest over the historical record: unless the story is set straight, the dynasty-destroying perception of incest among the Glenallan patriarchy may endure, contaminating the entire community. While national history is disrupted by the threat of invasion, the continuity of the community also depends on a revolution in its own historical narrative—the truth must out. As Judith Wilt writes in her description of Oldbuck’s “ecstasy” in possessing historical artifacts, “The Antiquary is about the Romance of Property when the property is history” (157). In the transformation of history into property in this novel, the visibility of the past is currency, and the representations that illuminate contested history are as frequently seen, or shown to be hidden, as they are written. In a process I describe as Scott’s historical “illustration,” in The Antiquary spectral intimations of the past materialize as spectacles that are visible in the physical world the novel represents.

I rely throughout on Derrida’s “spectrality” and Debord’s “spectacle” to ground my use of these terms, which, in these theorists’ accounts, share layers of ghostliness, visuality, and commodification. While Derrida explains the indeterminacy of the spectral as the “furtive and ungraspable visibility of the invisible” (6), Guy Debord writes that “The spectacle is capital to such a degree of accumulation that it becomes an image” (paragraph 34, italics original). As

54 For Derrida, following Marx, there are spectres in the “relations among commodities” (194), while “these ghosts that are commodities transform human producers into ghosts” (195). Derrida suggests two conclusions about spectrality: “(1) the phenomenal form of the world itself is spectral; (2) the phenomenological ego (Me, You, and so forth) is a spectre. The phainesthai itself (before its determination as phenomenon or phantasm, thus as phantom) is the very possibility of the spectre, it brings death, it gives death, it works at mourning” (169). Derrida further suggests that the spectre implies the “tangible intangibility of a proper body without flesh,” a “someone as someone other,” by whom “we feel ourselves being looked at” (6, italics original). Debord’s spectacle also encodes the ghostliness of capital: he contends that “spectacle extends to all social life the principle which Hegel […] conceives as the principle of money: it is ‘the life of what is dead, moving within itself’” (paragraph 215). The spectacle evinces hauntedness through its relation to capital. While Derrida’s spectrality is the result of the function of capital and implies mortality and a haunting of the evident world, Debord’s spectacles are visual experiences in the material world that can be circulated, and theoretically sold, among more than one person, and are functions of the commodity in society.
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necessarily inaccurate explanations or visual interpretations of other texts or scenes, illustrations exhibit the spectrality of indeterminate meaning and obstructed visibility. As commercial objects of display they are also spectacles for consumers. I argue that this combination of effects in the word “illustration” reveals its utility as a descriptive term for the oft-noted visuality of Scott’s representation of the past.55 Other critics have broached the historical meaning of Scott’s ghosts, the significance of visual media and sight in his work, and the connections between historiography and his genre of fiction.56 Derridean concepts of spectrality have likewise spurred much critical investigation of the relations between visibility, capital, and ghosts in nineteenth-century British literature in recent years.57 I build on these fields of scholarship to demonstrate that the historical representations of spectres and the spectacle of the past in visual media, landscape, and bodies together illustrate history in *The Antiquary*, both for the characters and for readers.

I begin by contextualizing this claim with reference to theories of history and visual media in Scott’s work, and then I historicize his own engagement with illustration. Next I offer a reading of historical illustration in *The Antiquary* as a process of bringing visibility to the past through images and prose, spectres and spectacle.58 The novel makes the past into a spectral presence by

55 J. Hillis Miller’s use of “illustration” to consider the project of cultural studies is a notable example of the productivity of the word, which is strung between display and explanation. Arguing that Scott’s writing visualized the past ekphrastically for readers, Maurice Samuels writes that his novels “turn readers into viewers, making the arbitrary signs of language act like the natural signs of painting in order to reduce to an absolute minimum the barrier that language poses between the subject (the reader/viewer) and the object (the past)” (167). Ina Ferris locates the spectrality of Scott’s visible past in the scene of reading his fiction, and observes that “[b]y so animating and mobilizing material details of the past through constant shifts in focalization, distance, and tempo, as well as by looping description’s objects into the story while linking them to modern readers through explicit and implicit acts of mediation, Scott’s fiction produced a quasi-physical impact, inducing a sense of reading as an embodied experience” (“Before our Eyes” 76-77).

56 Boatright, Smajić (“Supernatural”), and Bragg offer important considerations of supernaturalism, spectrality, and ghosts in Scott’s work, while Catherine Gordon, Hill, Garside (“Illustrating the Waverley Novels” and “Waverley’s Pictures of the Past”), Maxwell (“Walter Scott”), Terry, Finley, and Peacocke examine relations between Scott’s work and visual culture. For accounts of the place of Scott’s novels between history and fiction, see Lukács, Duncan (Modern Romance and Scott’s Shadow), Goode, Maxwell (Historical Novel), Rigney (Imperfect Histories), Chandler, and Zimmerman.

57 Discussing Wordsworth’s encounter with commodification through books and following from Guy Debord and Derrida’s reading of Marx, Simpson shows that spectres and bookishness must be involved in efforts to think through the commodity of spectacle in Romantic writing (4-14). Andrew Smith promotes “an economic theory of the ghost story” in Victorian literature with reference Marxist thought (10-32) while Wolfreys’s account of Victorian spectrality relies heavily on Derrida’s *Specters of Marx*.

58 Throughout the chapter, I depend on W. J. T. Mitchell’s descriptions of relations between prose and images (see Picture Theory and Iconology), and on Foucault’s theories of interchanges between visibility and knowledge in
linking intimations of history to ghostly appearances, while the developing visibility of the past as a spectacle makes it knowable but also opens it to possession. While Scott positions his writing as illustration, historical spectres and landscape spectacles also illustrate the past in this novel. Scott’s historical illustration reproduces the past as a visible object that contributes to the material circulation of wealth, exemplified by the commodification of a visible past in Lovel’s spectral and spectacular appearance. Scott’s illustration both reproduces visible histories for re-use in the world of his novel and was itself reproduced in visual culture, so I close by addressing how the historical reifications of Scott’s illustration were replicated in other visual contexts. In particular, the Romantic tourism industry in Scotland “ripped” the author’s historical illustration from his books for re-use in travel guides. In describing the spectres and spectacles in Scott’s illustration of the past, therefore, I account for the visuality of his historical depiction by addressing material pressures in the narrative and in later reproductions of his visible history.

**History and Illustration in *The Antiquary***

Figuring the past as a world of experience that can be visibly exposed or hidden, *The Antiquary* sheds light on events that may otherwise be lost to the historical record, and that might never have been included in public histories anyway. As Ian Duncan explains, Scott’s novels do not just “fictionalize history,” but they also “historicize fiction as an institution, a set of material forms and social practices, which includes as its paradigmatic modern case the novel itself and our act of reading it” (*Scott’s Shadow* 136). History is not only a theme of Scott’s fiction, but his genre is defined in relation to historiography, the written representation of the past. In the section that follows, I situate discussions of history and visuality in Scott’s fiction so as to contextualize my reading of historical illustration in *The Antiquary*.

The question of what detail about the past constitutes “history” is germane to critical debates about what makes Scott’s novels “historical,” whether it is simply their varied representations of past time, or their accounts of national political narrative. For Lukács, who popularized a misleading notion of *Waverley* as the first historical novel (Maxwell, *Historical* 1-2), Marx’s

[Western culture, particularly as they are articulated in *Discipline and Punish* (195-231), and *The Birth of the Clinic* (131-52).]
political thought “lives, moves and has its being poetically in the best historical novels of Scott” (Lukács 56). Some later twentieth-century critics read national historiography as the only mode of “historical” representation in Scott.\(^5^9\) This approach does not observe the multifaceted representation of the past in Scott’s novels, which allows their categorization as “historical” to encompass more than their relationship to national historiography. Mirroring the late twentieth-century academic turn to social history that looks for new sources of evidence about the past and privileges the experience of women and other marginalized demographics, more recent criticism has considered in *The Antiquary* a broader spectrum of depictions of the past as aspects of Scott’s historical representation.\(^6^0\) A wide range of representations and discoveries of the past in Scott’s fiction, including “antiquarian nostalgia,” together make his novels historical.\(^6^1\) Ina Ferris describes this thread in his work as “Scott’s emerging conviction that forces outside those conventionally featured in the discourses of history […] had historical import” (*Achievement* 199), a conviction that allowed him to offer a critique of official historiography, or what some have called “authentic history” (197). The personal, domestic histories represented in fiction participate in “history” in Scott’s work, expanding avenues for investigating the representation of the past in his novels.\(^6^2\)

---

\(^5^9\) Fleishman argues that *The Antiquary* is not really a historical novel (75), partly because “the frequent discussions of France and the pervasive, hysterical alarm at a supposed invasion are the only ways in which current affairs impinge on the characters’ lives” (76). Harry E. Shaw also focuses on the political dimensions of historical discourse of the novel. Although he does heed the primary importance of the female characters, his final description of the significance of Elspeth’s conflict with the Countess is as an expression of class unrest (76), rather than as a revelation of a shared past. “History,” for both of these critics, refers to power shifts among institutions and political groups.

\(^6^0\) On the emergence of social history in reaction to poststructuralist thought, see Spiegel’s edited collection, *Practicing History*. Fiona Robertson documents the urgency of memory to Elspeth (201), and the storytelling of female characters (198), though she too returns to the notion of “history” as the explanation of political conflict in the present, rather than as a depiction of the past. On the role of historical representation in *The Antiquary*, Goode writes that “Scott interrogates the cultural legitimacy of various modes through which individuals know the past and live with that knowledge” (2) and finds that both emergent enlightenment historicism and antiquarianism inform the novel’s placement of historical authority with Oldbuck.

\(^6^1\) Reading Nietzsche on Scott, Richard Maxwell describes this turn to the social and domestic in Scott’s historiography as “antiquarian nostalgia,” a trait that certainly describes the protagonist of *The Antiquary*: by Scott’s time, Maxwell writes, antiquarianism such as his is “increasingly designed to invoke a community, a home” so that “[b]y a kind of optical illusion, antiquarian nostalgia foreshortens, personalizes, and claims history” (*Historical* 61, 62). Antiquarian nostalgia thus enables the domestic details now associated with “social history” to offer evidence of the past.

\(^6^2\) This interpretation suggests the idea that fiction may be more “true” than documentary writing, and indeed, in a footnote, Grossman notes the “widespread nineteenth-century belief that the truth of the past is to be found in the writings of poets and novelists rather than in official histories” and that Scott was a better historian than “real” historians (52n 8). Similarly, Smajić writes that, like *Waverley*, *The Antiquary* can be said to “ponder what may legitimately be imagined and represented in a text that adheres to historical facts yet does not “intrude upon the
The threat of invasion in *The Antiquary* highlights the special purview of fiction to record personal history and demonstrates the risks faced by history itself.\(^{63}\) If the invaders arrive, social divisions might be broken down through the revelation of histories that cross ranks, the social order could falter under the burden of lost historical knowledge, or the community could face total historical oblivion by being swept away by the French.\(^{64}\) If the historical record is threatened by the invasion, the personal histories remembered and represented by individual characters and documented by Scott’s fiction are equally at risk, and their loss may prove even more devastating for the community. The precariousness of documenting the past and the instability of the division between history and fiction as modes of knowing and representing reality often erupt in ghostliness in Scott’s work. As Smajić argues, Scott’s realism in *Waverley* uses “the ghost as a dubious emblem of the inviolability of the historical record” (“Supernatural” 7). Similarly, seemingly supernatural events in *The Antiquary* speak to the battle for authority over the past that the novel charts. Scott’s invocation of the supernatural in intimating family history—for example, in the apparition of Oldbuck’s ancestor (100)—owes much to Gothic narratives that imply unknown history in ghostly and spectral appearances: spectres offer Scott an alternative version of historiography.\(^{65}\) Viewing the past in his work requires the synthesis of possibly incommensurate or unreasonable data, a willingness to read the historical multiplicity evoked by spectres for information about the past.
Some readers of Scott observe that the spectrality of his historical representations results in the past taking visible shape in his fiction. Emma Rosalind Peacocke suggests that painted portraits in the *Waverley* novels “are part of the apparatus of the novel for investigating the past” (188) and offer a “lens for scrutinizing *Waverley’s* reflections on time, history, and historiography” (206). The historical meaning Scott attached to paintings was not limited to their appearance in his novels: Peacocke recounts an anecdote in which Scott writes of having come upon a portrait of himself “hanging quietly” in the house of a deceased friend. “The image of the portrait salvaged from the wreck of the past,” Peacocke writes, “and ensconced at the domestic heart of the house replays the conclusion of *Waverley*” (187). For Scott (as for Dorian Gray, as we shall later see), the past is frequently salvaged by an image. In this particular anecdote, Scott’s discovery of an image of himself in a dead friend’s house mirrors the visible return of a ghost from the past. This visual recurrence suggests the potential for slippage between spectres and the spectacles of visible media, both of which represent the past in Scott’s writing.

While fictional paintings offer a useful site for interrogating shared ground between visuality, writing, and historical representation in Scott’s work, the common description of his prose as a palimpsest also implies that his work makes visible potentially contradictory versions of history. I agree with critics who suggest that reading Scott’s writing as a palimpsest reflects the spectrality of his layered narratives and offers a helpful model for considering the visibility of the past in his work. However, the palimpsest metaphor for Scott’s historical representation describes the return of the past—the old representation—as a verbal display, whereas I contend

---

66 Ann Rigney explains the eagerness of readers through the nineteenth century to produce visualizations of Scott’s work (*Scott’s Afterlives* 55-57), suggesting that “[b]ecause his depictions of the past were highly visual, he can be said to have helped imagine the paintings and spectacles, including the cinematic ones, to which his own work later gave rise” (55). Emma Rosalind Peacocke argues that Scott deliberately compares “history-painting and portraiture with novel writing” in *The Bride of Lammermoor* (1819) (189). Ruth Yeazell also elaborates the implications of such alignments of novels and painting. She opens her book on Dutch painting and literary realism with Scott’s famous comparison of Austen’s work to Flemish painting (1), even as other critics compared his own work to Dutch masters for its abundance of detail and scenes both domestic and exterior (4-5).

67 Peacocke, for example, suggests that Scott’s portraits are a “palimpsest of *mentalités*” (206), while Gosta uses the idea of the palimpsest to describe Scott’s representation of history. “Scott the empiricist,” she argues, “overwrites the past, leads the past into a more civilized future, but Scott the romanticist constantly unveils the *scriptio inferior*, the underwriting of the historical palimpsest,” so that his work “retains the memory of the past, confronting the past with the present” (711). Bragg suggests, however, alongside Judith Wilt (158), that the palimpsest has been a perhaps overused figure among critics of Scott’s novels for describing occasions where “the scene conveys different layers of significance to the “viewer”” (210).
that, for Scott, the past is an illustrated phenomenon, spectral and spectacular, as visual as it is written.

Illustration offers a more useful visual corollary for Scott’s historical representation than painting and palimpsests, and indeed it plays a key historical role in *The Antiquary*. The events of the novel are set in motion by the Antiquary’s enthusiasm over a newly acquired possession that illustrates the past in Scottish landscape. While traveling together as strangers, the Antiquary and Lovel first begin to converse over Alexander Gordon’s illustrated book, *Itinerarium Septentrionale: or, a Journey Thro’ Most of the Countries of Scotland and Those in the North of England* (1726), which the Antiquary has just purchased (18).68 The work, which, in the 1794 setting of the novel, is already nearly seventy years old, instigates the events of the plot by serving as the prop that introduces the two main characters. The *Itinerarium* contains many lavish engravings of the plans of old Roman forts in Scotland, as well as images of Roman cutlery, carvings, and castles, and it opens by announcing that the “Monuments of Antiquity, exhibited in the following sheets, are chiefly intended to illustrate the *Roman Actions in Scotland*” (n.p., italics original). This formulation is strikingly similar to the beginning of Scott’s Advertisement for *The Antiquary*, in which he anticipates Collins’s and Darwin’s uses of the “series” by describing the Waverley novels as “a series of fictitious narratives, intended to illustrate the manners of Scotland at three different periods” (3).69 A few sentences later Scott repeats this terminology in articulating his desire to “illustrate” the workings of passion as much as he wants to “describe manners minutely” (3). Scott positions *The Antiquary* as sharing a genre with the illustrated book about antiquity that begins the action of this novel. Although there were no illustrations in the first edition of *The Antiquary*, in describing his prose as an illustration, Scott proposes his text as a counterpart to visually enriched texts like Gordon’s that had similar intentions to expose historical landscapes to new audiences. Gordon’s book and Scott’s prose cast the past as a spectacle that books can sell to readers. Both works illustrate the past, shed light on it, and make the past visible.

68 This instigation of events exemplifies what Deidre Lynch describes as “the fetishism that the Gothic practices in making books the origin of plot” (“Romantic” 44).
69 Maxwell observes the interest of this same formulation in Scott’s opening to *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (“Walter Scott” 3).
“Illustration” as an idea was shifting in meaning during Scott’s time. For contemporary readers Scott’s use of the term “illustrate” seems to invoke visual associations explicitly. As a standard word for printed images beside texts, however, “illustration” was still young when Scott wrote *The Antiquary* and undocumented when Gordon published his *Itinerarium*. The word referred then more commonly to explanation, glorification, or illumination. The earliest example of its use to describe visual media in *The Oxford English Dictionary* is from 1813 (“illustration”), just three years before the publication of *The Antiquary*. Johnson’s 1755 *Dictionary* does not contain the meaning of “illustration” as a visual image, while its subtitle announces that its “words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers.” Curiously, a 1756 octavo edition of Johnson’s original folio dictionary modifies this formulation in the title, so that the literary examples no longer “illustrate” the meanings of words, but rather the words are “explained in their different meanings and authorized by the names of the writers in whose works they are found.” In these eighteenth-century settings, “illustration” is a mode of pointedly verbal explanation rather than visual depiction. Although Gordon (or his printer), like many other publishers of eighteenth-century illustrated books, seems to be using the visual meaning of the word in stating on the title page of the *Itinerarium*, “The Whole Illustrated with Sixty-Six Copper Plates,” this use of the term may imply explanation and glorification as much as visualization. Such early “illustrations” accompanying texts may also have been rhetorically imagined as light cast on unseen topics—a novel construal of the meaning of visual media well before the advent of modern projection arts. Given this etymological history, Scott’s use of “illustration” need not be taken as referring literally to the visual depiction of his topic.

Yet while Scott is “illustrating” Scottish customs to illuminate them, to explain them, and to make them illustrious, he also seems to be using the term in its new meaning: his written

70 Maxwell notes that during the Romantic period the meaning of “illustration” moved between visual depiction and verbal explanation, and he suggests that “Walter Scott inspired both kinds of illustration” in visual and written supplements and syntheses of his work (“Walter Scott” 1-2). Such paratexts, Maxwell argues, are a key part of the process by which “illustration as we now understand it established itself as a pervasive accompaniment to imaginative literature during the nineteenth century” (2).

71 Martin Meisel suggests that in the nineteenth century “illustration” as an idea “carried a sense of enrichment and embellishment beyond mere specification; it implied the extension of one medium or mode of discourse by another, rather than materialization with a minimum of imaginative intervention” (30).

72 On the history of spectral media see Castle (140-167).
“illustration” does seem to imply visual representation. He claims his works have “little more than some truth of colouring to recommend them” (3), and thereby describes the authenticity of his writing with reference to the visual quality of colour. As though character may be drawn, he considers “historical personages free subjects of delineation” (4). Taking pains to specify that Dousterswivel and Edie Ochiltree are based on “actual” people (3-5), he refers to his characters as “portraits” that may retain “some resemblance to real individuals” (4). Individuals in particular are visualized when rendered as fictional characters. Scott describes “the individual he had in his eye” (9) when imagining Edie Ochiltree, and, referring to a verbal description of the same character, Oldbuck says, “All this is an exact picture of the man” (350). Scott seems to affirm the authenticity of verbal representations of individuals by making claims for their visibility.

These frequent visual metaphors in Scott’s description of his fictional representations suggest that a kind of visibility may derive from writing. Well before the time of photography, Scott’s writing exhibits the habit of representing reality through visual detail that Nancy Armstrong ascribes to later nineteenth-century fiction (7). In concluding his anecdotes about the models of his characters, Scott claims a right to “add another picture” of them, as he considers “these illustrations as a sort of gallery” (10). While his visual metaphors for prose descriptions may not be intended literally, Scott is using the word “illustration” in its newer meaning, that is, in reference to pictorial depiction. He is illustrating his subjects so as to make them somehow “visible.” This literal reading of the visuality of Scott’s prose coincides with readers’ interpretations of his work. Richard J. Hill observes that audiences for 1830s editions of Scott’s work “came to require Scott’s prose to be visualized for them,” and he quotes a reviewer’s claim that illustrations of Scott’s fiction represented “a better guide than imagination” and the “key to thought” (161, italics original). Scott’s appeals to visuality as a way to confirm the realism of his depictions, therefore, validate his readers’ demands for actual visibility and manifest the combination of verbal and visual effects that came to define illustration.

73 For Hill, this insistence bespeaks the pre-photographic “sensationalism of the ‘real’” when “the public demand for realization in theatrical productions was relocated to the domestic environment” (160). The rhetoric surrounding the insufficiencies of Scott’s prose, and the visual aids devised to fill them correspond with what Bolter and Grusin call “remediation”—the use of new media technologies to enhance the semblance of “immediacy” offered by older formats (5).
The few uses of the word “illustration” within the novel itself elucidate the importance of both visual depiction and explanation as overlapping forms of signification in Scott’s representation of the past. Invoking “illustration” as explanation, the Antiquary notes that “the topographical details here laid down were designed to illustrate a slight essay upon castrametation” (340). Using its meaning of “illustriousness,” he insists that Lovel’s life “should be reserved to illustrate the literature of [his] country” (188). These uses of “illustration” and its cognates imply “explanation” as well as “decoration,” and combine meanings of verbal annotation with the ostensible clarifications of visual lustre. The Antiquary’s most telling use of the verb “to illustrate” comes in the Antiquary’s own voice. Speaking of his love of analysis of the historical liaisons between nations, Oldbuck says “everything that can illustrate such connexions is most valuable to me” (289). The Antiquary discovers value in the dual meaning of historical illustration, which makes prior events visible as a means of explaining them.

The significance of historical illustration in this novel corresponds to the eighteenth-century specifications of antiquarianism itself. Susan Manning suggests that the passion for collecting of antiquaries like Oldbuck “offered access to a kind of unsyntaxed past, whose unarticulated elements stimulated imaginative contemplation released from the pressures of context and the controls of social hierarchy” (50). For antiquaries, objects both display and explain the past: their collections illustrate history. On the special relation between illustration and antiquaries, Richard Maxwell writes that “Through the mediation of antiquarianism, with its destabilizing, sometimes anarchic craving for supplements of all kinds, the idea and practice of pictures in books achieved a new kind of power” (2). Maxwell demonstrates that both fiction and antiquarianism share a project of imagining that “[t]he past is by definition invisible” and that to create a historical narrative is “to illustrate times past” (27, italics original), while works like The Antiquary, he suggests in a footnote, proposed “historical novels as illustrations” (“Walter Scott” 74 Manning further explains that “As collectors of the fragmentary remains of the past antiquaries inhabited the boundary between two prevailing, and complementary, models of Enlightenment historiography: the empirical, analytic ‘Newtonian’ tradition which accumulated evidence and inferred social organization from it, and the conjectural modes of Scottish Enlightenment philosophical or ‘stadialist’ history which posited the universal progress of all societies through a uniform set of ‘stages’ from primitive hunter-gatherers, through a pastoral existence to civil society and (ultimately) decadence and disintegration” (49).
Caught up in a historical novel, the Antiquary’s disciplines and genres collaborate in the significance of “illustration,” a word that comes to describe windows on the past.

Actual illustrations, in the contemporary sense of the word, also helped to demarcate Scott’s historical sensibilities. To open her book on historical picturing during the nineteenth century, Rosemary Mitchell quotes from a letter in which Scott professed that “pictures and prints” would offer the best introduction to “a taste for history” (1). In this October 1823 letter of advice to a friend about how to teach history to his son, Scott insists that visual experiences make knowledge about the past both interesting and memorable: “For after the events which we have actually seen those which dwell deepest in our minds are such as are connected with scenes which we have visited or actors whose features are familiar to us” (Letters 104). His emphasis on visible history as a form of pedagogy seems to offer him a way of connecting historical representation to the function of personal memory. Insisting on the importance of making visits to historical scenes and galleries (104-05), Scott’s description of how to teach history relies equally on the productions of tourism and visual representation. He also declares that he “would have a gallery of portraits annexd [sic] to every great school,” since only “a dull man” could haunt such a gallery without learning the history of its characters, and “it is not to children alone that such illustrations are useful” (103). Whether Scott is referring to “illustration” as clarification or depiction is ambiguous, and it is likely that both meanings of the word are implied. His notion of the gallery here recalls his gallery of character illustrations mentioned above, as well as Christopher Kent Rovee’s explanation of how, in the Romantic period, the gallery was “an institution invested with the authority of the past, and a representative space that could put on view the face of the present” (3). At once explanation and visual representation, Scott’s historical pedagogy is indeed “illustration” in all meanings of the word. He would create for his students a gallery spectacle of historical scenes so as to better explain the spectre of the present yet invisible past.

75 Writing of both written and visual accompaniments to Scott’s writing, Maxwell also suggests that “[a]n illustrative supplement thus became the magical sign of authorial presence, as well as of history itself” (“Walter Scott” 3).

76 Scott’s interest in the utility of visualizations for children fits his pedagogic ideas into the broader history of children’s publishing: Seth Lerer notes that the new illustration technologies in the nineteenth century “provoked a reconception of the children’s book as fundamentally an illustrated object” (323).
The slow merger of verbal explanation and visual imagery in the definition of “illustration” clarifies exchanges between verbal and visual representation in Scott’s depictions of the past. Moving from the indeterminacy of an explanation that may or may not be literally visible as an image, to the firm visibility of a printed picture, the word “illustration” and its dual visual and verbal allegiances illuminate the spectral and spectacular representations of the past in *The Antiquary*.

**Spectres and Spectacles in Scott’s Illustration of the Past**

Scott’s novel “illustrates” the past by making it perceptible, both to the characters and to the reader. This historical representation need not entail written historiography: in the world of this book spectral intimations accompany visible spectacles to represent the past. In the following reading of *The Antiquary*, I first expose the spectrality of historical awareness in the novel and then demonstrate how moments of viewing spectacles also illustrate the past. I conclude my reading by examining how the historical illustration embodied by Lovel combines spectrality and spectacle and restores order to his family’s hereditary past.

The ghostliness of spectrality corresponds to the conditions of historical knowledge in the society *The Antiquary* depicts. Eighteenth-century communities in rural Scotland, such as the one Scott represents in the fictional “Fairport,” were largely illiterate. In oral societies, death reduces the accessibility of the past, and without living witnesses to tell of past events, history ceases. In such contexts, the symbol of the ghost implies the retrieval of history from the destruction wrought by mortality. Likewise, in this novel, characters encounter the spectre of the past in ghostly sights, and in the stories of characters who seem to transgress boundaries between life and death. Elspeth’s storytelling in particular projects historical images for those living in the present. She is an eye-witness to the distant past: no more ghost-like creature exists. While supernatural fiction might display the past in revenants, the characters in this work are not haunted by “real” ghosts. Instead, the preservation of their history depends upon the ghostly

---

77 See Houston on literacy rates in eighteenth-century Scotland (20-83).
78 The conjunction of Scott’s historiographic genre with the spectral oral histories frequently narrated by women presents, in Bakhtin’s words, Scott’s “movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into the rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia” (263).
affiliation of the living with the dead, making spectrality one component of the novel’s illustration of the past.

Ghostliness saturates the environment of *The Antiquary*. While nothing occurs in the novel that defies reasonable expectations, supernatural stories abound. Edie Ochiltree compares himself to a “troubled spirit,” while the narrator calls him “ghostly,” and he jokes about disembodied spirits (196, 197, 249). He has seen “mony a queer thing” in the cove, though he won’t tell tales of the sights (216). Though he professes disbelief, he is attuned to the habitats of haunts: “I am nae believer in auld wives’ stories about ghaists, though this is gey like a place for them” (207). While Edie seems well-informed about ghosts and somewhat ghostly himself, Oldbuck threatens that he’ll send Dousterswivel “where you’ll see spirits enough” (211). The swindler Dousterswivel is indeed responsible for many of the spectral sights and spirits hovering through the book. He terrifies Sir Arthur with the prospect of seeing a spirit in the process of retrieving a treasure (209), and seduces the victims of his frauds with “specious appearances” (128). Though he is responsible for creating false sights, Dousterswivel also is subject to them, and he believes in the fake spectre that Edie and Stevie create for him (250-51). This tenor of “explained supernatural” haunts the novel, but one of its few unexplained supernatural events is Lovel’s strange and visionary dream. While staying with the Antiquary, he has a vision in which a “tapestry waved wildly on the wall, till its dusky forms seemed to become animated,” and all its figures “pursued, with all the fury of the chase, the employment in which the artist had represented them as engaged” (100). This uncanny vision that seems to anticipate visual animation is dually spectral, both as a supernatural appearance, and as an instance of proto-cinematic representation that is similar in its prescience to the emergent desire for photography that Batchen describes in the same period (52-53). The odd spectrality of this experience is prefigured by a prized possession that the Antiquary shows Lovel earlier in the novel: a broadside that tells of “certain dreadful Apparitions” that came with “Appearances of several flaming Swords” and lists the names of the people who “were Spectators of the dreadful Apparitions” (37). Though he refrains from representing “real” supernatural events, employing instead what might be called the withheld rather than explained supernatural, Scott makes

---

79 Because of its implication of visual animation, the scene is also highly reminiscent of Scott’s story, “My Aunt Margaret’s Mirror,” which recounts the remarkable “appearance of a real scene, existing within the mirror, as if represented in a picture, save that the figures were movable instead of being stationary” (336).
ghostliness central to the atmosphere of *The Antiquary*: spectral figures and sights riddle this novel and contribute to its illustration of history.

A guardian of the historical record, the Antiquary is least willing to credit these supernatural appearances. He consistently undercuts characters who relate ghostly phenomena, and he disproves their versions of the real by providing his own rendition of causality. He uses a theory of sleep and dreams to dispel his sister’s story about a ghost in the Green Room (93), and then does the same to explain Lovel’s vision. He denies that his ancestor could have communicated with him, and instead blames Lovel’s knowledge of the family motto, *Kunst macht Gunst*, on his unconscious consumption of information during the dinner conversation the night before (131). He is a staunch disbeliever of Dousterswivel’s arts of divination (159-67, 23, 228-36), and correctly suspects Edie Ochiltree of conjuring the strange chest of silver (362). Oldbuck also expresses his distaste for Miss Wardour’s ghost story about Martin Waldeck, referring to it as her “extravagant fictions” (5). This motivation to determine the causes of events complements his character as an Antiquary. Fulfilling his character’s scepticism, Oldbuck disbelieves and questions reports of the invasion (412, 414). Yet by confusing the line of beacon watchers, his own fire has been responsible for inciting the panic (425); the spectre of an invasion seen in a misleading fire, itself a spectacle, is his own unwitting creation. The risk posed by the invasion has in fact been fabricated by the Antiquary, the purported representative and authority of the threatened historical record. Since his inaccuracies generate spectral indeterminacy, even the representative of authoritative history in this novel cannot dispel the spectres that both illustrate the past and destabilize the possibility of authentic historical representation.

While this is not a novel peopled by “real” spectres, the community’s ability to preserve its history is impinged upon by the threat that its characters may become ghosts themselves at any moment. Even the living characters seem to lurk about the boundary between life and death and risk fatal accidents at almost every turn. The Wardours and Ochiltree nearly die in the heavy tide (75); Lovel and Hector duel (199), Ochiltree is nearly hanged (355-67); although she is alive as the novel begins, the Countess dies and is buried before she may account for her actions (253); Stephen Mucklebackit performs as a ghost and dies the next day (250, 284); both Elspeth and the Earl are represented as belonging to the living dead (309, 276, 327). Being a person in this world means being in danger of disappearing, or becoming a spectral memory, a “real” or unreal ghost. This encroachment of mortality in the lives of the characters heightens the significance and
urgency of their thoughts. Without death standing as a possible obstruction to the completion of their stories, the tidy resolutions so keenly desired by readers might not occur or seem to be of emotional use to the characters. The narrative gains propulsion towards a resolution because someone with essential knowledge may die before transmitting their information to other characters. Having told Lovel about the mystery of his identity, Teresa dies in a fire (427), demonstrating the threat of extinction that is always posed to crucial information. The risk of a French invasion increases the urgency of establishing the historical record, since in an attack any number of potential informants like Teresa may perish with all their information. Such losses could destroy the community’s chance to retrieve its history and restore purity to the lineage of its aristocracy. The ever-present risk of sudden death thus links the characters’ contributions to the illustration of the historical record to the information about the past displayed by “actual” spectres.

Haunting and haunted by the past, the characters are themselves like ghosts revisiting the scenes of their disappointments, and dwelling upon past horrors: their hauntedness contributes to the spectrality of Scott’s historical illustration. Sir Arthur is haunted by his fiscal irresponsibility and subsequent financial burdens (400); Lovel is haunted by his spurned love of Miss Wardour, and by the mystery of his identity (427-28); the Earl is haunted both by his abandonment of his wife, and by the belief that their marriage was incestuous (276, 326-28); Elspeth is traumatized by the memory of her former actions (321), and this preoccupation propels the resolution of the plot by causing past events to come to light. The Antiquary is haunted by Eveline and her refusal of his proposal (325), and he guards the memory of her story in a collection of historical papers (338). He rarely goes into the “haunted” Green Room and “never without yielding to a melancholy feeling—not, of course, on account of the childish nonsense that Grizel was telling you, but owing to such circumstances of an early and unhappy attachment” (95). His memory of Eveline is enlivened in the Green Room not because it is literally haunted, but because it was “her taste” that chose the lines of poetry for the tapestry that hangs there (331). 80 The lives of the dead in the memories of these characters stand in for “actual” ghosts illustrating the past.

80 Deidre Lynch demonstrates how Scott’s uses of literary texts in the Green Room, the scene of Lovel’s hauntedness and the Antiquary’s memory of Eveline, “attests at once to Scott’s determination to make haunting something like a family affair and to a parallel determination to make literature something like a family heirloom” (“Romantic” 36).
Instead of being dead, and haunting the living, or being called up from the grave like ghosts, these traumatized souls haunt the dead by returning to Eveline’s story in particular. While the narrative has been haphazardly documenting the affairs of Lovel, his frustrated romance (98), unfortunate duel (199), and other idiosyncrasies, misfortunes, and triumphs of the characters living in the small seaside community, Elspeth’s narrative turns the focus of the story backwards to Eveline’s traumatic history. Eveline, like a ghost agitating for the living to have her story told and the mystery of her death solved, achieves the same result but without recourse to the spectral. Motivated by the news of the Countess of Glenallan’s death, Elspeth requests an audience with the Earl, and he agrees, with Ochiltree acting as their emissary (266-79). Eveline’s life in the memory of the characters suffices to expiate the trauma of her history, without the need for any supernatural appearances on her part. The relation between the ill-fated Eveline, the hot-blooded young Earl, and his cruel mother is revealed to have been the crucial theme of the novel all along—if only in the characters’ silent preoccupations. Rather than representing the past in supernatural or spectral appearances, Scott places historical knowledge in the memory of individuals. Their hauntedness prompts them to communicate with each other and tell their stories, establishing similar outcomes to the results a “real” ghost might have produced by terrifying the ignorant into researching the history of their homes. Miss Oldbuck, when telling her story of the ghost in the Green Room, says the tale makes her flesh creep though she has told it twenty times (91). The story acts on her as a ghost’s appearance would, by inspiring her with a fearful memory each time it occurs to her to tell it. The characters’ preoccupation with the dead orients the tale towards a spectral past, while they illustrate history by telling stories that reproduce the effect of ghost-seeing in supernatural fiction.

The spectrality of illustrating the past in The Antiquary is best displayed in Elspeth’s tale. Her story redirects the narrative by restoring its focus to a sequence of events long past. When Elspeth finally escapes her stupor and tells her tale, she makes the ghost of the past manifest. Like a spectre, the oral history she narrates conveys information about the past to those living in

---

81 In their experience of what Ann C. Colley calls “a sensibility in which there is a distinction and a distance between the past and the present” and a “longing for a past that is confined to the span of their own lifetime” (4) these characters exhibit adherence to what might equally be called “nostalgia.” Colley explains that the sentiment of nostalgia in nineteenth-century culture frequently inherits its earlier meaning as homesickness, whereby victims suffering from nostalgia experience a “desire for reunion, for some point of correspondence between their present and their past, their immediate surroundings and home” out of a hope for “continuity” (3, 4).
the present. This ghostly spectrality of Elspeth’s story is discernable in the rhetoric of her narration. She experiences a visit from the Countess as though from a ghost: “The sneck was drawn, and the Countess, your mother, entered my dwelling. I thought I had seen a spectre, for, even in the height of my favour, this was an honour she had never done me, and she looked as pale and ghastly as if she had risen from the grave” (314). The Countess appears to be undead when she visits Elspeth partly because of the gravity of her mission, the late hour, and the inclemency of the weather. Elspeth’s description of Lady Glenallan’s ghostliness also helps to emphasize the rarity of this visit, underscoring that divisions between ranks are as stark as those between the living and the dead.82 The most important reason the Countess looks like a risen spectre, however, is because she represents the past itself, the indefinite record of a history that affects the entire community.

Elspeth’s spectral illustration of this scene in her narrative establishes its reality, so that the past endures as a revenant on display. In her narration, Elspeth follows Scott’s own reliance on visual detail to verify the truthfulness of her tale. She says that the Countess “sate down and wrung the draps from her hair and cloak, for the night was drizzling, and her walk had been through the plantations, that were a’ loaded with dew. I only mention these things that you may understand how weel that night lives in my memory” (314). The specificity of Elspeth’s account of these details of the dew in the plantations and the drops of rain on the other woman’s hair and cloak help her to confirm that the night “lives.” Elspeth makes this spectral character of her memory explicit by claiming that “I was surprised to see her, but I durstna speak first, mair than if I had seen a phantom—Na, I durst not, my lord, I that hae seen mony sights of terror, and never shook at them” (314). Not only does she connect the Countess with a “phantom,” but she positions the woman as more fearful than other “sights of terror” she has witnessed. The Countess is ghost-like in this scene by which Elspeth illustrates the past, and is in fact a revenant when the story is told and she lives again in its narration.

82 David Richards uses a tellingly spectral construction to account for divisions of class in Scott’s historical displays: “Scott’s novels are about absent subjects; it is only when the Highlanders are constructed as historically invisible that they can re-emerge as textually visible and capable of bearing the burden of a historical discourse from which they are excluded as an extinct species. Scott is, in this respect, a precursor of later ethnographic strategies of hiding behind a cloak of invisibility the ostensible subject of analysis and textualisation” (123, italics original).
As the eldest character, and the one with the most important historical information to communicate, Elspeth herself is a living spectre, a person with claims on the worlds of both the living and the dead. The spectacle of her body posed between worlds illustrates a spectral past. When the Earl appeals to her for her story, she asks him what he is “seeking from a puir auld creature like me, that’s dead already, and only belongs sae ar to the living that she isna yet laid in the moulds?” (309). Elspeth herself admits her affiliation with a spectral world beyond the grave. As another character says of her periodic outbursts of story, “it’s like the dead speaking to the living” (260). Only Elspeth’s moving eyes distinguish her face “from the visage of a corpse,” while she joins a conversation unexpectedly “as if catching at any touch of association with the living world” (259). She feels death’s “grasp turning every day cauldar at [her] heart” (317) and is “like a mummy animated by some wandering spirit into a temporary resurrection” (266). She only wakes from her death-like stupor to recount the burial practices of the Glenallans, while she herself “hardly ken whether [she is] standing or sitting, or dead or living” (260). Elspeth is both alive and intimate with death. During Stephen’s funeral, her attention rocks back and forth between life (portrayed in her desire to spin with “the usual implements of her industry”), and death, seen in her uncanny focus on the coffin, to which she gazes with a “ghastly look” (300). Her participation in the scene of the living is uncertain, since no one could “understand, either from look or expression, to what extent she comprehended the uncommon bustle around her” (300). She is physically with the living, but mentally may already be joining the dead. For her family, she is “a being in whom the light of existence was already obscured by the encroaching shadows of death” (300). Light here attaches Elspeth’s waning life to visibility itself, while her presence at the funeral offers “a connecting link between the surviving mourners and the dead corpse which they bewailed” (300). Elspeth joins her society with the corpse partly because of her great age and encroaching mortality, but also because shortly, by telling her story, she will act as an emissary between the dead and the living. This transgression of states makes her into one of the spectral ghost-like forces communicating historical information in this novel. Elspeth’s age and illness lend plausibility to her violation of metaphysical boundaries, but she is indeed ghostly not because of these signs of encroaching death, but because she communicates historical knowledge. She remains alive to cast light on a spectral past, to exhibit its influence and to illustrate its events for the living.
While Elspeth communicates spectral historical knowledge, she dwells in a scene that illustrates history by representing a spectacle of past time. Reflecting Bakhtin’s notion of chronotope, the literary “inseparability of space and time” (84), the Mucklebackits’ family cottage gives a crucial setting to Elspeth’s storytelling and returns in the narrative as a topos of quaint enduringly old habit. Scott’s descriptions of the cottage’s smelly exterior (111-12) and messy interior (256) position the dwelling as a scene of history—a spatial witness to past events. Scott’s representation of the cottage enables a connection between the community’s past and the visual conditions of its habitat. The chronological and class transgressions that attend this representation follow from Romantic concerns regarding the aesthetic pleasures of the rustic and the links between nostalgia and the idea of home. The domicile, furthermore, reflects tropes of the nineteenth-century picturesque cottage, of which Linda M. Austin writes, “Rather than expressing the generations of lives it held, the picturesque cottage exhibited aging on its surface,” so that rather than “forming the carapace of private histories, the lives within, the picturesque cottage functioned as a life itself, an aging body that, like a human one, had been marked, bent, and changed by time” (135, italics original). Cottages like the Mucklebackits’ thus present a spatial display of the accumulation of time. The idea of the exhibition of history in architectural space returns in Edie’s description of Elspeth:

Elspeth’s like some of the ancient ruined strengths and castles that ane sees amang the hills. There are mony parts of her mind that appear, as I may say, laid waste and decayed, but then there’s parts that look the steever, and the stronger, and the grander, because thy are rising just like to fragments amang the ruins o’ the rest. (278)

Bakhtin explains that he “give[s] the name chronotope (literally, “time space”) to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” (84). Trumpener demonstrates that in its combination of travels in time and voyages in space, Scott’s historical novel reorganizes the potential of the chronotope to illustrate national life: “If the national tale before Waverley habitually presents a regionalist chronotope so strong that it pulls cosmopolitan modern travelers back into it, the historical novel presents a violent struggle between different possible future worlds derivable from the same past, a process complete only when a particular present subsumes the past, with all its historiographical and narrative possibilities (151).

