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**ABSTRACT**

GROTESQUE HYBRIDITY IN THE PEDAGOGICAL INTENT OF THOMAS ROWLANDSON’S *COMPARATIVE ANATOMY*

Desiree Scholtz  
University of Guelph, 2019  
Advisor(s):  
Christina Smylitopoulos

An understudied group of sketchbooks, titled *Comparative Anatomy Resemblances between the Countenances of Men and Beasts* (1822-1827), prepared by the British graphic satirist Thomas Rowlandson (1767-1827) feature intriguing juxtapositions and amalgams of animals, humans, and vegetables, but have nevertheless been virtually ignored in the discourses on the intersections of art, science, and satire. Through visual analysis, I argue that Rowlandson’s *Comparative Anatomy* is a pedagogical tool that engages with the Romantic grotesque which was being explored in art in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, and strongly employs hybridity, a device that can be found through the modes of Rowlandson’s artistic expression and within the work’s very materiality.
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Art, Science, and Satire: Rowlandson as teacher

Prepared by the British graphic satirist Thomas Rowlandson (1767-1827), *Comparative Anatomy Resemblances between the Countenances of Men and Beasts* (1822-1827) is an understudied group of sketchbooks that creates an intriguing space in which to debate the significance of hybrid innovations in Rowlandson’s late career. These texts, which feature intriguing contrasts and amalgams of animals and humans, have been virtually ignored in discourses on the intersections between art, science, and satire. Despite being referred to as one of Britain’s greatest draughtsmen, and considered to be one of the most prolific satirical artists of the period who was recognized for his excellence in representing the essence of eighteenth-century society, Rowlandson’s later works are often overlooked in the literature for being “inapt in defining [forms]” “sloppy,” and “impersonal.”¹ However, these late works evoke questions about the importance of hybridity, not only to the artist and his audiences, but also, more specifically, to the artistic devices found in Rowlandson’s oeuvre.

Rowlandson created a space within these unpublished sketchbooks for viewers to be both amused by his wondrous and complex juxtapositions and introduced to tools and images for the modern artist. In this thesis I will demonstrate that Rowlandson’s intention for *Comparative Anatomy* was pedagogical and that he intended it to be a source of instruction for modern artists of the nineteenth century. The question that this thesis aims to answer, which has yet to be addressed by the literature surrounding the artist and his

---

works, is: How best can this book be defined in terms of function and significance? As a result of my examinations, I argue that Comparative Anatomy is a pedagogical tool that engages with the Romantic grotesque which was being explored in art in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, and strongly employs hybridity, a device that can be found through the modes of Rowlandson’s artistic expression and within the work’s very materiality.

Chapter One will explore the artist’s experiments with the grotesque throughout his career and specifically within this sketchbook. Using a few key examples, this section of the thesis will analyze how Rowlandson engages with the grotesque throughout the folios, the different techniques and devices he employs, and how they work pedagogically. Largely relying on Jerrold Levinson’s definition of hybrid art forms, Chapter Two will argue for Comparative Anatomy’s hybridity in both its production and form. This will be supported by an examination of three main sources that Rowlandson borrowed, copied, and imitated in the sketchbook, which are examined as evidence of its hybridity and function as a pedagogical tool. The final chapter will explore one composition in which Rowlandson compares a Black woman and three satyrs. I argue that this example can be seen as a microcosm of the entire book and its function as a primer for modern artists. The figures, who I identify as Sarah Baartman and the classical figure of Marsyas, share a violent skin history.

Sources, Methods, and Anatomical Training

There are three bound copies of Rowlandson’s Comparative Anatomy featuring pencil, ink, and watercolour and, on occasion, all three mediums at once. One is held at the
Houghton Library at Harvard University and consists of fifty-seven pages; one at the British Museum that consists of sixty-four pages; and the third, held within the private collection of Sims Reed Ltd, a firm dealing in rare books, that consists of forty-seven pages. Each sketchbook varies slightly in content, but they generally follow the same theme and are primarily comprised of physiognomic comparisons between humans and animals. Although all three books reportedly have a title page that includes images of skulls of both human and animal origin, the version at the Houghton Library, which will be the key object of analysis for this thesis, is the only one in which the title page includes inscriptions that name each animal and/or human skull (fig. 1). For example the three rows of three skulls in the Houghton version’s top row are inscribed, left to right, “Negro,” “European,” and “Baboon.” Although the significance of the title page and its inscriptions will be explored more fully in Chapter One, it is these inscriptions that demonstrate the sketchbook’s true purpose; therefore, my analysis will privilege this text. Like the other versions, the Houghton copy includes comparisons and juxtapositions between the facial profiles of various humans and animals, folios dedicated to beautiful studies of female faces, studies of grotesque men, and other compositions that depict intertwined faces of humans, animals, and other beasts that appear to merge in a frenzy of fear, terror, and rage and provoke significant anxiety in the viewer. The artist does not seem to favour female or male physiognomies in terms of frequency of representation, yet the juxtaposition of a grotesque male and a beautiful female is a recurring theme in Rowlandson’s works that also makes an appearance here. In this case,

---

3 Meyer, “Man’s Animal nature,” 123.
however, the comparison may have a rich and compelling grotesque motivation.⁴ Similarly, Rowlandson does not seem to favour a particular type of animal, and features birds, fish, farm animals, and even hybrids of these creatures sporadically throughout the studies. There are still other folios in Comparative Anatomy in which the artist has rendered physiognomic statuary from both ancient Greek and Egyptian cultures, while others have rows of heads that in some cases depict non-human shaped skulls. This imaginative work seems to defy logic, but it is in the imaginative realm that Rowlandson makes his contribution.

In terms of situating these works in time, I have examined the paper of this version carefully and determined that fourteen pages contain watermarks showing the year 1821, except for one that bears a watermark of the year 1825. Also important to note is that the last ten pages have been tipped in, three of which include handwritten notes (presumably by the artist, himself) declaring that they are “better duplicates” of pages that appear earlier in the text. The sketchbook does not at first seem to have a discernible structure, but the title page and the duplicated pages make it clear that Rowlandson was preparing to publish this as a book.⁵ Thorough visual analysis of the sketchbook makes the strongest case for considering Thomas Rowlandson’s Comparative Anatomy as both a pedagogical tool for the modern artist and a hybrid art form. This approach reflects current trends in scholarship that view Rowlandson’s late career productions as more significant to his oeuvre than previously understood. Fused into a hybrid art form are these late career objectives and innovations, artistic methods and sources, and the function of pedagogical tools in the nineteenth century.

⁵ Meyer, “Man’s Animal nature,” 120.
Also unique for an eighteenth-century graphic satirist, Rowlandson was formally trained at the Royal Academy, where he began his studies in 1772 at the age of fifteen.

The debates that drove this organization are key to the development of these books of comparative anatomy. Established in 1768 under the presidency of Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792), one of the most celebrated portrait painters in Britain, the Royal Academy not only became the centre of artistic training in Britain, but also the centre of anatomy instruction for artists. Between the years 1769 and 1790, Reynolds gave a series of fifteen lectures at the Royal Academy that were later published as his Discourses. The lectures were concerned with the training of British artists and the establishment of a British school of art. In his first Discourse, which Rowlandson would have read, Reynolds states that students must have “an implicit obedience to the Rules of Art, as established by the practice of the great MASTERS.” One of these “rules” is to draw directly from nature, whether that be statues, history painting, or from life drawing. Once this foundation is mastered, the artist would then be able to combine elements of what was previously learned in order to create a new piece of art. Dr. William Hunter (1718-1783), an anatomist and the first professor of anatomy at the Royal Academy, shared Reynolds’ view that drawing directly from nature was a key component in an

---

8 Rowlandson attended the Royal Academy beginning in 1772, however half of that time was spent in France. Therefore it is likely that he read these discourses rather than listened to them in lecture, however it remains uncertain.
10 May seem peculiar to draw from history painting for nature, but Reynolds makes this connection through the study of the bodily movements and representation of nature.
11 Reynolds, Sir Joshua Reynolds’ Discourses, 8.
artist’s training. Hunter urged students to keep specialized sketchbooks devoted to anatomical studies in order to have a “better understanding of the body’s structure.” This focus on anatomical instruction had a discernible impact on British artists and, according to Anne Darlington, left British artists “more anatomically-minded than their Continental counterparts.”

