Appendix 1

Questions of attribution

Simon Grennan, Roger Sabin, Julian Waite

In revealing and analysing a body of work that has remained largely obscured and unconsidered for 135 years, the researcher faces a number of challenges. In the case of Marie Duval, the conditions in which she worked militated against clear attributions and claims to ownership from the very start: both Duval's professions as actor and humorous artist were low status, precarious and, consequently, largely unrecorded. Her chosen media were ephemeral and inexpensive to produce and consume. Immediately after the event (either a performance or a publication), no one was really interested. The next entertainment beckoned both the artist and the audience. Hence, evidence for the attribution of drawings to Duval raises challenges unknown to the historians of artists who are more successful, more lauded by posterity and, crucially, more completely recorded. These are not methodological challenges, in fact, but rather involve the degree to which established methods are relatively unproductive when applied to a search for Duval.

In compiling *The Marie Duval Archive*, writing this book and producing the other academic and public activities associated with our endeavour to reveal and contextualise Duval's work, we have applied a number of methods to the challenges of attribution. We considered her signed work and attempted to evaluate the significance of her signatures in the context of her recorded professional life, on stage and in periodical publishing. We considered the functions of anonymity and pseudonym, in creating and manipulating reader expectations, in the development of a professional life, which exploited mutable gender roles. We considered the status of the written components of her drawings, relative to the historic contingencies of undertaking visual journalism, within the team production that constituted Victorian periodical printing businesses.

We undertook visual stylistic analysis, ultimately grounded in the large task of viewing every known publication in which Duval appeared and many others that we discovered. We viewed every page of *Judy* magazine, from its launch in 1867 to Duval's death in 1890 (numbering approximately 11,500 pages, that is 46 volumes of approximately 260

pages each), in order to try and identify unsigned drawings by understanding and enumerating the particular ways in which Duval produced them.

Finally, we searched for contemporaneous historical commentary, particularly from those who worked alongside Duval. Part of this task was complicated by the contradictory content of this commentary and the repetition of inaccurate comments by subsequent commentators and scholars, until very recently.

What emerges is not a definitive body of work, but rather one with changing horizons, according to the period in which the drawings appeared. We cannot substantiate or contradict differences in authorship between text and drawings, for example. Neither can we establish the complete chronology of Duval's life relative to the drawings. Such a chronology is required to enable any scholar to substantiate her single and unqualified authorship in every case. Further, we believe that these methodological activities are the only grounds on which we can identify Duval as author of the work, or part of the work, or as a collaborator in the work. Simply put, this process is a way of identifying a corpus. This is not the same as claiming that Duval had an unqualified authorial role in every drawing and every text that form this corpus, identified in retrospect. We recognise this. In the absence of other evidence, we believe that this retrospective process identifies a corpus, distinct from others.

Duval's work in *Judy* was most commonly signed 'D', 'MD', 'M. Duval', 'Duval' or 'Marie Duval'. The way in which these signatures changed over time, in terms of their prominence and size, has been expertly tracked by David Kunzle, with emphasis on her Ally Sloper work (Kunzle 1986). Additionally, she signed 'Noir' for a number of cartoons published in 1875. Not every *Judy* contributor was allowed an authorial signature: for an artist to sign was a marker of status, and for a woman, it was doubly striking. But Duval's signed work is sporadic and the appearance of a signature followed no rationale, with the exception of the series of drawings signed 'Noir', in which it appears to be a concerted attempt to establish a visible pseudonym for a slightly different type of drawing to those recognisable to readers as by Duval.

The act of fictionalising the author had been a significant marketing device since the 1830s, as Bill Bell has shown (Bell 1993). Most obviously, anonymity or a pseudonym could be used to disguise ethnic background, nationality, social class and gender.¹ But it could also be used to suggest associations which were attractive to particular readers, as a niche marketing strategy or as a strategy to maintain continuity: a number of authors could work under the same name, for example, or the life of the pseudonym could be extended beyond the death of any single contributor. Elsewhere in this book, Simon Grennan argues that Duval visually fulfilled the role more usually taken by text journalists, as a member of the teams producing periodical print. She provided visual content for engraving in the same way that journalists provided written content for typesetting.