For George Eliot, the visuality of this scene displays for the reader class difference she would never otherwise perceive: “When Scott takes us into Luckie Mucklebackit’s cottage […] more is done towards linking the higher classes with the lower, towards obliterating the vulgarity of exclusiveness, than by hundreds of sermons and philosophical dissertations” (“Natural History” 110). For a reading of the work of “scenes” in another of Scott’s novels, see Chandler on The Bride of Lammermoor (330-47).

See Gary Harrison on rustic figures and picturesque landscapes in Wordsworth’s writing.
This comparison of Elspeth’s mind and memory to ruins depends on a spatial interpretation of her thought, even as it emphasizes visibility. Elements of her mind “appear” and “look” both ruined and grand, marked and dismantled by the passage of time. Writing of their presence in Romantic literary and visual culture, Sophie Thomas proposes that ruins “make the past, or the historical, appear in the present” and “represent the historical relation, rather than history itself” (x, 50). Like the spectacle of a ruin, and like her own setting, the Mucklebackits’ cottage, Elspeth attests to the reality of the past through a spectral and fragmented visibility that illustrates history.

Such historical illustration is more than a figurative way of describing the presence of the past in *The Antiquary*, in which history frequently becomes either “visible” or is notably hidden from sight. Some characters imagine hypothetical scenes from the past; for example, the Earl fancies he sees his child’s blood on the bodkin (321). Others visualize their memories, as when Ochiltree’s “mind wandered back to the scenes of his youth” (246). For Glenallan, learning the truth about the past transpires as a corrective to faulty vision: when Elspeth reveals her full history to him, he says, “it is as if a film fell from my obscured eyes” (317). Here, encountering history means recovering full vision of the past, a realm that can also be obscured from sight. Similarly, in accounting for how Eveline’s tragedy became a mystery in this community, Elspeth says, “A dark curtain has fa’en ower the past” (321). The past here is something that can be obscured both through darkness and by being “curtained.” In Scott’s illustration of history, the past is a spectre that may or may not be seen and a spectacle that may be closed with a final act.

Beyond spectrality, which may imply either false visibility or the intimation of the invisible, Scott’s historical illustration sometimes promises that the past is literally visible as a spectacle that requires particular modes of spectatorship. “Sights” of the past in this novel occur alongside other forms of Romantic spectatorship, including empirical questioning of facts received from sight, and touristic sightseeing practised with an eye for the picturesque and the sublime. In the tale of Martin Waldeck sights of the apparitional demon are “so generally admitted, that modern scepticism has only found refuge by ascribing [them] to optical deception” (170). Here spectres can be explained with reference to the failures of vision. Evincing the Enlightenment belief in

---

86 On empiricism in Romantic culture, see Budge. On the picturesque and the sublime in the practice of Romantic sightseeing, see Dekker.
sight that Martin Jay calls “Cartesian perspectivalism,” Sir Arthur needs to judge by his “own eyes” (212), and asks the Antiquary to “give me credit for having seen what I say I saw” (224, italics original). Arthur’s fault is indeed, to place too much store in the power of vision.

Arthur’s deceiver, Dousterswivel, claims to “have nothing to say—nothing at all—to people dat will not believe deir own eyesights” (237). The character who makes his living by creating false sights professes to the greatest confidence in the truth value of vision. Just as illustrations depict other texts or scenes and thus both sanction and risk undermining the accuracy of reproduction, sight is here shown to be a potentially deceptive window on the world.

While the characters in this work subject vision to empirical testing as much as they take its evidence on faith, they also enjoy a view, and practice looking at historical spectacles to see the picturesque. The walkers in The Antiquary gaze at the Wardours’ Castle Knockwinnock with different feelings (126), and, like good Romantic tourists, encounter their own sensibilities in gazing upon a prospect. Sightseeing in this work comes with theory and technique generated by practice. “It frequently happens,” declares the narrator, “that the most beautiful points of Scottish scenery lie hidden in some sequestered dell, and that you may travel through the country in every direction without being aware of your vicinity to what is well worth seeing, unless intention or accident carry you to the very spot” (159). The method for coming upon a beautiful sight sometimes includes a careful lack of intent, and the characters shortly experience the contribution accident makes to sightseeing. When they follow Oldbuck “through a breach in a low, ancient, and ruinous wall, they came suddenly upon a scene equally unexpected and interesting” (160), and then, gathered around him, they “admired the unexpected opening of a prospect so romantic” (162). The unexpectedness of the view seems to contribute to its felicity, while the opening of the wall allows the scene to be framed like an image for these viewers to admire. Scott’s narrator enforces a class distinction in the perception of beauty in landscape, writing that “the approach to the ruins of Saint Ruth” offers “a sight much more gratifying to the

87 See Martin Jay on Descartes’s “ocularcentrism,” and his creation of “a mode of scientific investigation through visual observation of evidence” (69-71).

88 This moment reflects Malcolm Andrews’s description of Scott’s influence in directing the eyes of seekers of the picturesque castle in Scotland (207), and underscores Dekker’s observation that “it is hard to imagine the earliest Scottish Waverley novels without characters who share Edward’s educated romantic responsiveness to landscapes, traditions and ancient buildings” (132).
eye of an admirer of the picturesque than to that of a planter or forester” (159). A rank-based sensitivity to Romantic aesthetic categories of the picturesque and the sublime affects Scott’s constitution of perspectives on a historical site. Seeing sights and sites in this work thus depends on social class as well as on the empirical and touristic methods of vision, while the visibility of the past depends on these techniques of spectatorship.

The ruins of St Ruth’s offer a spectacle for the eyes of sightseers that, just as in the description of Elspeth’s mind as a ruin, also illustrates the past by giving visible evidence of its reality. The ruins illustrate history and their decay expresses the passage of time. A site of overlapping meanings, the ruins represent an overdetermined visual topos in the narrative that prompts characters to question the evidence of sight even as they practice touristic vision in seeing the past displayed. The characters feel as if the ruins of St Ruth’s are haunted (252), thereby experiencing intimations of the past in their presence. Ruins pose a challenge to the historical memory of the living: visitors who return may discover a different scene than they remembered, and the ruins themselves may be changing at an unexpected rate, causing their viewers to question their recollections. The touring group experiences this quandary when they find a monument at St Ruth’s that no one remembers: “All were now induced to tax their memory as to the former state of the ruins in that corner of the chancel, and all agreed in recollecting a considerable pile of rubbish which must have been removed and spread abroad in order to make the tomb visible” (234). Not only does this unexpected monument constitute a spectacle that may indicate a forgotten history, but its witnesses are forced to “recollect” their memory of past scenes, producing in the effort a collective memory of a pile of rubbish. “Where can our eyes

89 Though planters and foresters are apparently never among those partial to a picturesque view, the mendicant Edie Ochiltree is moved by a sublime sight of the ocean: while in prison, he is “seated by a window which looked out on the sea; and as he gazed on that prospect, large tears found their way, as if unconsciously, to his eye” (360). This scene corresponds to Edmund Burke’s description of the ocean as offering a purely sublime prospect due to its incitement of terror (81), while its depiction of Edie, a beggar, as a Romantic sightseer furthers what Tom Bragg describes as the transgression of class status that is common to all of Scott’s “elemental” characters (216). While Scott links Edie’s desire for freedom to the sight of a sublime view, Dousterwivel is thought unlikely to be motivated by the pursuit of the picturesque. On pondering why Dousterswivel would have been at the ruins of St. Ruth’s, Oldbuck doubts that “a mere passion for the picturesque would carry the German thither in such a night of storm and wind” (356). Rank is thus often at stake in the perspectives Scott represents in this work.

90 On this point, Bragg observes that “Scott’s crumbling remains of stone circles, monasteries, and cathedrals are links to an English past that was still palpable yet seem also in touch with other-worldly knowledge and power. So these spaces may actually be haunted, even when all other spaces may be relatively realistic” (223).

91 Readers may draw their own conclusions on whether this recollection indicates Scott’s opinion of the value of collective remembrance.
have been,” Sir Arthur wonders, “that they did not see this curious monument before?” (234), to which Ochiltree responds: “’Na, whare was the through-stane that it dina come before our een till e’now?” (234). Being confronted with this “new” sight that may in fact have been there all along forces the characters to question the accuracy of their vision, even as they try to retrieve their memories of the former appearance of the ruin. A picturesque destination for touristic sightseers, the ruins of St. Ruth’s also represent an historical spectacle, and challenge the characters to illustrate the past by retrieving visible histories in their own memories of earlier appearances.

This mode of touristic gazing at space to see an illustration of past time appears in other experiences of landscape in this work. When enjoined to survey part of the Antiquary’s property, Lovel declares that it “commands a fine view,” to which the Antiquary replies,

‘True: but it is not for the prospect I brought you hither; do you see nothing else remarkable?—nothing on the surface of the ground?’

‘Why, yes; I do see something like a ditch, indistinctly marked.’

‘Indistinctly!—pardon me, sir, but the indistinctness must be in your powers of vision—nothing can be more plainly traced—a proper agger or vallum, with its corresponding ditch or fossa. Indistinctly! why, Heaven help you, the lassie, my niece, as light-headed a goose as womankind affords, saw the traces of the ditch at once.’ (40)

The Antiquary believes that the ditch he declares to be visibly evident proves that a historical battle took place on his land.92 While the Antiquary here elaborates a highly gendered idea of vision whereby men should have better vision than “womankind,” he is also demanding that the landscape be viewed with a particular kind of sight. Lovel’s desire to see the landscape for its beauty clashes with the Antiquary’s insistence that he view the history the scene represents. Both the empirical desire to view a scene for evidence and the touristic pursuit of visual pleasure are at

92 Arguing that the novel demonstrates a “showdown between the bard and antiquary” (120), Katie Trumpener suggests that the bardic Edie’s debunking of Oldbuck’s antiquarian theory about the camp demonstrates Edie’s “more rooted and less mediated local knowledge” (121). In a footnote she traces the literary history of such episodes of antiquaries finding false pasts in landscapes both before and after Scott’s use of the trope (121n121).
work in this effort to apprehend the purportedly visible past. Because its historical import is visible to the Antiquary and invisible to Lovel, the spectacle made by the ditch represents another spectre contributing to Scott’s illustration of the past.

For the Antiquary, seeing the illustrated past requires the right kind of eyesight as well as technique. When Lovel laughs at a historical broadside, the Antiquary says, “I do acknowledge that the charms on which we doat are not so obvious to the eyes of youth as those of a fair lady; but you will grow wiser, and see more justly, when you come to wear spectacles” (37). Appreciating historical relics requires a certain pathology or facility of the eyes, so that, paradoxically, eyes that are well-aged themselves may be better able to see the past. The Antiquary confirms this bias when Lovel offers a supporting bit of evidence for one of his theories, saying, “I see we shall make something of you even before you wear spectacles, notwithstanding you thought the traces of this beautiful camp indistinct when you first observed them” (42). Growing old and needing spectacles ironically allows people to see the past more clearly, so that failures of visual organs result in a greater accuracy of perception. This combination of heightened visual perception with lapsing visual aptitude evinces the spectral visible-invisibility of intimations of the past. Yet perceiving the past also seems to be a matter of perspective for those of any age. “No, my good friend,” the Antiquary pleads in trying to recruit support for one of his theories, “I appeal to people’s eye-sight—is not here the Decuman gate?” (42). Recalling the recurrence of optical deceptions in this work, the past may be evident in landscape, but only if the spectator employs the right perspective. Eyesight here seems to imply the willingness of spectators to uphold the Antiquary’s world-view, rather than their visual ability. The visibility of the past depends on the inclination of viewers to concur with the Antiquary’s ideological perspective on history. Predicated on the perceptions of spectators, history illustrated in landscape is both spectral and spectacular, at once indeterminate and visible.

Set between the landscape traces of ruins and the explicit illustration of visual media, antique inscriptions offer the Antiquary a particularly vexatious historical spectacle. The narrator describes Oldbuck’s full-bodied effort to apprehend the meaning of a seemingly old inscription: “Oldbuck, with his spectacles on his nose, had already knelt down on the monument, and was tracing, partly with his eye, partly with his finger, the mouldered devices upon the effigy of the deceased warrior” (234). The Antiquary’s vision of the inscribed meaning needs the supplement and verification of his touch: neither sensory inquiry suffices to draw out the elusive and
possibly non-existent historical information the Antiquary thinks is, literally, at his fingertips. This moment exemplifies Jonathan Crary’s description of how “touch had been an integral part of classical theories of vision in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” (19). He suggests that nineteenth-century spectatorship dispensed with touch as part of “a pervasive “separation of the senses” and industrial remapping of the body” (19). The Antiquary, this “old buck,” is an eighteenth-century character in a nineteenth-century novel and his techniques of observation reflect this historical placement, even as the past resists his gaze. The enhanced perception brought by the Antiquary’s spectacles cannot put the spectacle of the past into greater relief, either for his eyes, or for his touch. Recalling at once Derrida’s description of the tangible intangibility of the spectral (6) and the material visibility of spectacle, in peering for meaning Antiquary here encounters the endlessly promised and deferred present-absence of the past, but he refuses to submit to its relentless invisibility. Though Lovel doesn’t see any lettering in another example, the Antiquary “points out some vestiges of what he called an inscription, and shaking his head as he pronounced it totally illegible, ‘Ah! if you but knew, Mr Lovel, the time and trouble that these mouldering traces of letters have cost me!’” (31). The suspicion that letters may exist spurs the Antiquary’s historical imagination, and the spectacle of the past they make is real because he sees it and is willing to spend “time and trouble” on retrieving the meaning they might illustrate.  

Oldbuck’s sight is consistently more able than others’ to perceive illustrations of history in old inscriptions. The authenticity of another contested inscription Oldbuck “affirmed, (though many doubted)” (111). Upon finding an old vessel inscribed with a few initials, he chooses words to match the letters without wondering whether his guess may be right (41). His inappropriately acute power of sight perceives historical spectacles illustrating the past where none might otherwise be found. Yet speaking of his failure to perceive a detail of possible historical significance, the Antiquary confesses that “It is astonishing how blind we professed antiquaries sometimes are” (41). This admission is ironic, given that, although he is often more perceptive than other characters, his overeager vision also results in a failure to see—even with his spectacles. Being an antiquary in this work depends on navigating and succumbing to blindnesses, the spectrality of the past, as well as to visions of history. Whether blind or seeing,  

93 The term “historical imagination” derives from the writing of R. G. Collingwood, who explains it as the “work of historical construction” (241) that allows the past to “become an object of our thought” (242).
antiquarian knowing about the past is figured as the perception of information that is potentially, if not actually, available to sight and sometimes even touch, and a willingness to see illustrations of history in visible spectacles.

When the past is illustrated as a spectacle, a visual commodity, it can be owned. Oldbuck frequently makes the past into an item of his own property by insisting on its visibility, as though the landscape itself could illustrate prior events. “What would you think, Mr Lovel,” the Antiquary asks, “if the memorable scene of conflict should happen to be on the very spot called the Kaim of Kinprunes, the property of the obscure and humble individual who now speaks to you?” (41). The Antiquary’s insistence that the “scene” of the battle could be in his possession demonstrates his feeling that the past has value as a commodity. This sense corresponds to his antiquarianism, since as Susan Manning suggests, “The prized acquisitions of the antiquarian collections embodied longing for possession of the past, a kind of commodification of history” (50). The Antiquary makes his commodifications of sight explicit: he thought about growing corn on the land, “But then it was a national concern; and when the scene of so celebrated an event became my own, I was overpaid” (41). Owning the scene and spectacle of history is payment of more worth to him than literally profiting from agriculture, and he thinks landscape is most valuable when it displays the spectacle of the past.

While landscape offers the most saleable of the spectacles of the past in this work, the spectacular aspect of historical illustration also links painting and spectres as commodities. Aristocratic households rely on their ghosts to confirm their historical legitimacy. “[E]very mansion in this country of the slightest antiquity has its ghosts and its haunted chamber, and you must not suppose us worse off than our neighbours,” Oldbuck tells Lovel (89). “Owning” a ghost is a way to confirm the age of the family’s wealth. In the same passage, Oldbuck declares that he has “seen the day when, if you had doubted the reality of the ghost in an old manor-house, you ran the risk of being made a ghost yourself, as Hamlet says” (89). While “owning” a ghost is a point of property and estate pride, the ghosts themselves insist on having their value observed: Lovel has heard “that ghosts often chose the best room in the mansion to which they attached themselves” (97). Having a family haunt claim the “best room” is a way of acknowledging that by affirming the historical legitimacy of a wealthy household, a ghost also represents its most prized “possession”—a word that takes on added meaning in this context of haunting. The prized historical commodity of a ghost is matched by ancestral paintings. In the Antiquary’s hall hang
“two or three portraits in armour, being characters in Scottish history, favourites of Mr Oldbuck, and as many in tie-wigs and laced coats, staring representatives of his own ancestors” (33). Like ghosts, these paintings affirm the reality of the past and the legitimacy of Oldbuck’s claim to inheritance. The Glenallan house also has its own collection of gloomy and impressive family portraits (273), while in his room the Earl keeps images of religious history in stained glass and paint (275). Such visual representations illustrate history in this novel and allow characters to possess spectacles of the past.

The most valuable illustration of visible history in this book is a living character who is also a ghost. The spectacle Lovel makes in Fairport prompts the illumination—the illustration—of his past, a history that indeed affects all the characters and that coalesces in the apparition of his body. His initial reasons for being in the area are mysterious and unclear: “it remained a high and doubtful question, what a well-informed young man, without friends, connexions, or employment of any kind, could have to do as a resident of Fairport” (49). Like a tourist or apparition, he lacks a material connection to the present reality of the place, and indeed his role in the establishment of the historical record can be described as a kind of reverse ghost story. The supernatural phenomena observed by living characters in ghost fiction tend to reveal prior unfortunate events. The spectral display of a ghost may be a sign of an unfortunate death, cast in a pall of murder, hatred, or guilt. This pattern provides a mirrored counterpoint to the story of the heir of Glenallan, taken at its most simple expression in The Antiquary: the character who began by seeming to not exist at all, is revealed by Elspeth to have existed, briefly, but to have been kidnapped or died a violent death twenty years before (321), and he is then discovered in the mysterious character of Lovel (426), who has haunted the entire novel as a benevolent and living ghost. The generic death involved in this ghost story would have been his own, but instead of haunting the characters as the spectre of a baby, he has the good fortune to haunt them in the flesh, as the spectacle of a grown man masquerading as a tourist. Lovel’s presence in the community of Fairport is explained by recourse to the narrative of his family history, but his body itself also corrects the moral disorder of the story. In the partial history that has been haunting the other characters, the missing unknown detail had been that Eveline’s baby lived and was not the product of incest: Lovel’s full-grown, healthy, and hybrid body is the fact that completes and purifies the story. A fleshy display object precipitated from the spectral past, his body illustrates its own spectacular visible history. The pseudonymous character Lovel
constructed for himself displayed a false life story masking an untold history, while the past that once existed only in the spectral memory of a dead baby becomes spectacle in his present and incontrovertible adult body. The thread of inheritance here connects the contentious struggle over Glenallan family history to the circulation of wealth. As a dead baby who ought to have been the locus of financial inheritance in the novel, Lovel was the ghost of an heir who, due to the stain on his birth, could only have provided a corrupted direction for the flow of capital. As the spectacle of an actual living heir, with no reasons of incest or illegitimacy to prevent his inheritance, he is a commodity that restores order to his family’s wealth and history.

The revelation that Lovel is the heir of the atrophying and possibly incestuous Glenallen dynasty reveals that the earlier part of the narrative stages a profound dramatic irony that implicates the reader along with all the other characters in the revelation of having been duped. This discovery undercuts the possibility of omniscient perspective: not everything is known or can be known in this fictional world, not everything can be explained.\textsuperscript{94} The light the narrative sheds on the past exposes history as though through a partly closed curtain. While the spectres and spectacles of \textit{The Antiquary} illustrate the past, therefore, another option, an alternative to sight and visibility, also defines the world it creates. Threatened by war at every turn, the community in Fairport is equally threatened by historical oblivion and risks not simply being destroyed, but forgotten by the victors of history. Since the work makes the past into a visible spectacle, invisible offstage space in its fictional landscape is a spectral area outside of the historical record, the blank verso side of the page that limns all historicist and historical representation—the possibility of forgetting. Scott resolves this risk of historical invisibility that edges \textit{The Antiquary} in the final moments of his tale by addressing the fate of the historical record that has rested in the Antiquary’s guardianship throughout the novel. The book closes with the observation that Oldbuck’s completed notes “will be at the service of any one who chooses to make them public, without risk or expense” to himself (430). The bumbling Antiquary has no need to publish his masterpiece himself, since Scott’s novel exhibits his history for any readers who care to look, but also because he can rely on the spectral past to illustrate itself in the spectacles of landscape, paintings, ruins, and in the displays made by the bodies of the community.

\textsuperscript{94} Caroline Mc Cracken-Flesher writes that throughout \textit{The Antiquary}, “it is impossible to “tell” or value data correctly, to distribute a knowledge pedagogically, because its every utterance is a deformative and reformative performance arising in a gap” (38).
Scott’s illustration of the past, therefore, exposes history by revealing its presence in spectacles and spectres, in visible displays that reproduce the past for use and circulation in the present. *The Antiquary* and its references to “illustration” helped the word to consolidate its early nineteenth-century meaning between illumination, explanation, and an increasingly abundant category of images printed alongside texts. At the same time, in the duplications and displays implied by illustration, in its spectrality and its spectacle, can be found a description of historical representation in Scott’s novel.

**Conclusion: Ripping the Illustration from the Book**

Like many illustrations, Scott’s has been circulated independently of its original setting in a book: his historical illustration generated a fungible spectacle of a Scottish past that readers and tour operators could use, and displayed the past as a commodity to be circulated and reproduced in visits both literary and “real.”95 As I discuss in this final concluding section, this figurative “ripping” of Scott’s historical illustration from his books enabled the visuality of his display of the past to temper later touristic and cinematic views of Scotland.

While the ghosts and false stories in *The Antiquary* participate in a long tradition of spectral supernaturalism, Scott’s historical illustration also influenced the spectacles of material visual culture by authorizing a nostalgic “look” for Scottish landscape.96 As Alan Riach suggests, Scott’s work “helped activate the spectacle of Scotland as landscape” (*Representing* xv). While many visual artists capitalized on adapting this spectacle in Scott’s writing in visual media, these visualizations constitute only a fraction of the uses that brought the spectacles of Scott’s fiction into material visual culture.97 The discourse and industry of tourism generated perhaps the most powerful commercial uses of Scott and his writing in visual culture, and, in turn, influenced

---

95 In making this turn, I am indebted to Ann Rigney’s exploration of “Scott’s afterlife in multiple areas of cultural production across the English-speaking world,” which has resulted in allowing his work, she suggests, to be readable “at one and the same time as a major contributor to the cult of memory in modern societies and as a huge investment in making that past irrelevant as an active force in the present” (*Scott’s Afterlives* 2, 4).

96 David Sandner writes that “Scott’s “moderate” fantastic separates the fantastic from the modern, marking the fantastic as past in order to embrace the realistic commercial present and future of Union. Nevertheless, the fantastic abides in his works as a crucial embodiment of Scotland’s superstitious past” (80). According to Daniel Cottom, “Scott tried to adapt the machinery of the supernatural to the purposes of a rational art of the novel” (148).

97 In addition to numerous illustrated editions, Catherine Gordon notes that the Royal Academy and British Institution exhibited more than a thousand painted illustrations of Scott’s fiction between 1805 and 1870, a mass of visual work that charts the trends of nineteenth-century narrative painting (297).
Visualizations of his work. As Richard J. Hill writes, “the first landscape illustrations of the Waverley novels were directly inspired and informed by the visual discourse of contemporary illustrated travel-guides and tourist literature,” which were themselves meant to document historical sites perceived to be at risk of disfigurement due to modernization (158).

Visualizations of Scott’s work thus participated, like his Waverley novels, in a system of envisioning Scottish space in response to the visible change that seemed to be transpiring there. Illustrations meant to promote physical tourism and longing for far-off landscapes prompted literary images meant to inspire in readers a nostalgia for distant times and the desire to visit fictional landscapes. Scott’s fiction and its illustration of the past were thus complicit in and affected by a budding tourism industry’s production of visual culture in the Romantic period.

The exoticism Scott’s readers found in his illustration of Scottish space contributed to the spectacle of Scotland as a permanent past that the tourism industry reproduced and sold. Tourists who had read Scott frequently discovered visible history in Scotland. “So readily did sightseers in Scotland come upon the past,” writes Katherine Haldane Grenier, “that they often suggested those encounters were not play, but involuntary responses to the unavoidable presence of earlier years,” as though “previous centuries resided in a state of suspended animation, ready to return to life at the arrival of the tourist” (153). Members of the leisure class could visit the past both in Scotland and in Scott’s novels. Indeed, the Waverley novels furthered touristic discourse by following protagonists such as Lovel and Waverley on their visits to Scotland, and

---

98 Gillen D’Arcy Wood observes the complicity between both Turner’s and Fox Talbot’s illustrations of Scott and the profitability of tourism (177-94).
99 Katherine Haldane Grenier notes that through the nineteenth century, Scottish tour guides mined Scott’s fiction for incentives for tourists (152).
100 The discovery of the past as an exotic and spectacular destination recalls David Lowenthal’s suggestion (quoting L. P. Hartley) that “The past is a foreign country” (xvi). Similarly, Dellheim notes that “for most Victorians the sense of the past was a visual rather than a verbal faculty, cultivated in the landscape more often than the library” (37) and one that spurred on a burgeoning tourism industry (ix). Grenier notes that James MacPherson’s readers also found the past on their Scottish tours (20). MacPherson’s 1760 publication of Fragments of Ancient Poetry, Collected in the Highlands of Scotland, and Translated from the Gaelic or Erse Language, made Scotland into a place where ancient verse could be gathered by readers like anthropologists picking up pottery shards. Like Scott’s historical novels, MacPherson’s false “translation” of Gaelic poetry positioned his texts as resurrecting a prior moment and placed the Gaelic language in an anterior era. MacPherson’s Ossian poems also influenced Waverley (Pittock 156), while Scott repeatedly references the Ossian controversy in The Antiquary. The Antiquary himself often mentions Ossian disapprovingly as a way of testing his companions’ taste and commitment to historical authenticity (107, 110, 292-93, 294-95, 296, 334).
by inviting readers to experience an exotic taste of the region alongside its history.\textsuperscript{101} Part of the charm and novelty of the literary landscapes Scott created for readers was the chronological as well as spatial invitation to travel they offered would-be (armchair) tourists.\textsuperscript{102} As Scotland itself became a visitable idea in Scott’s prose illustrations, its past too became reified, a spectacle to be bought for the cost of a visit to the highlands—or for the price of a novel by the author of \textit{Waverley}.

Scott’s writing thus contributed to the illustration of a back-in-time Scotland as a visitable commodity and can be read as supporting the visual industries and spectacles of tourism.\textsuperscript{103} Predicated on sightseeing, tourism commodifies reality, and reifies landscapes that are exotic to consumers by making them into saleable spectacles. Its framing of “real” scenes makes them into objects within visual culture.\textsuperscript{104} Guy Debord explains that tourism is “nothing more than the leisure of going to see what has become banal” and he suggests that the “same modernization that removed time from the voyage also removed from it the reality of space” (paragraph 168). This account of tourism can be applied to the meaning of reading Scott’s fiction: his works sold convenient visits to a Scottish past in the experience of reading (“removing time from the voyage”). Scott’s reader becomes a sightseer among others in the history of spectatorship, a viewer of his illustrations either in reading the spectres of his novels, or in seeing Scotland through his spectacles—a pun I do intend.\textsuperscript{105} Tourists might go on Scottish tours to experience the “real” place, but the produced reality to be verified and consumed as a spectacle here is not simply the “what is” of Barthes’s “Reality Effect” (146). Rather the spectre of pastness—the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{101} Dekker explains that while Scott himself “aimed to enjoy many of the benefits of tourism without leaving home more than occasionally,” he wrote novels that “did the same favor for millions of people” (199).
\textsuperscript{102} Scott’s creation of Scotland as a past to be known as a consumable object has been called “Tartanry” partly because of his promotion of tartan during George IV’s 1822 visit. On Scott’s authorization of “Tartanry,” see in particular Riach (“Tartanry” 119), and Cheape (21) in Ian Brown’s edited collection \textit{From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History, and Myth}. Tartanry suggests a mode of kitsch whereby nostalgia for material culture becomes a way of knowing a locale. The object to be bought so as to participate in the nostalgic experience created in Scott’s fiction, however, is not a tartan textile, but rather the object of the book, an artifact that reifies the past.
\textsuperscript{103} This situation of Scottish space in the past reflects Fabian’s famous demonstration that anthropology denies “coevalness” with its subjects (31).
\textsuperscript{104} On the fictions of touristic vision, see Urry. Dean MacCannell explains the “ethnomethodology of sightseeing” (135-45).
\textsuperscript{105} Ina Ferris argues that Scott’s visualization of the past resulted in a new form of reading: “What distinguished Waverley reading from other modalities of fiction reading in the period, in sum, was precisely the sense of readers that there was something apparitional about it” (“Before our Eyes” 62).
\end{footnotesize}
feeling of Barthes’s titillating and photographic “that-has-been”—is also a fetish object in these touristic experiences of Scotland as illustrated by Scott.106

Scott’s illustration of the Scottish past received one of its greatest twentieth-century tributes in librettist Alan Jay Lerner’s 1947 Broadway musical *Brigadoon*, and its 1954 film adaptation. The musical follows two New Yorkers who visit Scotland only to stumble upon Brigadoon, a village that slipped out of history sometime in the seventeenth century.107 The film limits Scotland to rural back-in-time space, while a raucous bar scene locates modernity in New York City.108 In *Brigadoon*, as in the tour guides Scott influenced, purchasing a visit to Scotland consists of stumbling upon a spectacular rural past, reproducing yet again the historical illustration of Scott’s fiction. *Brigadoon* literalizes the spectre of history that Scott seems to make live in the present, promising audiences that there is a real past currently available for aesthetic consumption and that it is constituted in a brightly lit Technicolor landscape, a historical setting that is a timeless, ever-present set. While looking for shooting locations for the film version in Scotland, Arthur Freed, its Hollywood producer, is widely reputed to have given up, complaining that Scotland “no longer looked like Scotland” (Gold and Gold 261). This quip weirdly claims knowledge about Scotland’s historical appearance and, in a strange replication of the narrative of *Brigadoon* itself, locates the Scottishness of the landscape in the past. For this filmmaker, being visibly removed from history was not simply the preserve of fantasy, but was rather the actual condition of “real” Scotland. Freed’s rejection of Scottish landscape for his film signals his awareness of the same visual notion that is illustrated in the works of Walter Scott and evident in Romantic tour-guides: the idea that the “look” of Scotland somehow occupies the past, which endures in an unchanging state to benefit tourists and readers.109

---

106 Barthes explains that in realist representation “[t]he pure and simple representation of the real, the naked relation of “what is” (or has been) thus appears as a resistance to meaning,” while in historical writing, “this same “reality” becomes the essential reference” (“Reality Effect” 146). On his explanation of the feeling of “that-has-been” in photographs, see *Camera Lucida* (76-77).
107 *Brigadoon*’s story of temporal displacement also owes much to the age-defying fantasies of J.M. Barrie, whom Lerner cited as a major influence—and indeed, both *Brigadoon* and Barrie’s *Mary Rose* display marked indebtedness to the timeless landscape of *Tir nan Og* of Gaelic legend (McArthur 14-15).
108 Raymond Williams’s *The Country and the City* informs my observation of this distinction between urban and rural space.
109 Gold and Gold note that, throughout the twentieth century, dozens of filmmakers supplanted Scottish landscape with geographic stunt-doubles, largely because “Scottish cinematic landscape is as much concept as tangible reality,” whose authenticity depends on “certain established traditions of representation” that derive from Scott’s novels and which “see Scotland through a historic lens” (262).
An ongoing illustration, Scott’s presentation of the past makes it visible for his characters, and for cinematic, touristic, and readerly visitors to the space he represents. We might draw a connection between Lovel and the Antiquary as admirers of the *Itinerarium*, a commodity illustrating a Scottish past, readers of *The Antiquary* itself, and audiences viewing *Brigadoon*. Either through the object of the book (an artifact that reifies history) or in viewing the musical spectacle, the audiences of these works buy into the fictional commodity of a visible and more or less visitable Scottish past. Layering the past as another foreign locality onto the exotic Scottish landscape enhances the touristic experience these works sell, and increases the interest of the commodities they create.110 While Scott draws the intention to “illustrate the manners of Scotland” from an historical illustrated book, touristic visual culture detached his illustrations of the past from his own books, and reproduced them in new contexts, both printed and “real.” In investigating the illustration of the past in *The Antiquary*, therefore, we see that Scott took a concept from visual print culture that, once reconfigured in the spectres and spectacles of his fiction, was reproduced in later visual contexts. In a hybrid genealogy of fiction and visual culture that prefigures reproductive lineages in works by Charles Darwin and Wilkie Collins, Scott’s fiction both inherited printed illustrations of history and inspired the reproduction of images and visual experiences of Scotland as a site and a sight from the past.

110 As David Lowenthal writes, “If the past is a foreign country, nostalgia has made it ‘the foreign country with the healthiest tourist trade of all’” (4).
Chapter 2
Print in the Age of Biological Reproduction: Darwin’s Series and The Woman in White

The serialization of The Woman in White began a mere two days after John Murray’s publication of Darwin’s On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection on November 24th 1859.111 The weekly instalments of Wilkie Collins’s novel ran in All the Year Round until August 25th, 1860, and were twice followed by anonymous reviews of Darwin’s work. Both of these reviews reproduce passages of Darwin’s prose verbatim.112 Some of the earliest readers of The Woman in White thus met a text interspersed with Darwin’s writing, even as some first encounters with his astonishing ideas were likely fitted in between instalments of Collins’s serial. Since All the Year Round had a circulation of around 120,000 during this period (Altick 395), and since under ten thousand copies of the Origin were in print by the time the first of these essays appeared in June 1860, these plagiarizing reviews vastly increased Darwin’s readership.113 This chapter takes its cue from this hypothetical scene of overlapping and serial readings and interprets commonalities between Collins’s book and Darwin’s. These similarities are most evident in the authors’ shared reliance on visible seriality in their depictions of hereditary resemblance and reproduction.

The plagiarism in the first of these review essays exploits in particular Darwin’s use of the “series.” The small differences in individuals and species, the first reviewer writes (stealing

111 On the editions and publishing history of the Origin, see Kohler. The Origin appeared in six editions during the author’s lifetime, and the rapid issuing of subsequent revised editions might lead to an interpretation of the Origin as a kind of serial publication itself. Nevertheless, I refer throughout to the first edition so as to maintain a focus on this particular moment in print culture, which saw a propinquity between Darwin’s and Collins’s publications.

112 “Species,” All the Year Round 58 (1860): 174-78, and “Natural Selection,” All the Year Round 63 (1860): 293-99. In Darwin and the Novelists, George Levine notes the plagiarism in both of these essays, but refers to the thefts rather mildly as “borrowed” language quoted “without quotation marks” (128-29). Rather than being a banal instance of reissued terminology, however, this plagiarism seems worthy of further attention, especially since Dickens discouraged such insults to originality (Grubb, “Dickens’ Pattern” 1113). All the Year Round, was, furthermore, noteworthy among popular periodicals for discussing the Origin within its first year. In his study of the reception history of The Origin of Species in the periodical press, Alvar Ellegård attributes this exceptional inclusion to the fact that the “intellectual standard” of All the Year Round “was somewhat higher than the average of the class” (26).

113 The 1250 copies in John Murray’s first edition of On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection published on November 24, 1859 (Kohler 333), were joined by 3000 from the second edition of January 7, 1860 (Freeman 78), to which must be added the roughly 2250 copies from the American printings of the book before May 1860 (Kohler 336).
Darwin’s words), “blend into each other in an insensible series.”

114 Darwin’s “series” seems to locate the critical issue of his argument for this writer, who asks in his or her own words whether Darwin is right “to infer that, because we behold a series of forms, there has been an actual transition from one form to that next above it” (175). Darwin’s most shattering message, that differences between species are “of degree and not of kind,” is in fact an expression of seriality.115 Darwin describes family as a series in his proposition that a collection of resembling units, distinguished by small differences as much as united by visible similitude, could constitute one whole, even as their variation across generations could accumulate into changes so significant that some progeny might become entirely different species from their forebears or relatives.

My argument in this chapter is twofold. I describe the influence of print culture on Darwin’s idea of visible history as a series of resemblances, and I demonstrate that The Woman in White creates the individual as an item within a series of inheritors and as a series of variations whose reproducibility reflects the repetitions of print. Both authors ask their readers to agree to the visibility and hereditary significance of serial resemblances that are essentially invisible when displayed in prose, and they both conceive of identity as a serialized whole, a collection of variants whose visible repetitions and similarities mirror those of print reproduction. Rather than focusing only on visible histories in these works, this chapter also considers how Collins and Darwin stage divergences and lineation between the present and the past through the visible increments and degrees of change in the print series. Cannon Schmitt demonstrates that Darwin’s work gave the modern human individual the memory of itself as animal and as “the subject of evolution” (Darwin 4). I add to his claim to suggest that Darwin also participated, alongside Wilkie Collins, in imagining bodies as “printed” objects of mass reproduction.116

114 See Anonymous (“Species” 175) and Darwin (Origin 41).
115 The formulation derives from his discussion of intelligence across species in The Descent of Man: “Nevertheless the difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, is certainly one of degree and not of kind” (101).
116 In its effort to determine a relationship between mechanical reproduction and apprehensions of the human, my argument offers another angle on the “culture” of Victorian industrial manufacturing notably examined by Joseph Bizup. Investigating reproductive “series” of identities in these books, furthermore, reveals a Victorian interest in what posthumanism understands as “distributed” identity, which allows for subjective unity across varying species, bodies, and objects. In her discussion of its integral place in posthumanism, N. Katherine Hayles links this concept of “dispersed subjectivity distributed among diverse desiring machines” to Deleuze and Guattari’s “body without organs” (4).
I begin with a discussion of the critical contexts for this chapter and then investigate seriality, resemblance, and reproduction as linked phenomena with historical and theoretical implications for my argument. I next consider Darwin’s use of the notion of series to describe small differences between otherwise similar species and related individuals and his vision of history as a collection of lineages of evolving bodies. Emphasizing vision, his account of the progress of evolution offers a series of images to illustrate a monumentally ancient past, so that natural phenomena unfurl a vast and visible history.117 Just as Darwin presents biological prehistory in series of minute alterations and resemblances, Collins’s narrative relies on the resemblance between Anne Catherick and Laura Fairlie that positions them as serial variations of each other. The women possess the mark of hereditary connection without a known cause, allowing Collins’s novel to problematize the same serial heritability of resemblance that forms the basis of Darwin’s argument. The serial variation of individuals because of biological inheritance in this serialized novel provides a kind of running commentary on its inheritance plot, which combines the sexual bequeathal of traits with financial legacies.118 The novel contrasts the heterosexual lineages of financial and hereditary inheritance that Hartright desires with Mr. Fairlie’s print reproductions, another form of serial generativity. By casting printed reproduction as an alternative to heterosexual reproduction, Collins denies the monolithic hegemony of sexual procreativity and positions it as simply one entry in a series of modes of production. Accomplished alongside Darwin’s monument to sexual multiplication, this gesture brings serializations into a continuum of difference with replicated bodies and is a ringing tribute to print that shows the powerful influence of its model of reproduction.