**Literature and contextual review**

**Development of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century science**

Establishing the study of anatomy—through dissection, life drawing, and the sketching of cadavers—as a fundamental element in an artist’s education, is evident in Rowlandson’s oeuvre, although it often appears satirically. We know that Rowlandson was aware of Hunter and his Anatomy School in Great Windmill Street, by his print *The Dissecting Room* (1775-1782) (fig. 2). The watercolour print depicts a slanted-roofed room containing a group of men dissecting at least three visible cadavers. Handwritten on the back, very likely inscribed by Rowlandson, is a list of medical practitioners who may be subjects in the image, including the Scottish poet, novelist, and doctor Tobias Smollett, Hunter’s assistant William Cruickshank, and the surgeon and physiologist William Hewson. Hunter can be identified by his prominent nose and cleft chin. The

---

16 Yearl, “Anatomizing Thomas Rowlandson’s representation of William Hunter’s dissecting room.”
overall image, however, creates a sense of uneasiness in the viewer. The skeletons to the right and left in the image appear to be smiling along with the cadavers, while one anatomist pulls entrails out of the body which land on the floor. Furthermore, according to Mary Yearl, the animal skeletons hanging from the ceiling “[reveals] the growing interest in studying comparative osteology.” Two posters, which are shown hanging on the right wall have captions reading “Prices for Bodys,” and “Rules to be observed by Gentlemen who dissect,” and refer to the fact that obtaining bodies for anatomy lessons was illegal. Nonetheless, the study of anatomy through dissection was something that Hunter was trying to normalize, an endeavor which Rowlandson seems to critique in this print.

This satirical treatment of anatomy and other emerging sciences from earlier in the century culminates with more seriousness in Comparative Anatomy. The first drawings that appear in the Houghton Library sketchbook are direct copies of two drawings from Giambattista della Porta’s (1535-1615) De Humana Physiognomia, published in 1586, but are presented without a strong use of caricature. Recognized as one of the most influential physiognomists (before Lavater), della Porta’s theories argue that visual parallels found between humans and animals correspond to a person’s essential nature. Della Porta influenced Johann Kaspar Lavater’s (1741-1801) theories and his attempt at developing physiognomy as a credible science in the eighteenth

---

18 Yearl, “Anatomizing Thomas Rowlandson’s representation of William Hunter’s dissecting room.”
19 Yearl, “Anatomizing Thomas Rowlandson’s representation of William Hunter’s dissecting room.”
20 Yearl, “Anatomizing Thomas Rowlandson’s representation of William Hunter’s dissecting room.”
century was demonstrated with the publication of his four volumes of *Essays on Physiognomy*.\(^{22}\) During the late eighteenth century, debates concerning “human variety” were instigated by European colonial projects in the South Seas in the 1770s and, as David Bindman shows us, “by the issue of slavery, which raised questions across religious, scientific and political discourse.”\(^{23}\) Although not intentional, Lavater’s physiognomic theories nevertheless influenced emerging racial theories, and became incredibly popular in the nineteenth century when these debates were at the forefront of the scientific communities and socio-politics at large.\(^{24}\)

Lavater’s main argument is that the physical traits of a face can reveal signs of the person’s morality and personality and, crucially, that the face can be read like a “natural language.”\(^{25}\) Lavater explains, “the face’s beauty and ugliness have a true and exact relationship to the beauty and ugliness of a person’s moral condition. The better the morals, the more beautiful; the worse the morals, the uglier.”\(^{26}\) Lavater made multiple connections to the importance of the study of art to physiognomy, and had strong support from artists during its early stages of publication, most famously from the German poet and author Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) and Henry Fuseli (1741-1825), the artist and intellectual who taught at the Royal Academy.\(^{27}\) Lavater often used Goethe’s physiognomy as an example of perfection within the first volume of *Essays*, but, after a disagreement with the author, Goethe stops appearing within the pages of the later

---

\(^{22}\) Katherine Hart, “Physiognomy and the Art of Caricature,” in *The Faces of Physiognomy: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Johann Caspar Lavater* edited by Ellis Shookman, (Suffolk: Camden House, 1993) 127.


\(^{24}\) Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 120-123.

\(^{25}\) Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 94.

\(^{26}\) Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 95.

\(^{27}\) Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 100.
Fuseli translated the first English edition, for which he penned an introduction, and made artistic contributions to both the English and French editions as well. Further, the connection between Lavater’s theories and the arts are evident when he explains that a true physiognomist must also be an art connoisseur:

[He] whose soul is not elevated by the sublimity of the Apollo, and who feels it not even after Winckelmann; he who is not affected, almost to the shedding of tears, in contemplating these ruins of the ancient ideal perfection of humanity…that Man, I say, will never become a tolerable Physiognomist.

Throughout the Essays he made repeated references to examples of what he determined to be good or bad physiognomy present in art. Lavater often praises the Italian Renaissance painter Raphael (1483-1520) as having perfected physiognomy in his paintings; however, Lavater uses the British painter and satirist William Hogarth (1697-1764) as an example of an artist with bad artistic expression of physiognomy. These arguments would have been important to a satirist in a period when the genre in which he worked was defined as ‘caricature.’

Although Lavater does not explicitly spend time on discussions of racial difference, he does state “there are as many varieties among the race of Negroes as among Whites.” But, as Bindman highlights, Lavater also often refers “to the collective ‘Negro’ as if Africa were one people with common characteristics.” According to Lavater, black physiognomy is categorically unattractive, and he therefore concludes that a Black person could not attain the intellectual ability of the highly respected

---

28 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 100.
29 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 133.
30 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 99.
32 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 112.
mathematician and physicist Isaac Newton (1643-1727), because of this ugliness. Lavater addressed criticisms of physiognomy and his theories within the last lectures (chapters) of his Essays. In the first volume, lectures 22 and 23, titled “Mr. Professor Lichtenberg’s Remarks on a Physiognomical Dissertation”, Lavater goes through the multiple criticisms made by Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742-1799), the German physicist and satirist. In one section, Lavater focuses on Lichtenberg’s comments against Lavater’s theory that a Black person could not have the intellectual capacity of an Isaac Newton (1643-1727). Lichtenberg argues, “Why not? Why should Newton’s soul not sit in the head of a black? Are you, wretch, the judge of God’s works?” Lavater responds by stating that the question is not whether God would be able to put the brain of a Newton into the head of a black person, but rather “Would an angelic mind act in a hideous form, as in the body of an angel? Would the soul of Newton, had it been lodged in the skull of a negro, have invented the theory of light?” It is with these last two lectures that the involvement of Lavater’s theories with conversations about racial theories, and religious politics becomes evident.

The study of physiognomy, and Lavater’s efforts to getting it recognized as a legitimate science, received harsh criticism almost immediately. For example, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), who was instrumental in the development of aesthetics, disregarded physiognomy in 1798 when he defined “physiognomy, as the art of detecting someone’s interior life by means of certain external signs involuntarily given,” and

33 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 112.
34 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 112.
35 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 114.
36 Johann Caspar Lavater, Essays on Physiognomy, calculated to extend the knowledge and the love of mankind, 1 (London: H. D. Symonds, 1797), 208.
37 Bindman, Ape to Apollo, 113.
further claimed that it was “no longer a subject of enquiry.” However, despite receiving such strong denunciation, Lavater’s theories became popular in the nineteenth century, and even entered the popular press. As Bindman further explains, Lavater’s theories influenced two other scientific debates: “that the skull and face can indicate hidden psychological tendencies, and that they can be measured with indicative results.”

An example of a scientific interest that was inspired by physiognomy, and one that Rowlandson represented in *Comparative Anatomy*, is phrenology. While physiognomy is concerned with the facial characteristics thought to illustrate a person’s morality, phrenology encompasses the external examinations of the head, in particular bumps that can be detected on the surface of the skull, which was thought to determine a particular brain function. Franz Joseph Gall (1758-1828) the leading phrenologist in the nineteenth century was, as Richard Twine tells us, “perhaps the first figure to formalize the view that the mind and the brain were one and the same thing.” This phenomenon has been given scant attention in the literature, however it is credited as an early step in other more legitimate sciences. It is, for example, considered significant to the development of neuroscience, as evidenced by Robert Young’s *Mind, Brain and Adaptation in the Nineteenth Century*, when he introduces phrenology by stating, “of course [it] is nonsense.” Young’s opening paragraphs to the chapter on phrenology are collectively a defense of why he must begin the history of science with Gall, stating,

---

40 Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 123.
“Gall’s work is the proper beginning point because his was the first empirical approach both to the nature of the faculties and to their localizations.” This apologetic undertone of Young’s history makes it clear how Gall’s arguments were seen in the twentieth century, and suggests that there is still a fear of being associated with phrenology.

Nonetheless, in the twenty-first century there was a greater movement to acknowledge that although Gall’s phrenology is now considered a pseudo-science, its history and popularization within a nineteenth-century context is important in order to understand the history of science. Twine, in his article “Physiognomy, Phrenology and the Temporality of the Body,” argues that both traces of physiognomy and phrenology still appear in the twenty-first century, with the popularity of facial plastic surgery, where people aim to achieve a socially appealing and approved physiognomy.