As Duval's surviving body of work is exclusively print, it appears that Duval drew directly onto wood blocks or provided drawings on paper for transfer, and the engraver's job was key to how the final illustration turned out. In a sense, all Duval's cartoons could be attributed to anonymous engravers, based on designs by the artist. However, such a

radical rethinking of cartoon attribution is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that Duval's engravers had licence to interpret what they saw, but that in fact she was being engraved by the best in the business so we can reasonably assume verisimilitude to her wishes. The Dalziel Brothers, who published *Judy*, were a long-established engraving firm as well as a publisher, and staked their reputation on the quality of the former (see Chapter 1, note 18).

Duval drew single-frame cartoons with legends, strip cartoons (some of ongoing characters) and illustrated comic articles, stories and books. For the cartoons and strip cartoons we might ask about the attribution of the writing that often accompanies the drawings as an integral part. Conventional wisdom has it that because an artist made the drawing, they also came up with the scenario, joke and written text. In the standard histories, a Tenniel image will be credited to Tenniel, including the written component: that is what the caption would say in a book or gallery. We consider the same to be likely with Duval. In the case of her book *Queens & Kings and Other Things* there is little doubt that as sole author she wrote the text, whilst our assumption would be that the longer texts to which she provided illustrations are most safely considered not hers. There are a number of books in which she collaborated with other writers where they are specifically credited as author and she as illustrator and there seems no reason to question this in the vast majority of cases.²

In attempting to assess the presence of different hands and minds in drawings and writing, there are available a number of methods of stylistic analysis: at the story level, comparative analysis of topics, treatments and structures; with printed texts, benchmarked comparisons of the frequency and proximities of words, for example; with printed wood engravings, benchmarked comparisons of the types of cut lines utilised in an identified range of tactic situations combining both depicted story and the locations of ink marks on the page. But these techniques do not indicate any primary distinction between registers. In Duval's work, when words are present, both the drawings and the words produce the story. We might be tempted to think of the distinction between registers as indicative of a distinction between authors. Indeed, in twentieth-century anglophone comics in particular, the tasks of scriptwriting and drawing were habitually devolved. However, approaching attribution from the starting point of a distinction between registers is largely tendentious. In fact, we might as easily ask if different authors made some parts of a text or some parts of a drawing.

As we considered the possible drawings of Duval, in her named and unnamed productions, signed works and the thousands of pages of *Judy*, we reflected on the competing definitions of stylistics, the study of comparative methods of production for the purpose of analysis. In every instance, this production encompasses the material and formal properties of an image, the story and the discursive ecology of an image, thereby relating how it was made to when and where it was made and how it was used.

For the purpose of identifying Duval's work, a capsule description of stylistics would be: the study of the distinctive forms found in the works of individual artists and writers. This approach has its roots in a technique developed by Giovanni Morelli (1816–91)

whereby identification of a work relies on extrapolating to the whole from a part. In other words, the key to identifying authorship is found in the comparative analysis of the formal properties of an image. Morelli believed that every artist has a distinct style, or method of production, which reveals itself in the smallest details, and that this is evident even when the artist is working in an adopted style.

These ideas were later supplemented by those of art historian Bernard Berenson (1865–1959), who argued that not only the artist's hand but also their personality could be discerned in a work of art: in other words, that mark-making is an expressive gesture that reveals the body and environment of the artist in the artwork. These notions together have been extremely influential, and have led to the idea of the line being central to aesthetics. However, for all its sophistication, this kind of stylistic reasoning remains an inexact science. It can also be questioned on theoretical grounds. For example, the approach has been superseded by a more holistic methodology that locates stylistic analysis within a systematic analysis of discursive relationships.