117 Though it does not enter into my discussion in the present chapter, Darwin’s argument in The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals similarly relies on visibility and visual representation. This recurrent interest in the visual has been excavated by other scholars. In explaining his reading of vision in the Origin, Krasner argues that Darwin “abandons the omniscient narrative eye common to nineteenth-century scientific and literary discourse and adopts one characterized by misprision, illusion, and limitation,” with the result of “presenting, through the optical illusions and visual failures to which the physical eye is prone, the formal instability of evolutionary nature” (5). Krasner suggests that placement of differing species on a spectrum with each other stems from the “unfocussed” (33) quality of visual perception in the work, resulting in an “entangled eye” (35). For further discussions of Darwin’s involvement in and impact on visual culture, see Jonathan Smith’s Charles Darwin and Victorian Visual Culture and Barbara Larson and Fae Brauer’s edited volume, The Art of Evolution: Darwin, Darwinisms, and Visual Culture.

118 Hartright’s quest to secure the Fairlie inheritance in the final section of the novel allows Collins to represent an inheritance plot: the narrative trope, favoured by Dickens, of closing with an inherited improvement in the lots of the characters. Sadrin explains that Dickens took from “the literary tradition that he liked best” the imperative that “the heroes of fiction must ‘inherit’ in order to be, and, from Oliver Twist to Our Mutual Friend, the interrelation of parentage and inheritance is central to most of his plots” (4). Hepburn notes that such inheritances in fiction are not always positive in practice (4-5), though they do result in future narrative (10).
Serial Readings and Reproductive Arguments: Critical Contexts

Just as these authors describe elaborate series of reproduction, resemblance, and inheritors, so too do their readers inherit their ideas. While it is unclear whether Collins read the *Origin* as he wrote *The Woman in White*, since his letters show that he was still drafting the manuscript almost until its last instalment was published, like his own audience, he needed only to read the periodical in which his work was being serialized to encounter Darwinian thought. It is not my intention, however, to suggest that Collins was actively responding to Darwin in his novel, although the influence of the *Origin* may certainly have been present in its genesis. Though Darwin’s ideas had had little time to saturate the culture as Collins drafted his novel, to use Gillian Beer’s formulation, the novelist’s relation to the *Origin* might be thought of as “unread.” My objective in aligning Collins and Darwin is thus not to propose influence or replicated readings, but rather to examine resemblances that emerge when regarding their books from 1859-60 side by side, as history in some sense presented them.

Texts and genres other than Darwin’s also influenced Collins’s novel. While the field of debate sparked by *The Origin of Species* and perhaps anticipated by *The Woman in White* interrogates sexual procreation, Collins’s novel is also responding to the equally sexualized domestic reproductions of realism and the Gothic. Tamar Heller observes that it is “of all Collins’ novels the one most steeped in the conventions of the female gothic,” and she suggests that the novel

---

119 Although Gabrielle Ceraldi suggests that Wilkie Collins was actively responding to *The Origin of Species* and evolutionary theory, which she implies he knew well (175, n11), the *Origin* is not listed in William Baker’s reconstruction of the novelist’s library, which, out of over 750 titles, includes less than a dozen works on scientific topics (*Wilkie Collins’s Library* 44). Nor do *Vestiges*, *Lamark*, Cuvier, or Lyell, or any of the other key works and authors from which the *Origin* inherits appear in the novelist’s collection. Collins’s letters bear witness to his process of writing *The Woman in White*. By December 11th, 1859, Collins writes with relief to Edward Pigott that he had finished “a third of the story—more than four hundred pages of the novel-size!” (Baker, *Public Face* 184). By late spring 1860, this quick and energetic start to the novel had dampened somewhat, when he writes to George Samuel on the 24th of May that, despite the success of the serial, “the perpetual strain of it has almost knocked me up,” and claims, “I shall have done, I hope and believe, some time in August” (197).

120 In her landmark study of Darwin’s literary influence, Gillian Beer explains that “[i]deas pass more rapidly into the state of assumptions when they are unread” (7, italics original). While she takes this observation as a cue to examine authors who did read Darwin (6), Levine, in *his* landmark work in the field, uses this point to account for his choice to study only “writers who probably did not know any science first hand, who could have been ‘influenced’ by Darwin only indirectly” (*Darwin* 3).

121 In its effort to expose commonality due to proximity rather than direct lineage, this chapter shares less with Beer and Levine’s views of reading and relatedness than with Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s interest in the revelations of analysis informed by “the irreducibly spatial positionality of beside,” over more teleological frameworks that attempt to reveal origins (8, italics original). The productivity of the series as a logical structure itself depends on the spatial thought Sedgwick encourages.
replicates Radcliffe’s “figuration of domesticity as nightmare” (113). In what is commonly seen as its origination of sensation fiction, *The Woman in White* also modifies realism. The novel exemplifies the sensational genre it invents, according to George Levine, since it “takes the conditions of ordinary bourgeois life on which the realistic novel focuses and shows them to be mere surfaces above a world of energies and desires that are distinctly not domestic” (*How to Read* 107). The phenomenon in the plot that is most ordinary and most strange, most domestic and unheimlich, is the resemblance between Anne and Laura. Visible hereditary resemblance is at once an entirely familiar and uncanny aspect of domestic and reproductive family life, the world that sensation fiction and the Gothic query, and that realism reproduces. Besides its disruptions of domesticity, the sensation novel also proposes another orientation for fiction in relation to the bodies of its readers and characters, one that contrasts with the visual impulse of literary realism. The plot point of Anne and Laura’s visible resemblance thus combines the bodily imperatives of sensation fiction, the uncanny domesticity of the Gothic, and the visuality of realism, resulting in a potent site from which to examine the innovations of Collins’s novel.

The question of how *The Woman in White* makes the inheritances of fictional bodies visible is linked to its destabilizations of genre between Gothic, realism, and sensation, between the texts it inherited and the ones it inspired. The present chapter too inherits the texts of others. The readings of many other critics contribute to its primary observation that *The Woman in White* and *The Origin of Species* share interests in the visible seriality of identity and in commonality between print and biological reproduction.

---

122 The result, Levine suggests, is an on-going demonstration that “[e]verything that a strong bourgeois culture would like us to believe happens outside domesticity, outside the family, is actually inside it” (*How to Read* 103). Similarly, Ann Cvetkovich argues that the sensationalism of the novel is encoded by Hartright’s class mobility: “Walter constructs a sensational narrative about fate and chance that provides an alternative to the possibility that events are determined by social convention” (26).

123 Writing in 1862, Margaret Oliphant observes that the production of “sensation” in *The Woman in White* derives from its induction of feeling in the reader’s body: “The reader’s nerves are affected like the hero’s” (“Sensation Novels” 572). Ronald R. Thomas suggests that sensation novels are united by “a plot of identification that attends most closely to documenting the material facts of physical embodiment” (*Detective* 63). In contrast, Nancy Armstrong describes the visual imperatives of realism, and suggests that in this period the semblance of the real in prose derived from “referenc[ing] a world of objects that either had been or could be photographed” (7).

124 In its interrogation of commonalities between bodies and print, this chapter follows Deidre Lynch’s demonstration that “[u]nderstanding how character mattered in eighteenth-century Britain entails, first of all, understanding the curiously embodied terms in which literate people conceptualized their reading matter” (*Economy* 30).
Numerous scholars note the visual investments of the novel. Others have interrogated relationships between fiction published and written by Collins, Dickens, and their peers, and the ways in which material contexts of seriality and reproduction inform literary meaning. Questions of biological reproduction, inheritance, and the influence of Darwin in Collins’s work and in other Victorian fiction have also proved of significant interest to critics. While I consider the visual seriality of identity in The Woman in White, Ronald R. Thomas exposes the stakes of identification in Collins’s originary work of sensation fiction. William McKelvy addresses the overlaps between sexual success and visual reproduction in this novel, arguing that the novel “is about the copy, but in a way that is at odds with the cultural historiography associated with Benjamin’s “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” (287). I build on McKelvy’s focus on Hartright’s participation in the industry of printed illustration by addressing the dynamics of copying and reproduction that are also at play in Anne and Laura’s resemblance, which mirrors the reproductive interests in print that striate the novel. This chapter follows posthumanist theory in aligning the reproductions of the body with mechanical

125 Clare Douglass considers the relationship between Collins’s own connections to the business of art and the illustrations of his novels, and Darcy Irvin applies a visual analysis inspired by the methods of W. J. T. Mitchell to the print setting of The Woman in White. Mary Elizabeth Leighton and Lisa Surridge discuss the serializations and illustrations of The Moonstone (1868) in Harper’s Weekly.

126 Hughes and Lund use a thematic approach to address the continuities between serialized novels and everyday life and suggest that the serial form enabled a sophisticated relationship between fiction and history (66). Graham Law elaborates the serialization of Collins’s later novels. Caroline Reitz discusses the importance of the form of the serial to interpreting its meaning in Victorian literary culture, especially in the journals Dickens “conducted,” while Lorna Huett opens a better understanding of their publishing history, as well as Dickens’s and Collins’s relationship to the “unknown public” of their serializations. Julie Codell reads the context of Victorian periodicals and print reproduction through Benjamin’s seminal essay, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” Michael Moon demonstrates Walt Whitman’s late nineteenth-century inheritance of the sensual “series” of social theorist Charles Fourier.

127 Amanda Mordavsky Caleb addresses moral and hereditary inheritance in Collins’s Legacy of Cain (1888). Gabrielle Ceraldi compares pre-Darwinian evolutionary discourse to the themes of national panic and British supremacy evident in The Woman in White. Natalka Freeland addresses the odd resemblances in The Woman in White to note the similitudes the work draws between villains and heroes, and between human and animal agents, while Jessica Cox examines physiognomy in Collins’s novels. In studies of parallel themes in the work of related authors, Goldie Morgentaler considers heredity in Dickens, and Tess O’Toole explores inheritance in Hardy. Laura C. Berry argues that “the conclusion of Oliver Twist works to occlude inheritance as an economic category, and to replace it with heredity as a biological category that proves worth” (59). Michael Wainwright considers the science of heredity in The Picture of Dorian Gray, and David Amigoni comments on the influence of Darwinian concepts of inheritance on Victorian ideas of hereditary intelligence.

128 He demonstrates that Collins’s “characters are consistently being made both “recognizable” and “real”” through a “collaboration” between professional and personal authorities and their use of documents to verify and confirm identity (Detective 63).
reproduction. My variation in this series of readings is to connect Darwin’s representations of the visible series of identity to Collins’s, and then to demonstrate the relationship between these lineages and print seriality.

**Seriality, Resemblance, and Reproduction Between Biology and Print Culture**

“Series,” “resemblance,” and “reproduction” are related terms, since seriality implies an accumulation of resembling units that indicate a process of reproduction. In the section that follows, I offer a brief account of the shared histories and related theorizations of these three terms so as to contextualize my study of their roles in *The Woman in White* and *The Origin of Species*. The uses made of seriality in both Collins’s and Darwin’s works from 1859-60 represent a triple historical juncture connecting scientific series, the literary production of “serials” such as *The Woman in White*, and the historical condition of visual seriality in print culture.

Darwin’s use of the term “series” to describe the flow of variation of individuals and species is itself a notable gesture in the history of scientific discourse. The editors of a special double issue of *The History of Science* on seriality observe that, after it emerged in eighteenth-century mathematics and numismatic catalogues, “[o]nly in the nineteenth century was the word *series* used within specific sciences to describe the idiosyncratic arrangement and meaning of their objects: in accounts of entities such as strata and crystals from the 1820s, within statistics, palaeontology, chemistry and botany by the 1850s” (Hopwood et al. 252). While the series was a relative newcomer to scientific writing, and while Darwin’s ideas about how species alter from themselves through inherited seriality were innovative, the concept of species as a collection of resemblances that corresponded to other genera in visible series was not entirely new in 1859. In his history of the idea of “species,” John S. Wilkins notes the numerous instances when writers before Darwin define species through seriality (49, 51, 72, 82, 106) and as a collection of resembling organisms (74, 80, 84, 109). Darwin’s particular use of the word, however, and indeed his novel concept of speciation seem to depend on one of the primary original definitions

---

129 On relations between machines and bodies in posthumanist concepts of biological reproduction, see Squier. W. J. T. Mitchell suggests “that biocybernetic reproduction has replaced Walter Benjamin’s mechanical reproduction as the fundamental technical determinant of our age” (“Work” 483). For a recent study of applications of technological thought to human reproduction in Britain during the mid-twentieth century, see McLaren, who argues that “reproduction was a key site for many of those debating the merits of the modern mechanized world” (2).
of “series”: in use since the early seventeenth century, this meaning implies a line of descent. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines this sense of the word as “A number of persons in succession holding the same office or having some characteristic in common. Also, a succession of persons in descent, a family line.” In elucidating this definition, the *Dictionary* cites Boswell’s quotation of Johnson’s feeling that “Entails are good, because it is good to preserve in a country, serieses of men, to whom the people are accustomed to look up as to their leaders” (“series,” n. 1, 1b). As in Darwin’s work, this early meaning of “series” implies a legacy of inheritance, as well as a collection of variations on a theme. In emphasizing the “series,” Darwin was using a word with a relatively fresh hold on his own disciplines to clarify an equally fresh idea, but he was also deploying its implications of inheritance so as to enlarge his concept of speciation.

Darwin’s diction links a moment in the history of biology to contemporaneous evolutions in print and fiction. Dickens’s popularization of the serial began only a generation before, though his innovations with the *Pickwick Papers, Household Words*, and *All the Year Round* didn’t invent the genre of serialized fiction as is sometimes assumed. Whether or not serializing works of fiction really was an innovation by Dickens’s time, Hughes and Lund suggest that it seemed new in the 1830s (4). While *The Woman in White* is itself a serialized novel, the idea of the series also infuses the metafictional account of narrative within the text. Hartright introduces the story as being “told by more than one pen” so as “to trace the course of one complete series of events, by making the persons who have been most closely connected with them, at each successive stage, relate their own experience, word for word” (6). Collins’s use of the word “series” here aligns his account of the role individuals play in narrative with Darwin’s description of evolution, even as the phrasing indirectly acknowledges the material conditions of the production of his serialized novel.

Though applications of the concept of the series were relatively new in discourses of fiction and biology in 1859, seriality has been a condition of visual print culture since its inception due the

---

130 On Dickens and serialization, see Altick on *The Pickwick Papers* (279-80). Robert Mayo observes that there was fiction in serials from the end of the sixteenth century, and that after 1770 “there were few popular magazines of the many published in Great Britain and Ireland that did not attempt to satisfy the growing appetite for “tales” and “histories”” (2). Mayo further suggests that that the new era of serial fiction began not with Pickwick, but in 1817 with the *Edinburgh Monthly Magazine* paying well and regularly for original fiction in series, and that Galt’s *Ayrshire Legateses*, serialized in 1820, was the first serialized novel of quality since Smollett’s *Sir Launcelot Greaves* began to appear in 1760 (7).
inevitable variation between prints in the same edition. While only extreme variability between impressions of the same typesetting can alter signification, differences in print quality or technique in copies of the “same” image can impede or materially change visual meaning. For this reason, William Ivins famously claims that “since the invention of writing there has been no more important invention than that of the exactly repeatable pictorial statement” since such images, he argues, enable the flow of technical information necessary to the progress of science (3). Even after the invention of woodcut printing, however, truly precise repetitions remained elusive due to the degradation of print surfaces, the variability of impressions and substrates, and the layers of error-prone copying between artists and plate cutters.131 Just as manuscript copying can introduce errors into transmitted texts, such variety in print reproduction produces resemblance and variation within print runs of the “same” image. While seriality has, as a result, been a by-product of copying, the series has also been a frequent genre of print artists. Hogarth’s eighteenth-century series are the most famous examples of the genre to influence the British literary tradition.132 From the continent, sixteenth- to nineteenth-century print series by Dürer, Holbein the Younger, Callot, Piranesi, Goya and others endure as monuments of Western visual culture.133 While print series were already familiar in visual culture, the ease of reproducing similar yet slightly different photographs maintained the currency of the visual series after 1839.134 Seriality is thus a longstanding condition of visual print culture even as the series represents a genre often taken up by print artists since well before the nineteenth century.

In biology as in visual print culture, serial variation becomes evident through visible resemblance. While Darwin suggests that “series” of variations producing resemblance rather than exact replication transform one species into another, resemblance is itself at the core of his idea of species. Admitting the difficulty of fixing a precise meaning for “species,” Darwin concedes that he expects his reader to discern that he regards the term “as one arbitrarily given for the sake of convenience to a set of individuals closely resembling each other” (42). Rather

131 Ivins further argues that images only became properly reproducible with the advent of photography: “it eliminated the draughtsman, and then it eliminated the engraver from the making of exactly repeatable pictorial statements,” which “were no longer confined to the life of a single printing surface” (93-94).
132 Ronald Paulson demonstrates the significant influence of Hogarth’s prints on the development of the novel in several monographs (see in particular Hogarth, and Popular and Polite Art).
133 On the variety of print series made by these artists, see Linda C. Hults.
134 For example, according to Peter Barberie, the intentional series of Charles Marville’s late nineteenth-century photographs “carefully and coolly catalogue the alterations to the urban fabric” (34).
than denoting extreme similitude among bodies, “species” implies resemblance—that is, difference and variety as much as likeness—as a standard to be expected among individuals of a kind. The phenomenon of resemblance that defines both species and print series has a social existence in human faces. In her reading of the collection of similar heads in Hogarth’s *Characters and Caricaturas* (1743), Deidre Lynch suggests that “[t]hey invite the beholder to probe the limits of resemblance and identity. We find ourselves frantically trying to specify the characteristic particulars in which the countenances differ” (*Economy* 64). While the abundance of similar faces depicts the “limits of resemblance,” for Lynch, the printed replication of faces in this work also mirrors the abundance of faces in other printed images. “The proliferation within Hogarth’s image of copies that copy copies,” she writes, “shows how Britain’s printing-press-driven phiz-mongering allows excess—the overaccumulation of images—to threaten cognition” (65). In Lynch’s reading of this work by Hogarth, a portrait of a hundred human faces depicts both resemblance and print reproduction. A corollary for the serial repetitions of Laura and Anne’s similitude can thus be found in the mutual constitution of biological resemblance and printed replication.

While resemblance suggests similitude between bodies and objects, it is only constituted and made meaningful in the perceptions of viewers. If no spectator sees a resemblance, it may or may not be “fictional,” as it were. Foucault helpfully interrogates the meaning of this visual quality in *The Order of Things*, in which he lays out a theory of the significance of resemblance and puts particular pressure on the new field of visibility invented by natural history (144). “Is not any resemblance, after all,” he asks, “both the most obvious and the most hidden of things? (29). This quality of similitude that is at once obscure and distinct, visible and invisible, defines resemblance in both Darwin’s and Collins’s narratives. For both authors, resemblance overcomes its invisibility under the gaze of the reader, who is enjoined to concur that visible similitude exists between bodies that appear only in writing. As Foucault suggests, “without imagination there would be no resemblance between things” (76). Because it produces this imaginative engagement, Foucault argues that resemblance gave a fundamental prompt and structure to Western thought. It allows the character of things to become visible and thus open to comparison and decipherment (30). For Foucault, Darwin, and Collins alike, resemblance is constituted in the mind of an implied viewer; it is both a display object and the result of mental image making, a prompt to analysis and the product of reflection.
Foucault outlines a variety of resemblances, but his description of “aemulatio,” or “emulation” in particular elucidates the mirroring of identities of Anne and Laura’s similitude and links the phenomenon of resemblance to print culture. Emulation, he suggests, implies “a sort of natural twinship existing in things,” whereby it becomes impossible to distinguish the “reflections” from the “original images,” or “reality” from the “projection” (22). Collins destabilizes expectations regarding resemblance by allowing Anne and Laura to experience what Foucault calls a “relation of emulation,” without a known cause. Further elaborating the idea of twinship in emulation, Foucault cites Paracelsus’ comparison of “this fundamental duplication of the world to the image of two twins ‘who resemble one another completely, without its being possible for anyone to say which of them brought its similitude to the other’” (22). Resemblance troubles the prospect of locating an authoritative copy, whether between similar people such as Anne and Laura, or among prints in the same edition. Whether “explained” through heredity or not, through Foucault’s reading, resemblance itself provokes what might be thought of as print-culture anxieties regarding the identification of originals and copies.

Even as it helps to map the “emulations” of print and of Anne and Laura’s similitude, accounting for the current of resemblance in biological reproduction led Darwin to find a metaphorical explanation in the serial impressions of print. He twice expresses the tendency of some species to dominate in the appearance of their hybrid offspring as their “power of impressing [their or its] likeness” (197, 208). Importantly for Darwin’s theory of reproduction, and drawing on both the significance of resemblance and the seriality of print culture, this metaphor allows for mutability in reproductions: the weight of impressions can vary, resulting in reproductions that resemble rather than repeat each other. Without this potent variability within series of inherited resemblance, species would not evolve. Their procreations would produce identical bodies, rather than visibly altering series. This rhetorical use of the “impression” indicates commonality between the reproductions and serials of nineteenth-century print culture and Darwin’s biological theory. Gillian Beer notes that an ethos of reproduction was essential to the Origin: “Darwin’s theory depended on the idea of production. The natural order produces itself, and through reproduction it produces both its own continuance and its diversity” (53). Given Darwin’s use of print metaphors, and the dependence of his theory on concepts of production and reproduction, critiques of print culture offer an important context for his work.
An interface for Darwinian theory, then, might be found in the work of Walter Benjamin, the most influential theorist of the forms of nineteenth-century mass reproduction he called “mechanical.” For Benjamin, reproduction operates as a political force that alters the interpretability of art. According to his thinking in “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” copies allow originals to travel to “meet the beholder halfway,” without the “presence” of the authentic “history to which [an artwork] was subject throughout the time of its existence” (220). This feeling that copies lose the accumulated history of originals leads to his famous claim that reproductions lack “aura” (221). In his brief history of nineteenth-century reproduction, since historicizing cinematic projection arts is his primary objective, Benjamin moves quickly from lithography to cinema (219-20). As a result, he seems to overlook the fact that printed images are tactile and can accumulate their own patinas, histories, and “auras,” and which, due to imprecisions in the production process are rarely, to use Ivins’s turn of phrase, “exactly repeatable.” In a further elision of the materiality of print culture, Benjamin does not apply the implications of variability and resemblance in seriality to his theory of reproduction, though series were, as noted above, an important feature of visual print culture.

In accounting for the possibility of intersections between biological and technological theories of reproduction, therefore, the idea of the series can be read as a hinge between Benjamin’s reproduced artworks and Darwin’s resembling bodies. Benjamin assumes the interchangeability of reproductions of the same artwork, which seem identical to their companions in mass production. In contrast, Darwin’s bodies are fitted into series of similar but minutely differing individuals within species, and series of resembling species within genera. His interest in series and resemblance allows his “copies” to differ slightly, even as they repeat each other, and this productive exchange of resemblances propels the massive alterations he describes. While Benjamin describes reproductions as stripped of history, according to his theory they also seem statically immune to change, and thus removed from the ability to accumulate their own historical detail. Thus, while the two authors share an interest in the repetitions of print, the productive series of resemblances in Darwin’s reproduction can be read as an enlargement of Benjaminian reproducibility. By incorporating the historical potency of the series and its minute alterations within resemblance into his theory of reproduction, Darwin brings the productive seriality of print culture into a notion of the organism and its lineages.
I draw these connections between print culture and biology so as to establish the intellectual background of my argument, which looks to the pressures both Darwin and Collins put on visible resemblances within reproductive series of identity. The repetitions of resemblance recall the incremental alterations of printed and biological series, while material and critical contexts of printed reproduction and serialization have a bearing on the visible series that both Collins and Darwin described in 1859-60. Turning to *The Origin of Species* I next elaborate Darwin’s illustrations of these visible series.

**Darwin’s Visible Series**

A work that he refers to as a “sketch” (3), the *Origin* can be seen as an injunction to a way of viewing that sees the past incorporated in the bodies of the present. Darwin invites his readers to “contemplate every complex structure and instinct as the summing up of many contrivances” and to “regard every production of nature as one which has had a history” (366, 365). Darwin’s text both writes a volume of (pre)history, and enjoins viewers to “regard” its other volumes in the bodies and faces of organisms. By making this request he reinvents “history” as something that is written in bodies as much as in ink. In their generations, these bodies, “productions,” resemble each other and the reproductions of books and print. Darwin’s request asks viewers to see a history where one had not been evident before and creates the appearance of a previously invisible past in the visible series of organisms through time and across species.

The *Origin* abounds with moments in which the past either reveals its inaccessibility through living forms, or becomes visible, making for an apparitional rather than written history. Explaining the extent of time required to effect mutations in species forms, Darwin writes “we see nothing of these slow changes in progress, until the hand of time has marked the long lapse of ages, and then so imperfect is our view into long past geological ages, that we only see that the forms of life are now different from what they formerly were” (66). Darwin’s rhetorical habit of writing about time passing by describing views and sights lends his arguments cogency, since, as Foucault writes in *Birth of the Clinic*, description “is to see and to know at the same time, because by saying what one sees, one integrates it spontaneously into knowledge” (140). In the persuasion of readers, describing a sight often lets authors skip the step of proving that the sight is real. Writing of how Lyell’s work revealed how “incomprehensibly vast have been the past periods of time,” Darwin emphasizes that “A man must for years examine for himself great piles
of superimposed strata, and watch the sea at work grinding down old rocks and making fresh sediment, before he can hope to comprehend anything of the lapse of time, the monuments of which we see around us” (214). While the expanses of the past baffle human apprehension, looking, whether at sediments or the sea, can alleviate barriers to imagining its extent.

This pressure Darwin puts on visibility is evident in his appreciation for sophisticated sight, his common use of visual rhetoric, and in his wariness of logical “blindness.” Darwin’s admiration for vision extends from his wonder at the evolution of the eye (143-45) to his respect for the expert vision of breeders.135 “Not one man in a thousand,” he writes, “has accuracy of eye and judgment sufficient to become an eminent breeder” (27), whose flocks are studied “like a picture by a connoisseur” (26). This simile underscores Darwin’s alignment of visual representation (the “picture”) and the visibility of inherited traits. This reverence for expert vision is paralleled in his preference for visual rhetoric. He frequently narrates opinion and facts using visual metaphors. His observations during the voyage of the HMS Beagle seemed “to throw some light on the origin of species” (3), and he opens his first chapter with a “look to the individuals of the same variety” (8). Darwin uses such visual rhetoric to describe thought throughout the book until its conclusion: he often discusses different interpretations of situations by contrasting possible “views” (299-300, 344-45), and summarizes the points of his chapter on geographical distribution with five repetitions of the formulation “we can see why” with only slight variations (309). Darwin’s visual rhetoric culminates in his prognosis for his theory: he suggests that “The day will come when this will be given as a curious illustration of the blindness of preconceived opinion” (363). While Darwin’s use of the word “illustration” here implies an explanation or an example that is also a visible illumination, his invocation of the failures of vision (“blindness”) as a metaphor for faulty apprehension of the world underscores his heavy reliance on visibility as a necessary condition for perception. While this rhetorical emphasis on sight as a precondition of logic has a long history and was also a feature of Erasmus Darwin’s work, throughout the Origin, Darwin’s writing testifies to his particular struggle to describe a way of “looking at” species with the acuity the story told by their bodies demands.136

135 Shapiro links Darwin’s wonder at the biology of sight to William Paley’s discussion of vision in Natural Theology (55-56).
136 For an overview of visual rhetoric in Western thought before 1859, see Martin Jay (21-149). Robert Ross exposes Erasmus Darwin’s pictorial concept of the relation between poetry and visual display.
This innovation in looking at species asks us to see them for the connections that, alongside their differences, position them in visible series. These connections become visible through resemblances. In his schema of the genealogical arrangement of the natural system “with the grades of difference between the descendants from a common parent, expressed by the terms genera, families, orders, etc.,” Darwin not only lays out a method for evaluating resemblances, but suggests that the exigencies of classification explain “why we value certain resemblances far more than others” (327). While in the Origin resemblance between species explains their ancient relation, resemblance between individuals and their close relatives is of equal importance to Darwin, since natural selection is “the steady accumulation” of “each slight difference in the offspring from their parents” (131). The relations between species make them “resemble” varieties (354), and resemblance occurs among species across geographic distances, so that New Zealand and Britain have a remarkable similitude of crustacea (284). Darwin’s description of the connections among species relies on the visibility of resemblance, which provokes connections through “grades of difference” between disparate organisms. Collections of resemblances thus indicate the place of organisms within visible series. “And as the whole amount of modification will have been effected by slight successive steps,” Darwin writes, “we need not wonder at discovering in such parts or organs, a certain degree of fundamental resemblance, retained by the strong principle of inheritance” (331). In Darwin’s account of natural selection, evolution transpires in “slight successive steps” that strengthen or weaken visible similitude between species and related individuals. Every individual resembles its ancestors and inheritors in series that are propelled by reproduction and inheritance, while minor variations between species fit them into visible series.

For Darwin, the evidence of serial connection between species that resemblance seems to propose must be balanced against a healthy suspicion of appearances. He notes that the attention to the visible provoked by resemblance is partly a weakness: “Man can hardly select, or only with much difficulty, any deviation of structure excepting such as is externally visible; and indeed he rarely cares for what is internal” (32). Human vision is thus too oriented towards surfaces. In contrast, “nature cares nothing for appearances” and “can act on every internal organ, on every shade of constitutional difference, on the whole machinery of life” (65). Set against the seeming omniscience of “nature,” the human preference for visible appearances is as limiting as it is enabling. Hybrids pose a particular problem of appearance, since, rather than
manifesting perfect blends of their progenitors, they tend to look more like one or another parent (197). In guarding against the deceptions of such appearances, Darwin emphasizes “the very important distinction between real affinities and analogical or adaptive resemblances,” which let, for example, whales and fishes appear similar to each other (323). Focusing on similarities between biological systems rather than visual resemblance between forms protects the natural historian from inferring an erroneous heredity. Systematic affinity accounts for “the resemblance between species in structure and in constitution” (195), whereas analogic resemblance implies superficial similarity. Although these resemblances may be “intimately connected with the whole life of the being” (313), classifiers must not “trust to resemblances in parts of the organisation, however important they may be for the welfare of the being in relation to the outer world” (314). Believing too much in analogical resemblance puts classifiers at risk of making errors like those of Linnaeus, who, “misled by external appearances, actually classed an homopterous insect as a moth” (323). While Darwin often implies that the very matter of his argument is visible and thus “real,” the deception of apparition also threatens the lucidity of the natural historian by tempting him with false history.

Incited by the seeming ease of fitting resemblances into series, Darwin, too, catches himself in an instance of flawed viewing. “I have found it difficult,” he writes,

when looking at any two species, to avoid picturing to myself, forms directly intermediate between them. But this is a wholly false view; we should always look for forms intermediate between each species and a common but unknown progenitor; and the progenitor will generally have differed in some respects from all its modified descendants. (213)

Darwin’s method of classification entails “looking at” species, “picturing” them to himself, and hypothesizing the “forms directly intermediate between them,” while the risk of error in determining the course of the past presents itself as a “false view.” The awareness of serial transformations makes them appear everywhere and positions all resembling organisms into series with each other.

These visible series allow viewers to infer past trajectories of mutation by imagining animals in their previous states, known and hypothesized. The similarities between the forms of
varieties and species offer visual prompts: “We cannot suppose,” Darwin writes, “that all the breeds were suddenly produced as perfect and as useful as we now see them; indeed, in several cases, we know that this has not been their history” (25-26). Not only does the appearance of species describe a history, but the idea of evolution requires visualizations of the changes wrought by the progress of time. Admitting the difficulty of apprehending the mutation of a species, Darwin writes, “Slow and insensible changes of this kind could never be recognised unless actual measurements or careful drawings of the breeds in question had been made long ago, which might serve for comparison” (29). In this lament for a lack of old drawings Darwin hypothesizes a visual series, an on-going progression of images of each breed as it slowly changes. This desire for “careful drawings” of “insensible changes” that, as they accumulate, become a representation of difference over time also prefigures the progress and visual continuities of cinematic animation. In this respect, the passage recalls his observation earlier in the book that the differences between species “blend into each other in an insensible series; and a series impresses the mind with the idea of an actual passage” (41). While the idea of the series was novel in scientific discourse, a prehistory of film exists in Darwin’s interpretation of the history that is “visible” in the progressions of bodies. The incremental stages that the idea of the series helped to make visible can be situated within a longer history of spectatorship that includes Muybridge’s experiments with bodies pictured in states of motion, experiments with visual series that led to the advent of cinema. By organizing incrementally differing items into progressions, Darwin builds on past developments in visual culture while anticipating future ways of seeing so as to generate visual narrative from series of resemblances.

Indeed, in his effort to “picture” the past and “see” the real trajectories of evolution, Darwin’s biological historiography often displays the desire for “careful drawings” of old varieties of organisms, the idea of which recalls the series of visual print culture. Both embryos and fossils offer Darwin such historical pictures. “Embryology,” he writes, “rises greatly in interest, when

---

137 In *Darwin’s Camera*, Philip Prodger demonstrates that for his later work, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1871), Darwin would actively seek out the same sorts of photographs that Eadweard Muybridge would make in the following decade (32), and that the photographer he worked with developed a similar procedure for photographing moving subjects (202). “As a result,” Prodger writes, “one might reasonably contend that Muybridge, frequently identified as a key contributor to the development of cinematography, shared a direct lineage with the *Expression* project” (202). On the influence of Muybridge’s pictures of moving subjects on the emergence of cinema, see Progder and Gunning’s *Time Stands Still* (2003). Fresko explains how Muybridge’s “shocking images of animals in motion” reorganized nineteenth-century conceptions of visual epistemology and temporality, and so “helped prepare his audiences for the spectacles the cinema would soon unleash” (48).
we thus look at the embryo as a picture, more or less obscured, of the common parent-form of each great class of animals” (340). The evolutionary analyst’s method thus entails a particular visual connoisseurship about embryos. Seeing pictures of the past in embryos would, furthermore, become even more cogent “If it should hereafter be proved that ancient animals resemble to a certain extent the embryos of more recent animals of the same class,” in which case the “succession of the same types of structure within the same areas during the later geological periods ceases to be mysterious, and is simply explained by inheritance” (260-61). The pictures of past mutations offered by embryos project a fate of inherited change onto all species, while inheritance demystifies the succession of similarities.

Like embryos, fossils also provide Darwin with crucial images of historical developments. Fossils seem to materialize messages from the past and make the transmutation of species visible.138 While Darwin writes that “living fossils,” or “aberrant” species, “aid us in forming a picture of the ancient forms of life” (366), extinct species can themselves be known through fossils, which give “evidence of their former existence” though they are preserved “in an extremely imperfect and intermittent record” (138). This imperfect record is made possible by the pictures of the past he sees in embryos and fossils, pictorial statements about the series of historical species that make past mutations visible and position the corpses of organisms as curiously historiographic. The visible statements Darwin finds in the bodies of species and in embryos and fossils appear on their own, and are not authorized by an artist, writer, or printer. By seeming to represent the past, they imply a naturally occurring historiography.

The visibility of these forms, which lays them open to classification and interpretation, allows Darwin to compare the stories they suggest to those contained in historiographical writing. He gives this idea of the record created by the fossil legacies of the world a visual and bibliographic character. To explain the gaps in the geological record, he writes that, “following out Lyell’s metaphor, I look at the natural geological record, as a history of the world imperfectly kept, and written in a changing dialect” (235). This metaphor makes the geological past into something that is “written.” Darwin develops this historiographic notion of geological time, describing the

138 In “Romanticism and the Life of Things,” W. J. T. Mitchell describes their gift of an “imprint in stone” that makes “history” (or at least the past) visible (177, 175-76). For Foucault writing in The Order of Things, “the fossil is what permits resemblances to subsist throughout all the deviations traversed by nature,” and “recalls, in the uncertainty of its resemblances, the first buddings of identity” (171).
patchy history exposed by fossils as being only the final “volume,” missing chapters and written in a language that is itself changing, with definitions shifting (235). “On this view,” he continues, reissuing the visual rhetoric with which he frequently argues, possible disputes with his argument “are greatly diminished, or even disappear” (235). When looked at in the right way, barriers to “seeing” the origin of species as Darwin does vanish from sight. Not only is the past available for ongoing interpretation, but its history has already been written in the visible bodies of organisms, and Darwin himself is merely describing, not writing, a history that is already extant. The metaphor of the many-volume book provides an image of a monumentally vast but nevertheless “graspable” compendium of information. Since books are made for viewers, even this metaphor sets natural historiography in a visual format.

Rendering the idea of evolution through natural selection persuasive is a matter of revealing the almost unimaginable course of the past visually, and destroying obstacles to “seeing” what Darwin suggests is an already visible historical expanse. Darwin pursues this informatic visibility in describing the history he tells in his conclusion, writing that “the crust of the earth with its embedded remains must not be looked at as a well-filled museum, but as a poor collection made at hazard and at rare intervals” (367). For Darwin, the “poor collection” left by the course of time is always something to be “looked at,” while the living host of creatures becomes a museum of hereditary history, a space in which information about the past is made animate in the visible series of organisms.

Series of Resemblances: Recognizing Identities in *The Woman in White*

For Darwin, the evolution of species is a visible history of inherited resemblances that can be seen in series that are open to decipherment. In *The Woman in White*, the history of hereditary connection that links Anne and Laura is visible in the resemblance that makes them into items within a single series. Collins accounts for the resemblance through the uncanny, heredity, disease, and clothing, even as he constructs identity as a series of variants. By depicting identity as a visible series, *The Woman in White* restates the visible history that the *Origin* derives from inherited resemblance. Like species whose member organisms differ from as much as they resemble each other, individuals in this novel alter from themselves in looks, costume, and sentiment. As she changes from herself, Laura becomes successive items in a series of iterations of her own identity, even as her similitude to Anne fits her into a visible series with her half-
sister. Collins’s story depends on the willingness of readers to “see” the resemblance between Anne and Laura through the window of the text. Preoccupied by optical experience, like Darwin’s *Origin*, Collins’s narrative enjoins readers to visualize similitude through prose description, while moments of visual recognition and misrecognition consolidate, and render fungible, identities that are made up of minute alterations from themselves.\(^{139}\)

Visuality drives Collins’s narrative and frequently represents a defining aspect of characters’ lives. Collins introduces his primary narrator, Walter Hartright, as a “teacher of drawing” who inherited his profession from his father (6). Hartright’s status as a visual artist frequently contributes significantly to the course of the narrative. His luck in hearing of Frederick Fairlie’s call for a household drawing-master instigates the plot (15), while the circulation of his name as an accomplished teacher of drawing helps to reconnect him with Laura, and causes the revelation of their love to Glyde (264-65). When out of a teaching position, Hartright becomes a printmaker to earn money by “drawing and engraving on wood for the cheap periodicals” (420), and he is away making illustrations when news of their changed fortunes comes to his family (642). Other characters also craft their identities through visual artistry. Although Laura has little talent for drawing (490), it is her “favourite whim” (35), and, when she is unwell, Hartright “amused her in the evenings with […] scrap-books full of prints which [he] borrowed from the engraver who employed [him]” (444). While Laura and Hartright have great personal interests in drawing and visual media, Glyde becomes an artist of script so as to forge his identity in a false record of his parents’ marriage: “He was some time getting the ink the right colour (mixing it over and over again in pots and bottles of mine), and some time, afterwards, in practising the handwriting” (544). Throughout the novel, such visual creativity helps characters “draw” themselves.

Visuality also offers Collins metaphors for mental experience and narrative. For example, in a dream about Glyde’s evil intentions, Anne Catherick “saw down into his inmost heart” (79), while characters often read and interpret faces (58, 66, 104, 168, 250, 361, 486, 600, 612). Hartright receives impressions from a “view” (19) and describes a “new direction” in his life as

\(^{139}\) In its extreme reliance on recognitions, this narrative could be read as what Terence Cave describes as a fiction of anagnorisis: “To tell a story which ends in recognition,” he writes, “is to perform one of the most quintessential of all acts of fictional narration—the recognition scene is, as it were, the mark or signature of a fiction, so that even if something like it occurs in fact, it still sounds like fiction and will probably be retold as such” (4). In this instance of the anagnorisis plot, I want to suggest, recognitions allow characters to become aware of identity, but also to fuse incrementally different versions of identity into one “species,” as it were.
“the prospect which now opens before me, like the burst of a view from a mountain top” (420). While characters thus receive information from visualized avenues, in a recurrent metaphor, Collins describes the plot itself as a “design,” a word that evokes visual structure and collaborations between words and images, as well as the French word for drawing, dessin (“dessin”). Likewise, Gilmore assists the “design” of the novel (641), in which events are “trace[d]” (6); Hartright is “the instrument of a Design that is yet unseen” (278); events “force” on Marian “the conviction of an unseen Design in the long series of complications which had now fastened round us,” and make her wonder whether they were not advancing “blindfold” towards some terrible conclusion (288). This “unseen Design” that fits characters into a “series” of events is reminiscent of Darwin’s sense of the visible progress of speciation, even as it offers a graphic metaphor for fiction. In this drawing-obsessed novel, visual experience is both key to the plot and describes the fabric of the narrative.