Comparative anatomy emerges in the nineteenth century and studies what the body can reveal through observation and analysis. Anatomy has been important to scientists for centuries to reveal the inner workings of the body, however in the nineteenth century there was a rise in comparative anatomy, where two or more bodies, including both animal and human comparisons, were used to not only make connection across varies individuals, but also across species. Appel, in his examinations of comparative anatomy and its contemporary debates, makes a connection between the science and relative religious politics. As a Protestant, he explains, the leading French comparative anatomist Georges Cuvier did not believe that God could be constrained in His creation, therefore he did not believe in the Great Chain of Being or “the unity of

44 Young, Mind, Brain and Adaptation in the Nineteenth Century, 10.
plan in the animal kingdom.” As such, Cuvier did not believe in the pre-Darwin theory that all living beings could be placed on a linear scale. This important distinction will be later explored in Chapter Three, but it warrants mentioning here because it demonstrates the debates Rowlandson engages with in his *Comparative Anatomy*.

Foucault, in his book *The Order of Things*, explains that Cuvier argued that the function of the interior system of an organism is the most important, more important than the organ itself, and with this creates a new classification system. He states that “from Cuvier forward, function, defined according to its non-perceptible form as an effect to be attained, is to serve as a constant middle term and to make it possible to relate together totalities of elements without the slightest visible identity.” Therefore, lungs and gills can be seen as having a resemblance because their function is respiration, and it is with this new classification that biology and comparative anatomy are developed. In relation to comparative anatomy, Foucault continues that, “by really cutting up bodies into patterns, by dividing them up into distinct portions, by fragmenting them in space, discloses the great resemblances that would otherwise have remained invisible.”

Foucault is highlighting the very importance of dissection to this study of science. It is interesting that throughout Foucault’s analysis of Cuvier, he does not mention his dissections of humans or Cuvier’s theories of race for it is this “cutting up of bodies” that is used against Cuvier and situates him at the head of racial theory in France.

---

49 Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 265.
50 Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 264, 268-269.
51 Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 269.
Sander Gilman’s “White Bodies, Black Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine, and Literature” (1985) changed the late twentieth-century discourse concerning Cuvier by connecting him directly with the history of Sara Baartman (c.1789-1815).52 Baartman was a Khoisan woman from the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa. She was exhibited as the “Hottentot Venus” in London and in Paris from 1810 until her death in 1815.53 Staged as a racial oddity in a manner that emphasized her large buttocks and elongated labia, Baartman became a celebrity in early nineteenth-century “freak shows” as well as an object of analysis for scientists to support emerging racial theory. Cuvier dissected her in 1816 and Gilman states that it was Baartman’s “physiognomy, her skin colour, [and] the form of her genitalia that label her as inherently different.”54

Scholars, such as Fausto-Sterling, and Magubane, interacting with nineteenth-century racial theory following Gilman’s article, go into further detail than he did, and correct his inconsistencies and vague statements about Cuvier’s theories on race. For example, Fausto-Sterling argues that scientists who dissected women of colour from 1814-1870 were attempting to lay their own social fears “to rest.”55 She explains, by using excerpts from Cuvier’s Observations, that he compared her skeleton to that of an indigenous Canary Islander, a people who were considered Caucasian.56 It is widely known that he eventually concluded that Baartman was a “Bushwoman,” a category that

---

56 Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 38.
was considered the lowest of humanity, but this confusion proves this “angst” among nineteenth-century scientists and their conventions of discerning racial difference. With historians, anthropologists, and sociologists focusing on nineteenth-century scientific treatises there is a movement in the discourse to examine these sciences to discern their contemporary significance.

**Hybridity**

A main component of this thesis is the exploration of the Rowlandson’s use of hybridity within this sketchbook. Hybridity is a term that has changed in function and in reception over time. Originally referring to the biological fusion of two plant species, it can be most broadly defined as the fusion or mixing of two entities, which could include humans or animals as well as objects or theories. In a nineteenth-century context, hybridity was used in emerging racial theory in association with the mixing of what were considered “human varieties.” Since then, it has been employed in broader contexts, such as the discussion of complex strategies of coping with the anxieties caused by hegemony and dominance in colonial contexts.

Postcolonial theory expanded the definition of hybridity to describe the mixing, or amalgamation, of cultures. The historical links between language and sex are regarded as fundamentals in postcolonial scholarship since “both produced what were regarded as ‘hybrid’ forms (creole, pidgin, and miscegenated children), which were seen to embody threatening forms of perversions and degenerations and became the basis for endless

---

57 Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 38.
metaphoric extension in the racial discourse of social commentary.”

Robert J. C. Young states that in the twentieth-century the term hybridity “has been reactivated” to describe a cultural hybridity, while in the nineteenth century “it was used to refer to a physiological phenomenon.” Young places the historical significance of the word in the nineteenth century because of the debates about racial varieties. In the eighteenth century, when humans were being classified on the Great Chain of Being, Africans were placed closest to the ape, and debates discussed whether Africans should be categorized as a species of ape or human. A main component to this debate was whether Europeans and Africans could procreate, and whether those children were fertile. This mixing of races in a sexual union was, in the period referred to, as “amalgamation.” Further, according to Young, “theories of race in the nineteenth century, by settling on the possibility of hybridity, focused explicitly on the issues of sexuality and the issue of sexual unions between whites and blacks.” Therefore, these theories encompassed desire, and not just the theoretical hybridity of humans.

The term has also been used in conjunction with the effects of globalization and multiculturalism, as well as the resulting identity issues and can be explored through linguistics as well as other markers of culture. It has also more recently found its place within artistic practice, referring to the mixing or fusing of multiple mediums or disciplines in order to create new art forms or reflect on older art forms that did not fit in
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neat classifications of medium and genre.\textsuperscript{66} However, although aspects of each use of hybridity may be found throughout this thesis, I will concentrate on two functions of this term: the first refers to the hybridity of beings, vegetables, and animals, including humans, found within the compositions of the book, as well as the definition of Rowlandson’s book as a hybrid art form, in and of itself.

This thesis will also explore the term ‘hybrid’ in its connection with art. As I will show in greater detail in Chapter Two, I will examine Levinson’s definition of what a hybrid art form is, and how \textit{Comparative Anatomy} can be defined as such. Defining a hybrid art form as, “one in virtue of its development and origin, in virtue of its emergence out of a field of previously existing artistic activities and concerns, two or more of which it in some sense combines” he continues that “hybrid art forms are art forms arising from the actual combination or interpenetration of earlier art forms.”\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Comparative Anatomy} exemplifies an “emergence out of a field of previously existing artistic activities and concerns” through the combination of previous sketches, prints, and woodcuts from a multitude of sources, and Rowlandson’s original designs. Recognizing \textit{Comparative Anatomy}’s hybrid art qualities will also define Rowlandson as an innovative author, designer, and possibly publisher of a unique type of primer in the nineteenth century. Therefore, hybridity plays an increasingly integrative role and significance in the very makeup of \textit{Comparative Anatomy}.

\textbf{Thomas Rowlandson}

\textsuperscript{66} Levinson, “Hybrid Art Forms,” 5-13.
An important text in the literature on Rowlandson’s artistic oeuvre, his methodologies, and reputation, written after his death, is Joseph Grego’s (1843-1908) work, *Thomas Rowlandson: The Caricaturist* (1880). Grego was an avid art collector and produced biographical studies of artists, including the graphic satirists James Gillray, George Cruikshank, and the painter George Morland. Grego published his book on Rowlandson fifty-three years after the artist’s death, providing a biography along with a catalogue of many of his works that offer descriptions of the scenes and their contexts. The significance of Grego’s work is that it is one of the first to outline a significant trend in Rowlandson studies: namely, that his earlier works are more important than his later works.

Although Grego is influential in the initial understanding of Rowlandson’s oeuvre, scholarship has been making steady progress in exploring and accepting different interpretations of his work, methodologies, and social importance. For example, the art historian Osbert Sitwell’s introduction to *Famous Water-colour Painters VI- Thomas Rowlandson* (1929) has a very clear nationalistic tone and objective in his interpretation of how Rowlandson should be situated within British art history. Sitwell argues that Rowlandson ought to be considered a national symbol, made evident when he begins the second paragraph by calling him “our hero.” Sitwell attributes Rowlandson’s unpopularity in nineteenth-century literature to a belief that “he was indifferent…to the physical suffering of others.” Acknowledging, “the purple, bloated and distorted countenances of Rowlandson’s cartoons may offend the over-fastidious,” he argues that
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“the offense is no aesthetic one,” for “the line and execution is unimpeachable.”

Important to this particular thesis is Sitwell’s defense of Rowlandson’s exploration of the grotesque not being recognized for its aesthetic prowess. Sitwell continues, “his name…should be as much of a boast on our lips as the self-trumpeting names…of naval commanders,” and continues that “Rowlandson’s drawings clearly depict the whole broad panorama of English life.” The way to recuperate his significance, despite this change in fashion, is to reinforce his relevance in depicting the social life of Britain.