Finally, we might have presumed that commentary on Duval's work by her contemporaries, such as journalistic pieces, and quotations by editors and publishers and, later, the work of historians, would provide more-or-less accurate guides to what she produced. This was not the case. The secondary sources turned out to be just as slippery as the primary sources, and the pattern was, unsurprisingly, that mistakes made in the nineteenth century were repeated in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

The historic commentaries fell into three phases. First, during the period Duval was active, a range of surviving, repeated activity promoting publications featured her drawings to readers, as an attraction, notwithstanding the early hint that they were part of an editorial joke on the part of Ross, denied by Ross. Central to this period was Clayton's biography of Duval in *English Female Artists*. Second, after 1884 and her final published drawing in *Judy* in 1885, Duval's drawings were reused (and often dismembered) in *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday*, and her signatures erased. Third, after the death of Ross in 1897, published reminiscences in 1901, 1922, 1927 and 1930 (some by writers who must have known Duval personally, due to their daily proximity in business), stated or repeated that Duval either assisted Ross in making drawings or that Ross was their author.

In the first phase, Clayton's *English Female Artists* praised Duval for being an autonomous artist of note, identifying her authorship of 'drawn caricature subjects' under several pseudonyms, including Noir in *Judy* and in 'several books' (Clayton 1876: 332). In 1888 another account stated approvingly that she was 'the first lady comic artist' (Hone 1888: 274). *Judy* editor Ross himself came to Duval's defence in 1869: in a letter to *The Theatrical Journal*, in response to an article suggesting that it was 'difficult to determine, with any degree of correctness, which sketches are by Miss Duval and which by Mr Ross'. He wrote: 'her pictures are not imitations of Mr C. H. Ross's absurd style and can very easily be distinguished from that gentleman's production, because Mademoiselle is an artist and C. H. R. is not' (Ross 1869b).

Alongside these affirmations of Duval's authorship, over the course of her fifteen-year drawing career, small commercial advertisements in a range of periodicals announced

Duval's drawings in numerous publications for sale. Further, Duval's contribution of drawings was frequently announced boldly in these publications.

Throughout the 1870s and 1880s, the Ross-devised character Ally Sloper greatly increased in popularity, through Duval's development of a complete storyworld in which he had his adventures. The second phase began after 1883, when Ross sold his Ally Sloper copyright to the Dalziel Brothers, who established a company with nephew Gilbert Dalziel, to publish a new comic with Sloper as the star. *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday* (1884) became a bestseller in the 1880s and 1890s. Duval was excluded from the new comic. She was never mentioned, and when her *Judy* work was reprinted therein, she was never credited and her signatures were erased, for example in 'Zee Englishe Sommaire' (*sic*) (Duval 1886).

In the third phase, in 1901, Duval's own publisher, Dalziel Brothers, made the statement that 'His [Ross's] pages of humorous pictures, which appeared in *Judy*, were generally signed "Marie Duval"' (Dalziel and Dalziel 1901: 320). The Dalziels' sister, Margaret Dalziel, a significant figure in the firm for four decades, was described in the same reminiscence as an assistant to the Brothers (Dalziel and Dalziel 1901: 19–21).

In 1922, the *Half-Holiday* (then no longer under the control of Dalziel Brothers, but still associated with them) stated that Ross was 'assisted by his wife, Marie Duval' (Boswell Jnr 1922: 11), a claim repeated in the same column in the following week's issue.³ In 1927, the theatrical journal *The Referee* published a letter by Gilbert Dalziel crediting Ross, and adding that he 'no doubt availed himself of her [Duval's] artistic tendency in helping him with his 'Sloper' drawings. Often these would be signed 'M. D.' or 'Marie Duval'; but they were, in reality, the creations of Ross himself' (Dalziel 1927: 10).⁴

In 1930, an anonymous writer in *The Yorkshire Evening Post* stated that: 'Charles Ross, who was Editor at *Judy*, invited Ms. Duval to do a series of drawings, the jokes for which he invented' ('Ally Sloper Memories' 1930). Subsequent academic study of Duval's work constitutes quite a different type of activity to the historic commentaries. The change in the historic commentaries, from promotional during Duval's life to erasing and denying, after her death and Charles Ross's death, is now the topic of academic study and evaluation, rather than media manipulation and memoir.