The crucial feature of the compulsive visuality of The Woman in White is Laura’s astonishing resemblance to Anne Catherick. The news of the women’s resemblance first comes in Marian’s voice, reading an old letter from Mrs. Fairlie to her husband, the father of both women and the source of their similarity. Mrs. Fairlie contends that, although she “is not half so pretty” as Laura, “by one of those extraordinary caprices of accidental resemblance,” Anne is her “living likeness” (60). This resemblance instigates numerous circuits of the plot before the hereditary connection is ultimately revealed (567-68). Commented on in particular by Hartright, the resemblance indicates a connection between Anne and Laura’s bodies that Collins underscores through the logic of the uncanny, the biological connections of heredity and disease, and clothing.

Collins opens “views” of the women’s resemblance through Hartright’s painter’s eyes. Early in the novel, Hartright is able to see their likeness “all the more clearly because the points of dissimilarity between the two were presented to [him] as well as the points of resemblance” (96). Subtle difference allows similitude to become more evident. He thinks the women are identical “In the general outline of the countenance and general proportion of the features; in the colour of the hair and in the little nervous uncertainty about the lips; in the height and size of the figure, and the carriage of the head and body” (96). Despite this strong similarity, Anne’s face lacks “The delicate beauty of Miss Fairlie’s complexion, the transparent clearness of her eyes, the smooth purity of her skin, the tender bloom of colour on her lips” (96). For Hartright, an absence of traits defines Anne’s difference from Laura, and by extension her characteristic likeness to
herself. He feels that only “one sad change, in the future” would “make the likeness complete,” so that “If ever sorrow and suffering set their profaning marks on the youth and beauty of Miss Fairlie’s face, then, and then only, Anne Catherick and she would be the twin-sisters of chance resemblance, the living reflexions of one another” (96). Hartright’s observation, that only “one sad change” was needed to “make the likeness complete,” denotes the malleability of the visible world in the eyes of this drawing teacher. Rather than possessing actually different faces, for Hartright these two women are “likenesses” of each other that may be revised or re-drawn. As though offering “before and after” portraits of Laura’s resemblance to Anne, once the machinations of the plot have had their effect on Laura, Hartright returns to his descriptive effort, bemoaning how “The outward changes wrought by the suffering and the terror of the past had fearfully, almost hopelessly, strengthened the fatal resemblance between Anne Catherick and herself” (442). Even as it works to persuade the reader of the truth of this visual plot point, through Hartright’s eyes, the narrative gradually focuses the likeness until the women do seem truly identical.

Their resemblance allows Anne and Laura to represent each other and produces an uncanny connection between them, just as the apparition of a ghost reflects or recalls the appearance of a person who has died. In the absence of a known genealogical link between the women, characters frequently refer to their “ominous” likeness (61, 76, 96), while their similarities are so great that a startled boy who believes his sighting of Anne Catherick showed him a ghost, answers “T’ ghaist of Mistress Fairlie” when asked whose ghost he saw (87). Indeed, Anne is consistently likened to a ghost, since, as an apparitional version of Laura, she tends to localize the uncanny quality Collins loads onto hereditary resemblance. Her white costume especially enhances her ghostly character. As the boy who sees her says, she was “Arl in white—as a ghaist should be” (86). As the titular doyenne of the novel, “the woman in white” not only bears the stagey costume of a “ghost,” but her character offers a quintessentially apparitional and evanescent presence. She seems to direct the course of events from beyond the grave (460) and is most ghostly during her first scene, when Hartright tells her, “I only wondered at your appearance in the road, because it seemed to me to be empty the instant before I saw you” (21). Hartright’s sight of her hovers between appearance and emptiness. He calls her an “extraordinary apparition” (20) during the same encounter and later imagines that he will see her in a dream (30). When he tries to sketch or read, she becomes a rather chunky spectre, since he complains
that “the woman in white got between me and my pencil, between me and my book” (28). Like a ghost, physical laws don’t bind her presence. Though she begins to fade from Hartright’s mind, her haunting image lingers with him (31). Anne’s ghostliness may be due in part to her lack of an acknowledged place within a hereditary series: she represents a gap. The risk Laura faces of being connected to Anne through the resemblance is also spectral. Hartright declares that “To associate that forlorn, friendless, lost woman, even by an accidental likeness only, with Miss Fairlie, seems like casting a shadow on the future of the bright creature who stands looking at us now” (61). Though visible resemblance often denotes a past of hereditary connection, this one presages the haunting ill luck of a common future of misfortune, a shared series of events progressing beyond the present. Anne represents the spectre of a visible history for Laura’s life, a sight of a narrative of sorrow layered onto her wealthier half-sister’s body. By positioning Anne as a spectral “shadow” of and on Laura, Collins represents an uncanny vision of the social stakes of their hereditary resemblance.

While the haunts of the uncanny offer one explanation for Anne’s reflection of Laura, Collins also uses the biological explanations of inherited traits and illness to account for the apparent connection between their bodies. For example, the fantastical unlikeliness of the resemblance between Laura and Anne is mitigated by the oddity of Marian’s dissimilarity to Laura, though they are known to be half-sisters. Of their differences despite sharing a mother, Marian says, “We are in every respect as unlike each other as possible. […] I am dark and ugly, and she is fair and pretty. Everybody thinks me crabbed and odd (with perfect justice); and everybody thinks her sweet-tempered and charming (with more justice still)” (36). Marian emphasizes her difference from Laura to suit the ends of Collins’s narrative: the strange truth that they could be related but opposite makes Anne’s seemingly unrelated but perfect doubling of Laura more credible. Anne, too, invokes the question of hereditary similarity through the maternal line when she tells Laura, “You have not got your mother’s face […] or your mother’s heart. Your mother’s face was dark; and your mother’s heart, Miss Fairlie, was the heart of an angel” (282). This maternal legacy of a “dark face” that only one of Mrs. Fairlie’s daughters inherits is confirmed by Mr. Gilmore, who says of Laura, “She is a sweet lovable girl, as amiable and attentive to every one about her as her excellent mother used to be—though, personally speaking, she takes after her father. Mrs Fairlie had dark eyes and hair; and her elder daughter, Miss Halcombe, strongly reminds me of her” (128). Once the paternal connection between Laura and Anne is
revealed, Marian’s dissimilarity to Laura despite their shared mother becomes a point in favour of Laura’s extreme resemblance to Anne through the influence of their common father. 140 While Laura and Anne are thought to be unrelated, Collins nevertheless uses biological inferences to help “prove” the strength of their resemblance.

Collins also presents their similarity as a biological connection by describing it as the threat of a contagious disease. Laura’s own acknowledgement of her similarity to Anne introduces a common way of explaining their differences: she describes it as like “the sight of [her] own face in the glass after a long illness” (282). This description of Anne as an “ill” version of Laura recurs often. Glyde refers to her as “a sickly likeness” of his wife and tells Fosco, “Fancy my wife, after a bad illness, with a touch of something wrong in her head— and there is Anne Catherick for you” (339). Illness itself becomes a method of explaining similarity between unrelated bodies. As Foucault writes of the visibility of disease, “Beneath a gaze that is sensitive to difference, simultaneity or succession, and frequency, the symptom therefore becomes a sign” (Birth of the Clinic 115). Collins’s uses of illness as an explanation for the resemblance thus position it as the sign and symptom of the “disease” of the undomesticated hereditary connection between Anne and Laura. The construction of the resemblance as pathological explicates the odd and recurrent characterization of their resemblance as “fatal” (442, 443, 568). The pathological fatality of the resemblance is an aspect of the connection it seems to produce between Laura and Anne. Hartright admits that his reasons for connecting Glyde to Anne could be merely “because he had now become associated in my mind with Miss Fairlie; Miss Fairlie being, in her turn, associated with Anne Catherick, since the night when I had discovered the ominous likeness between them” (76). Like a contagious virus, the likeness connects their bodies in the minds of characters, even without the knowledge of a hereditary link.

Mediating between the immateriality of appearances and the physicality of illness and heredity, clothing offers another important link between Anne and Laura, as well as added evidence of their similarity. “Women in white,” these characters share a costume as well as a face, and their clothing gives new layers of similitude to their already resembling bodies. Both Anne and Laura wear white because of Mrs. Fairlie, though only Laura is “related” to her. Anne explains that

---

140 While Jay Clayton notes Collins’s overemphasis on maternal inheritance in The Legacy of Cain, here we see the supposed influence of gender in inheritance used as an argument about the causes of personal resemblance.
though she is teased “about dressing all in white” because “it looks so particular,” she believes that in this matter “Mrs Fairlie knew best [...] She often wore white herself; and she always dressed her little daughter in white” (102). Anne and Laura’s choice of a white habit marks them out as similar reproductions of each other, influenced by the same matriarch. The white clothing also helps Hartright to become aware of their resemblance: his “eyes fixed upon the white gleam of her muslin gown and head-dress in the moonlight, and a sensation [...] began to steal over me” (59). The “sensation” the sight of the white clothing inspires in Hartright announces his dawning apprehension of likeness between the two women. Likewise, when the identity of the churchyard apparition is in question, Hartright explains that the schoolmaster “unconsciously” identified her “when he spoke of the figure that the boy saw in the churchyard,” since “he called it “a woman in white,” a label that instantly prompts Miss Halcombe to declare, “Not Anne Catherick!” (89). The sartorial resemblance between Anne and Laura translates into an identification through verbal resemblance. Reflecting the interests of this text in doubles, the verbal repetition replaces visual recognition as the women’s similar clothes come to symbolize the likeness between their bodies.

While both Collins and Darwin are concerned with appearances that are shared among bodies, the novelist also uses Anne and Laura’s costume to bolster the credibility of their physical resemblance and serial similarity. Their white uniforms signify their characters as well as their interchangeability and call into question the validity of separating these two iterations in a series from each other at all. After Anne’s death, Fosco keeps her white clothes because “they were destined to assist the resurrection of the woman who was dead in the person of the woman who was living” (626). Clothing can enact the resurrection of identity as well as combine characters. Identification through costume is so powerful that when Laura is wrongfully confined to an asylum as Anne Catherick, “her own eyes informed her that she had Anne Catherick’s clothes on” and a nurse enjoins her to “Look at your own name on your own clothes, and don’t worry us all any more about being Lady Glyde. She’s dead and buried; and you’re alive and hearty. Do look at your clothes now! There it is, in good marking ink; [...] Anne Catherick, as plain as print!” (436). In this instance, the legibility of these clothes for their connection to either woman can only come through the name written on the clothing since their white colour could have identified either Anne or Laura. While their clothing makes their identity purportedly legible “as
print,” it also makes these women in white repetitive as print, and confirms their reproduction of each other: their clothes corroborate the series made by their similar bodies.

Identity here creeps unsettlingly towards becoming no more than a manner of fashioning the body, suggesting that selfhood, like white clothing, can be put on and off. Besides Anne and Laura’s white habit, Fosco’s frequently costumed character (291, 592, 640) offers another indication of the interest of this novel in the mutability of identity framed by clothing. Similarly, Glyde’s fabrication of a name and place for himself through his forgery of the marriage record (520-21) enacts an identity through a “disguise.” In another moment of “costuming,” Hartright, Marian, and Laura live under assumed names, “the changed aspect in which we three must appear” (421). As he pursues the mystery, however, Hartright wonders whether he should travel in disguise, but writes that “there was something so repellent to me in the idea—something so meanly like the common herd of spies and informers in the mere act of adopting a disguise” that he dismisses the idea: “In my own character I had acted thus far—and in my own character I was resolved to continue to the end” (492-93). This conclusion seems odd given that he has already been living under a false identity. Clothes, however, more than words or names, fashion selfhood in this novel. Hartright’s suggestion that by adopting a disguise he could act in a character other than his own is not merely a rhetorical turn, but defines the interest of this text in the identities created by clothes. Layers of incremental difference added to the body, clothes become another way of producing and reproducing identity.

While character can be generated and shifted by clothing in The Woman in White, identity itself frequently alters in degrees. Characters often find their identities somehow changed. Hartright says that hearing about the plot with Fosco leaves Pesca “so altered from the easy, lively, quaint little man of all my past experience, that if I had met him in the street, changed as I saw him now, I should most certainly not have known him again” (587). On the same occasion, Pesca tells Hartright that if Fosco knows him, he must be “so altered, or disguised, that I do not know him” (592, italics original), and asks that Hartright “Let [him] try to be like [him]self again, when we meet next” (592). Their exchange demonstrates Collins’s persistent interest in alterations of character. Hartright, Marian, and Glyde also differ from themselves. Hartright never expected Pesca’s help would “alter [him] to [him]self almost past recognition” (9), while Mr. Gilmore finds Hartright “so changed that [he] hardly knew him again” (157). When he sees Marian’s face again, Hartright finds it “Changed, changed as if years had passed over it!” (418).
While these characters all differ from themselves, Mr. Gilmore remarks that unlike Laura, Mr. Fairlie “had not altered” since they last met (128-29). Given the pervasive alterations that individuals in this book experience, Mr. Fairlie’s immutability seems to be a measure of his lack of human feeling. Just as Darwin’s concept of “species” entails a collection of minutely varying individuals, individuality tends to be plural in this novel. Differing from oneself is such a norm that identity itself becomes a series of altering states.

As a result of these recurrent personal alterations, the question of whether individuals are recognizably acting “in character” recurs throughout the work. More than any other character, Laura changes from herself. She tells Glyde, “There is a change in me” to suggest he ought to break their engagement (170), and she surprises her audience with a response to Glyde that “was so entirely unlike herself, so utterly out of her character, that it silenced us all” (250). Just as Anne and Laura reflect each other in person, since Marian and Laura are so close, Hartright observes, “no serious alteration could take place in any one of us which did not sympathetically affect the others. The change in Miss Fairlie was reflected in her half-sister” (66). Laura’s difference from herself is so powerful that it projects itself onto her sister, and allows for a new resemblance between them. She differs so substantially from herself, that her very identity slips from her body: “Strangers, acquaintances, friends even who could not look at her as we looked, if she had been shown to them in the first days of her rescue from the Asylum, might have doubted if she were the Laura Fairlie they had once seen, and doubted without blame” (443). Just as similarities among apparently different forms become visible to Darwin, the “looking” gazes of friends and strangers have the power to consolidate Laura’s character, both revealing and hiding her personal alterations.

Collins’s repeated focalization of recognition underscores the power of vision to verify and consolidate minutely altering identities, even as it leads to false conclusions. The most dramatic moment of such recognition restores Laura’s identity. As she comes forward from the tombstone declaring her death, he writes, “In that moment Miss Halcombe recognised her sister—recognised the dead-alive” (429). While this instance is crucial to the plot, Collins returns to the topic of recognition throughout the novel so as to emphasize the strength of visual identification. Hartright brushes away the possibility that he might not have immediately recognized Laura, saying he felt “Not the shadow of a suspicion, from the moment when she lifted her veil by the side of the inscription which recorded her death” (421). His powers of recognition are equally
sharp when, passing two men in the street, he “instantly recognised one of the men who had watched me before I left England” (456). Experiences of recognition may be misleading as they invoke and frustrate expectations regarding visible identities. In a display of the contingency of visual recognition, the arduous process of identifying Glyde’s body requires two sets of visual witnesses to his appearance as well as the corroborating evidence of his watch (533-34). While recognizing the dead man poses challenges to the living, Hartright anticipates needing to recognize people in the future: when being followed by a man, he notes “He was a stranger to me; and I was glad to make sure of his personal appearance, in case of future annoyance” (456). Hartright, too, is subject to recognition—to secure his bail (516-18), and by Laura when his services are recommended to her in a conversation about drawing lessons (264). Underscoring the visuality of recognition, Fosco sees and knows Pesca (585), and, though the recognition is not mutual (592), Hartright sees with his “own eyes, that he believed himself, in spite of the change in his appearance, to have been recognised by Pesca, and to be therefore in danger of his life” (593). This triangulation of sights and recognitions is an elaborate intersubjective staging of visual identification.

Such moments of uncertain recognition, when the identification may not be mutual, are common. Passing a man in the street, Hartright “instantly recognised the light-haired foreigner, with the scar on his cheek; and I thought he recognised me” (598, italics original). Hartright and one of Sir Percival’s agents also misread each other outside the vestry: Hartright “could not see his face; but, judging by his voice only, he was a perfect stranger” (525). Realizing Hartright is not Sir Percival, the man “drew back directly. ‘I thought it was my master,’ he muttered, in a confused, doubtful way” (525). All these recognitions and misrecognitions elaborate the general concern in this novel about how and whether vision has the authority to prove identity. Just as individuals within one species may vary substantially but are still recognizable as making up one collection of resemblance, in this novel individuals may alter from themselves in increments, and are constituted as wholly themselves only when recognized by others.

Like the repetitions of a major motif in a pattern or symphony, these recurring recognitions emphasize the centrality of the main theme: the massive misrecognition of Laura, both wilful and accidental. Not only is identity confirmed through visual recognition in this novel, faulty recognitions have the power to overcome identity: Laura is “dead to the servants of the house, who had failed to recognise her” (421). The most serious misrecognition permits Laura’s
admission to the asylum as a returning, but in fact now-deceased, Anne. Laura is accepted “with
great surprise—but without suspicion; thanks to the order and certificates, to Percival’s letter, to
the likeness, to the clothes, and to the patient’s own confused mental condition at the time”
(627). In this moment of misidentification, a collection of faulty assertions of identity produces
this recognition of Laura as Anne. The scene reflects Ronald R. Thomas’s account of the
processes of identification that drive sensation fiction: “The mystery at the heart of virtually
every sensation novel,” he writes, “is based on the disappearance and subsequent identification
of some “character”” (Detective 63). In this fabrication of recognition, each false document of
“Anne’s” identity becomes more authoritative through its propinquity to all the others, but the
visible likeness is essential.

In accounting for the process of his recognition, the proprietor who accepts Laura in place of
Anne exposes the uncertainties of visual identification. He “acknowledged that he had observed
some curious personal changes in her,” and allows that they may be due merely to the fact that
“insane people were often, at one time, outwardly as well as inwardly, unlike what they were at
another;” nevertheless,

he was still perplexed, at times, by certain differences between his
patient before she had escaped, and his patient since she had been
brought back. Those differences were too minute to be described.
He could not say, of course, that she was absolutely altered in
height or shape or complexion, or in the colour of her hair and
eyes, or in the general form of her face: the change was something
that he felt, more than something that he saw. (428)

Following the logic of the mutability of character that this novel transcribes, in this account of
uncertain visual recognition, Laura’s unlikeness to Anne becomes “Anne’s” unlikeness to
herself. The proprietor’s conclusion localizes character in “something” to be “felt” rather than
seen, echoing Hartright’s description of “That ‘something wanting,’” that he’d seen in Laura,
which “was [his] own recognition of the ominous likeness” (61). Though the proprietor doesn’t
yet realize that his “feeling” of difference is absolutely correct, and that the woman he thinks is
Anne has literally altered entirely from herself, by trying to account for the difference he “feels,”
he describes the limits of Anne and Laura’s resemblance.\textsuperscript{141} The similitude is at once incomplete and a powerful argument that Anne and Laura are the same person. As a result of this contradiction, the resemblance itself tests sensory perception. Recalling Darwin’s “insensible changes” that accumulate into “insensible series,” in the end, the proprietor cannot reduce his feeling that “Anne” has changed to visual information. Lynch attributes the “insensibility” of such minute differences to the modern overabundance of print variants: “modern print technology raises the question of the “more or less,” of the nuanced difference that in modern, mass-mediated times especially is [...] “insensible”’’ (\textit{Economy} 48). Laura and Anne’s visible divergences from each other are “too minute to be described”—too subtle to be captured in words, either in the warden’s description, or possibly, the implication remains, in Collins’s prose. This challenge to apprehension reflects the seriality in Anne and Laura’s relation: minutely altered versions of each other, their intense visible similarity recalls the resemblances between prints, draws out the risks of relying on vision to confirm identity, and tests the representational abilities of prose.

Collins’s representation of visual recognition and the resultant conflict between prose and sight lends weight to the pact between the text and the reader, who must agree to “recognize” the unverifiable resemblance between Laura and Anne. Although the reader is removed from “sight” of the scenes of this novel, the story cannot cohere unless she along with all the other characters “sees” the resemblance. In acknowledging the variability of Laura’s “look,” Hartright makes his claims of her resemblance to Anne more persuasive. While he recalls that, despite their powerful resemblance, “In those former days, if they had both been seen together, side by side, no person could for a moment have mistaken them one for the other,” they now seem indistinguishable:

\begin{quote}
The sorrow and suffering which I had once blamed myself for associating even by a passing thought with the future of Laura Fairlie, had set their profaning marks on the youth and beauty of her face; and the fatal resemblance which I had once seen and\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{141} By suggesting the differences could be “something that he felt, more than something that he saw,” the proprietor reflects the “sensational” experience of reading sensation fiction, since, as Laurie Garrison argues, the genre is defined by its emphasis on “inspiring physical excitement in the reader” (1). In this contest between the visibility and sensibility of evidence, therefore, we can find another angle on Collins’s delivery of sensation into a realist mode.
shuddered at seeing, in idea only, was now a real and living resemblance which asserted itself before my own eyes. (442-43)

Despite the barriers the characters’ textual setting presents to a verification of their resemblance, Hartright’s attestations to their similitude, its “life,” and evolution, verifies its reality as a dependable detail for the progression of the narrative. In attempting to shore up the reader’s faith in the reality of Anne and Laura’s resemblance, Collins pursues the evidence of the “visible.” Readers are invited to join Hartright in progressing from “seeing” the likeness in “idea only” to verifying its reality with their own “eyes” through the window of the text and Hartright’s assurances. Hartright’s distinction, between “seeing” the resemblance “in idea only” and seeing it later as a “real and living resemblance,” uses codes of realist fiction to affirm the reality and “life” of the resemblance. In arguing for the visible reality of Anne and Laura’s resemblance, which must remain effectively “invisible” on the typographic page but “visible” in the mind of the reader, the novel relies on realism’s push to use the “window” of printed text to represent visual detail as a measure of the actual.142

The story requires the reader’s conviction that this extraordinary resemblance exists, that Hartright and Collins’s depiction of the visual similitude between Anne and Laura is authentic. Verification of resemblance in “reality” might come from comparing two faces side by side, but while Laura Fairlie and Anne Catherick do meet once in person and recognize their similarity when face-to-face with each other (279-82), only the reader “sees” their faces together.143 The “viewer” with the clearest sight of the resemblance is, paradoxically, the reader. Like the audience to a stage comedy of mistaken identities, the reader alone sees all the characters at once, in the common realm of the text. Positioning the reader’s gaze as the most expert perspective on Laura and Anne’s purportedly extreme similitude, Collins obliges the reader to

142 As Nancy Armstrong argues, realist fiction of this period “made visual information the basis for the intelligibility of a verbal narrative” (7). For this concept of the “windows” in books, I am indebted to Anne Friedberg’s writing on “the virtual window,” Carol Armstrong’s discussion of photographs in Victorian books, and Isobel Armstrong’s history of windows in Victorian culture.
143 Accompanying visual documentation might have offered another verification of the resemblance. While the serialization of The Woman in White in All the Year Round contained no illustrations, the simultaneous publication of the novel in Harper’s Weekly did. While one of these images does display the meeting between Anne and Laura, it portrays the women as significantly different rather than working to affirm their resemblance, leaving Collins’s prose to verify this plot point just as in the British serialization. See McLenan in the March 24th, 1860, issue of Harper’s Weekly.
attest to the truth of this essential plot point. Marian’s request that Hartright “Let this discovery of the likeness be kept a secret between you and me” (61), therefore mimics the demand the text puts to the reader. The willingness of readers to “see” and “recognise” the resemblance of these women depends on their willingness to “keep the secret” of the text—the secret of a visible resemblance that it does not represent in a visual and therefore appropriate and truly persuasive medium. The “truth” of this visual detail couched in a work of prose works like a subtext to which the reader must acquiesce. Just as Darwin’s readers must “see” his view of prehistoric series of resemblances so as to comprehend evolution, in order for Collins’s narrative to proceed, readers must “keep the secret” of Anne and Laura’s resemblance by agreeing that it exists. Both works persuade their readers to hypothesize the visibility of scenes that remain in fact unremittingly invisible.

Collin’s reader gazes, like Darwin’s, at series. Just as other moments of visual recognition confirm or destabilize identity, the recognition of resemblance in the reader’s perspective sets Laura and Anne into a visible series with each other. The reader’s “sight” here, like Darwin’s view on species, entails the acknowledgement of the wholes made from collections of minutely shifting visible identities, “forms intermediate” that together, like print variants, narrate histories of alteration and connection. The reader’s view consolidates the serial identities in this novel, the series made of Laura’s versions of herself and the series she and Anne make together.

Reproducing the Series: Hartright’s Inheritance and Mr. Fairlie’s Alternative

In *The Woman in White*, the serial replication of identity is not distinct from sexual reproduction and familial inheritance, since the series of versions of Laura must be consolidated and authenticated in order for her progeny to fulfil the vector of the novel by inheriting their rightful fortune. While Collins presents individual character, like Darwin’s species, as a whole identity that varies in small increments from itself, he also, like Darwin, exposes the pressures of inheritance in establishing family series. Family inheritance, both biological and financial, creates individuals who are serial variations of each other. While fiction has long been concerned with the transmission of family legacies, Collins’s Darwinian innovation is to align hereditary inheritance with legal inheritance, even as he offers an alternate reproductive schema in comparing sexual procreation to print. *The Woman in White* confirms Darwin’s description of the
serial “impressions” of resemblance by depicting a print collection as an alternative to family reproduction, and in presenting individuals as items within series of biological and financial inheritors.

Under Hartright’s direction, financial and biological inheritances merge in the reproduction that closes the narrative. Although he narrates much of the novel, Hartright’s heterosexual regime is not hegemonic. Rather, Laura’s guardian, Mr. Fairlie, enacts another form of reproductive patriarchy. His taste for prints and his transgressions against the mores of heterosexually defined family values present an alternative to Collins’s simultaneous representation of resembling and inheriting series of individuals under Hartright’s authority. I conclude my reading of *The Woman in White* by associating its interest in hereditary reproduction, consolidated by Hartright, with its investments in print seriality portrayed in particular through Mr. Fairlie. These battling patriarchs each represent a different nineteenth-century orientation towards the reproduction and legacies of family series.

Hartright, who has no financial inheritance of his own, secures an inheritance for himself by authenticating Laura’s identity, and heterosexually reproducing her lineage. He inserts his own financial interests into hers, though he claims that he has “no money-motive [...] no idea of personal advantage” in helping Laura regain possession of her identity, and, by inference, her inheritance (454). Just as this claim seems possibly overstated, in wondering whether he was “justified” in these actions he also professes to know

that the motive of securing the just recognition of my wife in the birthplace from which she had been driven out as an impostor, and of publicly erasing the lie that still profaned her mother’s tombstone, was far purer, in its freedom from all taint of evil passion, than the vindictive motive which had mingled itself with my purpose from the first. (606)

While he tries to distance himself from an impulse of revenge against Fosco and Glyde, Hartright also goes to great lengths to insist that his major reason for risking his life in securing Laura’s identity is the “pure” love of truth. This assertion offers a weak shield for the possibility that his motivation is only the prospect of partaking as her husband in her inheritance.
Indeed, matching his personal effectiveness to his sexual success in a way that parallels Darwinian notions of “natural selection,” Hartright’s effort to secure Laura’s inheritance coincides with his biological legacy to their offspring. By reproducing with Laura and retrieving the social acknowledgement of her identity, Hartright ensures economic success for his children. His work in the final act of the novel to produce the just recognition of Laura thus mirrors the last moments of the story, when he “recognizes” his son. When he re-joins Marian, his wife, and his son at the old family house, Marian asks him “Do you know who this is, Walter?” to which he responds, “I think I can still answer for knowing my own child”—an answer she does not accept: “Child! [...] Do you talk in that familiar manner of one of the landed gentry of England? Are you aware [...] in whose presence you stand? Evidently not! Let me make two eminent personages known to one another: Mr Walter Hartright—the Heir of Limmeridge” (643). While Marian here employs a common mode of introducing two people by itemizing their names or titles to each other, the second phrase could also be read as a description of the initial name, describing Hartright as the Heir of Limmeridge. Since we know that the baby’s name is also “Walter” (641), Marian is in fact presenting “Walter Hartright” to “Walter Hartright.” This repetition of characters represents their legal similitude to each other while also listing a series of inheritors.

While he has protested his innocence of financial motives for resolving Laura’s identity, Hartright’s efforts have procured an inheritance for his son from which he is sure to benefit. As patriarch in this family Hartright will be in a position to determine the disposal of its resources, making him the effective “heir.” By “inheriting” his fortune from his son, Hartright will be “altered” from himself, and will take on the “likeness” of his son as heir, passing his own resemblance to his child, even as his child confers his likeness as heir on his father. Though Hartright professes himself eager to continue in his own habitual character, he ends the novel in the guise of his infant. Repeating the logic of altered character in this novel, Hartright’s likeness and unlikeness to himself and his son allow him to move from being a drawing master to landed gentry, as inherited resemblance shifts to legal inheritance. “Mr Walter Hartright—the Heir of Limmeridge” fits these Walters into a genealogical and financial series—a progression of father to son, of orphan to heir, and back again, and the phrase is the last of the many reproductive and resembling doublings that the novel presents. Appearing in the last instalment of this serialized novel, the formulation introduces a family series likely to progress into the future.
This scheme presents a markedly patriarchal and heterosexual system of inheritance. Hartright articulates this serial patriarchy of inheritance in the conclusion of the novel. Reflecting on their father’s impact on Anne and Laura, he recalls that “‘The sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children.’ But for the fatal resemblance between the two daughters of one father, the conspiracy of which Anne had been the innocent instrument and Laura the innocent victim, could never have been planned” (568). Hartright uses the genealogical series of inheritance to account for the exploitations that result from the father’s bequeathal of his appearance to his offspring. This emphasis on the paternal in biological and financial inheritance is also reflected in the “unlikeness” between Laura and Marian: “My father was a poor man,” says Marian, “and Miss Fairlie’s father was a rich man. I have got nothing, and she has a fortune” (36). The “traits” they inherited from their fathers transcend looks to include class. Hartright’s own interventions in the narrative present a similarly patriarchal system of genealogy and inheritance that, like evolutionary theory, presumes heterosexual procreativity. The heterosexual fulfilment he achieves in rescuing Laura, marrying her, and producing an heir, sets the “heart right” in this narrative, and restores a morally conservative status quo.

Set against this version of reproductive patriarchy is Mr. Fairlie’s model of resistance to heterosexual “family values.” He displays a marked lack of any family affection. As Marian says, “the idea of his missing his niece is simply preposterous—he used to let months pass, in the old times, without attempting to see her” (201). His possibly hysterical chronic illness, permits his disinterest in other people, and in having children of his own. “Mr Fairlie is too great an invalid to be a companion for anybody,” says Marian, “I don’t know what is the matter with him, and the doctors don’t know what is the matter with him, and he doesn’t know himself what is the matter with him. We all say it’s on the nerves, and we none of us know what we mean when we say it” (34). While subscribing to an illness allows Mr. Fairlie to avoid company, this nameless condition that Marian articulates negatively (a “matter” of which no one knows the meaning), may bear some similarity to the “love that dare not speak its name.” D. A. Miller observes that, like Marian, Mr. Fairlie transgresses genders (“Cage” 110). This dual identification is particularly evident under the eyes of Hartright, who describes his “white delicate hands,” his “effeminately small feet” and “little womanish bronze-leather slippers,” and who declares that Mr. Fairlie’s appearance displayed “something singularly and unpleasantly delicate in its association with a man, and, at the same time, something which could by no possibility have
looked natural and appropriate if it had been transferred to the personal appearance of a woman” (39-40). This description of effeminacy underscores Hartright’s own overly insistent manly heterosexuality and invites a reading of Mr. Fairlie as a queer character. Indeed, Richard Nemesvari notes that Fairlie can be read according to Eve Sedgwick’s scheme of Victorian “aristocratic homosexual style” because of his interest in the arts (100). Whether or not we read him as “queer” in the contemporary sense of the word, Mr. Fairlie does present a consistent alternative to the heterosexual family values of reproduction and inheritance.

While evolutionary theory indicates individuals ought to feel inclined to recognize their relatives so as to see them thrive, an assumption that underpins the value of loyalty to family, Mr. Fairlie directly flouts this social imperative. He refuses to recognize Laura, proclaiming that he sees “nothing in her face and manner to make him doubt for a moment that his niece lay buried in Limmeridge churchyard” (437). Rather than agreeing to see the likeness that verifies family relation, Mr. Fairlie denies it, preferring to imagine his niece dead rather than alive. This failure to recognize his niece is highlighted by the lawyer Gilmore, who cites the occurrence as a major obstruction to the re-establishment of Laura’s identity (451). While Marian allows “all due force to the influence of prejudice and alarm in preventing [Mr. Fairlie] from fairly exercising his perceptions,” Hartright, in line with his character’s insistence on the values of heterosexual procreation, proclaims it “manifestly impossible to suppose that [Mr. Fairlie] was capable of such infamy as secretly recognising and openly disowning his brother’s child” (437). Mr. Fairlie’s abnegation of family duties and heterosexual values is most evident in his refusal to make just legal arrangements for Laura’s wedding. After Mr. Fairlie refuses to ensure Glyde couldn’t benefit from Laura’s death, Mr. Gilmore says to him, “As the faithful friend and servant of your family, I tell you, at parting, that no daughter of mine should be married to any man alive under such a settlement as you are forcing me to make for Miss Fairlie” (162). Compared to the bounty of generations and issue that Hartright produces, Mr. Fairlie shows little interest in providing for the future life of his niece, a relation with some resemblance to a daughter. While this disinterest is somewhat mitigated by his ultimate decision to allow his estate to go to Laura’s
son (643), throughout most of the novel he lacks any concern for the thriving of his relatives’ generations. 144

Mr. Fairlie’s failure to “recognize” Laura is particularly odd because of his status as a connoisseur of prints, which often differ from each other only in slight degrees. Unless we are to suppose him a complete aesthetic dilettante, his educated eye, trained to see the differences between copies of the same print, ought to have been able to detect minor variations between Laura and Anne. Like the expert gaze of Darwin’s breeders who perceive nearly invisible distinctions between the bodies of their animals, Mr. Fairlie’s cultivated vision should be able to see similar faces for their minute differences. Even though he fails or refuses to see her as the “authentic” version of herself (the original print, as it were), the similarity between this moment of evaluation and his acts of looking as a collector frames Laura as a subject for his aesthetic gaze. Collins’s plot likens Mr. Fairlie’s gaze on his prints to his gaze on Laura, thereby casting her as another item in his collection of printed objects. Recalling the collections of natural history, and Darwin’s use of print metaphors to account for inherited resemblance, here members of Mr. Fairlie’s family enter a shared continuum with objects in his print collection.

Indeed, his prints rather than his family consistently mediate Fairlie’s involvement in circuits of reproduction and affection. Indifferent to his relatives, only displays of appreciation for his collection move him: upon their first meeting Marian advises Hartright “to humour his little peculiarities, when you see him to-day. Admire his collection of coins, prints, and water-colour drawings, and you will win his heart” (34-35). Just as Des Esseintes in Huysmans’s À Rebours (1884) replaces the pleasures of human companionship with aestheticism, Fairlie’s companions are his objects, recasting his collection as a family, and family as a collection. The unstable boundaries between family and aestheticized collections in this novel are also indicated in Marian’s description of the hallway of family portraits in Glyde’s house (204). This collection offers evidence of his family dynasty that proves to be forged (521). The works denote the reproduction of family in all its forms, painted and hereditary, while not being admitted to the collection could be a matter of failing an aesthetic test as much as failing to produce the right

144 The reversal of Fairlie’s dishonourable intentions in his establishment of Laura’s son as his heir can be read as an example of what Levine calls “the disruptions that the sensation novel unleashes (and then purports to tame)” (How to Read 107).
biological or archival identity. The most heterosexually and family-oriented character, Hartright, also demonstrates the instincts of a collector and restorer of drawings in his husbandly feelings for Laura: “she was mine at last! Mine to support, to protect, to cherish, to restore. Mine to love and honour as father and brother both” (422). His repetition of the word “mine” here emphasizes the possessive aspects of his love, while his reference to himself as her father and brother throws into question the sexuality of his intended relation to her. His desire to “restore” her recalls his initial services to Mr. Fairlie, who hired him for “the business of repairing and mounting a valuable collection of drawings, which had been suffered to fall into a condition of total neglect” (15). The drawing master supplants Mr. Fairlie as head of his own house, reproducing not only drawings, objects that Mr. Fairlie collects, but also collectible inheritors to his family’s dynasty. Both relatives and collections of artworks are to be kept and restored, while family and procreativity in this novel are entwined with the value of collections.

The obsession with print culture on the part of this flaccid patriarch, whose replacement by Hartright the novel documents, is not at all incidental to the focus of the plot on hereditary reproduction. Through references to Rembrandt in particular, Collins elaborates a reproductive ethos of print. In Marian’s catalogue of Mr. Fairlie’s favourite photographs of his collection is a “Unique Rembrandt etching. Known all over Europe, as The Smudge, from a printer’s blot in the corner which exists in no other copy. Valued at three hundred guineas” (201-02). The irony of this catalogue entry is its vacillation between singleness and plurality: prints are by definition not meant to be unique, yet the ridiculous “smudge” (a flaw) increases the interest of this one.145 Since this description is actually of a photograph, however, as Benjamin would remind us, this “unique” print no longer exists in a single edition of one.146 Layers of rarity and the fetishization of print culture collaborate to produce the desirability of this collectible. Symbolizing the value of print reproducibility, Rembrandt is singled out as a favourite of Fairlie’s, whose talk to Gilmore has always been “all about himself and his ailments, his wonderful coins, and his matchless Rembrandt etchings” (129). Due to modern national galleries and photoreproduction,

---

145 Of this item in Marian’s catalogue, William McKelvy writes “To crown things off in this creative litany of replication, the copy of the Rembrandt etching is English literary history’s prime example (pace Benjamin) of aesthetic aura’s alliance with reproductive technologies: what makes “The Smudge” valuable is a form of uniqueness derived from an aberrant instance of mechanical reproduction” (301).

146 Benjamin writes that, “From a photographic negative, for example, one can make any number of prints; to ask for the “authentic” print makes no sense” (“Work of Art” 224).
contemporary readers know Rembrandt primarily as a painter, but he was more present in earlier visual culture as a printmaker. While Rembrandt’s painting was admired in eighteenth-century England, Ellen D’Oensch writes, many felt a “madness to have his prints,” which were “not only prized by collectors” but also “among the most widely imitated images of this period” (63). Rembrandt’s appearances in the plot thus work as invocations of a cherished symbol of print culture. Like Mr. Fairlie, Fosco also displays an interest in Rembrandt. In his account of his night-time flight with Laura to the asylum, he asks “Where is the modern Rembrandt who could depict our midnight procession? Alas for the Arts! alas for this most pictorial of subjects! the modern Rembrandt is nowhere to be found” (622). While Fosco’s call is for an artist able to “depict” his escapade, the publicity that would be brought by the hypothetical Rembrandt’s work, whether in print or painting, must be seen as equally or even more desirable to this fame-obsessed character. Rembrandt here serves as touchstone of a visual series maker, a patriarch for Fairlie and Fosco to reference in their trajectories away from biological reproduction in favour of the procreations of print.

Collins constructs Mr. Fairlie’s character in particular as singularly concerned with such printed generations. He foregoes the genealogical reproductions of bodies in favour of reproductions of objects and taste. Instead of parenting, Mr. Fairlie grows his collection, while he aims to foster not family but printed images. Totally “relieved” to have his female relatives gone from the house, Mr. Fairlie’s “last caprice” is “to keep two photographers incessantly employed in producing sun-pictures of all the treasures and curiosities in his possession,” so as to eventually donate “one complete copy of the collection” to the Mechanics’ Institution of Carlisle, each titled and labelled “In the possession of Frederick Fairlie, Esquire.” With this new pastime, Marian writes, “Mr Fairlie will be a happy man for months and months to come; and the two unfortunate photographers will share the social martyrdom which he has hitherto inflicted on his valet alone” (201-02). This obsessive and asexual procreativity aided by the two “martyrs” to his whims, represents a novel if not queer form of reproduction. Mr. Fairlie’s procreativity is in fact all in

147 As though his body could be reproduced or resurrected by being narrated in print, his wife publishes a biography of Fosco after his death (641), reiterating the link this book draws between the constitution of bodies and print reproduction. Similarly, the publicity of Fosco’s death scene makes him into an object to be consumed by a crowd of spectators (640).

148 This patriarchal vector exemplifies Judith Roof’s demonstration that, in Western culture, “patriarchal order deploys the father’s name, concepts of generation, real property, legacy, and tradition to maintain the illusion of continuity, rightly directed productivity, and meaning in its reproductive organizations” (11).
the form of taste: in his account of being interrupted by a letter from Marian regarding Laura’s wellbeing, he claims that he has amassed his collection so as “to improve the taste of the barbarous people in my neighbourhood,” while his intention to donate its photographic record to the Institution at Carlisle comes “with a view to improving the tastes of the Members (Goths and Vandals to a man)” (346). While Mr. Fairlie withholds himself and his affection from his family and companions, he does have a “giving” impulse, but a condescending one that would bestow the immaterial benefits of “taste” on others, rather than more tangible gains. He aligns this condescending munificence with more significant contributions to the public good: “It might be supposed,” he writes, “that a gentleman who was in course of conferring a great national benefit on his countrymen, was the last gentleman in the world to be unfeelingly worried about private difficulties and family affairs. Quite a mistake, I assure you, in my case” (346). Attending with integrity to family affairs might otherwise be thought to count as a “national benefit,” but Mr. Fairlie’s character marks a shift in values away from the conservation of wealth and family through generations, towards the conferral of taste through printed reproduction.