Falk, although agreeing with Grego that Rowlandson’s best works were produced before 1789, does not seem to respect Grego, and calls him a “gossip-loving author.” Falk does, however, praise Rowlandson’s mastery of representing social life during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and states that no other artist working in the same medium could “compare with him in calligraphic mastery or induce pure line to perform so many functions,” and states that his “early performances” are all “[stamped] with the hall-mark of authentic genius” and even gives him the title of the “Byron of art.” This is where we begin to see a change in the literature, from solely focusing on his line work, to focusing on his representation of nineteenth-century society.

However, the scholar’s disapproving analysis of Rowlandson’s later works is evident in the chapter title “Stooping to the Gutter.” Falk states that Rowlandson began producing anything that would bring him pay, exerting, “‘these staring abominations,’ as they have been fittingly called,” were coloured with “gaudy red, yellow and blue
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stains.”\textsuperscript{75} He continues that “there is no record of Rowlandson doing any further work or by any subsequent action causing the slightest ripple of interest in the world which, four or five years previously, had been hymning his praises as the Creator of \textit{Doctor Syntax}.\textsuperscript{76}

Robert Wark, a Canadian art historian and former curator of the Huntington Library Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens from 1956 to 1990, has taken a similar approach in his writing. He seemingly praises Rowlandson’s early career, but suggests that the artist declined due to “sloppy and inferior” line.\textsuperscript{77} Wark suggests that Rowlandson’s “uninterrupted and steady decline” started in 1784, an earlier point than even Grego’s claims, and classifies the last forty years of Rowlandson’s career as “rather depressing.”\textsuperscript{78} There is an ongoing undercurrent to Rowlandson literature that continuously states that he could have been more if only he did not go into satire. Wark praises Rowlandson for having “a larger repository of comic devices at his command and comes closer to exploring their full potentialities than any other British artist” but then continues on to state that “unfortunately it is very seldom that his knowledge and skill in this matter come into focus in a single work of art, and this is probably the most disappointing feature of his career.”\textsuperscript{79} Wark goes as far as to state that “imagination is not his strong point, and in this matter he operates within a limited range.”\textsuperscript{80} Because of these observations Wark “hesitates to class Rowlandson as a great artist. But he certainly holds an honourable position on the fringes of that select company.”\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{75} Falk \textit{Thomas Rowlandson: His Life and Art}, 160.
\textsuperscript{76} Falk \textit{Thomas Rowlandson: His Life and Art}, 181.
\textsuperscript{77} Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection}, 26.
\textsuperscript{78} Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection}, 26.
\textsuperscript{79} Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection}, 5-6.
\textsuperscript{80} Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection}, 10.
\textsuperscript{81} Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection}, 26.
There seems, however, to be a shift in the dialogue surrounding Rowlandson’s late career and its significance in the twentieth-first century. Arline Meyer is a scholar who has written numerous articles on Rowlandson’s late career and its importance to not only the study of his trajectory, but also to art history in general.  

She acknowledges “the elegant watercolour drawings he produced in the early years of his career received much critical acclaim” and, similarly to Falk, states that Rowlandson’s art is “the most telling and complete graphic record of social life in later Georgian England.” She further acknowledges, like Sitwell, that “Rowlandson’s embrace of the grotesque has been seen as an unsavory sign of personal depravity and of a remarkable talent dissolutely gone astray.” She writes on *Comparative Anatomy* and declares that the sketches are “highly individualized characterizations, and they offer a rich cross-section of human nature that transcends the categorical distinction between low-life brutishness and aristocratic self-indulgence that typified late Georgian caricature and satire.” For their acknowledgment of the breadth of Rowlandson’s work, Meyer’s scholarly contributions to the studies of Rowlandson will be heavily relied upon within this thesis.

Rowlandson studies, therefore, have gone through a dramatic shift from ignoring and even proclaiming disdain for his later works, to appreciating and exploring them as significant pieces to the artist’s development and oeuvre. This change will be further developed by this thesis, as it aims to prove the importance of one of Rowlandson’s latest works, produced at the very end of his life, as a creative innovation.
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Book Illustration: Science, satire, and illustration

Rowlandson’s book illustrations have received little attention by art historians over the past two centuries.\(^{85}\) Grego mentions that Rowlandson was a “skillful and popular contributor of book illustrations” and he does name a few, but did not continue to explore these contributions in any detail.\(^{86}\) Falk addresses these illustrations in only a sentence or two, stating that “the vogue which he enjoyed by reason of the books he illustrated for Ackermann did nothing for his reputation as a draughtsman” and continues that the illustrations “merely resulted in his being looked upon as a dexterous designer of humorous book plates."\(^{87}\) However, aquatint was becoming the most popular technique to use for topographical illustrations, a technique that Rowlandson mastered and his “cold clear washes…will always be associated with this process.”\(^{88}\) Gordon N. Ray begins to give primacy to Rowlandson as a book illustrator and mentions that “he was equally at home realizing in line the characters of a classical novel, giving the animation of human activity to an architectural sketch by Pugin, or devising a grim or rowdy episode for Combe’s jingling rhymes.”\(^{89}\) Ray goes as far as to cast doubt on the previous negative connotations of Rowlandson’s contributions to what is considered one of the “minor
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branches of art,” and states, “one may doubt if the paintings we have lost would have
given pleasure as acute and widespread as the many and varied smaller designs we have
gained.”

This thesis will continue this exploration that has been building momentum and, in the pages that follow, it will become clear that the sketchbook is an imaginative space, featuring wondrous comparisons within which we encounter the traditions of both text and image. This thesis will also further demonstrate the significance of Rowlandson’s late works with respect to the innovative hybrid methodology of the composition of *Comparative Anatomy*. My analysis will show the sketchbooks in their role as satirical illustrated works of art and an artistic primer.
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Chapter One
Investigating the Grotesque in *Comparative Anatomy*

Rowlandson’s experiments with the grotesque throughout his career have been repeatedly undervalued and misunderstood. This may be due, in part, to when these studies took place; Rowlandson explored the grotesque in considerable depth late in his career, precisely when his hand was deemed by subsequent scholars to be lazy and coarse, and coincided with what some believed was his increasing inability to draw character. Joseph Grego believed that “the very fluency of his pencil, and the fidelity of his memory towards the grotesque side of things proved his stumbling blocks” in the beginning of his career.\(^\text{91}\) Robert Wark suggests that the reason why Rowlandson did not do many portraits later in his career was because “as his pen work became more settled in its bouncy, cursive manner it became less capable of capturing the eccentricities of a particular face without slipping into caricature.”\(^\text{92}\) Further, in the late nineteenth century, Thomas Wright argued that Rowlandson

> Appears…to have been naturally a man of no real confinement, who easily gave himself to low and vulgar tastes, and, as his caricature became more exaggerated and coarse, his females became less and less graceful, until his model of female beauty appears to have been represented by something like a fat oyster-woman.”\(^\text{93}\)

In other words, Rowlandson’s study of the grotesque was considered an inability to render beauty, as opposed to an expansion of his artistic repertoire. However, *Comparative Anatomy*, which also contains portrayals of female beauty of the highest
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quality, challenges this conclusion and, instead, suggests that the grotesque became more important to the artist. Rowlandson, throughout his career, remained consistently modern, developing and adapting to new styles, techniques, and devices, such as the Rococo, Neoclassicism, the Romantic, and the grotesque.

The majority of Rowlandson studies focus on his contributions to Neoclassicism and his remnants of the Rococo from his education in France, largely ignoring his experiments with, and contributions to, Romanticism. *Comparative Anatomy* can be investigated as a contribution to the Romantic Movement, because of its experiments with grotesque figures, faces, and themes. These studies offered the audience of the sketchbook a new aesthetic treatise on grotesque expression for the modern artist that the beholder experienced visually. Arline Meyer, in her chapter “Man’s Animal Nature: Science, Art, and Satire in Thomas Rowlandson’s ‘Studies in Comparative Anatomy’” (2006) argues that *Comparative Anatomy* “is more in accord with the romantic sensibility of the nineteenth century than with the rationalist of the eighteenth.” Although Meyer does discuss Rowlandson’s experiments with the grotesque in *Comparative Anatomy*, this chapter will provide a more in-depth study of Rowlandson’s grotesque, and how it functioned specifically as a pedagogical tool.

I argue that Rowlandson employs the grotesque in *Comparative Anatomy* through the devices of expression, comparison, and juxtaposition. Rowlandson does this not only to comment on the branch of science that the sketchbook is named for, but also to display the various techniques and devices of the grotesque to the modern artist. In order to prove this, I will investigate the deployment of the grotesque in the hybrid and monstrous compositions that Rowlandson features to distort the nineteenth-century classification
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system. I will then examine the significance of Rowlandson’s portrayal of beauty, and the function of this beauty in a didactic book that underscores the grotesque. Lastly, I will consider the power of Rowlandson’s use of comparison and juxtaposition to explore this emergence of the grotesque, and the artist’s ability to distort and distract the viewer from this power.