We believe that it is impossible to draw conclusions about Duval without looking at the wide scope of her oeuvre, which we have been fortunate enough to identify and collate. Our creation of *The Marie Duval Archive* has meant that scholars and members of the public can view Duval with fresh eyes. With over 1400 drawings collected in one place for the first time, it is now possible to see patterns and make judgements that were simply impossible before. For example, we now know that Duval was not just a routine contributor to *Judy*, but a mainstay, over period of fifteen years. We can also see that her Sloper work was, approximately, only 15 per cent of her overall output. These observations make it easier to evaluate the extent to which she was ignored in later years, when her work (now freshly identified in many cases) was reprinted in the *Half-Holiday* and how she was pivotal to that publication's early success.

There is more Duval to be discovered. We remain tantalised by a mention in Clayton that Duval contributed to French and German magazines, about which we have been able to discover nothing (Clayton 1876: 331–2). There are also Duval works that we know existed, but which we have not been able to find, including an illustrated periodical published by Lynes and Sons for which she contributed illustrations to two volumes, *Smiles and Styles* and *Mirth and Modes* (see Chapter 3, note 7, p. 97), *The Archive*, and our Duval research in general, is an ongoing project.

Notes

- 1 See ‘How Did You Choose Your Pseudonym?’ by Dora D’Espaigne, *The Girl’s Realm*, Volume 6, September 1904 (wherein female authors such as George Egerton, George Paston, John Oliver Hobbs, Lucas Malet and John Strange Winter, discuss their ‘masculine disguises’).
- 2 For example, *Ally Sloper’s Guide to the Paris Exhibition* (1878) states: ‘By Charles H. Ross and many pictures By Marie Duval’. In the case of some other books with Duval content, her name is left off the credits. Very occasionally, authorship is more complex: for example, *Ally Sloper: A Moral Lesson* (1873), states ‘750 pictures by Marie Duval’ with ‘The words by Judy’s Office Boy’. When it comes to the drawings, it turns out that not everything is by Duval: some is by Ross in a solo capacity (including Sloper’s debut ‘Some of the Mysteries of Loan and Discount’, originally from 1867). When it comes to the writing, a fair speculation would be that, so far as the strips per se were concerned, Duval scripted most of them. However, as well as the examples by Ross, there were others that were collaborations between the two of them. Finally, the text narrative that holds the strips together, which is the bigger prose story into which they are embedded, numbering many thousands of words, is by somebody else entirely. This is the uncredited Arthur Pask, a jobbing writer for *Judy*.
- 3 The first quotation is interesting because it speculates that Duval did the foregrounded female figures while Ross did the cartoony material in the background, that is, ‘the funny ones’.
- 4 Gilbert Dalziel had made this claim privately some years earlier. In a recently discovered letter dated 20 February 1920, Dalziel wrote to a certain Mrs Callcott about the circumstances of creating *Queens & Kings and Other Things*. The relevant passage reads: ‘It was a Dalziel venture, Charles H. Ross being paid by us for his part, & Chatto & Windus being paid for publishing the Book. I have all the original designs by Ross’ (Dalziel 1920). There are cogent reasons for questioning the claims of the letter – many covered in Chapter 4 (not least the explicit attribution of the book to Duval by Clayton) – and this is something to which we shall return in a forthcoming academic publication. With thanks to Harrison-Hiett Rare Books for providing photographs of the letter.