While Hartright propels the value of heterosexual series and inheritance, Mr. Fairlie represents a “queer” patriarch in the family series of the novel, one who replaces the demands of heterosexual reproductivity with an unwavering obsession with collecting and reproducing printed images. In this novel that appeared alongside Darwin’s tribute to heterosexual reproduction, we find in Mr. Fairlie a character who discovers reproductivity in print media, a creative outlet to bequeath himself upon future generations. He is an ancestor of other “queer” aesthetes in nineteenth-century literature, who, like Dorian Gray, hoard their artworks like eggs, and who find in personal solitude an escape from resembling others and themselves. In this option lies an alternative to the nineteenth-century and very Darwinian hegemony of heterosexual procreativity, an ethos represented by Hartright. Sidestepping the ostensible creation of new generations in its final pages, the ulterior conclusion of The Woman in White is the link the novel traces between Anne Catherick’s visual replication of Laura Fairlie, the hereditary repetitions of bodies in “Walter Hartright—The Heir of Limmeridge” (643), and the reproduction of Mr. Fairlie’s collection. Like the lineages of Darwin’s species, individuals and objects in this novel exist in series that are constituted by resemblance and hereditary reproduction and that reflect the visual repetitions of print culture.

Conclusion: Serial Bodies
For those readers of *All the Year Round* meeting the theory of natural selection amid instalments of *The Woman in White*, Darwin’s account of serially varying individuals connected through inheritance might have gained cogency by being set alongside Collins’s text on the same phenomenon. For both authors, seriality offers a potent denial that difference between objects, bodies, and identities can be absolute, even across existential categories. The implication that, when set within a range of reproductive sentiment, bodies and printed objects might exist in a continuum of difference, a shared series, profoundly upsets what are often seen as constrained “Victorian” heterosexual mores. The disruption of domesticity in Collins’s foundational work of sensation fiction, therefore, can be located in Mr. Fairlie’s affection for his prints, as well as in the destabilizations contained in the uncanny personal series of Anne and Laura.

Even as the species of serial identity Collins depicts corresponds to Darwin’s concept of inherited resemblances as impressions, the novelist’s representation of individuals as serial units, varying in visible increments from themselves and from their relatives, can be read as a response to the financial pressures of print serialization: serials needed characters sufficiently charismatic, similar to and differing from themselves, to keep attracting weekly buyers. Each instalment of a serialized novel needed to welcome new and forgetful readers, while resembling its prior iterations sufficiently to reward attentive revenants with the pleasures they recalled from the last chapter, and varying enough to sustain their interest. A serialized novel whose instalments failed to capture a readership caused editors considerable consternation and faced possible cancellation. The material success and ultimate completion of a serial novel could thus depend on the recurrence of compelling storylines and characters, whose charm in each chapter obviated the need to have read all previous instalments. Ed Wiltse suggests that Arthur Conan Doyle made a knowing and lucrative modification to the narrative form of the serialized novel in creating Sherlock Holmes and his formulaic scenario. Holmes’s repetitive detections allowed readers to purchase serials at any time and get the novelistic pleasures of recognizing and returning to a familiar and likeable storyline and character without losing their way in a long-term plot. The more financially successful inheritor of the serial novel would, in the wake of Conan Doyle’s

---

149 Nicholas Dames explains that “‘reminding’ was one of the formal techniques any serial novelist would have to have learned,” and that, by extension, “Collins’s fiction is continually engaged in fighting off his reader’s own forgetfulness” (*Amnesiac Selves* 184).
150 See Grubb “Dickens’ Pattern” and “Editorial Policies.”
innovation, later extract a charismatic character and plot formula, and set it into a series of similar but distinct and independent stories, rather than interdependent units of progressing narrative. Thus the arrival of character-based serial fiction later in the nineteenth century deepened the alignment between printed series and reproduced bodies that both Darwin and Collins identify. In both the text of Collins’s novel and in its material history, unstable distinctions between resembling bodies and reproductions in ink allow readers to buy into printed characters through the “body” of the paper serial.151

While the combination of Darwin’s and Collins’s texts in readers’ experiences draws biological lineages and literary serials closer together, the trajectories Collins gives to serial resemblance in print and family reproductions echo the vectors of Darwin’s visible series. Like bibliographical fraternal twins, *The Origin of Species* and *The Woman in White* are books born of the same generation, but while a coincidence in publishing history connects them, they also share a focus on resemblance and a haunting sense of the similarities between biological and mechanical reproduction. These contemporaneous books may be like species that are deceptively similar despite being, to use Darwin’s phrase, “remote in the scale of nature” (*Origin* 58). Noting resemblances between them may put readers at risk of following in the footsteps of Linnaeus and mis-categorizing these moths. Nevertheless, the simultaneous ascendance of the idea of the series in both fiction and science in 1859 seems not to represent a coincidence but rather a shared Victorian effort to account for small differences among similar and related bodies. Opening visual access to untold pasts, these authors’ series of varying impressions put the progress of history on display in bodies that resemble printed illustrations. This mode of historical representation anticipates the political viewing that George Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda* elaborates and to which we now turn.

151 Akira Mizuta Lippit argues that the very idea of the “serial killer” in criminology itself came from serialized movies, inheritors of the print mystery series *The Woman in White* helped to originate, whose violent endings seem to crave their own repetition (354). As the serial mystery came to presume the plot of a murder, the “body” sold by the paper serial is not simply that of the charismatic detective, but also of the murdered everyman, furthering this connection between concepts of narrative production and the “serialization” of bodies.
Chapter 3
Distant Views: *Daniel Deronda*, Illustrated Travel Books, and the Spectre of Palestine

On November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1917, British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour sent the following statement on behalf of Parliament to the Zionist leader Baron Rothschild:

> His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.\textsuperscript{152}

This statement, called by Balfour a “declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations” (Gilbert 34), informed the policy objectives that drove Britain’s post-WWI settlement with Turkey after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and the establishment of the British Mandate for Palestine, which administered the region until the formation of the state of Israel in 1948.\textsuperscript{153}

Weaknesses in Balfour’s rhetoric bear some responsibility for the appalling political situation that endures in Israel-Palestine today.\textsuperscript{154} As Gudrun Krämer explains, the danger of the declaration partly lies in its reference to “Arab Muslims, Christians, and Druze in Palestine as “non-Jewish communities,” a mere residual group formed on the basis of this difference” (150). Balfour’s expression of policy as a “view” can be read as another rhetorical turn with unfortunate political ramifications. Balfour’s “view” refers to an opinion as a perspective, a figuratively visual thought. Yet this wording can also be read literally, as an expression of a colonial vision, a

\textsuperscript{152} Gudrun Krämer quotes the full letter, which was published a week later (149).
\textsuperscript{153} James Renton offers a comprehensive account of the contentious impact of the Balfour Declaration on the history of British interventions in Palestine.
\textsuperscript{154} Jonathan Schneer suggests that “the Balfour declaration sprang from fundamental miscalculations about the power of Germany and the power and unity of Jews” (345), and that it engendered emotions of “disillusion, distrust, and resentment” that “continue tragically, bloodily, to unwind” (xxix).
gaze enacting knowledge and power over the landscape of Palestine.\textsuperscript{155} Writing of another statement by Balfour regarding the Middle East, Edward Said explains that “[k]nowledge to Balfour means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline—and of course, it means \textit{being able to do that}. Knowledge means rising above immediacy, beyond the self, into the foreign and distant” (\textit{Orientalism} 32, italics original). Balfour’s distant view of Palestine is encoded with an expansionist fantasy of knowledge as surveillance. Colonial ambition itself can be understood as an ideological view of landscape as open to possession, a gaze on the territory of others that insists often violently on itself, to the exclusion of other political perspectives.\textsuperscript{156}

This colonial gaze nationalizes viewership, and makes the landscape it imagines real. As W. J. T. Mitchell observes, viewing and representing landscape “serves as an aesthetic alibi for conquest, a way of naturalizing imperial expansion” (“Holy” 266).\textsuperscript{157} Even as it helped open Palestinian landscape to the colonial movement of Zionism, Balfour’s “view” operates within a colonial discourse, since it invited Britain to imagine it could control a landscape that its citizens neither occupied, nor viewed themselves on a regular basis.

The British willingness to legislate Palestine in 1917 represents a “view” of the reality of the region and its inhabitants that has a history in the perspectives represented in George Eliot’s \textit{Daniel Deronda} (1876) and in nineteenth-century British books illustrated with pictures of Palestine.\textsuperscript{158} The uses of vision and visual media in these illustrated books and in Eliot’s novel are complicit in the establishment of Balfour’s political view, since they present Palestinian reality as the product of British viewership. Viewing Palestine from a distance, these works regard the region as a spectre, something that is real in its visibility and as a harbinger of the past, but not as a material locale in the present. As Derrida explains, the spectre “is always a \textit{revenant}” (11), a “Thing that is not a thing, [a] thing that is invisible between its apparitions,

\textsuperscript{155} This interpretation is indebted to Foucault’s account of the modern culture of surveillance that allows authorities to amass power through their knowledge of increasingly visible subjects (\textit{Discipline} 170-228).

\textsuperscript{156} On reading colonialism as a visual practice, see Timothy Mitchell and Terry Smith.

\textsuperscript{157} This chapter is indebted to W. J. T. Mitchell’s suggestion that landscape, especially as it is depicted in views of Israel-Palestine, is “a potent ideological representation that serves to naturalize power relations and erase history and legibility” (“Holy” 262).

\textsuperscript{158} In inquiring into this history, I follow Amanda Anderson’s “interest[ in what it would mean to give primacy to political philosophy or political theory as a disciplinary partner for Victorian studies” (“Victorian Studies” 196), rather than aesthetic modernity, its more frequent companion (198). Anderson notes that \textit{Daniel Deronda} provides a “primary” case for study in this effort, since in it “Eliot offers vying representations of self-crafting in the political and aesthetic registers” (201).
when it reappears” (6). A place from prior time, the Palestine of these books is a visible history that is reproducible in illustrations, a printed spectre of a geographic past that seems available to Victorian knowledge because it is visible, and thus open to being “viewed.” Alongside what Nancy Armstrong identifies as the increasing reliance of realism, due to the advent of photography, on visual detail as a measure of the real (7), these books imply that sight and visual representations can offer viewers access to reality. In these works, the actual Palestinian landscape under Victorian eyes becomes a site of elusive reality that is visible only from the right point of view, a distant and spectral history that lives most vividly in images printed in books.

In making this argument, I begin by addressing accounts of spectrality in *Daniel Deronda* and then offer a reading of how viewing gives its characters access to reality and looking at books models the spectatorship of their lived experience. I next move to examine several nineteenth-century books that were printed in London and illustrated with pictures of Palestine, and that are now housed at The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library in Toronto. These books replicate the habits of looking in *Daniel Deronda* as they ask their viewers and readers to imagine knowing Palestine by experiencing looking at a book as an act of gazing through a window.159

Hundreds of illustrated works about Palestine were printed in London between the time of Wynkyn de Worde and the Balfour Declaration of 1917.161 Individually, they have been less popular than now-canonical works like *Daniel Deronda*, but, over time, the entire spectrum of British printed images of Palestine may also have accumulated as great an influence on generations of readers and viewers as any one bestselling literary work. Increasing the immediacy of what British readers thought of as the Holy Land, as well as its accessibility to verbally illiterate people, such illustrated books should be incorporated into critical understandings of the British colonial impulse in the Middle East, as well as the British Zionist movement. They gave inspiration to pilgrims, topographical knowledge to geographers, and

159 Though these British publications depict scenes foreign to London, England, this Canadian collection of books is itself local for me. Limiting my study to its holdings makes the Fisher Library into one of the bookish landscapes this chapter gazes upon, and offers a way for me to acknowledge what Linda Hutcheon calls the “crypto-ethnicity” that critics trained in Canada experience in relation to English studies (31), that is, in this instance, the inevitable national perspective of my own work in addressing the nationally vexed topic of Israel-Palestine.

160 Friedberg makes the connection between the reliance on windows for perceptions and knowledge of the world and the frames that recur in Western visuality and visual representation (1).

161 For a sense of the full range of British illustrations of Palestine, see Long, *Imagining the Holy Land*, and Khatib, *Palestine and Egypt Under the Ottomans*.
settings to childhood readers of Bible stories. By inspiring travel and instructing ideology, they share an important history with colonialism, religion, and tourism.\textsuperscript{162} While many nineteenth-century Britons might have had a religious feeling for Palestine, most would never have visited the region, so Eliot’s novel and these illustrated books offered a moderately accessible landscape of perspectives on the region to Victorian readers and the electorate behind the parliament of 1917. The landscapes created in these books represent a kind of alternative constituency, the Palestine with which British citizens might have felt somewhat acquainted.\textsuperscript{163} In their views lies one explanation for a British thread of Middle Eastern history.

Distant Images: Seeing through \textit{Daniel Deronda}

\textit{Daniel Deronda} opens with a scene of watching, and thus moves from a male gaze on a woman’s body to a project of envisioning a new nation in a distant landscape.\textsuperscript{164} The national drama of Eliot’s novel turns on the ideological meaning of gazing at landscape, as Daniel Deronda replaces one political perspective with another. Mordecai’s political dream of a Jewish national future involves “Looking towards a land” (454): his nationalist vision transpires as an ideological view of a distant landscape. For Daniel Deronda himself, nationality itself is a kind of viewership. He wants to study abroad, because, he says, “I want to be an Englishman, but I want to understand other points of view” (155). Being an Englishman is a “point of view,” a perspective to claim, to the possible exclusion of other nationalized perspectives. While Palestine is not a literally “visible” setting in the narrative, Eliot links the viewership involved in Mordecai’s political vision for the “East” to practices of looking prompted by print culture.

Looking at the real and unreal scenes of books offers characters spectral models for memory and

\textsuperscript{162} For an account of the complicity of visual culture in the establishment of practices of travel, tourism, and colonialism, see Stafford’s \textit{Voyage into Substance}. Richard Maxwell’s edited collection, \textit{The Victorian Illustrated Book}, demonstrates the influence of illustrated books across multiple cultural fields.

\textsuperscript{163} In making this claim I am drawing on scholarship in the history of reading that looks to literate audiences for traces of democratic culture, political participation, and citizenship. See Altick, Benedict Anderson, Darnton and Roche, and Rose. The audiences of images in books ought to be taken as part of this political history of print culture.

\textsuperscript{164} The dynamics of vision in \textit{Daniel Deronda} concern many critics. Peter Brooks argues that “‘Looking’ is pursued throughout the early parts of the novel, and is indeed an integral part of Gwendolen Harleth’s story” (97), while Robert Preyer explores what he calls “a ‘visionary element’ in the novel, ‘which increasingly emphasized the way in which our receptivity (or lack of it) to signs and portents helps us to break free from the tyranny of habitual responses’” (48). For Kate Flint, Eliot’s central preoccupation with vision in \textit{Daniel Deronda} concerns “issues of perspective and subjectivity” (\textit{Victorians} 251). Hugh Witemeyer uncovers the meaning of portraits in the novel and characters cast in the style of paintings (92-104). For Coral Ann Howels, dreams and visionary experience link \textit{The Lifted Veil} (1859) to \textit{Deronda} by way of a “continuum of speculation” (181) and denote “cracks” revealing “forces which transcend human knowledge” and “influence national and personal histories” (178). Sarah Gates notes the gendered dynamics of Deronda’s gaze on Gwendolen at the opening of the book (705-06).
anticipation, and they experience existential threats in obstructed vision and in the blindness of seeing scenes that are invisible to others. Deronda’s own likeness to distant and receding images combines blindness and visibility, a spectrality that Eliot links both to print, and to his ultimate destination. In the following section I offer a reading of how in Daniel Deronda, just as in Balfour’s view and in the scenes pictured in the illustrated travel books I discuss below, viewing and visibility consolidate what stands for reality.

I introduce my reading of visibility in the novel with an account of debates regarding spectrality as a symptom of competing ideologies in Daniel Deronda. In particular, the realism of this novel has often been interrogated through questions about how and to what end Daniel Deronda makes Jews and their “parts” visible. Ever since it was first published, critics have debated the accuracy of its rendition of Jewish lives, the sincerity of its sympathy with Jewish experience, and its utility as a symbol for Zionism. Eliot’s Jewish characters have been decried as “cold,” “fake,” or inaccurate, while some critics find that the philo-Semitism of the novel ends in anti-Semitism.165 Though many Jewish communities did embrace the novel enthusiastically, some have been as bent on eliding the “Christian part” of the text, as F.R. Leavis was on taking out its Jewish “part.”166 This reception history of textual dissection and suture between Gwendolen’s plotline and Deronda’s reveals that the novel has typically been seen as incoherent. Like Derrida’s spectre, the text itself has been read as a “Thing that is not a thing.” Spectrality as an idea of competing blindness and visibility has also acted as a catalyst for critical concepts of ethnicity in

165 In Constantius’ voice in his conversation on Daniel Deronda, Henry James writes, “[a]ll the Jewish part is at bottom cold” (313). Alex Goody notes that the Jewish author Amy Levy did not approve of Eliot’s depiction of Jews (467). While the novel has been cast as directly Zionist, Eliot’s efforts to imagine a national future for Jewish people preceded Herzl’s fully-fledged Zionism by close to a generation (Dekel 784), and while “[t]he title character became a cultural icon to the incipient national community, yet Eliot did not” (785).

166 Carol A. Martin in “Contemporary Critics and Judaism in Daniel Deronda” concludes that though the book was received with anti-Semitism by some critics, it succeeded in motivating a Zionist movement, evident in the twentieth-century cult of the book in Jerusalem, “proving by the fact of its being that the vision of Mordecai and Daniel was neither inexplicable nor impossible nor impractical” (106). Though it has been extremely important to concepts of Zionism in England, writing in 2007 Mikhal Dekel pointed out that Deronda had not yet been fully translated into Hebrew (795), though two previous “translations” significantly contracted the parts supposedly less relevant to a Jewish reader, thereby reversing Leavis’s efforts, as Dekel notes (784). Leavis writes that, “As for the bad part of Daniel Deronda, there is nothing to do but cut it away” (150). He further claims that in it there is “an actual great novel to be extricated” and salvaged “for separate publication as Gwendolen Harleth” (151). The debate surrounding Leavis’s rather bizarre proclamation have been illuminatingly exposed by Claudia L. Johnson. Casting the structure of Eliot’s novel as a political argument, Marc E. Wohlfarth writes that “the Jewish-nationalist plot of Daniel, a revision of the classical Bildungsroman along nationalist lines, functions in many ways as a narrative and symbolic solution to Eliot's emphasis on continuity as well as rupture” (188).
the novel. Cynthia Chase argues that the sophistication of Eliot’s realism in *Deronda* depends on the fantastical notion that Deronda himself had never “looked down” to see his own circumcision (222). According to this reading, his physical spectrality to himself—the question of his real or unreal circumcision—provides the foundation of the plot about his Jewish self-discovery. For Daniel Novak, “the Jewish body in *Deronda* can only be seen as a not-yet-visible Jewish national body—a specter of a past inheritance and an inheritance to come” (“Model Jew” 84). This Jewish spectrality is linked to what Jaffe describes as an impossibility for Victorian minds, “the Jew who does not look like one,” while it also affects concepts of Jewishness as a nationalized perspective, since “For Eliot and her hypothetical spectators, the Jew’s gaze is focused elsewhere: on his nation but not on theirs” (*Scenes* 123, 124). The spectrality of double vision here allows a divergence of gaze to serve as a metaphor for incommensurate political perspectives.

While these interpretations suggest that conflicting views result in spectral bodies, characters themselves risk becoming spectres, as the narrative displays a regulated and regulating scene that leaves some subjects out of its frame and escorts others away. Meyer suggests that since the novel “purges away resistant female selves and it purges away Jews,” it is not actually invested in Jewish nationalism, but in “guarding the boundaries of the English nation” (753, 754). Meyer thus reveals that Eliot enforces English “purity” while seeming to promote a sympathetic

---

167 Jules Law argues for the “spectrality” of the Jew as being both the summation of critical reflections on Eliot’s representation of Jewishness and the philo- or anti-Semitic interventions the novel makes in questions of Zionism and Jewish rights (251-54).

168 Mary Carpenter describes this point as leading to the “discovery of the reader’s blind spot, not the writer’s, for the plot has been carefully engineered to function only if Deronda’s circumcision is “seen” as an effect, not a cause, of prophetic vision” (67). Influential as Chase’s argument has been to *Deronda*’s interpreters, Jaffe notes its “astounding literal-mindedness—one might also say essentialism—about Jewishness: a Jew must be circumcised; a Jew cannot become a Jew through conversion, and Eliot must have known these things; therefore the novel’s account of Jewishness is contravened by Judaism’s very nature” (*Scenes* 134).

169 Describing Eliot’s relation to visual projects of defining Jewishness, Novak further observes out that Deronda, an “amorphous yet seemingly individual figure, this spectral and typological body, is both the product of a technological novelistic vision and a literal reproduction of visual technology in the age of photography” (“Model Jew” 60).

170 This notion of Eliot’s narrative depends on Foucault’s description of the politics of the panopticon, the idea that surveillance regulates space and disciplines subjects by excluding unsanctioned behaviour (Discipline 195-228).

171 While this reading observes a parallel othering of women and Jews in this novel, the work does also describe gender and ethnicity as mutually defining identity categories: Jacob Press describes the “marriage” between Mordecai and Deronda that “initiates Deronda into a homosocial brotherhood that reconciles the identity categories of “Jew” and “man” (306), while Cannon Schmitt writes that “Daniel Deronda in some measure rewrites race as an elective affinity and nationality as the offspring of male homosocial romance” (“Empire” 20).
solution to the “Jewish question.” This reading suggests that there is hostility in the conclusion of the novel, which promises to make the Jews of the story invisible by pushing them out of the frame of the narrative—Mordecai dies, and Deronda and Mirah are set to depart. As Edward Said famously argues, the novel also treats Arab subjects to this banishing action. Though sympathy seems to have motivated Eliot’s writing, Said points out that her omission of Arab Palestinians shows a lack of sympathy that might aptly be cast as racism. In a response to Said, Christopher Hitchens suggests that Eliot would have included sympathetic portrayals of Palestinians had she ever visited the Middle East. By positing her as a failed tourist, Hitchens overemphasizes the accuracy of touristic vision, since, given the dominance of Biblical visions of Palestine in Victorian England, had Eliot visited, or had she peered through contemporary illustrated books on the region, she might not have achieved a more accurate perspective on Arab life there. Rather than representing a lapse in Eliot’s empirical information-gathering, the absence and disappearing of Arabs as well as Jews in her narrative represents the participation of her work in a Victorian gaze on Palestine and nationalized others whose boundaries were themselves difficult to elude. The spectral visibility and invisibility of marginalized subjects in this novel, whether women, Jews, or Arabs, delineate the political perspective through which Eliot frames her fictional world.

172 Commercial interests prompted British gentiles’ enthusiasm for proto-Zionism like Deronda’s, Meyer argues, and such early support neared anti-Semitism by withholding the hope of Jewish emancipation (747-50).
173 Suggesting that Eliot elides Palestinians from her picture of Deronda’s destination, Said notes “the total absence of any thought about the actual inhabitants of the East, Palestine in particular. They are irrelevant both to the Zionists in Daniel Deronda, and to the English characters” (Question 65).
174 Elizabeth Ermarth argues that sympathy remained “a crucial concern to George Eliot throughout her career” and implies “a split in the psyche that permits two conflicting views to exist simultaneously,” thereby providing “the material of consciousness” (“George Eliot’s” 23). Audrey Jaffe explains that “For Eliot’s readers, sympathy with the individual presumably lays the groundwork for sympathy with the Jews. By letting readers get to know Deronda as an English gentleman first, and as Jewish only later, Eliot attempts to secure sympathy from English readers who then find, belatedly, that they have identified with a Jewish character” (Scenes 122). Suggesting that Said and others have inappropriately attempted to pin Eliot to one side in postcolonial debates about racism, Newton warns against the “dire effect of reading a literary text as if it is a straightforward presentation of political ideas and arguments” (665).
175 Hitchens points out the fact that Eliot never visited Palestine despite invitations as a cause for the failure of her knowledge of the region, and suggests that had she visited she might have found that “Palestine was not an unpeopled wilderness for spiritual contemplation” (12). He suggests that had Eliot known of the Palestinians, she would have felt for them as much as for the Jews: “To the question “Had she no room in her heart for the Palestinian Arab?” the reply must be that she was, like most of her contemporaries, quite unaware that any such people, or “problem,” existed” (12).
176 See John Urry on the social construction and historical dependence of the tourist’s gaze.
While critics most commonly position spectrality in *Daniel Deronda* as a product of competing ideologies, I want to suggest that it also stems from the instabilities of relying on visibility for access to the real, a mode of perception that recurs throughout this work. The characters all experience reality as its visibility: the real is what they can see. Reality itself depends on visibility in the world Eliot creates in this narrative, and the work elaborates a kind of visual metaphysics, so that the realities of both space and time are framed through visual perspective. Towards the end of the novel, Eliot writes, “all things are bound together in that Omnipresence which is the place and habitation of the world, and events are as a glass where-through our eyes see some of the pathways” (641). Events become a transparent window on the “pathways” of the world, which are themselves visible. Eliot’s construction of this visibility of the world, however, “our eyes see,” underscores the specificity of all perspective: she is addressing a particular first-person plural audience, the implication being that while “our eyes see,” “their” eyes might see something else. The narrator’s discovery of a visible “world” (a synonym for the plenum of reality), therefore, enables a visual statement of ideological perspective, since places that seem to lack importance need not appear in the world, while the eyes of “others” might be blind to some facets of “reality.” Further elaborating this visual constitution of reality, Eliot writes that when the world intrudes on the ignorant, “Then it is as if the Invisible Power that has been the object of lip-worship and lip-resignation became visible” (689). In becoming visible, the “Invisible Power” is insisting on its reality over the falseness of “lip-worship and lip-resignation,” insincere tributes that, importantly, Eliot figures as verbal. Visible appearances are more real in this realist novel than verbal statements, even as the metaphysical “Power” underpinning events is available to vision.

While the structures of reality are visible in this novel, so too is character, and Eliot links subjectivity to visibility throughout the book. Deronda observes that “there are some natures one could see growing or degenerating every day, if one watched them” (345). Here the use of the word “nature” both signifies personality, and underscores Eliot’s almost botanical description of the growth and decay of characters, as though they were plants in a garden that could be watched over. Character is something that can be seen and seen changing. In describing the visibility of character, Eliot makes an indirect reference to the photographic development of images, writing that “No chemical process shows a more wonderful activity than the transforming influence of the thoughts we imagine to be going on in another” (462). The displays of “chemical process”
here offer Eliot a metaphor for intersubjective perspective. Identity and watching are further linked in one of Eliot’s chapter epigraphs, in which she writes that “Men, like planets, have both a visible and an invisible history” (139). This visibility or invisibility of the past refers to the relative availability of the experience of others to outside perspectives. Visibility thus offers Eliot a way of describing the accessibility of characters’ subjectivities. Real character can be seen.

Reality is so dependent on visibility in this novel, that images also describe the passage of time and help characters orient themselves chronologically. Characters frequently apprehend the past and the future in moving images. The “rushing images of future difficulty” (600) accompany “hurrying images of what might come” (607) and “images which have a foreshadowing power” (404). While, as Pamela Thurschwell argues, these moving images mirror the recurring thread of uncanny and prophetic insight or “second sight” in the novel, they also participate in a broader spectrum of visibilities through which characters apprehend reality. Mental processes also tend to use these swift images: while “Deronda’s thinking went on in rapid images” (176), Gwendolen “lived back in the scenes of her courtship” (515). In a most telling instance of such speeding images describing memory, Eliot writes of Gwendolen that “Quick, quick, like pictures in a book beaten open with a sense of hurry, came back vividly, yet in fragments, all that she had gone through in relation to Grandcourt” (247). Eliot figures Gwendolen’s experience of memory as similar to the visual experience of looking at picture books. Not only do Gwendolen’s hurrying pictures bring the past back visually, their pace also represents time, and predicts Lynda Nead’s observation that “developments in visual technology at the end of the nineteenth century had made the idea of a still image a conceptual impossibility” (12). While this representation of flipping through illustrated pages in books anticipates time-based visual animation, Eliot’s succession of vivid yet partial images also prefigures modernist interests in the signification of fragments. Of course Gwendolen cannot actually “see” all her former experiences with Grandcourt; this is a moment of memory described as mental vision. The perspectives generated

177 Thurschwell suggests that Eliot’s representation of foreshadowing images “works to establish second sight as a given” (93), and she explains this supernatural perception in Eliot’s work as the “vision of something that is far distant in space or time, or both” (90). She further claims that second sight functions “in Eliot’s work as on the one hand prophetic, elevated, nation- and vocation-forming, and on the other hand uncontrollable or unwanted” (89). For both Gwendolen and Mordecai, she argues, second sight is “integral” to their motivations and influence on Deronda (92), while Mordecai “coerces Deronda by imposing his own vision of the future upon him” (95).

178 On the interdependence of material print culture and Modernist uses of the fragment, see David Bennett. Just as Geoffrey Batchen finds that the desire for photography significantly preceded its invention (ix), we can imagine these time-based images of Eliot’s predicting cinema.
by the visible pages of books and the phantasmagoria of images in visual culture offer Eliot a Benjaminian metaphor for the spectatorship of personal history. 179 “Pictures in a book” becomes a way of naming the spectral return of the past, the reproduction of experience as memory.

For the characters in this book, the reality of the past and the future depends on visibility and the perception of spectres. While the substrates of reality are figuratively available to sight in this novel, the visibility of intractable forces also obstructs vision. Reflecting on Grandcourt’s failure to realize that Gwendolen could reject his offer, the narrator observes that sometimes “our objection to a contrary issue […] is so strong that it rises like a spectral illusion between us and our certainty” (109). In Eliot’s fictional world, where events are a glass to be seen through, and Invisible Omnipresent powers become visible, ignorance and inattention are spectres, visible phenomena that also present barriers to vision. Deronda articulates this dependence of reality on images and perceptions in this novel by wondering “whether one oftener learns to love real objects through their representations, or the representations through the real objects” (361). Whether wandering through art galleries, or falling in love with their own visions, these characters are consistently torn between believing in the reality of what they see, or in what they think might be more real, as they rely on vision to discern the dimensions of their world.

Because of this faith in sight, the risk that accurate visions of reality may be impossible troubles the narrative, and is particularly evident in the intimations of blindness that threaten some of Eliot’s characters. For example, in a brief parable that is unnecessary to the plot save in its elaboration of this theme, Meyrick had given too much money for an old engraving which fascinated him, and to make up for it, had come from London in a third-class carriage with his eyes exposed to a bitter wind and any irritating particles the wind might drive before it. The consequence was a severe inflammation of the eyes, which for some time hung over him the threat of a lasting injury. This crushing trouble called out all Deronda’s readiness to devote himself, and he made every other

179 Margaret Cohen explains Benjamin’s notion of the phantasmagoria of modern visual culture and she quotes his feeling that what history must “fix in graphic form are the images deriving from the collective unconscious” (206).
In this anecdote, an excessive desire for a work of visual art, the old engraving, causes Meyrick to overspend, and his effort to make amends for his outlay punishes him with temporary blindness in his “severe inflammation of the eyes.” Deronda is able to be “eyes to Hans,” underscoring that viewing is fungible in this book, which has Mordecai give Daniel his perspective. Eliot’s linkage between the purchase and the physical punishment exemplifies Mary Ann O’Farrell’s suggestion that, in Victorian literature, blindness proposes “a relation to things that […] is more immediate and more intense” (513) and lets authors contemplate “the experience of having and being a body in the world” (512). While Meyrick encounters blindness and his own painful embodiment by overinvesting in a commodity, a thing, the inflating growth of his overspending on the engraving and the resulting inflammation of his visual organs can be likened to the ballooning importance of vision in this book. The threat that looms over him menaces all the characters to varying degrees. They may overvalue images and scenes, their eyes may fail, the visions they perceive may prove untrue, and they may “lose sight” of themselves, their lives, and their futures. The obstructed vision that results from Meyrick’s pathological desire for an image thus works to confirm the overarching importance of vision in the characters’ experiences of reality.

All the main characters in this novel experience or represent reality through often-precarious visibility. While Mordecai’s politically persuasive visions seem invisible to others, the visions of women in this book—both as they are seen and as they see—frequently occur as touchstones of the real and they often risk the blindness of having an incomplete perspective on reality. When he encounters Mirah for the first time, Deronda feels he “had no right to linger and watch her: poorly-dressed melancholy women are common sights; it was only the delicate beauty, the picturesque lines and colour of the image that were exceptional, and these conditions made it the more markedly impossible that he should obtrude his interest upon her” (159). Mirah’s reality is confirmed by her likeness to the “common sight” of poor women, who make such plentiful spectacles that they might not be worth looking at in the individual. The implied rarity and class in the heightened aestheticization of Mirah’s looks, however, both invites Deronda’s stare and works to restrict it by dissuading him from intruding on her privacy. Under Deronda’s perspective in this first appearance, Mirah recalls the “sight” of regular real women, and
demands to be seen for her picturesque attributes.\textsuperscript{180} The greatest spectacle of female tribulation in this novel is Lydia Glasher. When they meet for the first time, the horror of what she represents so impresses Gwendolen that “it was as if some ghastly vision had come to her in a dream and said, ‘I am a woman’s life’” (128). The spectacle of this “ghastly vision” becomes more spectral when, later, Gwendolen thinks of the scene as “an accusing apparition” (363), while Lydia Glasher herself becomes a “Medusa-apparition” (517). Though she refuses to admit knowledge of the reality of Lydia and her children until Grandcourt dies, this revenant becomes Eliot’s and Gwendolen’s way of representing the stark insistence of “reality” itself. Though she might have encountered similar women’s lives through books, Eliot writes that “Gwendolen’s uncontrolled reading, though consisting chiefly in what are called pictures of life, had somehow not prepared her for this encounter with reality” (131-32). Though literature provides “pictures” of life, while the “ghastly vision” of reality offers more a more intense meeting with the actual, Eliot presents each of these accesses to the real as visual.

Gwendolen’s own character is most defined by her visibility, and the spectacle of her life offers proof of its reality. In encountering her own subjectivity, she meets a display: she is disturbed by “images half real, half fantastic” (299) during her engagement, while she wonders, “Was not all her hurrying life of the last three months a show, in which her consciousness was a wondering spectator?” (301-02). This description of her life positions it as a spectacle, a representation rather than a reality, and constructs her own subjectivity as dependent on watching. In being “apt to think rather of those who saw her than of those whom she could not see” (59), Gwendolen’s concern for the reality of others depends on her own visibility. While other people are only real insofar as she is visibly real to them, she feels Grandcourt is an unsuitable romantic partner because he “could hardly have been more unlike all her imaginary portraits” (91). The intractability of Grandcourt’s reality seems to derive from his unlikeness to Gwendolen’s imaginary pictures. In both cases, in her need to be seen, and in her dismay at the sight of Grandcourt, Gwendolen determines the reality of individuals visually.

\textsuperscript{180} Perspective also transforms the ugly reality of poverty into the picturesque earlier in the novel, when Eliot writes, “Perspective, as its inventor remarked, is a beautiful thing. What horrors of damp huts, where human beings languish, may not become picturesque through aerial distance?” (131).
Since she relies on vision for her sense of the real, blocked vision represents an existential threat to Gwendolen, which Deronda is most able to dispel. The narrator writes despairingly of “girls and their blind visions” (103), and it seems Gwendolen’s sight is most perturbed of all. “In Gwendolen’s consciousness,” Eliot writes, “Temptation and Dread met and stared like two pale phantoms, each seeing itself in the other—each obstructed by its own image and all the while her fuller self beheld the apparitions and sobbed for deliverance from them” (577). Eliot combines mythological constructs of the guarding gates of the Sphinxes (who paralyze those caught in their gaze) with a Narcissus fantasy (where a figure’s fondness for his own image causes his downfall). Eliot illustrates this psychological complex as a layering of images obstructing each other and presenting multiple barriers to vision. In contrast to this thicket of blocked perspective in Gwendolen’s own psyche, Deronda is consistently responsible for pointing out, often by his presence alone, faults and pathologies in her vision. She thinks of Deronda as having “first risen on her vision as a corrective presence” (682), while his “presence and touch seemed to dispel a horrible vision” (690). As Gwendolen speaks to Deronda her sentences give her a “picture of her own helplessness” (658), while his “present cares for her were like a revisiting of scenes familiar in the past” (589). Her perspective is consistently affected by his actions. She feels “upborne by the prospect of soon seeing him again,” writes Eliot, while “her supreme need of him blind[s] her to the separateness of his life” (682). While Deronda acts as a corrective to faults in her vision, her dependence on him creates another blind spot in her life, and she fails to achieve an appropriate perspective on his own reality until the close of the novel.

As though in response to Gwendolen’s persistent visualizations of her relation to him, Deronda in turn takes up visual metaphors in his effort to come to some moral resolution to his involvement with her. Even as Deronda listens to her plight with sympathy, “imminent consequences were visible to him” (658). He attempts to turn her onto a course of redemption, though “looking at your life as a debt may seem the dreariest view of things at a distance” (658). Changing her attitude requires a new way of viewing. To account for her experiences, he also advises her that “You have had a vision of injurious, selfish action—a vision of possible degradation; think that a severe angel, seeing you along the road of error, grasped you by the wrist and showed you the horror of the life you must avoid” (658). He glosses her unpleasant experience as a “vision” that has made her into a roadside spectacle for an angel who in turn reflects the sight she makes. While Deronda instructs Gwendolen’s vision by using visual
metaphors, he himself also affects Gwendolen’s sight. Deronda serves as an interpreter of and
doctor to Gwendolen’s visions, and a corrective to and dispeller of her blindnesses, even as her
reliance on him presents its own visual obstruction. Eliot contrasts the failures of Gwendolen’s
vision with the political success of Mordecai’s; part of Gwendolen’s fault is that she is always
thinking of those watching her, rather than, like Mordecai, of those whose futures she could
watch over. These characters define themselves and their relations through their relative
visibility, their visions, and access to perspective.

This visual constitution of character is also evident in Deronda’s “looks.” He is at once a
spectacle, aware of his own perspective, concerned with the perspectives of others, and willing to
acquiesce to the appearances others perceive. He objects to the notion that his appearance draws
notice (158), even as he accustoms himself “to the habit of seeing things as they probably
appeared to others” (307). Deronda orients himself around the spectacle others see in him.

Enjoined to “Look at his hands” readers find that “they are long, flexible, firmly-grasping hands,
such as Titian has painted in a picture” (157-58). This form of description begins by making
Deronda’s body into a spectacle to be looked at, while, as Witemeyer discusses at length, he is
frequently thus likened to paintings: “He puts me in mind of Italian paintings. One would guess,
without being told, that there was foreign blood in his veins” (281).181 Suggesting that Deronda
looks like “Italian paintings,” indicates a Victorian idea of his aesthetic “type,” while this way of
linking his appearance and his nationality indicates that being foreign means looking like a
distant picture. The spectacle of difference Deronda makes to others is encoded with distance.

Indeed, Deronda’s appearance is frequently likened to distant images, as though his body were a
far-off scene. Gwendolen thinks that invisible or remote images make up Deronda’s aspect. She
notes that “Hardly any face could be less like Deronda’s than that represented as Sir Hugo’s in a
crayon portrait at Diplow,” and at the same time “An image which had immediately arisen in
Gwendolen’s mind was that of the unknown mother—no doubt a dark-eyed woman—probably
sad” (281). While the differentiation between Deronda and his representation in the portrait
inserts distance between himself and his image, Gwendolen’s idea that he must be like an
“unknown mother” presents another remote image for him to resemble. This image Gwendolen

181 Witemeyer notes that Eliot’s frequent comparisons of Daniel to Italian—in particular Venetian—painting further
his alignment with Jewishness and contrast him with characters who represent English schools of painting (98-100).
has of Deronda’s “unknown mother” is similar to Deronda’s likeness to Italian paintings. He too sees his possible relatedness as his likeness to an invisible portrait. “His own face in the glass,” Eliot writes, “had during many years been associated for him with thoughts of some one whom he must be like—one about whose character and lot he continually wondered, and never dared to ask” (158). Even to himself, Deronda’s image thus presents an invisible picture. While his appearance provokes the idea of distant pictures in others, he too sees absence in his own reflection, “thoughts of some one whom he must be like.” Indeed, Deronda’s absent relation frequently calls up his own visualizations. When imagining his mother’s image “the ardour which he had given to his imaginary world in his books suddenly rushed towards his own history and spent its pictorial energy there, explaining what he knew, representing the unknown” (141-42). “Pictorial energy,” the work of imagination, of active seeing what is not visible, which Deronda developed in the “imaginary world in his books,” helps him to fill in the absent picture of the person he must be like. Recalling Gwendolen’s rushing “pictures in a book,” the active work of imagination prompted by print culture, whether literary or visual, makes the invisible and unknown visible. This visualization consolidates what Deronda knows, but also helps him to broach the unknown: one imagines based on what one knows, but also, through speculation, on what one does not know, on what one wishes to find out. Books help him to read the distant image that defines his identity, while the spectres their images make do not contradict so much as illustrate reality.