Rowlandson was influenced by the Rococo during his education in France, which had lasting effects on his technique. First established in France in the seventeenth century, the Rococo style made appearances throughout the Continent well into the eighteenth century. For the British, the Rococo, or what they termed the modern style, is distinguished by its allowance of “freedom of invention and variation,” with “S” and “C” curves that typically marked its presence and warranted individualism, “without rules, orders, or authority.” Some theorists, including “Shaftesbury, Richardson, and Daniel Webb” did not like these very aspects (and French origins), and the fact that it leaned away from rational proportions and symmetry, but these elements reached across the social classes and political spheres. Wark mentions that the Rococo is evident in Rowlandson’s landscapes, such as House Near a Rocky Gorge (1808), where the “overall surface activity and the absence of emphasis on mass and depth point up Rowlandson’s stylistic affiliations with the Rococo, affiliations that run through all phases of his art.”

Hayes, furthermore, states that the “winding, curving, billowing Rococo shapes are the
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very essence both of his figure style and of the relationships between his figures.”

Hayes even goes further to state that “Rowlandson was stylistically a man out of his time, the last great exponent of the Rococo in England.” These strong affiliations with the Rococo and its “winding” and “curving” shapes also easily transfer into the serpentine movements that the grotesque is known for, and so these two different styles emerged in the compositions of one artist.

Stimulated by radical socio-political and aesthetic changes, the grotesque found a revival in nineteenth-century Britain and France. The Industrial Revolution in Britain, the violent ending of the Napoleonic Era, and the Enlightenment’s focus on radical science and the classification of nature, all contributed to the development of the Romantic. Emphasizing emotion and individuality, subjectivity and inspiration, Romanticism elevated nature to a sometimes overpowering source of beauty and sublimity. First appearing in the English language in the middle of the seventeenth century, it shows the need “to give names to certain characteristics of the chivalrous and pastoral romances.”

The representation of nature and its affects on the human experience encouraged emotions such as terror, awe, and horror to be explored aesthetically in visual art and literature. It “lay in the falsity, the unreality, the fantastic and irrational nature of events and sentiments.” As Praz states, “everything that seemed to have been produced by a disorderly imagination came to be called ‘romantic.’” For Gombrich, who has been influential in the study of graphic satire, “The Romantic era might well have been an
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important contributory factor in the transformation of the hieroglyphic print into the triumphant idiom of Gillray and Rowlandson.”

He continues,

For now the weirdest combinations of symbols, the most grotesque conglomerations of images were no longer merely tolerated as the pardonable license of a low medium of illustration. They could be attuned to the taste of the time if they were presented as phantoms, nightmares, and apparitions.

The grotesque, which predated the Romantic Movement, nevertheless found a welcome home in the aesthetics that emerged in the late eighteenth century, expanding and exaggerating this taste for “phantoms, nightmares, and apparitions.” However, theorist Wolfgang Kayser states that “grotesque” is an over used term:

[And] we hear it ever more frequently, since it seems to be one of those quickly cheapened terms which are used to express a considerable degree of emotional involvement without providing a qualitative distinction beyond rather vague terms “strange,” “incredible,” “unbelievable” – it is certainly not a well-defined category of scientific thinking.

Revived in the Renaissance, the grotesque is a space in which inanimate things, and the realms of plants, animals, and human beings are fused; it is a space “where the laws of statics, symmetry, and proportion [were] no longer valid.” The concrete definition of a term that is decidedly overused, and yet an incredibly important artistic concept, that spans across the arts including painting, print, sculpture and architecture as well as novels, poetry and essays, has troubled scholars for centuries. The grotesque is often related to the comical, or satirical, however Steig argues that although many scholars have attempted a systematic definition of the grotesque, “no one study seems

adequately to cover the field” nor to give sufficient “methods of distinguishing the grotesque, on the one hand, from the merely horrific and, on the other, from the purely comic.” For Kasyer, it seems to be nearly impossible to distinguish the grotesque from the affect that is had on the viewer/audience. According to Steig, however, Kayser does not go far enough with the “psychological implications,” and does not define the role of the comic. For the purposes of this chapter, I will be using Philip Thomson’s broad but helpful definition that the grotesque is “fundamentally [an] ambivalent thing… a violent clash of opposites, and hence, in some of its forms at least… an appropriate expression of the problematical nature of existence.” Further, I will use Kasyer’s “essential ingredients of the grotesque” including: “the mixture of heterogeneous elements,” “confusion,” “the fantastic,” the “alienation of the world,” “the abysmal,” “the insecurity,” and “the terror inspired by the disintegration of the world.” The definitions and perimeters presented by these two respected scholars are privileged among many others because they are broad enough to encompass everything that studies on the grotesque have to offer, while still providing boundaries on defining factors of the grotesque.

As mentioned earlier, the grotesque was revived during the Renaissance when, in the late fifteenth century, the ruined vaults of Nero’s first-century Golden House were discovered, painted with strange and elaborate decorations that fused the vegetable, human, and animal into fantastical hybrid beasts. Floral decorations that transform into
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satyrs, snakes, humans, and other creatures filled both the walls and the minds of the society that rediscovered these creative embellishments. These hybrid grotesque bodies symbolize inner corruption and underscore the unnaturalness of their existence.\textsuperscript{114}

Explored over time by artists such as Hieronymus Bosch (c.1450-1516), Raphael (1483-1520), Jacques Callot (1592-1635), Diego Velazquez (1599-1660), William Hogarth (1697-1764), Francisco Goya (1746-1828), and Salvador Dali (1904-1989), the grotesque was constantly revisited and revived between early and late modernity.\textsuperscript{115}

When Rowlandson’s \textit{Comparative Anatomy} emerged, there was a helpful juxtaposition already underway. Romanticism’s exploration of the irrationality and sublimity of nature was both a response to and a juxtaposition with Neoclassicism explored by both British and French artists. Neoclassicism—distinguished by its revival of classical motifs, resulting in symmetrical, unified, and harmonious compositions—emerged in Britain between 1750-1820.\textsuperscript{116} As many of Rowlandson’s satirical prints depict classical motifs, particularly the sketchbook \textit{Drawings after the Antique} (1820-1827) that focused specifically on classical figures and was produced during the same years as \textit{Comparative Anatomy}, it is clear that Rowlandson is aware of both intellectual concentrations of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{117} The two sketchbooks, \textit{Comparative Anatomy} and \textit{Drawings after the Antique}, seem to act as sister sketchbooks. They juxtapose each other in theme, as the grotesque in \textit{Comparative Anatomy} exposes (and seems to relish) the unknown, the disturbing, the absurd, and the terrifying, while the other emphasizes
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order and proportion. This seems to support Praz’s statement that the Romantic and
classic are opposites.\textsuperscript{118} The preparation of these two sketchbooks, during the same years,
supports the pedagogical function of the \textit{Comparative Anatomy}. Rowlandson was not
only showcasing the two dominant styles in Britain, he was also teaching them, showing
both standard and innovative ways to interpret them for the modern artist in print.

\textbf{The Hybridization of the Monstrous-Grotesque}

Perhaps because it was not published, and so its association with a category of
artistic practice is not precise or, because it was a late career work, \textit{Comparative Anatomy}
in general is examined in only a handful of scholarly works.\textsuperscript{119} Looking to justify its
importance in Rowlandson’s oeuvre, these studies have yet to examine its particular
parts. In this section, I will begin by investigating the hybrid bodies found on various
folios throughout the sketchbook. The hybrid bodies found in \textit{Comparative Anatomy}
follow the general purpose of figures found in other grotesque art that Justin D. Edwards
and Rune Graulund characterize as follows: the grotesque hybrid “foreground[s] the
limits of the human body, policing the margins of human classification, but they can also
engender fear, rather than stability, through frightening depictions of what happens when
the boundaries of classification give way to monstrous hybrid creatures.”\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{119} See, Arline Meyer, “Man’s Animal Nature: Science, Art, and Satire in Thomas Rowlandson’s “Studies
in Comparative Anatomy” in \textit{Humans and Other Animals in Eighteenth-century British Culture: Representation,
\textsuperscript{120} Edwards and Graulund, \textit{Grotesque}, 40.
Rowlandson’s hybrid explorations are most clearly exhibited in his studies of the vegetable, animal, and human forms.