While Deronda is frequently likened to distant images, perspective defines Gwendolen’s and Mirah’s apprehensions of his reality. Deronda often calls up images from the past in Gwendolen’s mind: his “look of sorrow brought back what seemed a very far-off moment—the first time she had ever seen it, in the library at the Abbey” (690). Her memory of him transpires as the spectral return of a “far-off” look. This visualized apprehension of distance is germane to both women’s perceptions of Deronda’s presence in their lives. While Gwendolen “did not imagine him otherwise than always within her reach” (682), Mirah is pained by an “image of Mrs Grandcourt by Deronda’s side drawing him farther and farther into the distance” (627-28). Not only is Mirah afflicted by an “image,” but this fantasy itself is of a visualized scenario. The scene relies on perspective, which makes distant objects smaller, and more difficult to see. The threat of his acquiescence to Gwendolen is figured as Deronda’s encroaching invisibility from the purview of Mirah’s own perspective. Here again we see Eliot describing Deronda as a
receding scene, as an image that is becoming more distant, and less available to visibility. While Mirah’s ultimate fantasy is to keep Deronda, Eliot positions her fear that this desire will not be fulfilled as the recession of his visibility due to distance. The reality of Deronda’s body both to himself and to others is determined by its relative visibility, distance, and placement within the space of individual perspective.

While for the women in his life, Deronda is frequently a distant image, under Mordecai’s eyes he is a collage of pictures from other settings that enables the realization of a political vision. Mordecai himself is an active looker, who “had, both abroad and in England, looked at pictures as well as men, and in a vacant hour he had sometimes lingering in the National Gallery in search of paintings which might feed his hopefulness with grave and noble types of the human form, such as might well belong to men of his own race” (405). His spectatorship of pictures and people helps him both to articulate and find the embodiment of his ideals.182 Eliot extends the visual significance of Mordecai’s retrieval of his hero into a symbolic description of their relation. “Thus it happened,” she writes in a telling passage, “that the figure representative of Mordecai’s longing was mentally seen darkened by the excess of light in the aerial background. But in the inevitable progress of his imagination towards further detail, he ceased to see the figure with its back towards him. It began to advance, and a face became discernible” (406-07). As in Gwendolen and Mirah’s fantasies, in describing Mordecai’s vision of Deronda, Eliot uses the language of perspective, which produces visible reality through the obstructions to vision of distance, depth, and shadow.

This combination of obstructed vision and visibility contributes to the spectrality of Deronda’s presence as a real body in the world of this book. The narrator continues that, gazing at Deronda, for Mordecai, “the words youth, beauty, refinement, Jewish birth, noble gravity, turned into hardly individual but typical form and colour: gathered from his memory of faces seen among the Jews of Holland and Bohemia, and from the paintings which revived that memory” (407). Mordecai draws his perspective on the figure of his dreams from faces and paintings—reproducing these visible histories in his own mind to reissue them in a projection upon the right figure. In this passage Eliot also deploys the relation between romance, vision, and imagination

182 As Jaffe writes, “Mordecai seeks the image of his protégé throughout the world and, specifically, in the museum” (121), a relation that constructs Deronda as “a space to be filled with images whose specific referents, hanging on the walls of the National Gallery, are assumed to be the cultured reader’s intellectual property” (Scenes 122).
in the description of Mordecai’s projecting imagination: “Reverently let it be said of this mature spiritual need that it was akin to the boy’s and girl’s picturing of the future beloved; but the stirrings of such young desire are feeble compared with the passionate current of an ideal life straining to embody itself, made intense by resistance to imminent dissolution” (407). Whereas Gwendolen has imaginary portraits of future love objects, Mordecai looks at paintings and Deronda to see his own visions represented. Both visionary dreams and real vision are constituted by perspective, allowing Mordecai to see Deronda in the light of his ideological desire, and to see in Deronda the body and embodied perspective for which he has been looking.

Under Mordecai’s gaze, Deronda becomes a physical origin point for a political perspective, a person able to take up Mordecai’s view and so make his vision for eastern landscape real by fulfilling his colonial enterprise. As in the illustrated travel books of the period, Mordecai’s political vision creates a reality by latching an ideological position to a perspective on a landscape. In expressing his desire to give his people a “national centre,” a geographic as much as political goal, Mordecai frequently states his proto-Zionism in visual terms. “Looking towards a land and a polity,” he vows, “our dispersed people in all the ends of the earth may share the dignity of a national life which as a voice among the peoples of the East and the West—which will plant the wisdom and skill of our race” (454). The project of thinking this dream involves “looking” to a landscape. Mordecai’s passionate vision results in his “living an intense life in an invisible past and future” (455), realities that only he can see. Eliot suggests that the political future he imagines is made present for him just as a parent’s gaze on a child’s future makes it real (455). While Mordecai is himself a “portrait” (425), he describes himself as sustained by visions: “‘They said, ‘He feeds himself on visions,’” and I denied not; for visions are the creators and feeders of the world” (426).\footnote{Of this passage Howels writes that “Mordecai himself asserts the historical rationality of his visions in a way that relates him both to Shelley’s poetic enthusiasm and to G. H. Lewes’s philosophy” (180) and describes a balance between visions as mental activity, and visions as revelations of a vast reality (181).} This emphasis on visions as the substrate of reality helps to affirm the importance of his political views. In a reference to Moses’ vision of Israel from Mount Pisgah, Mordecai tells Deronda, “You see it all—you are by my side on the mount of vision, and behold the paths of fulfilment which others deny” (461).\footnote{See Deuteronomy (34:1-4).} For Mordecai, sight is the currency of political agreement and his convictions about the rightful future of “his people” transpire as visions. Coral Ann Howels argues that Deronda “inherits” Mordecai’s vision (179), and his
journey with which the novel ends has the effect of “transforming Mordecai’s visionary nationalism into action” (179). Vision is thus a prompt to ideological action, a spur to bringing political projections into reality. Mordecai is able to bequeath his political visions to Deronda by teaching him to share his perspective, a transference of an ideological “view” on a foreign destination that constructs a potential reality for the landscape it purports to “see.”

While their political obsession transpires as a creative gaze towards a distant landscape, Mordecai also uses vision to articulate his political demands to Deronda. In what becomes a repeated slogan in Deronda’s mind, Mordecai calls, “You must believe my beliefs—be moved by my reasons—hope my hopes—see the vision I point to—behold a glory where I behold it!” (436, repeated on 455). In addition to sharing his ideology, Mordecai requires that Deronda employ his sight. “Seeing” Mordecai’s vision implies taking up his perspective, both literally, as a view of a future landscape for the Jewish people, and figuratively, as an adoption of a “vision,” a speculative or imaginary ideological dream. Deronda describes the mission he inherits from Mordecai as follows: “The idea that I am possessed with is that of restoring a political existence to my people, making them a nation again, giving them a national centre, such as the English have, though they too are scattered over the face of the globe” (688). In describing his vision as an “idea,” Deronda chooses a word that shares an etymological history with “image” (“idea”). As W. J. T. Mitchell writes in Iconology, “the very idea of an “idea” is bound up with the notion of imagery. “Idea” comes from the Greek verb “to see”” (5). This idea, the ideological perspective on Palestinian landscape and its availability as a setting for Jewish futures is itself a kind of image, a political fantasy for a distant and spectral scene that creates the reality it seems simply to view.

Mordecai’s insistence on the reality of his visions and on fitting Deronda into the future landscape he sees does not proceed entirely without tension. Deronda reminds him that “You have your own way of looking at things” (455). Protecting Mordecai from strangers, Deronda also takes care to hide “everything that might feed the ready repugnance in minds unblessed with that ‘precious seeing’” (494). Deronda casts Mordecai’s difference and the source of his prejudice against others as a matter of perspective. Mordecai’s visionary creation of Deronda himself does not go without Deronda’s notice: “Mordecai, on his side, had his visions of a disciple, and he saw me by their light; I corresponded well enough with the image his longing had created. He took me for one of his race” (439). Mordecai’s visions are not only images, but
they cast light by which to see, while Deronda himself is aware of the triumph of Mordecai’s perspective in the elaboration of his own identity and destiny. Mordecai’s perspective determines Deronda’s reality, and so overcomes other visions for his future.

In the transmission of Mordecai’s political perspective, print serves as an important symbol. Mordecai has Jacob repeat the words of his poem about “a blended past and future” because “The boy will get them engraved within him […] it is a way of printing” (408). In addition to representing a way to preserve knowledge, engraving here offers an emblem of visibility, and an archive of present, past, and future that can be shared among many people. Eliot repeats this formulation in referring to Mordecai’s pedagogy as “strange printing” (408), while the observation that Mordecai’s “figure had bitten itself into Deronda’s mind” (404) also references the print technique of etching. Eliot’s use of print metaphors to describe connection among people persists in Deronda’s sense of “the strong stamp of race on [Pash’s] features” (448), in Mordecai’s idea that he “engraves his thought” (426), and in Deronda’s unlikeness to his grandfather in sentiment though he is “a young copy of him in [his] face” (540). These invocations of print contribute to the rhetoric of transmission in Daniel Deronda that numerous critics have noted. Of this interest in print, Dekel writes, “Mordecai, with all his pathos and intensity, calls his instruction to Deronda “a way of printing”: a printing on the body that remains free of the printing industry, a hostile audience, and anti-Zionist sentiments” (795). As with any effort to create a new nation, the fulfilment of Mordecai’s ambition depends on the possibility of aligning the thoughts and sentiments of a large group of people. The political significance that Mordecai associates with this concept of printing beyond the mainstream, therefore, recalls Benedict Anderson’s description of the importance of print to the “imagined communities” of nations (44), a model that Jaffe also points out is germane to nationalism in this book (Scenes 138, 136). As a means by which to spread and represent his ideals, print is thus essential to Mordecai’s project and so becomes a symbol of the hope of a new Jewish nation.

So crucial is print to Eliot’s construction of Mordecai’s vision that he first meets Deronda, his political inheritor, in a bookshop (424). The relationship that will send Deronda on Mordecai’s mission to the east and so extend his nationalist vision for the region has as its original locale a
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185 Meyer calls this thread in the book an “ethos of “transmission”” (734). See also Brooks (107-10), Osborne (484, and 489f), Novak (“Model Jew” 78).
space teeming with the fecundity and visibilities of print culture. While in the bookshop Mordecai and Deronda experience “an instinctive feeling that they needed to see each other fully” (424). This desire for sight of each other corresponds to Mordecai’s emphasis on vision as the substrate of his nationalism. Eliot pushes towards a kind of light-box rendering of the scene both for the characters in their effort to “see each other fully” and for her audience of readers, on whose behalf the narrator laments her inability to offer a painted representation: “I wish I could perpetuate those two faces, as Titian’s “Tribute Money” has perpetuated two types presenting another sort of contrast” (424). Here “perpetuation” stands in for “reproduction”: being able to visualize a scene whether in paint or in prose contributes to its semblance of reality. As “lookers” among the displays of the bookshop, a literary market-place, the two men confirm their role as spectator consumers, while their bodies, items to be looked at in this store, take on something of the commodity and spectacle of reproducible book objects. An origin point for Deronda’s journey to the east, the scene links his collaboration with Mordecai’s proto-Zionist nationalist vision to the sites and sights of print culture.

In contrast to this scene of bookstore visibility, the hypothetical eastern destination—perhaps Palestine itself—towards which this origin sends Deronda is a vanishing point in this book. All the characters’ distant images of Deronda coalesce in the scene of this far-off destination towards which they gaze. Acquiescing to the recession of visibility at the end of the novel, Deronda, Mirah, and Mordecai are about to begin their journey and so fade into the distance: either Mordecai’s death or their departure will come first (695). The departure itself could close the narrative by sending its titular character into what is offstage but implicated space for this novel, the nationless east, but the novel ends instead with Mordecai’s death (695). Since the plan for their voyage was always his vision, Eliot leaves open the possibility that Deronda will abandon the dream once Mordecai is dead. Both Mordecai and the reader of this novel “die” without ever learning whether his vision of Deronda’s journey becomes reality. Palestine remains a spectre perceived through an ever-receding chronological and geographic distance, a place that is only as real as the views pictured in or left out of books will allow.

While Deronda’s own appearance and perspective inherit the visions of others, as the novel ends he is about to leave its scene by going out to meet an equally spectral landscape, an imaginary

186 Hugh Witemeyer uncovers the significance of Eliot’s invocation of this particular Titian painting (101-04).
geography that has been, like his body, constituted in bookstore meetings and reproduced images. The real world in this novel exists so long as characters can see it, while the “East” remains invisible, and so represents a thing that is not a thing, a spectre. Obsessed with vision, its representations, and its obstructions, ironically, by failing to achieve a “realistic” vision of Deronda’s destination, the novel is guilty of the visionary blindness of incomplete perspective it so often describes.\(^{187}\)

Palestine as Illustration: Clear, Connected, and Accurate Views

Eliot’s emphasis on vision in the establishment of proto-Zionist desire in her characters prompts a curiosity about what images of Palestine might have been available in that bookshop where Deronda and Mordecai meet. As readers interpreting that scene of print, politics, and visibility, we might do well to hypothesize about the books surrounding Mordecai and Deronda, and the books in other London bookstores through the century leading to the Balfour Declaration. Had the characters picked up one or two books in the store and flipped through a few pages, not even reading the titles, what images might have, in a glance, encouraged or discouraged an eastern mission? What arguments, opinions, and views of Palestine might a “common reader” have seen pictured between the pages of such books?\(^{188}\) What perspectives on the region might these illustrations have shared with Mordecai? To begin to answer these questions, I turn now to a discussion of a collection of books illustrated with images of Palestine that were printed in London during the nineteenth century.

While reality depends on sight in Daniel Deronda, the “real” Palestine reproduced in these works is subject to British perspective and represents a spectre from the past that is both real and unreal. A spectral Palestine offers an appropriately mystical atmosphere for a destination of utmost religious and historical importance to British readers. Yet precisely because of its great cultural meaning, these works place a strong emphasis on the authenticity and authority of their views, and on the possibility of accessing real Palestinian landscape through vision and visual

\(^{187}\) As Amanda Anderson concludes in accounting for the failures and objectives of Eliot’s intervention in the “Jewish Question,” “even the most reflective dialogical models can harbor violent blindesses and exclusions” (58).

\(^{188}\) For this approach to the study of public spectatorships and the meaning of visual representation in reproduced and mass-consumed settings I am particularly indebted to Carol Armstrong’s Scenes in a Library, Isobel Armstrong’s Glassworlds, Anne Friedberg’s The Virtual Window, and W. J. T. Mitchell’s Picture Theory.
media. As a result, these books evince their makers’ faith in the ability of visual representation to
give, in the words of one illustrator, a “clear, connected, and accurate view” of Palestinian space
(Bartlett iii). These books were made to present would-be tourists with a cheaper commodity: the
illustrations are substitutes for the “real thing,” the actual and original Palestine that they represent. “The here and now of the original,” writes Benjamin, “underlies the concept of its authenticity” (“Work of Art: Second Version” 21). For eager tourists and pilgrims, the semblance of the “here and now” is the greatest commodity a destination can offer in exchange for the expense of a visit, a function that these illustrated perspectives replace by opening up views that might persuade regular people that they have some knowledge of Palestine. In creating their perspectives, these illustrated books combine claims of empirical authenticity—the clear, connected and accurate view—and authority, the sense that, for example, Biblical authors could offer correct accounts of the contemporary region.

In the following section I examine three habits of viewing Palestinian space that recur in these books as they work to frame their images as authoritative and authentic. First, they use geographic landmarks, particularly the Mount of Olives, to muster authority for their illustrated perspectives. Second, they abbreviate Palestinian space by representing it with a kind of visual shorthand that turns it into a system of icons rather than a richly-featured landscape, thereby inviting perspectives that, like Mordecai’s, fill in gaps in knowledge with fantasy. Third, the images in these books view Palestine as a visible religious history: reproducing Palestine as a past moment in a religion rather than as a place, these illustrations echo what the region itself seems to offer pilgrims—a visual gloss on scripture, or an illustration of the Bible. I close my discussion of these illustrated books by examining two works from 1900-01 that display the uneasy cooperation between Victorian religious perspectives on Palestine and the technologies of photography and colonialism. One of these works deploys photography in the effort to represent a perspective as a reality, and the other uses images of Palestine to realize a view of colonial entitlement towards another country. These books illustrate the political and religious ideologies and Victorian perspectives that conspired to reproduce “real” Palestine as an historical spectre.

Seeing and knowing reality is a matter of perspective, which, exemplifying their first common viewing habit, the illustrators and authors gathered here frequently connect to geographical position. British illustrators often work to heighten the authority of their illustrations by labelling their views with the physical origin points of their perspectives. For example, in Edward Daniel
Clarke’s 1810 work *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa*, the scene of Nazareth is subtitled, “in the approach from Sephoury” (462), while the view on the Sea of Galilee is specified as the “Lake of Gennesareth, or the Sea of Galilee, with the town of Tiberius and the baths of Emmaus, taken from the Western side, looking towards the country of the Gadarenes” (426). Likewise the fold-out frontispiece in Henry Light’s *Travels in Egypt, Nubia, Holy Land, Mount Lebanon, and Cyprus, in the Year 1814* (1818) makes a curious announcement of the location from which the image was taken: “Jerusalem from the Terrace of the Convent of the Latin Monks, looking on the Mount of Olives.” Here as in many other illustrated books about Palestine, the relative holiness of the place from which the perspective begins contributes authority to the image and is as important as the scene displayed.

In these works, the Mount of Olives itself often serves as a crucial origin of perspective. Frederick Henniker’s *Notes, During a Visit to Egypt, Nubia, the Oasis, Mount Sinai and Jerusalem* (1823) opens with an aquatint fold-out view of Jerusalem that depicts the city with map-like precision. The injunction noted to the binder that the fold-out view ought “to face the Title Page” gives a point of origin for viewing the illustration, and invites the interpretation of the book itself as a map and maze to be journeyed through, deciphered and created as an urbane place for dwelling and wandering. As with many such views, the caption announces a point of origin: “from the cave of the Apostles on the Mount of Olives.” This disclosure increases the informational value of the image, since it purports to give viewers an experience of two places at once: the seen, and the seen-from. The holiness of the origin point, however, also enhances the import and seeming authority of the view itself. Describing a perspective as being taken from the Mount of Olives represents a pose of authority, both then and now. The interest of this viewpoint for British travellers might be linked to its status as the final resting place for some one hundred and fifty thousand individuals whose graves date back three thousand years (Friedman). While viewing a scene from the Mount of Olives might have titillated a quintessentially Victorian and touristic curiosity about what the dead see, today the site represents a panopticon in Jerusalem that has been among the most contested of sites in the region’s ongoing conflict.189 Just as treading on its soil has both spiritual and political ramifications, describing a perspective on or
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189 As part of East Jerusalem, the Mount of Olives was under Jordanian rule from 1948 until the Six-Day War in June 1967, when Israeli forces annexed the area and “proclaim[ed] the unification of Jerusalem,” to the dismay of the international community (Tessler 404).
from the Mount of Olives indicates a particular orientation to or invocation of power and authority.

Viewing a scene from a particular vantage point excludes other possible perspectives. This framing has a counterpart in the second viewing habit of these Victorian illustrators, that of abbreviating a depiction of the region by using a visual shorthand, most frequently, an image of a camel and palm trees. As early as 1850, this iconography had become distinctly common in British visual representations of Palestine. As with any logo, this one helps to suggest that its topic is visible and so knowable. This icon often appears as a silhouette, the detail of its hypothetical scene shrouded through distance and a too-powerful light-source. For example, we see the icon of the gold camel and palms, here with the addition of a few other animals and a human figure in Arab-identified clothing in Samuel Manning’s Religious Tract Society publication *Those Holy Fields: Palestine*, published two years before *Daniel Deronda* began its serialization. This iconography also appears in the gold camel embossed on the cover of John Kitto’s *The Land of Promise: or, a Topographical Description of the Principal Places in Palestine, and of the Country Eastward of Jordan* (c.1850). W. H. Bartlett’s *Walks About the City and Environs of Jerusalem* (1845) is also embossed in gold with the classic British icon of Palestine, a camel and palms (fig. 1). This reliance on a visually simplistic iconography contrasts with the detail available in photographic representation, a visual alternative to hand-drawn media that was gaining cultural visibility in this period. Icons offer telegraphic communication, a visual shorthand to replace the more abundant information associated with realistic representation. Stripped of detail, an icon allows fantasy to fill in the blanks of what its image leaves out. Inviting perspectives on a place whose representation is narrowed to a suggestion rather than a scene, these icons imply that there is more to be seen, and that the viewer can have a role in imagining the view.

Such room for fantasy is germane to the third viewing habit of these British spectators of Palestine, their common feeling that the scenes available to them somehow illustrate the Bible, or that modern readers ought to be most interested in the contemporary appearance of the region so as to better understand Christian religious history. Palestine in the present becomes an illustration of its spiritual past self. An example of this trend comes in Kitto’s *The Land of Promise*. Its excellent fold-out map of Palestine contributes to the book’s qualities of positivist display, though it was published by the Religious Tract Society. Simultaneously discounting purely
impressionistic or spiritual encounters with the region through religious history, as well as admitting the inevitably subjective nature of seeing land, the author announces in the preface that “It is the object of the present work to describe every place or site of interest or importance in the Land of Promise as it now appears” (vii). Choosing “every place or site of interest or importance” relies on the tacit conclusion to Kitto’s sentence: his real topic is Palestine “as it now appears to a British subject.” The apparitional quality that Kitto ascribes to these sights makes their visible aspect seem highly dependent on perspective, changeable as a spectre, and not bound by “reality.” Similarly, for an 1810 map of Jerusalem, Edward Daniel Clarke notes, “some attempt is made to reconcile Historical Documents with existing phenomena” (552). Present Palestine becomes a “phenomenon,” a perceived display to be reconciled with the equally real evidence of “Historical Documents.” Here writing, “documents,” and visible landscape vie for reality even as they collaborate in its production. These illustrators and authors invite a gaze on Palestine that imagines seeing both the Biblical landscape and the modern together at once, a view that represents a kind of spectral double vision that is blind to the actuality or contemporary reality of the region.

Even a geographic work such as John Doner’s *A New General Atlas of the WORLD* (1831), a prose-less collection of maps, reveals Palestine’s double life as both a contemporary place and a Biblical scene. The frontispiece (fig. 2) announces with exuberant flourishes and swoops in the only sentence of this book that it has been “Compiled by the latest authorities both English and Foreign” of maps “Exhibiting th[e] Boundaries and Divisions” of contemporary nations, as well as “Ancient Maps of Greece, the Roman and Persian Empires, & Palestine,” all created “from Drawings made Expressly for this Work.” This sentence emphasizes the reliance of Doner’s images on “authorities” and the freshness of the views exhibited in its drawings, so as to shore up the semblance of authenticity of his images. As a work that sets out to display the “world” visually, Doner’s atlas participates in what Heidegger thought of as the modern phenomenon of the world picture. Visualizing the world depends on the idea that the world is knowable and open to being categorized. The inclusions and exclusions of world pictures like this one become ideological statements that imply political hierarchy. Physical geography, empire, and history here compete for organizational primacy: the maps of the “Roman and Persian Empires” give
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190 Heidegger suggests that “the fact that the world becomes picture at all is what distinguishes the essence of the modern age” (quoted in W. J. T. Mitchell, *What do Pictures Want?* xiv).
imperial history a primary place in the construction of the visible world, whereas in the maps of Ancient Greece and Palestine, classical pasts that have gained eminence in Western culture appear in maps of their own. The book represents Palestine twice, in the nationally vexed map of the Ottoman Empire entitled, “Turkey in Asia,” and in the map of “Ancient Palestine.” While Palestine was not thought of as a nationalized region in this period, its double placement in the present Ottoman Empire and in ancient history displays the competing classifications that defined its precarious knowability and visibility in nineteenth-century Britain. Its importance as a “still visible” Biblical past lets the region appear twice in the book: like a ghost, it is visible both in the present and as an history, an emblem of the past. As was so frequently the case in Victorian illustrations, Palestine as a contemporary place occupied by Palestinians does not exist in the visible “WORLD” this book perceives. At once a nameless place in the present and the apparition of a Biblical past, Palestine in this book is a spectre.

Perhaps the most startling articulation of the insistence on seeing the past in Palestine comes in W. H. Bartlett’s *Walks About the City and Environs of Jerusalem* (1845). In a book that addresses itself to the armchair traveller, Bartlett valorises walking through a city as the prime method of possessing or knowing it. The book thus participates in the cult of the *flâneur* that Baudelaire was brewing in the same period and a modernizing tourism culture that privileges the spectacle of travel. A frontispiece offers a slanted bird’s-eye view of Jerusalem. Bartlett tries to enforce a sense of his own modernity by claiming that earlier illustrated books on Jerusalem represented a “desultory” load, all of which lacked “correct and well-chosen Views” (Preface, n.p.). As a result, he formed

the idea of attempting to give a clear, connected, and accurate view of the City, by gradually tracing its progress from the earliest period of authentic history, [r]estoring its past appearance by a
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191 Muhammed Muslih traces the emergence of Palestinian nationalism as an outgrowth of the pan-Arab nationalism that coalesced after World War I in the aftermath of the Ottoman Empire.
192 See Walter Benjamin on Baudelaire, Paris, and the history of the *flâneur* in *The Arcades Project* (21-23), as well as MacCannell on the Benjaminian relationships between modernity and the spectacles of tourism (47-48, 60).
193 Published ten years later, Bartlett’s sequel to *Walks About Jerusalem, Jerusalem Revisited* (1855), gives a broad view of the city in a fold-out panorama, while action-based scenes deliver a more photographic atmosphere to his images than was present in his work of a decade before. W. H. Bartlett also illustrated Henry Stebbing’s religious view of Palestine in *The Christian in Palestine; or, Scenes of Sacred History, Historical and Descriptive* (1847), suggesting that, like a colonizing miner or trader, an artist in the period might find multiple ways of capitalizing on having visited the region.
careful study of existing data, and exhibiting its present condition in a series of Views chosen with express reference to historical illustration, and in which the local character should be the only object, and where, at every step, the past and present should be compared. (iii-iv)

This passage demonstrates Bartlett’s assumption that a perspective on the present can be derived from a history that is visible and a past that can be illustrated: the “present condition” of Jerusalem, can be “exhibited” through “a series of Views” that will offer “historical illustration.”

Both the visual and explanatory meanings of “illustration” are at work in this passage, in which Bartlett demonstrates his emphasis on the possibility of deriving knowledge from images of Palestine. As in Darwin’s *Origin*, we see the term “series” being used to marshal faith in the visibility of distinctions between eras. A word for infographic display, “series” exhibits differences and presents an authoritative account of change over time by making history visible in a sequence of altering images. Jerusalem itself is a series here, a collection of perspectives that, when gathered together by the right (British) illustrator-curator, can “trac[e] its progress” and present a coherent, authoritative, “clear, connected, and accurate view of the City.” Bartlett’s hope for this view, which acts as both an exhibit and a perspective, denotes his faith in a British empirical vision of Palestine, a fantasy of knowing the region through sight that opens it to possession and creation while anticipating the colonial ambitions of Balfour’s view.

Since Bartlett aims to depict both current conditions in Jerusalem and scenes from the city’s past, it seems that for him the past and the present visibly coexist in Jerusalem. Bartlett’s representation of the benefits of “restoring its past appearance” overlooks the possibility that the “restoration” could be a fictionalization. In the same passage, he continues, “If the student who reads the history of Jerusalem in the Scriptures, or in Josephus, or the pages of later historians, can find in this little work any assistance in bringing before him a picture of what they describe the principle object of this writer is attained” (iv). Bartlett’s explicitly male reader is enjoined to use these exhibits of “present” Jerusalem when reading scripture so that they may contribute to “bringing before him a picture” of the ancient history being narrated. In a very curious illustration of the purposes of illustration, Bartlett claims to be using images to retrieve past appearances while representing present states with accuracy, so that readers may use these
contemporary images to imagine a religious past. This layered reproduction of visible Jerusalems, past and present, results in a spectral city whose visual representations hover between reality, imagination, and history.

Because of this common representation of Palestine as a shifting and spectral landscape from the past, the authenticity of the images in these books is most starkly belied when they attempt to represent people in the present. The bodies of residents appear in Bartlett’s images almost as part of the topography of the city, and their captions reveal the uneven admissions to visibility of human subjects. While the image captioned “Jewish family on Mount Zion” seems to be torn from the pages of a contemporary fashion manual, the one called “Roman and Medieval Masonry” (fig. 3) is ostensibly of a crowd of Arab men. This disjunction between the caption and what the scene seems to portray is an instance of unequal identification. While the Jewish family is made visible both in the label and the image, the caption of “Roman and Medieval Masonry” implies that Arab bodies are to be read as part of the antique architecture of Palestine. In an instance of what, in Fabian’s terms, might be called a denial of coevality, Palestinians are cast as elements of an ancient landscape, rather than as people with a history that brings them into the present.194 This captioning makes these bodies “invisible” in their own image, and exemplifies what Said describes as the disappearing of Palestinian experience in Western representation.195 The caption is complicit in establishing the perspective viewers are meant to take in relation to this illustration. While the illustration is intended to be read for its authentic rendering of a scene, by representing a contrast between the title and the image, the caption itself belies the depiction of the illustration. The quest for visual authenticity in these images of present Jerusalem contends with the desire to see Palestinian space as a return of the past.

As book illustrators continued to represent Palestine through the nineteenth century, the invention of photography brought some of them a new source of “authentic” visual details, and indeed Palestine was a crucial inspiration and common subject of early photographers.196 Though

194 Fabian explains the “denial of coevalness” as “a persistent and systematic tendency to place the referent(s) of anthropology in a Time other than the present producer of the anthropological discourse” (31).
195 Addressing references to Palestine in Western literature, Said writes, “epistemologically the name of, and of course the very presence of bodies, in Palestine are—because Palestine carries so heavy an imaginative and doctrinal freight—transmuted from a reality into a nonreality, from a presence into an absence” (Question 10).
196 Dror Wahrman recounts the experiences of M. J. Diness, an early photographer of Palestine (8-36), while Carol Armstrong tells of Francis Frith’s mid-nineteenth century photographic adventures in the region (277-332).
only one of the books I include here contains photographs, their presence in illustrated travel books rose sharply through the last period of this study, when late nineteenth-century halftone processes allowed photographic images to be mass-produced. Curiously, although halftone photoreproduction processes were available at the time of its publication, Margaret Oliphant’s account of her 1890 excursion to Palestine, Jerusalem the Holy City: Its History and Hope (1892), includes “wood engravings from drawings and photographs.” This reproduction of both photographic and drawn images using wood engraving allows all the images in this book to appear under the visual system of one medium. The design choice also combines the seeming “here-and-now” authenticity of photography and on-site drawing with the preference for older printmaking methods in the visual fashion of the day: in the 1890s older image reproduction processes like wood engraving carried a particular charm and semblance of authority. Though electrotyped or halftone reproductions of original photographs of Oliphant’s travels might have brought their own authenticity as more immediate documents of the region, the wood engravings offer the sort of visual linkage of past with present that British illustrators of Palestine often attempted to depict. Oliphant’s layering of visual reproductions actively deploys particular media to argue for the authenticity and authority of their views of Palestine, belying Benjamin’s suggestion that “the technology of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from the sphere of tradition” (“Work of Art: Second Version” 22). Photography brought a new visual mode of referencing real Palestine, but it did not offer an immediate replacement for the veridicality of older techniques of visual representation.

Ten years after Oliphant’s voyage, adventure writer H. Rider Haggard attempts to use photographs directly to render authentic views of Palestinian reality in A Winter Pilgrimage: Being an Account of Travels Through Palestine, Italy and the Island of Cyprus, Accomplished in the Year 1900 (1901). Opening a century of “documentary” realism in visual media, this is the

197 On the advent of photographs in books, see Carol Armstrong (424-25).
198 Elisabeth Jay explains that this work was the result of two months Oliphant spent in Palestine and Egypt (195), funded by an advance from Macmillan, her publisher (22).
199 A more famous example of this “bibliographical nostalgia”—I am indebted to Alexandra Gillespie for the term (13)—is William Morris’s tireless efforts to propagate the woodcut (Cowan 131-89). Woodcuts were an antiquated print technology by the late-nineteenth century: they couldn’t communicate as much detail as newer print technologies, and they degraded quickly, meaning that image quality varied, and print runs were necessarily short. Newer print media offered more detailed, higher quality, and cheaper images, but the lengthy tradition of woodcut lent the medium lasting authority and meaning.
only Victorian book containing photographs of Palestine that I found in the Fisher collection. The photographs throughout are referred to as “illustrations.” As with Bartlett’s depiction of Arabs as architecture, Haggard’s captions sometimes enact spurious vanishings of what his images ostensibly portray. For example, an image of four Arab men in a boat is labelled as “Boat on the Sea of Galilee,” rather than “boaters.” These photographic “illustrations” pretend to the realism modern viewers frequently expect of photographs, but they also often operate like hand-drawn images in their imaginative enactment of scenes in the text. For example, a photograph captioned “Shepherd Carrying a Lost Sheep” (fig. 4) depicts both an actual experience of the author and a vision of Palestine as inscribed with Jesus’ famous acts and symbolism. Though it is clearly staged, this image does ask to be interpreted as a spontaneous and therefore more authentic representation. The sheep is a “lost” sheep, as though this shepherd had just happened upon the photographer as he supposedly happened on Jesus, and Haggard himself. This particular sheep, however, has evidently been found. Describing it as “lost” in the caption allows the scene to mirror Jesus’ parable of salvation, in which the repentance and retrieval of one human sinner, a “lost sheep,” is worth more to heaven than the virtue of the rest of the flock. This image thus uses photography to communicate that Jesus’ historical promise of salvation is visibly real in modern Palestine.

Haggard’s use of photography here makes this scene seem more authentic and truthful—Palestine as it now appears. Yet this image also relies on the assumptions of illustration, which presumes that an informative image may be staged if it is meant to reflect a text. In a culture accustomed to drawn illustration as the primary mode of mass-produced visual representation (whether printed in steel engraving, halftone, or lithography), and familiar with photographs of still people because of long exposures, images in books at this time were still meant to be “set up.” Whereas we expect drawn illustrations to reflect texts, photographs are now supposed to be more happenstance, caught in a real moment, not staged to suit an author’s purposes. This different standard of visual interpretation derives in part from the year this book was written, 1900, when Eastman introduced the Brownie, the first portable, affordable, and “fast” camera that allowed regular folk to take what we now call “snapshots” (Brayer 204). Such photographs

200 John Roberts points to the emergence of “documentary” photography in the 1920s and 1930s when the “term came to be used to mediate the “factographic” culture of the Soviet Union separately from its revolutionary politics” (58) and helped label realist desires to represent “everyday” life (59).
201 See Luke (15:3-7), and Matthew (18:12-14).
created the value of spontaneity as a measure of photographic meaning. Before the snapshot, photographs were not expected to depict spontaneous moments such as this image pretends to represent. Spontaneous photography was not yet widely available to travellers, but this image, like others in Haggard’s book, declares its own authenticity by implying that it reflects the contemporary landscape (viewed as the Biblical past) as well as the text at hand, as though the author had had a Polaroid camera in his pocket while travelling.

Though the photograph was clearly set up, Haggard writes of the scene actually occurring during his travels. On his way back to Haifa he met a shepherd clothed in a robe of many colours, doubtless such as Jacob gave to Joseph and bearing upon his shoulders a lost sheep. This illustration of the saying recorded in St. Luke was really remarkable. “What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders rejoicing.”

It shows once more how closely the Saviour clung to the use of natural examples around Him as a groundwork of His parables, and how little those examples have changed in the course of nineteen centuries. (246-47)

In his willingness to imagine Palestine as unchanged since ancient times, Haggard evinces the Victorian feeling that things mostly “look different” in the modern world, a region that, for him, does not yet exist in Palestine. There, people (“natural examples”) exist like plants or rock formations whose rate of change over time is imperceptible, who represent the Christian past to British visitors but are without lived history of their own. This passage displays Haggard’s eager insistence on seeing the Biblical parable illustrated in Palestinian land and life. Its accompanying image is a picture of landscape seen as a repetition of the Bible, rather than a “realistic” depiction of contemporary Palestine. This photographic illustration is thus an illustration of an illustration,

---

202 Dellheim attributes this Victorian sense of a visual distinction between the past and the present to the effects of industrialization (37).
an echoing chamber of representations of representations. An artifact of a shifting visual culture, it is steeped in traditions of realism, static photography and illustration, even as it anticipates emergent modes of making and interpreting photographs. Even seen through the more “authentic” lens of photography, Palestine remains a spectral illustration of the Bible, the visible reproduction of a religious past mapped onto a landscape.

Whereas Haggard’s work uses the new technology of photography to make real Palestine feel more immediate for Victorian book viewers, another illustrated work of the same year, H. A. Harper and J. Clark’s tiny and well-worn The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: Illustrated from Original Drawings Made in the Holy Land (1900), marshals images of Palestine to affect the reality of another country. In Harper and Clark’s landscape prints, Palestinian space is portrayed in an explicitly religious setting that nevertheless enacts a colonial purpose. Whereas in Doner’s atlas Palestine exists in the past and in the Ottoman Empire, the images of Palestine in this book are meant to be seen from South Africa. The book is filled with landscape illustrations of Palestine (fig. 5), while its cover is painted with nationalist signifiers (fig. 6). Its function vexes interpretation: it is either a religious book object masquerading as a talisman of national fervour, or a nationalized commodity pretending to be a trinket for prayer, or both. This religious and political layering of authorities, sentiments, inspirations, and appeals is well-advised, since the book was printed to be taken by soldiers to the Boer War, one of the last to be fought by Britain for purely and admittedly imperial goals (Saunders and Smith 618). The date and location of the war at hand are even noted on the binding of the book as though in a kind of notch-marking of conquests. The claim that these drawings were made in the Holy Land lends the book authenticity and contributes to its religious value as a pilgrim’s companion. A soldier might head into a South African battle with a piece of ancient and Biblical Palestine in his pocket—a reproduced print culture artifact, but a relic of Palestine nonetheless.

This book thus tells a poignant fable of international relations brought down to the scale of the individual. It is a personal object produced to engender feelings of religious comfort and intimacy in its owner, small enough to be carried about daily in a pocket or brought to bed.\textsuperscript{203} Yet the book was clearly also intended to provide spiritual solace and inspiration to soldiers, the

\textsuperscript{203} For this spatial sense of the intimacy of reading, I am indebted to Gaston Bachelard’s The Poetics of Space (12-17).
cogs in the wheel of Britain’s colonial system. Small and strangely nationalized Bibles like this one offered many soldiers in many wars moral comfort to fuel their motivation in battle. Writing of the activities of the influential British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), Leslie Howsam explains that the Crimean War of the 1850s “initiated a resolution to provide a New Testament to each soldier going on service,” an undertaking that some society members seem to have read as a direct contribution to the imperial project (Cheap Bibles 181). The Harper and Clark New Testament thus supports the odd notion that images of Palestine were used to muster the conquest of South Africa. Howsam notes that in its circulation of masses of such small cheap Bibles through the nineteenth century, the BFBS tended not to publish illustrated editions (99), making this particular Bible all the more noteworthy. While it may seem inappropriate to align works that appeal to a touristic, or “realist” interest in a landscape with works that, like this one, attempt to illustrate the scenes of a religion, in the visual culture of the era and the Victorian gaze on Palestine these purposes overlapped. Bar-Yosef cautions against so direct an interpretation of the imperialism in British attitudes towards Palestine in this period, arguing that their origins in religious history contradicts Said’s description of a purely colonialist Victorian Orientalism (4-7). Nevertheless, this particular work demonstrates that images in religious books could indeed contribute to colonialist discourse frequently thought to be more evident in books devoted to tourism or geography.

For the soldiers who were given this book, images of an ancient promised land may have reflected a viable perspective on the present contested land of South Africa. While the book does not direct active colonialism towards Palestine itself, it demonstrates that such a proprietary view of the region could further Victorian colonial discourse, and that, just as Mordecai bestows his perspective on Deronda, Victorian perspectives on Palestine were transferable to colonial projects in other countries. The imagined visibility of the Palestinian past offered Victorian spectators an entitled view of another present-day landscape. This hypothesis casts a strange light on the “view” of Palestine taken by Balfour seventeen years later, as well as on the visions Eliot gave Mordecai twenty-four years earlier. The illustrations in this book and their intended use both demonstrate and are complicit in the seepage of the idea of “Promised Land” into British
colonial epistemology. The inheritance of the concept may have spurred colonial feelings of entitlement towards other landscapes, while thinking of Palestine as “promised” and therefore already possessed may have seemed natural to those immersed in the imperial project. This vision of a Biblical Promised Land seems to have offered enduring inspiration to colonial imagination, itself a visual practice and a possessive way of regarding the landscapes of others. The image as well as the idea of the Promised Land encouraged imperial attitudes both towards Palestine—a spirit evident in the Balfour Declaration—and towards other countries where Britain was at war. Acting like shades printed with fantastical images and covering Victorian thoughts of Palestine, these perspectives are as much blind spots as scenes of reality.

Like the other books I discuss here, the Harper and Clark New Testament displays the way political and religious fantasies combined to transform “real” Palestinian landscape through the windows of Victorian print culture. The views in these nineteenth-century illustrated books rely on captions to privilege the authenticity of some geographies and bodies over others and represent suppressions and fabrications of reality as much as transcriptions. In these works, Victorian perspectives on Palestine that are born from contests of authorities, quests for authenticity, and elisions and creations of detail, reproduce a spectral landscape from the past that is difficult to dissociate from a “visible” religious history.

Conclusion: Viewing Palestine Through a Book

The illustrations in these books must be regarded not as they present themselves, as transparent windows on Palestine, but as visible British visions of the region that are by times as fantastical as Mordecai’s. Each of the illustrations in these books amounts to a printed gaze on Palestine, a portal onto Victorian perspectives working in tandem with the sights in Daniel Deronda, and prefiguring Balfour’s “view.”

Both Daniel Deronda and these illustrated books offer insight into Victorian culture’s construction of an imaginary Palestine. In Eliot’s work, reality can be accessed through vision,

204 W. J. T. Mitchell exposes the same use of the notion of “Promised Land” in American colonialism and visions of Israel-Palestine when he writes of “the English and American tongue that speaks invisibly in the contours of the holy landscape, projecting fantasies of a Zion that is all too close to the national imaginary of the United States as a promised land for God’s chosen people—white, Christian, and English speaking” (“Holy” 285).
characters are real insofar as they are visible, the visibility of printed images offers a mode of accessing the real, and the “East” remains an invisible landscape that is nevertheless open to Mordecai’s visions and gaze. The illustrated books that make claims for their “clear, connected, and accurate” views rely on a similar faith in the accuracy of vision and visual representation. The visual statements about Palestine in these books, like Mordecai’s convinced visions, sweep past the risks of unverified verbal claims. They make arguments that seem to present knowledge about reality in a single glance, and invite perspectives that are easy to adopt in an instant, thus opening up new but not necessarily accurate points of view. Though there is reason to have more faith in Eliot’s perspicuity than Haggard’s, had she visited Palestine she too might have seen only “illustrations” of the Old Testament, scriptural real-estate deeds seeming to prove a British entitlement to and favourable “view” of establishing a Jewish state in the region. Mordecai’s visible future and the visible history that nineteenth-century illustrators saw in Palestine create the region as a reproducible spectre, opening it up to Victorian perspectives and fantasies of possession.

Bar-Yosef opens his account of Victorian attitudes towards Palestine with “an image that encapsulates the English fascination with the Holy Land: an image of a reader and a book” (18). While for most Victorians the book implied in this imaginary scene of reading would have been the Bible, other books could also have found their way onto that hypothetical reader’s lap—Daniel Deronda and numerous illustrated travel books among them. In Bar-Yosef’s reader we must also see a viewer of texts and their scenes, a person gazing at Palestine from a distance, through a book and from an inevitably ideological perspective. Isobel Armstrong suggests that the Victorian icon of an “isolated figure at the window” who “gazes from a hidden interior” displays a viewing subject who “claims ownership” of the spaces she occupies and gazes upon (7). The “hiatus of the window,” Armstrong writes, “dramatizes the uneven relation of subject and object” and is “the disputed space of the century” (7, italics original). The printed page, with its semblance of transparency, is another space in dispute, a hiatus posed, in this instance, between the present and the past, between Victorian Britain and the Middle East. Similarly, as The Picture of Dorian Gray makes abundantly clear, the picture-viewing reader, shaded by the pages of books while gazing through their windows onto distant landscapes, must be counted as another powerful Victorian subject exerting control on the scene outside.
Figure 1. Cover of W. H. Bartlett’s *Walks About Jerusalem* (1845). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto. 23 cm x 17 cm.
Figure 2. Frontispiece of John Doner’s *A New General Atlas of the WORLD* (1831). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto. 52 cm x 28 cm.
Figure 3. “Roman and Medieval Masonry,” in W. H. Bartlett’s *Walks About Jerusalem* (1845). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto.

Figure 4. “Shepherd Carrying a Lost Sheep,” from H. Rider Haggard’s *A Winter Pilgrimage* (1901). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto. 14 cm x 11 cm.
Figure 5. “Jerusalem,” from H. A. Harper and J. Clark’s *The New Testament* (1900). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto. 11.5 cm x 7.5 cm.

Figure 6. Cover of H. A. Harper and J. Clark’s *The New Testament* (1900). Courtesy of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto. 24.5 cm x 7.5 cm.
Chapter 4
Picturing Dorian’s Past: Wilde’s Realization

Closer to life than a good likeness, Basil Hallward’s portrait of Dorian Gray writes a biography that its subject would never wittingly authorize. While no reader can literally see Dorian’s historiographic portrait, a complete reading of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) requires imagining, or visualizing, its ultimate state. The text thus establishes visibility as a mode that communicates despite and in excess of what could be figured in words. Readers glimpse Dorian’s past through the fictional visibility of his portrait, often finding a queer history in its display. In *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde invites readers and viewers to see the pasts that they want to see, allowing them, according to Wilde’s terminology, to realize Dorian’s history.

---

205 Tracing the “(un)death of the author” in Wilde’s work and reception, Elana Gomel identifies the distribution of authorship in the painting and *Dorian Gray* as a whole (78-90). Jane M. Gaines suggests that “[t]he novel is a metaphor for photography,” especially in its interrogation of “authorial originality as a claim to ownership in a work” (42, 43).

206 Audrey Jaffe suggests that Dorian’s portrait displays “not the detail of experience but the fact of it,” since, as readers, “we can’t know, from looking at it, what experience it records” (*Scenes* 165). While this ambiguity is present in Wilde’s representation of the portrait and the history it implies, readers cannot actually look at the portrait, they can only imagine it. If readers visualize the painting, they can also be interpreted as imagining causes for its alteration, while visualizing Dorian’s crimes or their representation in his portrait are equally imaginative generations of fictional objects.

207 This relation between visual and textual information in the book can be understood through the literary forms of ekphrasis and paragone. An extended description of a painting, Wilde’s novel performs what W. J. T. Mitchell would call an ekphrastic triangulation between Dorian-the-body, his image, and the reader. Ekphrasis, he writes, “must be pictured as a ménage à trois in which the relations of self and other, text and image, are triply inscribed” (*Picture* 164). In considering balances between text and image, furthermore, Wilde’s books about pictures enter into the literary tradition of the paragone, famously defined by Lessing in *Laocoon* (1766). Lessing distinguishes between blunt efforts to construct poetry as a “speaking picture” and painting as a “silent poem” (5). In privileging text, Mitchell writes, Lessing “rationalizes a fear of imagery that can be found in every major philosopher from Bacon to Kant to Wittgenstein” (*Iconology* 113). Another angle on the ekphrastic tension in *Dorian Gray*, therefore, is Wilde’s placement of this aesthetic fear into an iconophobic Gothic plot, since Dorian’s image is the source of the horror of the text.

208 The visibility of the painting, in contrast to the verbal text, is crucial to the legitimations of homosexuality that readers have identified in it for generations. As Frankel notes, “even before Wilde’s trials, the novel was generally read as a thinly veiled account of homosexual desire” (135). Linda Dowling reads the suggestiveness of Wilde’s verbal reticence regarding male same-sex desire in *Dorian Gray* through its encoding in Oxfordian Hellenism (126-27). Ed Cohen suggests that while *Dorian* is a “manifestly straight text” (803), the visibility of the portrait enables the entrance into discourse of “homosexual meanings” that have yet to be legitimated or verbalized: “Since the portrait stands outside the text and evokes an eroticized tableau transgressing the limits of verbal representation, it establishes a gap whereby unverbalized meaning can enter the text” (806). Meaning is “slipped in” through the painting, like an extra leaf in the book. The visibility of the portrait enables its communication of homoerotic significance. “Basil’s portrait of Dorian,” Cohen writes, “can embody his desire for the eponymous character, and yet male homoerotic passion remains, in the dominant representational codes of the period […] a love whose name
In this chapter, I argue that Wilde authorizes a novel spectatorship in visual culture, a habit of looking at portraits to see—and thus imagine—personal histories that are not declared in words. This practice of looking at portraits to generate new histories and discover untold pasts can be better understood through Wilde’s multi-faceted uses of the term “realization.” Wilde’s realization entails a spectatorship that finds and imagines new histories through looking at pictures and in acts of picturing. In a visual extension of his verbal irony from text into the realm of images, Wilde’s realization enables viewers after Dorian to read pictures for the histories that they might imply rather than what they actually disclose.

In elaborating my argument, I begin with a reading of Wilde’s uses of the word “realization” in Dorian Gray. By enabling readers to see the past in an imagined picture, Wilde’s realization expands the textual limits of his novel and reorganizes concepts of visibility in literary realism. Next, I situate Wilde’s realization in the context of nineteenth-century visual culture by examining its relation to notions of picturing and photographic evidence about the past. By

the text dare not speak” (811). In discussing the visibility that critics suggest Dorian gives to homosexual desire, Jaffe argues that “rather than announcing that a particular identity has currency, visibility bestows that currency” (Scenes 162). She suggests that Dorian’s picture “reflects a process of accumulation: the portrait turns sin into gain by rendering it visible” (174). In another account of the tacit nature of same-sex desire in this text, Elfenbein shows how Wilde uses the idea of “influence” to encode “homosocial relationships” (498). My examination of Wilde’s realization of visible histories intersects with discussions of his relationship to aestheticism, his uses of the gaze and specular symbols, and criticism of illustrations of Dorian Gray and its characters. On Wilde’s relationship to visual art and aestheticism, see Julia Prewitt Brown on Wilde’s “philosophy of art,” Michele Mendelssohn on Henry James, Oscar Wilde and aesthetics, Leon Chai’s Aesthetics, Talia Schaffer on Wilde’s aestheticism and fashion, and Elisha Cohn on the afterlives of Wilde’s aestheticism. Richard W. Hayes reads interiority in Dorian Gray through Wilde’s relationship to interior décor and the decorative arts. Kay Heath links Dorian’s portrait to a mirror (33), and suggests that Dorian ages prematurely because he “identifies with signs of age in the mirror” (28). Xavier Giudicelli examines the illustrated editions of Dorian, and notes that illustrations of Dorian Gray represent what seems to be “unsayable” in the text and offer a history of the reception of Wilde. Lorraine Janzen Kooistra interprets illustrations of Wilde’s works in a study of what she terms “bitextuality.” Linda K. Hughes addresses the Wildean afterlives of fin-de-siècle periodical illustrations in digital contexts. Other critics of Wilde’s work consider the duplicity of Dorian the image and Dorian the person: while Christopher Craft explains the “image-theft, mimetic proliferation, enchantment of the double” in Wilde’s delineation of identity (132), Sarah Malton demonstrates that “the narrative wholly subverts the conventional distinction between the fake and the authentic identity, displacing as it does the visual record of Dorian’s criminality onto his portrait” (126). In considering the role of fictional visibility in Wilde’s work, my study of his realizations answers to the photographable objects of Nancy Armstrong’s realism. Armstrong observes that The Picture of Dorian Gray, like most other Victorian novels, “defined what was real in terms of what could and would eventually be depicted by a photographic image” (10-11). She suggests that the heightened authority of Dorian’s painting inverts the usual relationship between original and copy in realism (159). Wilde, she writes, “has Dorian’s portrait undergo the kind of disfiguration that would afflict the young man’s body, were this a work of realism,” so that the portrait itself “provides the original Dorian” (160).
imagining a visible past, Wilde’s realization responds to photography and to literary traditions of portrait narratives. To address the historical afterlife of Wilde’s realization, I conclude with a discussion of the photograph Richard Ellmann famously mislabelled as “Wilde in costume as Salome” (428). Viewers’ uses of this image to authorize a history of Wilde in drag reflect the generation of history through spectatorship in Dorian Gray, thereby confirming the longevity of Wildean realization.

Wilde’s Realization

In the following section, I offer an account of Wilde’s concept of realization as historical visualization by reading its significance in The Picture of Dorian Gray. Wilde’s realization implies a visualization of the past that bears on the relations and identities of characters and on concepts of history, visibility, and realism in the text. A favourite word in many of Wilde’s works, “realization” is not simply a mental experience; rather it describes an often material or visible process of representation that erases limits between authors and audiences. For Wilde, the word implies a visualization of history that includes the spectator’s creation and representation of the past. Wilde’s implication of the reader in structuring his text reflects this aesthetic mode, since it is the reader who realizes Dorian’s history by visualizing the ultimate horror of the face in Basil’s painting. Only the reader’s participation in imagining the portrait fully “realizes” Wilde’s story.

Realizations are ever present in Wilde’s writing, and his fixation on the term merits close attention. The word and its cognates appear and reappear in his work, from Jack’s famous conclusion to Wilde’s most popular play—“Aunt Augusta, I’ve now realised for the first time in my life the vital Importance of Being Earnest” (307)—to Lord Henry’s foreshadowing admonition to Dorian: “realize your youth while you have it” (187).211 As William E. Buckler notes, “Variations on the word “realised” recur with such frequency as to create the perceptual or spiritual texture of De Profundis, melding its ideas and emotions into a unique expression of the imaginative consciousness” (100). The long essay, Buckler argues, “enabled Wilde to see that art

211 Wilde uses “realize” and “realise” interchangeably. He uses “realize” and “realization” in all editions of Dorian Gray but uses “realise” and “realisation” in The Importance of Being Earnest (1895), The Portrait of Mr W.H. (1889) and in all versions of De Profundis compiled in the Oxford Complete Works. “Realize” is the more common spelling, according to The Oxford English Dictionary ("realize").
and self-realization are one and the same thing” (114). Both a favourite word and an idealized aesthetic mode, realization branches through much of Wilde’s work.

Wilde often associates realization with visibility and representations of history. While in French réalisation refers to the direction of films (“réalisation”), and thus to the visualization of time and narrative, Wilde’s realization combines mental and material realities, and frequently implies a manifestation of the past in the present in a kind of historical representation. For example, in The Picture of Dorian Gray, the “young Parisian” in the yellow book that Henry sends Dorian “spent his life trying to realize in the nineteenth century all the passions and modes of thought that belonged to every century except his own” (274). Throughout the book, as in this instance, realization allows novel vantages on the past to enter into the text. When he wanders through his picture gallery filled with the portraits of dead forebears, Dorian pauses before one and wonders, “Were his own actions merely the dreams that the dead man had not dared to realize?” (288). While Dorian wonders whether his own actions in the present “realize” the desires of this figure from the past, the prompt to historical reflection is delivered by a painted portrait. Realization increases and is aided by visibility as it invites the past into the present.

The idea of realization, a combination of mental and visible representation, enables Wilde to stage himself and his fictions against the backdrop of history. His novel dwells on the meaning of culture at the end of the nineteenth century, promoting in Dorian a realization of history’s constant quest for a “new personality for art” (176). Likewise, while Dorian’s portrait depicts a history, it also has a place in history: Lord Henry’s declaration that Dorian’s picture “is the finest portrait of modern times” (188) denotes the portrait’s success as a “wonderful work of art, and a wonderful likeness as well” (188), and its historical significance.212 The fin-de-siècle moment when he published Dorian Gray allowed Wilde to make broad pronouncements about the character of the closing century. Though the novel does not address “real” historical events, the

---

212 Basil’s creation is often judged according to such a historical meter. Speaking of the moment when he met Dorian, Basil tells Harry, “I believe some picture of mine had made a great success at the time, at least had been chattered about in the penny newspapers, which is the nineteenth-century standard of immortality” (10). Newspapers here are the grounds on which artists may test their impact, while Basil’s typically self-deprecating quip describes an historiographic process: the documentation of noteworthy work in print media. For Wilde, newspapers were far more burnable than books. Protesting in defence of The Picture of Dorian Gray, he wrote to the editor of the St James Gazette, “To say that such a book as mine should be ‘chucked into the fire’ is silly. That is what one does with newspapers” (“To the Editor” 106). While print seems to promise historical immortality bred both in ephemera and books, the modern moment could be said to carry a disposable historicity, since its most authoritative and abundant record, newsprint, is created to be burned.
uniqueness of Dorian’s character is confirmed by setting it against the backdrop of the nineteenth century as an identifiable historical era, one that is bolstered in significance by frequent references (167, 234, 174, 203, 234, 274, 348, etc.). The fin de siècle here is a culmination in tandem with Dorian’s own exceptionalism. Wilde uses Dorian’s supernatural portrait as the visible and historical evidence—the realization—both of its subject’s decline and of the apex of a modern era (188), just as he saw himself.\footnote{Wilde’s active exhibition of his own exceptionality and his construction of Dorian’s portrait as kind of iconic celebrity shot can be better understood through Sharon Marcus’s discussion of the sophisticated relationship the author cultivated with the reproducible visibility of nineteenth-century stardom: “Not only are stars widely copied,” she writes, “they often present themselves as copies,” while the celebrity process itself “demands that […] authors put themselves on display” (1003-04, 1018).} “I was a man who stood in symbolic relations to the art and culture of my age,” Wilde writes in De Profundis. “I had realised this for myself at the very dawn of my manhood, and had forced my age to realise it afterwards” (162). Wilde’s use of realization in this context is indebted to Hegel, whose work he encountered at Oxford.\footnote{Philip Smith explains Wilde’s introduction to Hegel’s “realization of ideas” at Oxford through Benjamin Jowett (30). He also quotes Wilde’s citation of Hegel at the end of “The Truth of Masks” in a turn of phrase that evinces the author’s inheritance of the philosopher’s terminology: “just as it is only in art-criticism, and through it, that we can apprehend the Platonic theory of ideas, so it is only in art-criticism, and through it, that we can realise Hegel’s system of contraries” (34).} Hegel relies heavily on “realization” in illustrating how zeitgeist manifests itself through the lives of “world-historical individuals,” a process he describes as “the realization of the great ideal aim by means of individuals” (33). In taking up Hegel’s vocabulary, Wilde positions himself as one such paragon of history. Thinking of himself as a pinnacle offered Wilde a sense of the historical arena in which he visualized—or rather realized—his own impact, much as Henry imagines Dorian’s.

While Hegelian realization refers to the materialization of ideas in history, Dorian Gray also links realization to aesthetic expression and to the animation of the past in the present. Dorian claims to have loved Sybil Vane “because [she] realized the dreams of great poets and gave shape and substance to the shadows of art” (243). The realization of her acting vivifies aesthetic ideas from the past and gives the visible qualities of “shape” and “substance” to aesthetic “shadows.” Dorian confirms that his interest in Sybil depends on her realizations when his feeling for her vanishes because her bad art “was wrong in colour. It took away all the life from the verse. It made the passion unreal” (239). Sybil Vane’s fault in Dorian’s eyes is a failure of aesthetic realization: since he suggests her acting is wrong in “colour,” for Dorian the failure of
her work is a visual fault. While the visualized idea of aesthetic realization informs Dorian and Sybil’s relationship, Lord Henry attributes Dorian’s attractions to his own artful realization. “He lives the poetry that he cannot write,” Lord Henry says of Dorian, while “others write the poetry that they cannot realize” (218). According to this description, Dorian’s life is a realization that parallels the aesthetic expression of poetry. In exploring his own desires, Dorian himself comes to look “on evil simply as a mode through which he could realize his conception of the beautiful” (290). His realizations turn aesthetic ideas into realities. Confronted with his murder of Basil, Dorian feels “that the secret of the whole thing was not to realize the situation” (301). For Dorian, realization gives facts solidity. While he tries to evade the consequences of his actions by refusing to realize them, others see Dorian as an icon that realizes their own desiring dreams from the past.  

215 “Indeed,” writes the narrator, “there were many, especially among the very young men, who saw, or fancied that they saw, in Dorian Gray the true realization of a type of which they had often dreamed in Eton or Oxford days, a type that was to combine something of the real culture of the scholar with all the grace and distinction and perfect manner of a citizen of the world” (277). The nostalgia in perceptions of Dorian gives his visible presence the aestheticized historicism of romance. He is both the realization of a fantasy type and a revenant from a youthful past. In both dimensions, Dorian’s realization operates as a visualization of history. In all these instances of its role in the novel, realization breaks down divisions between artifice and reality and gives visible solidity to ideas, desires, and dreams of the past.

Wilde also establishes realization as the animation of the past in *The Portrait of Mr W.H.* (1889), which, in addition to prefiguring the later work’s title, shares numerous themes with *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. In *Mr W.H.*, realization is a process primarily conceptualized through the stage and through the writing or researching of history. The story dramatizes a series of epistemological realizations, charting exchanges of discovery and delusion among a set of characters who fix their identities to a particular question in literary history: the authorship of Shakespeare. In the opening paragraph of the story, the narrator contends that “all art” is “a mode of acting, an attempt to realise one’s own personality on some imaginative plane” (3). Realization here implies the aesthetic manifestation of identity. It also elaborates character: writing of Shakespeare’s sonnets, the narrator claims, “they have given form and substance to

215 As Craft writes, to his witnesses Dorian is “not merely a superb image of present male beauty, but also the living incarnation of an image about which they once used to dream” (116).
what was within us; they have enabled us to realise our personality” (76). Donning the visible qualities of shape and substance seen in the realizations of *Dorian Gray*, personality itself is construed as the product of realization. Wilde emphasizes these aesthetic realizations of selfhood throughout *Mr W.H.*. Like “the aged scholar” who “seemed to see” in a young man “the realisation of the Greek ideal” (46), Shakespeare finds in Willie Hughes a rather Christ-like “visible incarnation of his idea of beauty” (47). Realization is the process that renders the historical Greek ideal visible and incarnate, and often enables the apprehension of visible beauty. The narrator imagines Shakespeare pointing out to Willie Hughes “that his beauty is such that it seems to realise every form and phase of fancy” (25). He reiterates the idea of Hughes’s realizations by referring to him as “the youth to whom Shakespeare had entrusted the realisation of his most exquisite creations” (49). Like Sybil’s efforts to realize drama, Wilde here again imagines the visible displays of actors as producing what he calls realization. While these realizations could be imagined as metaphors for mental discoveries rather than visible materializations of beauty and ideas, these acts of realization do not seem to be entirely intellectual. Rather, the narrator claims, “Shakespeare invites us to notice how the truth of acting, the truth of visible presentation on the stage, adds to the wonder of poetry, giving life to its loveliness, and actual reality to its ideal form” (25). Visible staging enhances Shakespeare’s realization of invisible ideas, while “actual reality” becomes a condition to which art can aspire through the realizations of acting. In *The Portrait of Mr. W. H* just as in *Dorian Gray*, Wilde’s realizations blur boundaries between representation and the real and visualize past notions.

Wilde’s realization operates as a kind of representation that does not distinguish between the author and the audience: both the person who realizes and the witness to what is realized are equal participants in artistry and spectatorship. A complicity exists between the audience and the scene—one that Wilde makes explicit in his depiction of Dorian-the-person watching his life manifest itself in another representation, Dorian-the-painting. In a reflection of this aesthetic mode, the narrator writes that sometimes

a tragedy that possesses artistic elements of beauty crosses our lives. If these elements of beauty are real, the whole thing simply appeals to our sense of dramatic effect. Suddenly we find that we are no longer the actors, but the spectators of the play. Or rather we
are both. We watch ourselves, and the mere wonder of the spectacle enthralls us. (254)

Here real beauty combined with real tragedy seems to result in an Artaudian aesthetics avant la lettre, whereby the audience is complicit in the creation of the visible scene.\footnote{In his 1938 description of the space of the theatre, Artaud writes, “We abolish the stage and the auditorium and replace them by a single site, without partition or barrier of any kind, which will become the theatre of the action. A direct communication will be re-established between the spectator and the spectacle, between the actor and the spectator, from the fact that the spectator, placed in the middle of the action, is engulfed and physically affected by it” (96).} Likewise, in Lord Henry’s vision of “a new Hedonism” that was to “recreate life,” the representation afforded would “be experience itself, and not the fruits of experience, sweet or bitter as they might be” (279). With aesthetic reality difficult to exceed or improve upon, the possibility of a truly realizing aesthetic mode for Wilde seems to exist in this radical merging of the positions of audience and author. This combination of stances is evident in Dorian watching himself age in his portrait, and in readers watching themselves imagine the horrors he has committed. These forms of spectatorship differ, since the reader’s gaze is self-aware and Dorian’s is self-regarding. Yet from both vantage points the merging of representation and reality in realization generates new perspectives on the past.

Wilde’s realizations register his interest in the propensity of artworks to reflect, restore, prefigure, and dictate the material realities experienced by bodies—whether on stage or in life.\footnote{On Wilde’s concepts of the relationship between aesthetic reality and life, see Chai (95-111).} Martin Meisel suggests that in nineteenth-century culture, “realization is central to the persistent pressure toward uniting a concrete particularity with inward signification, the materiality of things with moral and emotional force, historical fact with figural truth, the mimetic with the ideal” (36). Embedding a moral indictment in a painted object, and attempting to picture an idealized type in Dorian’s body, \textit{The Picture of Dorian Gray} effects this combination of “the materiality of things” with “moral and emotional force.” \textit{Dorian} the book realizes the implications of his tale by manifesting a moral perspective on the visible world.\footnote{For Nicholas Frankel, \textit{Dorian} accomplishes this realization in its bibliographic materiality: “In its form as a book we might say, Wilde’s novel repeats at the level of fact a question of meaning (announced as a question of beauty) suggested simultaneously at the level of plot by Dorian’s encounters with texts whose actual perversity is only hinted at by their “outward” appearance” (134).} Meisel further suggests that realization in the nineteenth century “meant both literal re-creation and translation
into a more real, that is more vivid, visual, physically present medium” (30).219 “To move from
mind’s eye to body’s eye was realization,” writes Meisel, “and to add a third dimension to two
was realization, as when words became picture, or when picture became dramatic tableau” (30).
Indeed, Wilde’s uses of the term “realization” display his intimacy with theatrical procedure.
Meisel points out that as a term for a very popular stage technique, realization referred to
“theatrical tableaux based on well-known pictures” (30). In the theatre, realization implies the
depiction of a painting in actors’ bodies on stage; however, Dorian Gray stages the embodied
life of its main character in a painting that itself realizes his history.

While the painting symbolizes the primary realization of Dorian’s past, the narrative demands
that its readers share responsibility for realizing its portrait of Dorian’s queer history. His lapsing
soul is illustrated by changes in the painting (245, 272), and his most heinous crimes are made
explicit in the text—for example, his “murders” of both Sybil and Basil (252, 300) and his mortal
blackmail of Alan Campbell (310). However, many of the details of his fall remain vague. The
“charges” that Basil puts to Dorian are not specified by a glance at the now-horrific painting,
though Dorian implies they would be (296-98). The image does not reveal particular crimes, only
a general criminality. What other clues to guilt does the painting reveal when visualized—
realized—by a reader? Further crimes suggested by its silent testimony are of the reader’s own
authorship, and so the painting uncovers evidence of the criminality the reader’s mind already
holds. Since, as Ed Cohen writes, the picture “interrupts the novel’s overt representational limits
by introducing a visual, extra verbal component of male same-sex desire” (806), Wilde’s
insistence that readers take responsibility for realizing Dorian’s past can be counted among his
contributions to the battle for queer social acceptability. Dorian’s readers, his audience, become
the keepers of the painting that remains officially invisible and yet imaginatively vivid to them.
Readers effect one of the text’s realizations by visualizing Dorian’s magical portrait and
inferring details of his past.

The generative spectatorship of realization is crucial to the moral adventure of this story, since
the narrative depends on the idea that visibility itself can disclose meaning distinct from

219 In this sense, realization acts as a counterpart to the increasing “immediacy” that new technological innovations
are said to bring consumers. Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin make this argument in Remediation: Understanding New
Media.
language. The text constructs visibility as a measure of the real and a conduit of erotic desire.
“To test Reality,” quips Mr Erskine in defence of one of Lord Henry’s paradoxes partway through a quail lunch, “we must see it on the tight-rope” (202). Reality here must be seen to be understood. Henry restates this focus on visibility, claiming that “The true mystery of the world is the visible, not the invisible” (186). Distinguishing between the visible and the invisible in interpreting the world’s “mystery” relies on a logical interplay between display and secrecy that informs the erotic potential of the text. In another observation of a contrast between the visible and the invisible in this text, Christopher Craft claims that the novel offers an “erotic directive: visualize what you cannot see” (119, italics original). The wish to make the invisible visible is thus a sexually charged impulse in the text, while desires to watch often mediate sexual desire itself. “All I want now is to look at life,” says Lord Henry, continuing with a coy invitation to Dorian: “You may come and look at it with me, if you care to” (207). Such seductive expressions of desire to watch may be a stand-in for other sensual invitations. “You filled me with a wild desire to know everything about life” cries Dorian to Henry later. “I used to look at every one who passed me, and wonder, with a mad curiosity, what sort of lives they led” (211). Dorian’s “wild desire” lives in his promiscuous “looking” at strangers, just as readers realize their own wild desires in visualizing his past in the portrait.

The historical visibility of the painting aligns it with realism according to Wilde’s framework. Realism is not a neutral category of representation for Wilde, and indeed the label could be

---

220 Wilde’s statement of the relative interest of the visible and the invisible echoes the French fin-de-siècle painter Odilon Redon, who purported to make art so as to, in his words, “place the logic of the visible at the service of the invisible” (Hauptman 59). Redon belonged to the coterie of Huysmans (see Gamboni), whose À Rebours had a major influence on Wilde, and which inspired the corrupting “yellow book” in Dorian Gray itself (Goldstone 627).

221 In The Birth of the Clinic, Foucault suggests that “the relation between the visible and the invisible is […] necessary to all concrete knowledge” (xiii), and that it is always “linked with the division between what is stated and what remains unsaid” (xii). What Foucault calls the “visible invisible” is the manifest secrecy of the human body that simultaneously presents and hides its truths (209).

222 Craft further suggests that the portrait is the “precipitate of Basil’s troubled desire for Dorian” (120) and demonstrates that the work “intervenes in an already entrenched history of thought regarding the place of vision and reflection—of specular mimesis—in the constitution of individual identity, of sexual desire, even of truth itself” (110).

223 Jeff Nunokawa suggests that a “fetishism of the gaze” is the “chief form of worship in The Picture of Dorian Gray” (128) and that the dynamics of eroticized visuality invoke both painted and real individuals. Observing the intricacies of the gaze between Dorian and Basil, Nunokawa writes that “The distraction of the young man’s glance in these pictures exhibits the blindness that defines the condition of any painted figure, none of whom are after all in a position to look back upon the eye fixed upon them” (140).
considered an insult in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Wilde’s “The Decay of Lying” proposes realism as a kind of campy fetishism of the present moment. The character Vivian declares that, “As a method Realism is a complete failure, and the two things that every artist should avoid are modernity of form and modernity of subject-matter. To us, who live in the nineteenth century, any century is a suitable subject for art except our own” (191). Realism here presumes a historically particular and contemporary setting. Wilde confirms the idea that realism occupies itself with the facts of the present in *Dorian Gray*. Setting “Romanticism” and “Realism” in contest, the opening epigrams claim, “The nineteenth century dislike of Realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass. The nineteenth century dislike of Romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass” (167). Replicating the visuality of realization, for Wilde, realism is the unwanted and too-accurate sight of historical reality in the mirror of representation. Wilde’s “Realism” here, in contrast to “Romanticism,” denotes a view of the historical world as available to intelligence through uncomplicated vision. Writing on such juxtaposition of romantic and realist elements in *De Profundis*, Regenia Gagnier states that “romance dreams a future for the prisoner and resists the temporal regimentation of prison life; realism, in its patient enumeration of details, reconstructs the past obliterated by the sterile prison space” (179). For Wilde, realism and its “patient enumeration of details” provide a point of access between dreamscapes and history, a hope of “reconstruct[ing] the past,” and thus recuperating the present. Realism and realization both restore the past for spectators willing to see it.

Indeed, the realizations of Dorian’s painting allow it to stand as a symbol of visual realism. The portrait enables an on-going process of iteration, an historical authorship through the accumulation of represented time. Dorian notes that the painting “was conscious of the events of life as they occurred” and “had received the news of Sibyl Vane’s death before he had known of

---

224 The novel evaluates realism’s characteristic accumulation of details. Lord Henry Wotton, who claims to hate “vulgar realism in literature” (334), also announces that “One should absorb the colour of life, but one should never remember its details. Details are always vulgar” (254). A critique of the “vulgarité” in details and realism is repeated in Basil’s complaint that people of the nineteenth century “in [their] madness [...] have invented a realism that is vulgar, an ideality that is void!” (177). Ronald R. Thomas suggests that vulgarity in *Dorian Gray* “mediates not only between a certain kind of “realism” in book and picture” but also “between private life and public spectacle” (“Poison Books” 185). Though these characters declare the vulgarity of details and realism in general, Basil in fact describes his method of painting Dorian in clothes of his own era as “Realism” (264). It seems that realism is not universally vulgar, but it can be an historically accurate aesthetic mode to which acclaimed artists like Basil might aspire, and which great paintings (such as Dorian’s portrait) manifest.
it himself” (257). The docketing “consciousness” of the painting is allied with historiographical prose, as well as with the abundance of details that characterizes realism, and Dorian indeed several times refers to the work as writing. He “keeps a diary of [his] life from day to day” that “never leaves the room in which it is written,” and which he invites Basil Hallward to “read” (296). The documentation of the past that the painting keeps is more specific than visual media is supposed to be, and Dorian fears that its silent display could take on the weight of testimony after his murder of Basil (356). With its all-too-accurate visibility, the painting itself proposes an alternative realist text. While the accumulation of detail in the portrait aligns it with realism, its fantastical spectrality enables its overabundant display of historical information, just as the narrative itself juxtaposes realist, Gothic, and supernatural elements. Wilde modifies the realist novel of personal history or education by re-imagining the source of authentic knowledge about his subject. The painting becomes the best authority on Dorian’s history, exceeding even the text itself in documentary value. The truth about Dorian is not Wilde’s written narrative, but rather a fictional painting seen through the text of the book. As Ronald R. Thomas writes, “the subject of this book is not Dorian Gray’s story; it is his picture, his image” (“Poison Books” 187). As a representation that parallels realism in its transcription of an history of character, the overeager knack of the painting for keeping track of Dorian allows it to realize his life by rendering his past visible.

While the painting itself can be read as a corollary for literary realism, Wilde’s involvement of the reader in realizing Dorian’s past also reorganizes realism’s interpretive codes. The reader visualizing Dorian’s portrait combines the roles of audience and actor, and so recalls Elizabeth Ermarth’s concept of the rationalization of perspective in realism, which tends to imply a spectator (Realism 20-21). The histories realized by Dorian’s portrait, the anonymous historical voice of the narration, and the reading subject collide tellingly at the end of the book. Speaking of the knife he has used to murder Basil Hallward, in free indirect discourse the narrator writes for Dorian, “As it had killed the painter, so it would kill the painter’s work, and all that that meant. It would kill the past, and when that was dead he would be free” (357). Dorian links the

225 Dorian Gray is particular about person, time, and place, as Ian Watt suggests realism must be (31). It also displays a markedly innovative foray into the established genres of “magic-picture” (Powell 148), Faust (Oates 419), and Narcissus (Craft 110) stories. Observing the Gothic inheritance of the text, Craft points out that Wilde’s appropriation of Ovid’s Narcissus story is distinguished by technology: “Ovid employs a ‘natural’ speculum, Wilde an artificial and supernatural one” (114).
painting to the past itself and ascribes to both the ability to die, giving them each a living quality. Rather than inventing a ghost to represent the past, Wilde reveals the undead nature of the past itself, which may be killed through forgetting or by a strike at an artwork. Dorian’s resulting death combines representation and the real: once Dorian has stabbed the picture, the narrator writes, “There was a cry heard, and a crash” (357), begging the questions of who hears, and what kind of history is being witnessed and written. Within moments we are to infer Dorian’s death, but the shift in perspective announces his sudden absence. Though his is the primary consciousness of the novel, he cannot see or hear himself die. The reader might choose to assume that the implied aural audience of the cry and the crash are Dorian’s servants, but perhaps ought not to feel so detached from the narrative.

In the sound of the crash is a history representing itself for whomever will listen, a history realized in the implied sensorium of the implied witness and the implied reader. Readers trained in realism are not merely spectators but actors as well. In the uncertain landscape of Dorian’s house, where sound may or may not travel, we realize the cry and the crash. We are left, or rather I, the reader, am left, to be the actor and spectator creating the history by reading it, and by hearing Dorian’s cry in place of the absent subject of the sentence. This line then, “There was a cry heard, and a crash,” represents a history produced as much by the reader’s realization as by the author’s incomplete disclosure. Significantly, given the emphasis of the book on visible history, the substrate of historical evidence here turns from the visible to the audible. The quick shift is an ironic reversal of the characters’ fetishization of the visible in favour of another kind of history. The audible cry is a reminder of the evidence of the invisible given in noise and the visualizations prompted by invisible sounds. Wilde here invites his audience, those reading along to the sound of one hand clapping while a tree or a man falls in this forest of a novel, to remember that nothing is so real as unreal words. Equally marvellous is his invention of undeniable sound, which readers find themselves obliged to realize by witnessing: if the crash and the cry were not heard by a fictional character, they must have been heard by a real one,

226 Michael Patrick Gillespie argues a similar point in suggesting that, in “The Critic as Artist,” “Wilde the critic is demanding that Wilde the artist acknowledge the concept that the determination of meaning rests at least in part with each reader who encounters the work” (45). On the question of the viewership of Dorian’s readers, Craft writes that “readers get to watch a pretty boy become a beautiful image, then watch again while the same boy identifies with that mimetic image” (121).
reading. The crash and the cry are as real as the portrait realized by the reading mind’s eye, just as its display of Dorian’s criminality attests to the reader’s guilt in tandem with his.

Without a known witness, the cry that the reader is forced to realize replicates the device of Dorian’s historiographic portrait. The unheard sound, like the unseen portrait, represents a history that only the reader can generate, realize, and verify. Locked in the experience of the reader, where only words are real, the ultimate realization of the work transpires in the reader’s consciousness. The scene tacitly queries what evidence of Dorian’s final crime could be admitted in court, and so offers an example of what D. A. Miller calls a “radical entanglement between the nature of the novel and the practice of the police” (Novel 2, italics original). The possibility that the fantastical scene of Dorian’s murder of himself would defy documentation in police shots undermines the valorisation of visible evidence in the rest of the narrative. In contrast to Nancy Armstrong’s description of the real in nineteenth-century literature as that which is photographable, using photoreproduction to document history or the visible world here loses credibility in relation to the individual subject realizing what actually happened. History in this fiction is the product of the reader’s realization. The contest between visibility and language is swiftly resolved. The written—or painted—documentation of a subject’s realizing perspective trumps the impotent-until-seen evidence of the visible world.

Wilde’s realization invites readers to contribute to his text through a generative gaze on the invisible portrait, allowing them to view past sins that only they could authorize. By involving audiences, readers, and spectators in acts of representation, by enabling them to visualize the histories they desire, Wilde’s realization represents a novel literary innovation that underpins the strange charisma of The Picture of Dorian Gray.

Picturing the Past: Realization in the Age of Photography

As a literary invention with implications for visualization and spectatorship, Wilde’s realization has a place in the history of visual culture. Its significance can be better understood in the context of theories of the display of the past in visual media and the relation between words and images. Dorian’s portrait throws into relief the authorities of painting and its windows on the past during the assimilation of the changes that photography precipitated in ways of seeing history. Wilde’s novel enacts an ironic comparison of the two media. Through an examination of theories of
picturing the past, photographic evidence, and the literary history of portraits, in the section that follows I situate the historical visibility of Wilde’s realization in fin-de-siècle visual culture.

The relation between picturing and historical realization that Wilde’s novel proposes recalls Walter Pater’s fables of visual historiography in Imaginary Portraits (1887). Pater’s title itself anticipates Wilde’s two titles that classify prose works as visual documents of individuals, The Picture of Dorian Gray and The Portrait of Mr W.H. Norman Kelvin notes that Wilde and Pater’s “portrait” titles are part of a late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century trend in titling novels, one in which Henry James and James Joyce also participated (117-18). Despite the contrasts in their approaches, both Pater and Wilde imagine the painted portrait as the biography of visual culture, and as a metaphorical alternative to biographical narrative.

Richard Wendorf points out that the relation between images and language is duplicated in the connection between portraiture and biography: “the biographer will be able to find specific models for his work among the various forms of portraiture” (98). Biographically driven chapters comprise Pater’s book, each of which is devoted to another artful character. Pater’s portrait stories thus reveal their inheritance of his precursor Vasari, who focused on biography as a primary prose method for art historical writing. Examining the visualization of the past in a medium whose elevated cultural position was changing if not threatened in nature, both Wilde and Pater use the idea of painted prose to realize history.