Seen on one folio within the sketchbook, five separate studies of faces are arranged in each of the corners of the page with one in the centre (fig. 3). The structure of the central face is made from a white, bulbous vegetable, presumably a turnip, which forms its forehead, nose, cheekbones, ears, and chin. The figure wears a small coronet of onion- or garlic-like shapes, and two red horns, shaped like carrots, extend from the bridge of its nose. Its mouth is agape, and its eyes are peculiarly designed as round, white scallop-like shapes, with smaller red corresponding designs acting as pupils. Green, leafy vegetables surround the head, making up its hair and beard, suggesting that this figure is male. Although Giuseppe Arcimboldo121 (1526-1593), the Renaissance painter who created scenes and portraits comprised entirely of seemly random objects, both inanimate and even sometimes human, compositionally, is not mentioned in the literature as an influence on Rowlandson either in general or with specific reference to this sketchbook, Rowlandson must have known about the artist as this composition is very much in Arcimboldo’s typical style. The components of the face are vegetal, but the intense expression reads as angry, and though it resembles a human, it appears animalistic and challenges the assumption that this was playful in intent.

The viewer is confronted with an uncomfortable incapacity to place this creature firmly within the realm of vegetable, human, or animal. The classification of all beings was an important task for most emerging scientists in the nineteenth century, but in
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particular comparative anatomists. Placing the vegetable, the animal, and the human within distinct categories on one linear system, which was called the Great Chain of Being, was part of the rationalizing of nature, but was also used to establish and maintain the superiority of Europeans over Africans, and the other “varieties” of humans.\(^\text{122}\) The creature appears to continually transform between the three categories, distorting itself to deceive any rational classification within nature. As Steig states, “in the true grotesque we are kept unaware of the connections between the alien world and our own.”\(^\text{123}\) This barrier to classification reveals the threat of the monstrous grotesque body, and this distorted fear of threat is where the grotesque thrives in this composition. Therefore, Rowlandson uses the grotesque to comment, but not resolve the issues raised by comparative anatomy and the system of classification it aims to codify.

Another key example of the hybrid monstrous-grotesque in *Comparative Anatomy* is when Rowlandson overwhelms the viewer with a picture plane filled with various animals and hybrid beasts (fig. 4). The veil between the comical or the amusing, and fear and terror, is lifted in this composition which, unlike the previous example, collapses the spaces between figures and creates a space in which the anxiety over the classification of the hybrid creature is released in a frenzy of movement. Rowlandson presents an image of eleven entangled and intertwined bodies, with faces of animals, indistinguishable beasts, and three male satyrs. Cats, a snake, a lion, and other beasts claw and bite in anger, pain, and pleasure. Using a serpentine shape, established by the depiction of a serpent near the center of the composition, which creates movement across the picture plane, Rowlandson identifies a key characteristic of the grotesque. The three satyrs form

\(^{122}\) Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 26.

a diagonal line in the centre of the melee, each looking desperate to escape the confusion. Rowlandson does not present an escape, or a solution to the conflict. Rather, he leaves the viewer in a state of anxiety. Despite being able to relate to the satyrs, the viewer still isolates the satyrs from the image because of their bestiality. The grotesque thrives in this lack of a solution for the beings inside the image, and for the effect it has on the viewer and sets the tone of the interaction with the rest of the sketchbook.

This analysis shows that Rowlandson’s intention for the book was pedagogical because, as Gombrich noted earlier, print was changing, and the Romantic Movement was strongly taken up by satirists. The Romantic Movement was largely ignored by the Royal Academy, when Rowlandson attended in his youth, which “prevented [it] from finding [a] full outlet in great art.”¹²⁴ Rowlandson’s sketchbook therefore provides his intended audience tools and devices to produce the Romantic grotesque in the modern medium of print and the modern genre of graphic satire. This included the formal delineation of line, shape, colour, and general composition of the grotesque, such as the serpentine, rapid movement in order to produce those emotions of fear when looking at the physiognomies of the hybrid creatures.

**Depicting grotesque expression through beauty and ugliness**

A major component of Romantic expression was depicting the beautiful. Representing pure beauty is an aspect of Rowlandson’s artistic oeuvre that was criticized as declining later in his career, specifically rendering beautiful women. Within *Comparative Anatomy* this assumption is refuted by Rowlandson’s amazing compositions of beautiful women. He does, however, go beyond the beautiful; these attractive physiognomies do not just
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serve as something pretty to look at, but as examples from which to learn a different methodology of capturing the grotesque through beauty.

For example, there is a composition that is filled with thirteen young Caucasian women, all dressed finely, some with jewels, hats, or other head pieces (fig. 5). Some of the women appear on their own, while others appear to be in conversation with each other. Each woman is fair in complexion with soft features. Positioned quite close to the beginning of the sketchbook, and appearing dramatically different from the collection of sketches that come before and after, the study asks if the viewer is meant to be pleased by their beauty? Is the viewer meant to compare or juxtapose? And, ultimately, why is this study full of women in a book titled “Comparative Anatomy”? Only three women are looking at the viewer: the middle woman in the top right register, the woman in the centre of the composition, and the woman to her right. This study is not meant simply to showcase the artist’s ability to render beauty, it functions to create a feeling that unsettles, without having a firm idea as to why.

According to Edmund Burke (1729 – 1797) in his exploration of the sublime, beauty, and taste in his *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), the sublime is when the body reacts to an object in nature by feeling the most intense emotion of astonishment, pain, and danger.\(^{125}\) According to Shun-Liang Chao, “the accentuation of demonic horror in the Romantic grotesque is inseparable from the sublimity of terror that was made popular by Edmund Burke.”\(^{126}\) Translated by Chao, Victor Hugo’s remarks are helpful: “that universal beauty that the
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ancients spread solemnly on everything was not without monotony; [...] the grotesque may serve as a half, a contrast, a starting point where people appreciate the beautiful with a fresher and keener perception."\(^{127}\) Captured by the undisrupted beauty in the study, the viewer is suspended between the comical yet distorted comparisons of human and animal, and the catalyst read of what might await. In this sense, Rowlandson showcases his undeniable skill in depicting beauty in women in a grotesque tactic to confuse, confront, and distract. This satisfaction of looking at beautiful young women is only momentary.

Rowlandson deals directly in the sketchbook with expression in a study of nine heads of Caucasian men that are placed in three rows of three, where they are each inscribed with an adjective (fig. 6). From left to right they read: The Malignant, the Old Trifler, the Dissembler, the Busy body, the Ostentatious, the Suspicious, the Penurious, the Plausible, and the Detractor. Charles Le Brun (1619-1690), the court painter to Louis XIV in the seventeenth century, published \textit{Méthode pour apprendre à dessiner les passions} (1698). Its purpose was to organize and codify expression so that artists could better execute their expressive intentions, and enable viewers to effectively, and without ambiguity, ‘read’ the painting.\(^{128}\) Le Brun exemplified forty-three expressions including: rapture, fear, love, laughter, and horror. We know that Rowlandson was aware of Le Brun and his work on expressions, because he caricatured them in a series titled \textit{Le Brun Travested, or Caricatures of the Passions} (1800) published by Rudolph Ackermann.\(^{129}\) Hybrid creatures throughout \textit{Comparative Anatomy} are being juxtaposed intellectually with codified human expressions in art. This supports the argument that Rowlandson had

\(^{127}\) Chao, \textit{Rethinking the Concept of the Grotesque}, 105.  
\(^{129}\) Missing footnote
pedagogical intentions with this book, because he is using a similar system to that which had already been established.

Rather than identify and name expressions in *Comparative Anatomy*, Rowlandson inscribes each man with an adjective. This is because, rather than being examples of expressions, these men are characters. Their faces are not caricatured, yet each are physiognomically different. Hogarth’s *Characters and Caricaturas* (1743) (fig. 7) is brought to mind in this instance. Hogarth created this etching to warn against the use of the foreign and increasingly popular Italian tradition of caricature and argued instead in favour of the importance of character. Here, it appears that Rowlandson is recalling Hogarth’s passion for character, but for a satirical purpose.

Rowlandson presents a much wider array of expressions and characters than those found in previous studies when he depicts twenty-four physiognomic studies of men and women, two of which are shaped in an inhuman form (fig. 8). For example, a head that is in the upper right register is in the shape of an axe, and a head in the bottom right register also resembles an inanimate object, or at least an unnatural shape. The first head from the left appears to be borrowed from Hogarth’s *Characters and Caricaturas*, and the bottom right head could be comparable to the “European” skull on the title page, that will be discussed later (fig. 1). Although the rows and columns keep the studies organized, they are not set out with a particular expression or type of character in mind. This composition’s purpose is to provide the viewer with various examples of grotesque expressions, and how to create those expressions with enough caricature and comical exaggeration for the face to function within the grotesque modes of expression.
In conclusion, this image, along with the others discussed in this section, showcase the book’s function as an instructive manual to teach artists a new way of depicting expression, through grotesque modes of representation. Rowlandson, through his use of historic methods of codifying expression, inserts himself into this history, and modernizes these codes for the nineteenth-century artist.