227 On the depth of Wilde’s intellectual affinity for Pater and his work, see Ellmann (47-53).
228 Kelvin reads this titling trend as evidence of a reaction against photography (125).
229 While Allison Pease suggests that Wilde followed Pater in his focus on the “responsiveness of the individual mind to the art object” (103), a fin-de-siècle contention between images and history differentiates how these authors saw the literary rendering of their fictional portraits. In particular, Pater’s classification of his portraits as “imaginary” distinguishes the two authors’ approaches to literary portraiture. For Pater, “imaginary” refers both to his stories’ preoccupation with images as well as to their origins in a fancy that is detached from the particularities of realism. The work explores what Wilde, in a review, called the “impress of real character” (“Mr Pater’s” 13). In the same essay Wilde calls Pater an “intellectual Impressionist” (14), further linking his prose style to visual art. One of Pater’s portraits, “A Prince of Court Painters,” refers to a “real” historical figure in Antony Watteau, but in general the stories are far more “imaginary” than Dorian Gray in their detachment from identifiable landscapes. Wilde’s emphatic placement of Dorian’s life and scene within a recognizably 1890s London, with concerns and cares that could make him the personality for the age, are more aligned with literary realism than with the subjective visuality of what he termed Pater’s “impressionism.”
230 References to Vasari’s The Lives of the Artists (1550) striate Pater’s The Renaissance (1873) (29, 57, 68, etc). Lynn Walhout Hinojosa notes Vasari’s enormous influence in defining the meaning of the Renaissance throughout the nineteenth century in Britain (31), while Paul Barolsky demonstrates the rhetorical artifices of Vasari’s use of biography to illustrate the history of Renaissance art (32).
Wilde’s use of the word “picture” for the title of his novel announces his own placement of the book in relation to visual culture. Daniel Novak argues that Wilde’s choice of “picture” for his title can be contextualized with reference to nineteenth-century photography criticism, which associated “a “picture” with language and narrative,” and “a “portrait” with a form of mechanical realism” (Realism 136). Rather than referring directly to Basil’s painting, Wilde’s use of “picture” in his title could imply what The Oxford English Dictionary suggests is now a rare meaning of “picture”: “The art or process of pictorial representation; the fact or condition of being pictorially represented” (“picture”). Not simply a reference to Basil’s portrait, therefore, the “picture” of Dorian Gray can also be read via W. J. T. Mitchell’s interpretation of “picturing.” Mitchell excavates “picture” as a practice (“picturing”) and as a representational object (Picture Theory 4, 4n5). He suggests that “to picture” is a theoretical act and a moment of visual representation (57). Like realization, picturing involves audiences in creating the representations they perceive. In his examination of picturing, Mitchell includes an essay on what he calls metapictures, images that are self-referential, that are “pictures about pictures” (35), and that “show themselves in order to know themselves: they stage the “self-knowledge” of pictures” (48). Such images, Mitchell writes, “don’t just illustrate theories of picturing and vision: they show us what vision is, and picture theory” (57). According to Mitchell’s theorization, metapictures, like Magritte’s Ceci n’est pas une pipe, integrate contradictory meanings either through text, visually, or both, and so “interrogate the authority of the speaking subject over the seen image” (68). The mission of such pictures “is to picture the relation between the visible and the readable in the intersections of power, desire, and knowledge” (81-82). Of such images that concern the act of picturing and that sometimes integrate text, Mitchell writes, “the very identities of words and images, the sayable and the seeable, begin to shimmer and shift in the composition, as if the image could speak and the words were on display” (68). Dorian’s portrait can be read as a metapicture because it portrays the signification of the visible. In its startling expansion of the representational power of painted depiction, Dorian’s portrait instructs readers in the usual limits of paintings. Like a metapicture, it is a picture about visual representation, a picture that references picturing. While the text involves the reader in picturing Dorian Gray, the portrait itself also represents the act of picturing in its realization of the past. To

231 Elsewhere W. J. T. Mitchell addresses The Picture of Dorian Gray itself to suggest in passing that the novel “reminds of the equivocal moral status of the work of art” (“911” 572).
read Wilde’s novel is thus to be involved in picturing Dorian Gray, the character, and his past in the portrait that realizes his history by picturing him.

By accepting that the portrait realizes Dorian’s history, Wilde’s readers view the image as a picture of the past, an act of spectatorship that recalls the impact of photography on the historical imagination. The visual resurrection of historical evidence in Wilde’s realization exemplifies Barthes’s account of photographic apprehensions of the past. For Barthes, only its visibility in photographs makes the past fully real. “Perhaps we have an invincible resistance to believing in the past, in History, except in the form of myth,” he writes. “The Photograph, for the first time, puts an end to this resistance: henceforth the past is as certain as the present, what we see on paper is as certain as what we touch. It is the advent of the Photograph—and not, as has been said, of the cinema—which divides the history of the world” (Camera 88). In attributing to photography the very certainty that the past exists, Barthes ascribes a monumental historical significance to the new medium, but also to visibility itself. This historical visibility features in Dorian’s portrait since it verifies his past: realizing Dorian’s past in his painting reflects modes of interpreting historical evidence in photographs. “The important thing,” Barthes writes, “is that the photograph possesses an evidential force, and that its testimony bears not on the object but on time” (89). Like a photograph, according to Barthes’s framework, Dorian’s portrait is a work of visible history that, by bearing witness to Dorian’s experience, offers an “evidential force” that attests to the passage of time itself. In its spectral realization of history through the preservation of the past, Basil’s painting invites spectators and readers to view it through the interpretative codes of photography.

232 Dorian and his portrait also evince the spectral death-in-life quality that Barthes and Bazin famously associate with photography. Barthes explains this trait in the feeling of being photographed: “I am neither subject nor object but a subject who feels he is becoming an object: I then experience a micro-version of death (of parenthesis): I am truly becoming a specter” (Camera 14). Bazin describes the “mummy complex” at the heart of the medium, writing that “[t]o preserve, artificially, his bodily appearance is to snatch it from the flow of time” (9). This body-snatching character of photography is replicated in the mummification Dorian himself experiences. His own aging is displaced to the painting until the final “murder” scene that loads decay onto his body. Gaines, too, notes that Bazin’s notions of mummification and photography illuminate Dorian Gray. She suggests that since the novel gives a representation the mortal decay that threatens human bodies in photographs, it offers “an illustration of the “mummy complex,” but in reverse” (43).
Given the increasing presence of photographs in his milieu, Wilde’s choice to realize Dorian’s past in a painting rather than a photograph can be read as an oddity in media history. While the painting is, as Christopher Craft writes, “part of the well-rehearsed Gothic technology bequeathed to Wilde by his forebears” (114), it is both strange and still unsurprising that Wilde should have kept the “technology” of painting in deploying this trope. Indeed, the Gothic tradition of literary pictures was itself responding to new visual media. Susan Williams argues that photographic technology reinvigorated the Gothic magic picture tale and advises reading Dorian Gray as “an attempt to re-enchant the disenchanted portrait by returning to an earlier tradition” (189). According to this interpretation, Wilde’s novel reissues the device of the Gothic painting as a response to photography. Whereas a photograph preserves the image of youth in contrast to the subject’s aging body, Dorian ages in the portrait and his young body endures. Kamilla Elliott demonstrates that Romantic Gothic fictions often use portraits to “rationalize the uncanny” by allowing characters to see the resemblance between ghostly apparitions and the painted faces of dead forbears (7). In Wilde’s post-photographic use of this trope, the resemblance that verifies the presence of the uncanny is between the different versions of Dorian, painted and embodied, aging and youthful, mortal and apparently immortal. Thus Wilde’s realization of Dorian’s past in his portrait inherits a Gothic tradition of portraiture that was in the process of being reconfigured by changes in visual culture.

In the age of photography, what are the stakes of realizing or picturing a character’s history through a painting? The historical meaning of the painting would be different were Basil a photographer, and his portrait of Dorian a photograph, and indeed, the seventeen or eighteen photographs of Dorian that Henry is said to possess represent precisely this photographic alternative to Basil’s painting (45-46). The abundance of these pictures nears the copia of

---

233 Carol Armstrong explains that, due to a variety of advances in printing technology, in the 1880s photographs were for the first time widely available in newspapers and books (424-25). At the same time, the technique was also becoming accessible to amateurs in the shape of Kodak cameras, and Daniel Novak notes that Wilde himself was very taken with the possibilities of the medium and became an avid photographer towards the end of his life (Realism 145). Tom Gunning links this arrival of hand cameras to the use of photography in detection, and the idea of photographic evidence (46-65). An almost instant art was now open to regular folk, one that was already imagined to be “automatic and mechanical” (Tucker 4).

234 “Even as the daguerreotype and other reproductive technologies challenged the pictorial power of writers,” Susan Williams writes, “they also encouraged those writers to use portraits to create a realm beyond mimetic representation” (3). The abundance of these portraits in the nineteenth century, she suggests, can “be read as a commentary on the daguerreotype, which was itself often seen as an agent both of perfect imitation and Gothic magic” (11).
twenty-four frames per second, and, in contrast to the extreme uniqueness of Dorian’s painted portrait, their excess makes their precise number irrelevant. Without participating in as long a tradition, and with less hope of being definitely unique, were Basil’s portrait of Dorian a photograph it would realize a different sort of history. When Wilde wrote *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, the authoritative visual depiction of identity was, for a few more years at least, open to media other than the photograph. Yet even then, as Wilde’s setting of Dorian’s portrait in paint suggests, when compared with photography, documents made with older visual media could offer only ironic authority on the details of a human face. By the 1890s a painting could accuse by portraying a narrative, or it could be stolen goods, but, in the face of forensic uses of photography, the idea that it could give incriminating evidence, the trace rather than the testimony of a real event, must have seemed pointedly ironic.

The portrait, Dorian’s invisible visible history, is painted both in technique and in sordid inference, but is also a dead-serious satirization of a nineteenth-century willingness to interpret photographs as authoritative evidence of the past. Just as Dorian’s portrait seems to provide the definitive record and trace of his history, the visibility of the past in photography seems to verify its truth. As Susan Sontag writes, “The consequences of lying have to be more central

---

235 British police forces had employed photographers to produce evidence of identity since the 1840s, but Wilde was writing at a curious moment just prior to what John Tagg describes as the early twentieth-century proliferation of photographic detection that accompanied the invention of fingerprint identification (74-75). Police uses of photography, Tagg writes, are “clearly underpinned by a whole set of assumptions about the reality of the photograph, and the real “in” the photograph” (76).

236 Comparing painting and photography, Gregory Currie suggests that “photography is not just a device to make paintings by cheaper and quicker means; a photograph is a trace of its subject, while a painting is testimony of it” (142, italics original). In Victorian courts, however, the authority of photographs sometimes neared the status of testimony as well as trace. Writing on judicial uses of photography in the nineteenth century, Jennifer Green-Lewis observes that “[d]espite their figuration by courts as images produced “not by the hand of man,” in certain circumstances, photographs have been held to constitute “written evidence”” (189). They also were made to function like utterances: “Although a photograph was not admissible as testimony in the courts,” Green-Lewis writes, “as mug shots began to be made by force in jails and police stations, they functioned as such. By photographing a man’s body against his will, after all, in a sense one forced him to testify against himself” (199).

237 Daniel Novak reads the novel “as a fiction about photography and about photographic fiction” (*Realism* 145), and writes that “having become the portrait, Dorian turns Basil’s painting into a reproducible work of art. That is, he turns painting into photography” (139, italics original).

238 Barthes explains that, “in the Photograph, the power of authentication exceeds the power of representation” (89), and he suggests that “our vision” of photography “is certain—contrary to the text or to other perceptions which give me the object in a vague, arguable manner, and therefore incite me to suspicions as to what I think I am seeing” (106, italics original). Bazin also describes the certainty of photographic visibility. In “The Ontology of Photography,” he writes that “[t]he objective nature of photography confers on it a quality of credibility absent from all other picture-making” (13). While painting or drawing may in fact be more revealing, “despite the promptings of
for photography than they ever can be for painting […] A fake painting (one whose attribution is false) falsifies the history of art. A fake photograph (one which has been retouched or tampered with, or whose caption is false) falsifies reality” (86). Even when they lie, photographs propose themselves as traces of reality, thereby seeming to remove the potential for falsity from their testimony.239 Jennifer Green-Lewis writes that nineteenth-century courts imagined that the photograph “could be a self-evident and self-explanatory truth” (189). In both photography and Dorian’s portrait, visual disclosure makes verbal admission irrelevant, allowing pictures to realize history independent of speaking subjects. The visibility of the imagined evidence of Dorian’s portrait in the eye of the reader confirms its veracity, just as it would in a photograph.

“After all, what is a fine lie?” Wilde writes in “The Decay of Lying.” “Simply that which is its own evidence” (165). Following Wilde’s logic and discussions of the credibility of photography, a false photograph would be the finest of lies, because it would be read as its own evidence. Wilde’s novel creates a fine lie in a fictional painting that asks to be read for its photographic evidence about the past; that is, for its testimony about the truth of Dorian’s history. Paralleling Dorian’s own description of his portrait as “evidence” (356), in Sophia Lee’s Gothic novel The Recess (1783-86), Lord Leicester declares, “Look but at that picture, and you will find an indubitable evidence of my sincerity” (40). Separated by a century, these two Gothic references to the evidence of portraits carry significantly different connotations. The word “evidence” implies truth in visibility, since it is taken from the Latin for that which comes out from seeing, that which appears.240 Lee’s pre-photographic use of the word to describe painted information is earnest. In contrast, Dorian’s description of evidence must be read ironically, as the neurotic and imprecise label of a troubled mind, because his painting offers only unspecific documentation of his past that, unlike a photograph, could not be offered in a court as evidence of any particular crime. While both novels participate in a common Gothic tradition of literary pictures, in the years between them, photography intervened in the meaning of visible evidence. The reader’s

---

239 On reading photographs as “traces,” see Snyder (224-25).
240 The Oxford English Dictionary explains that the word is constructed as follows: “ē- out + vident-em, present participle of vidēre to see” (“evident”).
discovery of history in Dorian’s painting replicates habits of viewing evidence about the past in photographs, and reveals Wilde’s caricature of photographic truth.

In addition to reflecting the photographic preservation of history, the visibility of Dorian’s past in the portrait can be read in relation to concepts of photographic duration. Dorian’s portrait displays a marked mutability in contrast to, for example, Queen Victoria’s notion that having her photograph taken meant having her image “fixed” (Green-Lewis 1-2). This idea that photographs rendered their subjects static parallels the terminology of photographic processing, which involves a bath of chemical “fixer.” Indeed, the pace of the developing photograph, its own logic of slow display, informs the gradual alteration of Dorian’s portrait. Bit by bit, Dorian’s painting exposes his past, allowing the picture to compare the tempo of photographic exposure and processing to the rhythm of human aging. In this sense, Wilde’s visual realization of the past explores the potential for what we now call time-based media. Just as Batchen describes a pre-photographic “desire” to photograph in European culture, the visualization of progressing time in Dorian’s portrait seems to mirror photographic method and anticipate cinema.243 The impassive, almost mechanical, transcription of the painting imitates photographic processes and anticipates twentieth-century recording devices. As it represents Dorian’s changing face, the painting looks backward and forward to a new mode of art that arguably realizes the passage of time more precisely than any that had come before.

Wilde’s realization, the spectatorship that sees and creates the past in images, can thus be situated within the history of visual culture through its relation to the literary picturing and habits of interpreting photographs as historical documents. Picturing the past in the age of photography, Wilde’s realization corresponds to contemporaneous shifts in the literary and material history of images even as it invents a novel form of textual visibility.

241 Richard Benson traces the invention and naming of this stage of the photographic developing process (152).
242 Ronald R. Thomas observes that Dorian’s portrait is essentially a “motion picture” (“Poison Books” 186), a work of very, very slow cinema, and a time-based portrait. Though as Thomas notes no public theatrical display of moving pictures had occurred in London by the time Wilde published Dorian Gray (189), reading the portrait for its cinematic intimations is encouraged by other instances of Wilde’s fascination with the visual display of motion in general: for example, a passage at the opening of The Picture of Dorian Gray imagines “shadows” across silk curtains as a visual mode of representing movement (169).
243 Batchen writes, “the desire to photograph was felt by a wide range of individuals in a number of different countries during the thirty years prior to the actual introduction of a marketable photography in 1839” (56).
“Wilde in Costume as Salome”: The Afterlives of Wilde’s Realization

I close my study of Wilde’s realization of visible history with a discussion of a false photograph of Wilde himself, the picture Richard Ellmann mislabelled as “Wilde in costume as Salome” in his 1987 biography (428). Like Dorian’s portrait, Ellmann’s image in collaboration with its spurious caption realizes a visible history. Interpreting Ellmann’s image alongside Dorian Gray thus reveals the endurance of Wilde’s visual realizations of the past. The verisimilitude of Ellmann’s image depends on conventions of interpreting photographs, but Dorian’s portrait satirizes those same customs of seeing history with certainty in pictures. Readers may feel emboldened to add to Wilde’s novel by imagining past experiences for Dorian; likewise, the misidentified photograph authorizes viewers to see a fictional history of a Wilde in drag. Like spectators of Dorian’s portrait, viewers of this image read it for visible history, and so enact a belated Wildean realization. Reading Ellmann’s portrait alongside Dorian’s further illuminates the realizing spectatorship of Wilde’s readers, revealing another aspect of the history of his authorship and influence.

Just as readers imagine Dorian’s crimes in visualizing his portrait, for viewers unaware of the error, Ellmann’s enthusiastically reproduced image displays a new history of a transvestite Wilde. The 1906 photograph of actress Alice Guszalewicz interpreting Salome was first mis-captioned as Wilde in a review in La Monde published on March 20, 1987, and then quickly reprinted in Ellmann’s then-forthcoming biography of Wilde. As John Stokes writes, “fake and mistake, the association was tempting because the circumstances seemed right, or could be made to seem so” (18). Merlin Holland discredited the caption of the portrait and definitively restored its proper identification as Guszalewicz in “Wilde as Salomé?”, published in the Times Literary Supplement in 1994. Remarking on the image and the excitement it generated, Alan Sinfield concludes that “cultures observe the Wilde they expect and want to see” (6). While this picture, like Dorian’s, allows its viewers to see the history they crave, it is Wilde’s own

---

244 Addressing Wilde’s enduring authorial presence, Novak suggests that “we are of course still trying to “know” and read Wilde through his endlessly reproduced image and pose” (Realism 118), and that the reproducibility of Wilde’s image is crucial to its legibility. Aiming “to historicize how we read photographs of Wilde” (118), Novak asks “what happens to sexuality in the age of technological reproducibility,” and concludes that if “Wilde is figured as a type, and as the embodiment of homosexuality as such, sexuality becomes legible as a specific and individual image and pose, but, paradoxically, as a reproducible one” (120).

245 See Merlin Holland’s “Wilde as Salomé?” for the complete account of the archival history of the image.
discourse of realization that authorizes the cultural willingness to discover new history by looking at portraits.

Confirming the tacit connection between the renovations of photography and Wilde’s visual realizations of the past, the apparition of history in Ellmann’s picture works because the image is a photograph. If Ellmann had mislabelled a painting of “Wilde in costume as Salome,” it would not have been read as historical evidence of a certain history. Attached to a photograph, the caption seems less equivocal. The crucial incorporation of the misleading caption makes the image into what W. J. T. Mitchell would call a metapicture: we see here again that in the contradiction between the caption and the image, “words and images, the sayable and the seeable, begin to shimmer and shift […] as if the image could speak and the words were on display” (Picture 68). The caption, “Wilde in costume as Salome,” makes the picture into its own fiction and its own ekphrasis, its wishful representation of what might be said to be in the image. In mislabelling the image, putting the words, “Wilde in costume as Salome” on display, Richard Ellmann seems to point out something that certainly existed because it is visible in a photograph. In fact he inadvertently invented a history and its evidence by saying that it was visible, allowing viewers to continuously realize the past the image seems to display.

By letting an image authorize new versions of the past, viewers who believe the history implied by Ellmann’s image participate in Wildean realization, and indeed, this suggestively mis-captioned photo has inspired many published engagements with its visible history of a Wilde-in-drag. The critical uses that have been made of the picture reveal a desire to broaden Wilde’s role in a genealogy of modern gender theory. Merlin Holland himself uses this anecdote in an argument about the affinities between the failures of historical writing and Wilde’s pleasure in the authenticities of the untrue (“Biography” 10-12). In Sexual Anarchy, published in 1991, Elaine Showalter uses the episode to read Salome as a narrative of homosexual desire, an interpretation she defended after Holland’s revelation in 1994.

---

246 In recounting the history of the image, like Sontag, Holland notes that “Photographs are seldom reproduced with corroborative evidence or footnotes. On condition they resemble their captions, they pass unquestioned” (“Biography” 10-11).

247 See Sexual Anarchy (156-57) for Showalter’s original mention and reproduction of the image. In “It’s Still Salome,” her response to Merlin Holland published in the Times Literary Supplement a few weeks after his refutation of the image in the same journal, Showalter concludes, “we will miss the picture of Wilde as Salomè, but apart from footnotes, seeing Alice instead of Oscar isn’t going to change a lot.”
Interests, Marjorie Garber cites the image in a reading of gender and transvestism (339-45), writing that “The drag Salome is not a send up but a radical reading that tells the truth” (339). Here again we see the visibility of the image taken to confirm its authenticity. In his 1994 history of drag, Roger Baker includes a description of the mislabelled photo, suggesting that it possibly depicts Wilde (129), only footnoting (with a whiff of disappointment) Holland’s demonstration that it certainly does not show the author himself (133f). In her 1995 study of “bitextuality” in *fin-de-siècle* illustrated books, a work preoccupied by Wilde and his oeuvre and published after Holland’s exposure of the false image, Lorraine Janzen Kooistra cites Ellmann’s Salome photograph to open a chapter entitled, “Cross-Dressing,” asking whether Wilde was “occupying a female subject position when he dressed in the character of Salome” (203). These readings of this false image eagerly build on the suggestiveness of Wilde’s texts to give his figure as author a new place in the history of drag and its interventions in discourses of gender. In the eyes of these critics, that which the image makes visible realizes a new history for Wilde.

Wilde coming out of the closet as a cross-dresser was a thread of history that never spoke its name, but that was realized by being made visible. While Merlin Holland argues that drag ran contrary to Wilde’s habits of sexual expression (“Biography” 11), perhaps something in Ellmann’s late-eighties milieu rendered a Wilde-in-drag useful, as a further extension of the author’s discourse of liberalization. Laurence Senelick demonstrates that while drag performances had been fairly common in clubs from the nineteen-thirties and earlier, they gained new popular visibility and acceptance in mainstream culture following the emergence of AIDS as a consolidating force in the fight for queer rights: “the AIDS pandemic invested drag with new vitality as a tool of protest” (*Changing* 469). Wilde’s legend legitimated new space for

---

248 Megan Becker-Leckrone critiques the foundation of this reading on the false photograph (253-54).
249 Helen Davies suggests that despite the inaccuracy of the “Wilde in costume of Salome” photograph, its uses by critics demonstrate that “it still functions as a generative artifact, exposing a line of enquiry into the promise—and problems—that cross-gendered identification can offer to critics” (56).
250 Petra Dierkus-Thrun addresses the role of this spurious photograph in lending Wilde’s support to a gay rights movement that also put stock in the visualizations of his history in 1990s biopics and theatre (177-78).
251 “As with the term ‘queer’ and the act of ‘coming out,’” Senelick continues, “what had once been considered shameful or shabby was reclaimed and rehabilitated as a defiant emblem of selfhood. The stereotypes of burnt-out and suicidal transsexuals were replaced by images of self-confident men who had no desire to be women but had a good time wearing their clothes” (469). In his own commentary on the “Wilde in costume as Salome” photograph, Senelick suggests that the story “makes for a cautionary fable about leaping to conclusions in matters of iconography” and that it reveals a cultural desire to read all gay men as “naturally” drag performers (“Master Wood’s Profession” 165).
homosexuality in culture. The eagerness to believe the revisionist history in Ellmann’s picture reflects the desire to see Wilde as a *pater familias* to drag performers, a nineteenth-century authority figure for a queer practice that was gaining mainstream visibility and acceptance. Given the strength generated by Wilde’s story for the battle for gay rights, in the late nineteen-eighties it could have seemed culturally expedient—to Ellmann, his publishers, and his readers—to have Wilde’s further support in this new front.252

Those critics who imagined new Wildean history by pointing out its visibility in the false Salome image inherit Wilde’s own texts. Like readers of *Dorian Gray*, they, too, realize a fictional past by looking at a portrait. The realizing spectatorship that looks at images for the histories they imply but do not specify can be read as a visual form of irony growing from Wilde’s authorship, since the image that reveals history that it does not make explicit enacts contradictory signification. Linda Hutcheon argues that ironic objects activate contradictory meanings from a common ground of understanding between ironist and beholder, and that “discursive communities” make irony possible by creating a field of shared knowledge (*Irony’s Edge* 98-101). This collaboration is present in the interpretation of visual irony, too. As Biljana Scott writes, the “ironic bent” of the viewer is what allows for visual irony (54). We can see Wilde’s readers as a discursive community of people who, assimilating the lessons of *Dorian Gray*, might be willing to discover contradictory meaning and untold histories in portraits. Thus by interpreting a new silent history for Wilde by viewing the Salome photograph, those who took up this picture as an accurate historical document of Wilde’s transvestism demonstrate their training as his readers. They prove their inheritance of *Dorian Gray* in generating new history by looking at a portrait, furthering Wilde’s realization as a mode of creative spectatorship that endures in visual culture.

The history realized by this false image is so visible and powerful because it is delivered in a photograph in a book. Since the essential reproducibility of the Salome image bolsters its visible history, this episode in the history of Wilde’s authorship recalls the fictions of *The Woman in White* and *The Portrait of Mr W.H.* While Collins’s Mr. Fairlie preserves the past by reproducing

\[252\] Matt Cook explains that while Wilde had been an important figure for queer discourse throughout the twentieth century, in the nineteen-eighties the potency of his story gained fresh prominence in a new wave of writing informed by postructuralism (286).
visual media in *The Woman in White*, the character in *Mr W.H.* looks for historical truth in the “full-length portrait of a young man in late sixteenth-century costume” (4). He sees in the image “an authentic portrait of Mr W.H. with his hand resting on the dedicatory page of the Sonnets” with the name “Master Will Hews” written in the corner (17). The narrator here is a sleuth of portraits as much as he is the investigator of a missing historical character. The discovery in a printer’s shop of a drawing of the painted portrait (18-19) places the literal duplicitousness of modern reproduction methods in stark contrast to the singularity of antique modes of painted portraiture. Printed and bound in a book, and then printed again in more books, and then copied online, the inviting reproducibility of Ellmann’s Salome image allowed its false history to become tenacious. Without knowing the “real” history, readers will find the image and will interpret it as a “true” photograph forever. Wilde himself might have delighted in the ironies of such an ongoing realization of false history.

Wilde’s realization endures even in contexts only tangentially linked to his work and symbolism in Western culture. For example, when it was discovered on eBay in 2007 and widely posted online, Lucy Mangan wrote of David Bowie’s 1976 mug shot that it presents “an unflappable level gaze that admits nothing, but with the hint of a smile that suggests all sorts of ongoing exotically depraved activities whose existence the authorities do not even suspect.” Mangan here evinces a stronger reading of *Dorian Gray* and of its portrait than of the rather blank picture of Bowie. The residue of Dorian that seems to linger in her reading of the image may be due in part to Bowie’s own active citation of Wilde. Just as Dorian’s history in the reader’s eye transcends the actual purview of the text, the transgressions Mangan imagines for Bowie exceed the frame of his mug shot, and thus elude control by the police. In seeming to confuse Bowie’s

---

253 As Craft writes, the portrait in *Mr W.H.* “corroborates nothing more than the desire for Willie’s substantiation” (119).

254 Declan Kiberd traces Wilde’s emphatic and earnest contribution to the “the resurgence of lying,” and the lasting influence of his promotion of insincerity (276-78). Aligning the duplicity of this photograph with Wilde’s insistence that “A Truth in art is that whose contradictory is also true,” Holland writes that “Equivocality is maintained by both man and artist, and the biographer’s nightmare continues” (“Biography” 3). Andrew Eastham links Pater and Wilde through a common use of ironic detachment in what he terms “aesthetic vampirism” (37).

255 Bowie styled himself upon the suggestiveness of Wilde’s brand, while his celebrity image is likewise read for its reflection of Wilde’s transgressiveness. As Stan Hawkins suggests, “Following in Wilde’s footsteps, [Bowie] ridiculed gender norms by rejecting the stultifying image of masculinity through an adventurous form of representation that set out to shock and amuse” (18). “Bowie’s flirt with a range of unconventional sexual codes in the 1970s,” Hawkins writes, “paved the way for an entire movement still in rage over the indictment of Oscar Wilde in Victoria’s England,” while he, like Wilde, worked toward “Resurrecting androgyny and transvestism through intellectual stylishness” (18).
mug shot with a hundred-year-old fictional painting, Mangan reveals the longevity of Wilde’s realization, his authorization of a practice of seeing untold history in portraits.

A stage in the history of spectatorship, Wilde’s discourse of realization appears first in his fiction about a painting but continues to inform the interpretation of photographs. After Wilde, we read pictures of androgynous young men for a queer history that never speaks its name in words but that nevertheless appears in the visible insinuations of an imagined face. In one of his most powerful and lasting interventions in visual culture, Wilde emboldens viewers to assume that behind a pictured face is a world of past experience whose opportunities and possibilities are as substantive, attractive, and radical as a reader is inclined to realize they could be.
To verify images kills them, and it is always more enriching to imagine than to experience.

- Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space* (88, italics original)

Ghosting my account of the visible and reproducible past in the nineteenth-century British novel has been the history of images in books. While Scott premises his fiction on an illustrated book (18), Darwin looks at the history of the world as an incomplete volume (235) and laments the lack of old pictures of its former states (29), Collins’s Laura recalls Hartright through a book of his drawings (167), Eliot’s characters and contemporaries see Palestine and the past through images in books, and the missing illustration in Wilde’s novel, Dorian’s portrait, teaches readers how to regard a fictional portrait illustrating a late twentieth-century book. To consider the earliest and most recent illustrated books that this project addresses, both Alexander Gordon’s 1726 *Itinerarium* and Richard Ellmann’s 1987 biography appeal to readers’ willingness to assume that an image printed in a book constitutes an accurate reproduction of the past, but only Ellmann’s lets an image stand as history in itself.

Photography has not been the only spur to this increasing willingness to see the past in visual reproductions. Rather, as I suggest in this dissertation, by encouraging readers to imagine visible histories, fictional narrative also promotes this habit of spectatorship. Nineteenth-century British novels sanction, question, represent, and fantasize about the reproduction of prior time in images, either literary or visual, printed in books, and a Benjaminian modernity inheres in their visions of the past as a reproducible display. By way of conclusion, I consider one of the earliest illustrated books ever printed in tandem with a twenty-first century film so as to offer a closing portrayal of what this dissertation reveals about the fictions and ghosts of visible history and print-culture reproducibility in nineteenth-century novels.

Modern readers imagine the utility of images reproduced in books to be linked to their own reproduction of reality, as though images offer windows onto the topic of the text. This semblance of veracity emerged over time and strengthened during the period I examine. The
most famous illustrated incunable is Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum, printed in 1493. Better known as The Nuremberg Chronicle, the work is an illustrated history of the world that is notorious for the overt fictionality of its woodcut images of cities and people. Illustrations were costly embellishments in 1493, too expensive to be designed individually for each depicted place, so the Chronicle repeats its images to illustrate different subjects and makes use of only 645 woodcut blocks for 1809 pictures.256 In this troubled scene of reproduction occasioned by new technologies for printing text and image together, a reading viewer moves from looking at an illustration of Padua (158), and sees Marseille in the same image fewer than forty pages later (191). The proliferating repetitions of the reproduced images in this book match the increasing cultural presence of printed pictures, as though the printers’ enthusiasm for new methods of visual duplication spilled into an eagerness to reproduce the same illustrations within one book. Fifteenth-century readers more familiar with meditative book use and woodcuts printed as pilgrims’ mementos might have enjoyed these pictures as they would devotional icons, as decorative prompts to reflection rather than transparent referents to the places themselves.257 These images are not eyewitness accounts of cities, nor can their makers have meant them to be seen as factual representations. Touristic verification would have been extremely unlikely for most viewers of the book, but its scenes are in any case images of places in time, visible histories not meant to be visitable.258 While the Chronicle participates in an embryonic culture of realism in its depiction of individual cities, the repetition of the pictures drains them of authenticity.259 Even as it prefigures tourism by encouraging a consumerist yearning to see distant locales, the internal reproductions of this book seem to express the futility of trying to depict an authentic

256 David Bland documents these numbers (108). He observes that, in the early history of printed book illustration, the habit of reusing woodblocks in different books, and even in the same books, was very common, and he notes that one illustrated book printed in Ulm in 1483 used the same block thirty-seven times, “and altogether 19 blocks do duty for 134 illustrations!” (106). He attributes this practice to a different visual culture and, of the images in The Nuremberg Chronicle, suggests that “[t]he picture of a city is that of a typical city and it does not matter if it appears on various pages where different cities are mentioned” (106).

257 Brian Stock explains that “[f]or medieval thinkers, reading was rarely an end in itself; most often it was conceived as a means to an end, which was the creation of a contemplative state of mind” (17). Peter Schmidt documents the fifteenth-century history of woodcuts used to commemorate pilgrimages, and even to adorn religious manuscripts (45-47).

258 John M. Theilmann explains the extreme rarity of travel in medieval and early modern Europe where the only common form of geographic mobility was pilgrimage, a practice that gradually gave way to modern tourism.

259 Jessica Maier argues that an “impulse to individualize images of cities materialized in publications across Europe in the 1470s and 1480s” (721). She suggests that The Nuremberg Chronicle participated in this trend, which “initiated the process of replacing stereotyped representations with recognizable portraits” (722), although to modern viewers the book seems to downplay visual differentiation of cities.
view of a place. The repetition of the images in the *Chronicle* declares that every illustration is at heart a fiction.

This early printed book demonstrates the fictions that underlie the veridicality of illustration. The medium evinces a vexed visual authority that photographic depiction further complicates by seeming to offer windows onto the real.260 The 2008 documentary film *Waltz With Bashir* stages this interpretive divergence between illustration and photography as part of its narrative. Through animated conversations and reminiscences, the film follows Israeli director Ari Folman’s effort to recollect how and whether he was complicit in the 1982 massacre of Palestinian refugees in Sabra and Shatila. As the characters search for culpability and truth, the animated style of the film persists until the final sequence cuts to a video taken in the aftermath of the massacre. In a horrifying scene, women wail over dead children lying in rubble. The animation, like a hand-made drawing, helps Folman to depict the subjectivity of his unreliable memories of having been party to mass-murder. In contrast, like a psychological breakthrough that shatters amnesia, the switch to photographic representation seems to give his recollection and his viewers access to the real experience of the people whose lives he may or may not have personally affected. I assisted in a course that taught *Waltz with Bashir* to undergraduates, and in their responses to the film, most had insufficient vocabulary to discuss this switch in medium in the final scene. The majority referred to the video footage, in contrast to the animation, as “reality.” Whereas the images in *The Nuremberg Chronicle* undercut their own connection to fact, these twenty-first century students read the video in *Waltz with Bashir* as “real,” not a document of reality, but as reality itself.

In the divergence between these modes of interpreting images lies the thread in the history of Western visual culture that this project endeavours to trace through the nineteenth-century British novel: the fictional idea that the past endures as a visible reproduction or that it can be authentically reproduced or visualized through images, sights, landscapes, and bodies. The four words I probe in this study, illustration, series, viewing, and realization, promote this literary illusion by allowing verbal representation to stand in for visibility. Faith in this fantasy grew

260 Whereas Barthes suggests that it is “in the arrest of interpretation that the Photograph’s certainty resides” (*Camera* 107, italics original), Jennifer Green-Lewis argues that “a photograph has an unusual relationship with the idea of truthfulness, in part because of its manner of production, which diminishes the significance of human agency, in part because of its surface verisimilitude” (20).
stronger with photography, but the eagerness to see visible pasts has a longer history in print as
well as visual culture. In the May 1842 opening issue of the first illustrated newspaper, The
Illustrated London News, which brought wood engravings to its readers, an introductory editorial
claims that “The public will have henceforth under their glance, and within their grasp, the very
form and presence of events as they transpire, in all their substantial reality” (“Our Address” 1). Photographs was only three years old and not yet in widespread use, but the craving it
would come to satisfy, the wish to interpret reproduced images as authentic accounts of the past,
was already in full force. The semblance of transparency of photographs helped to justify the
desire to see the past reproduced, but did not create it. As I argue in this dissertation, the
nineteenth-century novel offered one of the grandest contributions to this current in visual
culture that allowed reproducing the past for audiences in the present to become as much a
matter of revealing the visibility of former time as of narrating past events in prose.

One conclusion of this project could be read as a rejection of the authenticity of sights of the past
reproduced in images, both material and literary. To recall the distinction I make between history
as representation and the past as former time, we can say that, in these moments in books when
prior events seem to become available to sight, the scene is always visible history, a fictionalized
representation, and never a glimpse of the past. In seeing perspective as always already an act of
representation, however, rather than simply repeating what Martin Jay calls the “denigration” of
vision in modern cultural theory, I hope instead to bolster a sense of the potency of visible
fictions. Fiction tends to be associated with verbalized narrative, but, as Wilde’s realization
demonstrates, display can induce viewers to imagine story. Such visible fictions are evident, as
Kate Flint explains, in the late twentieth-century photography of Cindy Sherman and Jeff Wall,
whose work creates stories by displaying scenes that imply narrative, that make histories purely

261 In making this claim, I parallel Geoffrey Batchen’s demonstration that a cultural “desire” for photography
preceded the technology itself.
262 King and Plunkett contextualize the innovation of The Illustrated London News (376-77). Julia Thomas writes
that this opening address “predicts with almost uncanny accuracy the expansionism that made this publication itself
so formative in naturalizing the conjunction that would lead to television news and the pictorial magazines so
popular today” (162).
263 On the meaning of photography in British culture of the 1840s, see Munro.
264 Martin Jay argues that “recent French thought in a wide variety of fields is in one way or another imbued with a
profound suspicion of vision and its hegemonic role in the modern era” (14).
visible. The scenes these photographers depict are fictions, not meant to be taken for quotations of reality in the way that photographs in books and newspapers have trained viewers to regard images in nonfictional settings. The visible histories of nineteenth-century novels thus historicize the potential for fiction in visible display itself, even as they evince the fantasy of accessing the “real” past through vision. A kind of fiction is evident in images that appeal to and depend on viewers’ capacity to imagine narrative, and, as the novels I discuss show, these visible histories can be integrated as spectral appearances in literature as easily as they can be exhibited as spectacles in material settings of display.

Literary spectres have indeed haunted this study, offering numerous examples of, explanations for, and alternatives to visible history in novels. This recurrence of the spectral can be understood through the relation between realism and the supernatural that recent criticism identifies in nineteenth-century British literature. Smajić suggests that “supernaturalism, as far as the nineteenth-century novel is concerned, is not disruptive but consistently and overtly constitutive of its realism,” which “is not haunted by supernaturalism as the parasitic or saboteurial harbinger of ideological, epistemological, and ontological disruption, but instead openly collaborates with it” (“Supernatural” 3). Rather than demarcating the boundaries between genres that differ in their depictions of the real, the ghost in the nineteenth-century novel can be read as a counterweight—or even a spirit level—to the appeals to authenticity of realism. As Elaine Freedgood suggests, “If the dominant mode of Victorian fiction—realism—relies on visibility, legibility, and thoroughgoing epistemological closure, the ghost story questions the evidence of sight, the possibility of reading that evidence accurately” (45). Recalling the emphasis I place throughout this study on the imaginative visualization of readers, Freedgood also suggests that the reader of Victorian supernatural fiction, contributing to the metalepsis of the fictional ghost, comes into being as a Liberal subject by encountering her own agency in deciding whether or not to believe in literary spectres (46-47). The reader, with her gaze on fictional apparitions, has herself been a ghost in this dissertation, disrupting, enabling, and, most

\[265\] Flint describes their staged works as “photographs of narrative plenitude” (395-96), and explains Jeff Wall’s notion of his images as “unwritten novel[s]” (“Photographic” 397). “The Barthes that matters here,” she suggests, “is not the late elegiac writer of Camera Lucida but the killer of the author, the liberator of the reader. Rather than the photograph being used to confirm our version of what the world is or was like […] we ourselves are invited to write the script of how, in our imaginations, it just possibly might be” (398).
importantly, participating as a spectator in the visibilities through which novelists display their histories.

If the reader is one of the ghosts of the nineteenth-century novel, print is haunted space. The very materiality of print is spectral in its penchant for both initiating and vanishing from questions regarding the meaning of literary fiction. One final goal of this project has thus been to reveal print as another of the ghosts whose literally duplicitous habits of signification haunt the nineteenth-century novel. There are spectres in narrative returns in prints and images, and, indeed, part of the ghostliness of print culture is the eternally undying, dying, or undead visible history that printed paper represents in Western culture. As online marketplaces supersede bookshops, books as physical objects recede from the high-water mark of their presence in public everyday life.\(^\text{266}\) The paper book itself increasingly becomes its own visible history as the visitable monument of print culture, an empire whose greatest dominion may lie in the past. Nevertheless, the history of images in books extends to images of books online: as more of the remnants, traces, and customs of literary activity are reproduced in digital contexts, relics and artifacts of print culture find new public spaces to inhabit, displaying their visible histories and ghostly returns for anyone inclined to look and be haunted.

\(^{266}\) On the struggles of small bookshops and the disruption of book retail due to Internet sales and large chain stores, see Laura Miller. For this urban idea of the public space of everyday life, I am indebted to Michel de Certeau’s notions of “walking in the city” (91-111).
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