**Distraction and Distortion of Rowlandson’s Comparisons, Contrasts, and Juxtapositions**

Comparisons, contrasts, and juxtapositions are common devices that Rowlandson uses throughout his oeuvre. Starting in the 1780s and 1790s some of his earliest prints are composed of contrasts and comparisons of faces or actions, and are typically presented in pairs. Some are simple and obvious in their comedic function, such as the comparisons between height and weight that Rowlandson often applied to couples, for example *Dropsy Courting Consumption* (1810) (fig. 9). Or, in *Contrast 1789* (1789) (fig. 10) the viewer first compares the two representative emblematic and allegorical women of the country of Britain and France in order to recognize the stark contrast between the two; Rowlandson makes sure that the contrast is comprehended by the viewer by listing the points of difference beneath the image. However, the comparisons, contrasts, and juxtapositions in *Comparative Anatomy* are more complex in their meanings than previously credited, and the employment of these devices develops a grotesque affect on the viewer through distraction and distortion of the face.

In *Comparative Anatomy*, there is no shortage of productive comparisons that shed light on the devices of distraction and distortion, which are important to this
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sketchbook because a key component of the grotesque is that the viewer is not given a solution to the problem.\textsuperscript{131} Through distortion and distraction, Rowlandson is able to present different environments and expressions for the artistic learner. Although, twenty-five folio pages of the sketchbook, not including duplicates, provide particularly interesting comparisons between the facial compositions of human, animal and vegetable, for the sake of brevity this chapter will only go into a few examples.

The first example that will be examined is the title page of \textit{Comparative Anatomy} (fig. 1). Here, Rowlandson depicts nine skulls of both humans and animals that are each inscribed with the name of the animal or “variety” of human that they depict. The first row is what this analysis will concentrate on, for the skulls are inscribed, left to right, “Negro,” “European,” and “Baboon.”\textsuperscript{132} The two human skulls are depicted in side profile, while the baboon skull is presented frontally. The skull inscribed “Negro” is a similar size to that of the baboon. Its features are soft, with large eyes, and the expression is over all non-threatening with a closed mouth, however, it is missing a nose bone, and ear holes. This is in contrast to that of the skull inscribed “European.” The bottom jaw is large, and slightly agape and it appears to have a large nose from the bridge that is still intact. Rowlandson did include ear holes; however, its eyes appear angry, with furrowed brow bones, and small black eyes. The skull inscribed as “Baboon” curiously appears to be the most humanoid, with large eyes, slightly furrowed eyebrow bones, large check bones, a slender nose, and a tapered chin. Its teeth are fully exposed, and appear to be smiling with the edges of the mouth tilted upwards towards the eyes. This is important

\textsuperscript{131} Thomson, \textit{The Grotesque}, 21.
because comparative anatomy had considerable influence on the classification system of what was termed “human variety.” Rowlandson’s skulls are curious because the skulls are in two different profiles, negating the ability to compare, which is a key aspect of comparative anatomy. The next example helps make it clear what Rowlandson is trying to accomplish.

The sinister grin of the “Baboon,” and the humanoid features it possesses, appear to be playing a trick on the viewer. Baboons and other apes, including the orangutan, were considered close relatives to the human species by the nineteenth century. By having the “Baboon” represented in a frontal portrait, it prevents the viewer from envisioning Peter Camper’s facial angle theory that was misinterpreted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by emerging racial scientists to prove that Africans were closer to the ape species than Europeans. Further, despite the title of the sketchbook, the rows of skulls act as a deterrent to analyzing the animals and human heads in a comparative way. The viewer, therefore, is met immediately with a grotesque portrayal of skulls, science, and art before even proceeding to the contents of the book. This tells us that Rowlandson was clever, and that he was purposely distorting the viewer’s assumptions of the book’s contents.

Within the contexts of Comparative Anatomy these juxtapositions are fully realized as experimentations of the grotesque and a playfulness toward the human condition. An example of this juxtaposition can be seen in a study of four young, Caucasian women who are placed above four grotesque Black and Caucasian studies of men (fig. 11). Formally, the women are drawn with light pencil strokes, and lightly
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133 Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 27.
coloured skin, with rosy cheeks, while the men are drawn with a harsher line and colouring, showcasing the formalistic difference in depicting the beautiful vs. the grotesque. Rowlandson’s depictions of young/beautiful vs. the old/ugly typically have a sexual connotation, however with the body and environmental scenery omitted, the purpose of juxtaposition changes from comical to instructional, and what we learn is the aesthetic impact of grotesque comparison and expression. Not only does the grotesque exist in the men’s facial deformities, but also in this confrontation between two seemingly unrelated subjects.

This composition seems to have been important for Rowlandson to perfect and include in the book for he created a duplicate (fig. 12). There are slight differences between the two studies of the same subject, but improvements in detail are discernible. Rowlandson has changed the women’s hair to blonde, and their faces have become slightly plumper in the other version. More detail has been given to facial features, particularly for the first two women, portrayed in their eyes, nose, chin, mouth, and hair. The first man on the right is now bald, and more intense line work is given to each of the men, who are coloured more harshly and darker than the previous production of this comparison. According to Mario Praz, “for the Romantics, beauty was enhanced by exactly those qualities which seem to deny it, by those objects which produce horror; the sadder, the more painful it was, the more intensely they relished it.”134 Therefore, this use of comparison and juxtaposition is a Romantic quality that Rowlandson expressed grotesquely.
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134 Chao, Rethinking the Concept of the Grotesque, 106.
Conclusion

Rowlandson’s *Comparative Anatomy* has not been tied to Romanticism and the critical reactions to Enlightenment thought more broadly, because, as discussed in the introduction of this chapter, scholars and viewers alike expect to see less in his works. The aesthetic properties of *Comparative Anatomy* places these books firmly in the Romantic grotesque, and Rowlandson along with it. Rowlandson, through the use of the grotesque, engages with the Romantic Movement to promote not only this visual record of the grotesque concept for the general viewer, but to expand the tools for the budding artist.
Chapter Two:
The function of hybridity within *Comparative Anatomy*

The aim of this chapter is to explore Rowlandson’s use of hybridity in *Comparative Anatomy*. This concept will be traced to key points in the artist’s career, first to demonstrate how this device can be detected throughout his oeuvre and, second, to show the varying ways it emerges. Hybridity, by which I mean the fusing or mixing of two or more animals, things, or concepts, was defined in the previous chapter as a device used to blend two or more entities into one body. However, here it will be investigated as a specific function of the book’s production, which is itself a hybrid form of art. This concept will largely be examined through Jerrold Levinson’s arguments on hybrid art forms and their effects because, as one of the first theorists to examine the results of combining processes in art, his expanded understanding of the concept enables the researcher to achieve greater specificity and nuance in scope. A hybrid art form is more than just a compilation of different “elements” into one visual experience. According to Levinson, it is a purposeful concoction arranged in order to transform the overall effect of the piece, and transform the affect on the viewer to something different than the influence each element would have exerted in isolated form. However, these elements that Levinson describes are not “structural elements” that operate at the same time, such as: “two-dimensional patterning, three-dimensional depth, disposition of bodies and
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135 Hybridity was an important device in the development of British art. A good example is the combination of portraiture and elements from history painting, resulting in the late eighteenth century with grand manner portraiture. For more on this, see David H. Solkin, “Great Pictures or Great Men? Reynolds, Male Portraiture, and the Power of Art,” *Oxford Art Journal*, 9, no. 2, (1986): 42-49.
136 Levinson, “Hybrid Art Forms,” 5.
137 Levinson, “Hybrid Art Forms,” 5.
movements, and psychological interaction."  

Further, it is not to be defined when “two or more distinct artistic activities or ostensible media” can be conceptually decomposed. Levinson defines a hybrid art form as one consisting of a “combination or interpenetration of [two or more] earlier art forms.”

Rowlandson, by virtue of his profession as a graphic satirist and his training as a Rococo artist, is uniquely situated to examine and teach this form of imaginative art. His use of hybridity enables him to reach into history, interpreting for modern artists the methods by which excess, expression, humour, and social reality are combined and distorted through ontological classifications of media (pencil and ink drawings, watercolour painting, and words), species (books, folio sketches, and illustrations), style (Rococo, Neoclassicism, and Romanticism,), and device (grotesque and satire).

This is not, in other words, merely pastiche but an interpenetration of historical text and images, combined with the artist’s pedagogical intentions. The result is that this hybridity validates Rowlandson as an artist and situates him in the history of art, satire, and the grotesque.

Generally understood to be mere references to, and appropriations of, Giambattista della Porta’s *De Humana Physiognomonia* (1586) and Johann Kaspar Lavater’s (1741-1801) ideas on physiognomy from earlier in the century, I argue that *Comparative Anatomy* is in reality an imaginative space dynamically fusing sketches,
text(s), style(s), book illustration, and comparative scientific methodology. In the construction of a book we encounter the traditions of both text, which he interprets visually, and image. Rather than just recalling these important historical works, I argue that Rowlandson presents them intertwined throughout the sketchbook, and combines them with his own original compositions, placing himself in this artistic lineage, that further merges historical and modern iconography, to aid nineteenth-century artists in learning the foundations of grotesque expression.

The significance of this argument is in underscoring Rowlandson’s expertise in grotesque expression, which is lost in scholarship because his commercial practice is based on the ability to duplicate and copy rather than innovate and imagine. In order to support this, I will first investigate Rowlandson’s use of duplicating, copying, and imitating in order to establish which process is being used in *Comparative Anatomy*. This will determine how to look at these images, and how to decipher the function they serve both within the sketchbook, and within Rowlandson’s oeuvre. I will then, using Levinson’s conceptualization of hybrid art forms, present evidence as to why Rowlandson’s *Comparative Anatomy* fits properly into this category of art.

**Copying, Duplicating, and Imitating: Rowlandson’s production process and its distraction from his innovation.**

---

The Royal Academy was the site of an intense debate between the relative positions of artifice and nature. For example, Sir Joshua Reynolds, a founder and the first president of the Royal Academy in London, delivered fifteen lectures at the Royal Academy that were later developed, published, and known collectively as his Discourses. In them, he places importance on the practice of copying in an artist’s education, especially from the Masters, defined as High Renaissance painters, favouring Michelangelo and Raphael most especially. In the second Discourse, Reynolds outlines what he believed to be the three stages in an artist’s development, then sketches out what was expected at each stage, and explains why each was significant. The first stage, which he calls “rudimental,” is a phase the student should be in prior to his studying at the Royal Academy. He should, at this point, have the ability to draw any subject, and demonstrate some ability to “manage colour,” and have a simple understanding of the rules of composition. Curiously, as it seems to challenge a logical chronology, the second stage is defined as the period in which the artist learns everything that comes before his artistic training, when he “endeavour[s] to collect subjects for expression […] and must extend his capacity to more sublime and general instruction.” The importance of this stage is that the “perfections which lie scattered among various masters are now united in one general idea, which is henceforth to regulate [the artists] taste, and enlarge his

imagination.”

It should be noted that Reynolds uses the phrase “general idea.” He did not believe in what he terms “mechanical practice” or direct copying of every detail, but that copying should be more generalized, in order to understand the original artist’s effect and be able to use that as a tool. The third and final stage for Reynolds is a reliance on one’s own judgment, that from the success of the previous stages the artist “may now without fear try the power of his imagination.” Reynolds continues,

Invention, strictly speaking, is little more than a new combination of those images which have been previously gathered and deposited in the memory: nothing can come of nothing: he who has laid up no materials can produce no combinations.

Therefore, Reynolds’ premise in the outlining of the three stages for an artist’s education is that learning the general ideas, tools, forms, and overall compositions from the Masters would provide a base upon which the modern artist could develop their individual practice.

An example of the other side of this debate is offered by the librarian and theorist Johann Joachim Wincklemann (1717-1768), who instructed modern artists to imitate the ancient Greeks. In his *Reflections on the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks* (1765), he argued that the only way modern artists would be able to achieve the same greatness as the Greeks, or to perhaps become “unequalled,” would be through imitation. The key reasons for the success of the ancients were climate, contour, drapery, and expression. He argues the climate in Greece made it possible for the Greeks to have perfect bodies and
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therefore perfect models to inspire art. The idea of imitation being an important tool in artistic development is not novel by the mid-eighteenth century, as other national schools of art in Europe employed this method frequently. The significance to Rowlandson’s practice in *Comparative Anatomy* with respect to Winckelmann’s theories lies in his emphasis on the Greeks achieving greatness, with everything that came after as a decline. Despite evidence that Rowlandson copied ancient sculpture, he lands on the other side of this debate between artifice and nature.

Rowlandson is therefore gathering the images that Reynolds would say should “have been previously gathered and deposited in the memory” in this primer. From here the viewer could move forward to Reynolds’ third stage by interpreting and inventing their own combinations. Moreover, throughout his career, we have evidence that Rowlandson often copied and duplicated, terms that seem interchangeable, but may have also referred to multiple drawings or prints made through more mechanical processes. Bernard Falk states that the controversy is not whether or not Rowlandson made duplicates: “What is in question is the method he adopted to produce these copies.” The methods Rowlandson uses demand investigation because they will help to clarify his processes in *Comparative Anatomy*.

---

For example, in the 1828 Sotheby’s auction of Rowlandson’s private art collection held after his death, the catalogue advertises “[Several] of his most celebrated subjects, many of them originals from which he made duplicate drawings.” Further, an anonymous “W. P.” described Rowlandson’s method of duplication in 1869 in Notes and Queries, which warrants quoting at length:

If at any time collectors should be surprised at finding that five or six of his productions are almost exactly similar in outline, and scarcely different in colour, they may rest assured that all are by him, and by him were considered to be equally original. The process of production was simple. Rowlandson would call in the Strand, ask for paper, vermilion, a brush, water, a saucer and a reed; then, making of the reed such a pen as he likes, he drew the outline of a subject (generally taking care to reverse the arms of his figures), and hand the paper to Mr. Ackermann to be treated as if it were a copper-plate. This was taken to the press, where some well-stamped paper was laid that turned them out as a right and left outline. The operation would be performed with other pieces of damp paper in succession, until the original would not part with vermilion enough to indicate an outline; then that original became useless, and Rowlandson proceeded to reline the replicas, and to tint them according to the fancy of the moment.

This quote has stimulated a major debate in the discourse. Joseph Grego suggests it is plausible, but states that only two or three duplicates would be able to be produced from this process. Falk’s heated contribution to the debate counsels that anyone who stops to think about this methodology would acknowledge that it is “sheer lunacy, “because no left-handed productions have been discovered.” Suggesting an alternative method, Falk advocates that Rowlandson either drew the design fresh from looking at the original, or he traced. Furthermore, the Sotheby auction acknowledges the selling of
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155 Samuel Sotheby, A Catalogue of the Valuable Collection of prints, drawings pictures of the late distinguished artist Thomas Rowlandson Esq., 1828, Yale Centre for British Art.
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the originals; if Rowlandson did use the method described by W.P., the originals would have been useless after several duplicates were made.

But is there evidence that Rowlandson used this method of tracing? Meyer argues that in one of the few known portraits of the artist, he is pictured tracing, evident by the position of his hands; “his left index finger is clearly positioned to steady what must be a translucent sheet of paper while his right hand guides the pencil” (fig. 13). This is important visual evidence to the understanding of Rowlandson’s methodology in creating copies. Meyer suggests that *Comparative Anatomy*’s sister sketchbook, *Studies After the Antique*, was largely created using this method of tracing. Meyer reveals that Rowlandson was copying from volumes of outline illustrations of antique works from the Louvre by Thomas Piroli published between 1804 and 1806, and Thomas Hope’s *The Costumes of the Ancients* (1809). Remarkably, Meyer uses the term “imitate” rather than copy, or duplicate because “he rearranges and transforms the replicate image […]. Typically [Rowlandson’s] inclination is to build a narrative with accompanying figures.”

Therefore, we know that Rowlandson was using this method at the same time as the production of *Comparative Anatomy*. However, I argue that rather than trace the images from the historic sources that Rowlandson pulls from, he “imitates” them. And although Meyer suggests that Rowlandson created *Studies After the Antique* in order to serve as an “utilitarian […] graphic equivalent of a commonplace book,” I suggest that this method of imitating images from other well-known sources is the creation of a hybrid art form, especially regarding *Comparative Anatomy*. The significance of this interpretation is
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that it reveals a departure from the current narratives surrounding this sketchbook. Rowlandson’s genius in his production of these duplicates, his copying, and his imitations, highlights *Comparative Anatomy*’s function of hybridization.

Falk states two reasons for the purpose of duplicating. The first is that Rowlandson wanted to keep originals while giving his publishers the replicas, and the second, that he anticipated two or more patrons wanting the same subject, which Rowlandson would be able to deliver efficiently through this reproductive method. In terms of the multiplicity of the sketchbook, this is a plausible explanation for the existence of the three versions of *Comparative Anatomy* as well as the instances where subjects receive multiple treatments. This is supported by inscriptions made, presumably by Rowlandson himself, in several pages of the sketchbook held in the Houghton Library collection. These inscriptions, which read “better duplicate” also include a corresponding page number that directs the reader to a folio that appears earlier in the bound book. As such, my speculation that these duplicates could have been created to pique a publisher’s interest and to help Rowlandson perfect his studies is highly probable. Regardless, it is clear that creating duplicates, replicas, and imitations were important aspects of Rowlandson’s artistic practice.

The controversy surrounding the process described above does not lie in in the fact that he is duplicating; rather, the controversy lies in the employment of mechanical processes to make these duplicates, and presenting them as “equally original” watercolours. Rowlandson’s various products of copying and duplication can therefore be classified as having multiplicity in an ontological sense. This is key, because it is not
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simply creating an original from which duplicates are made. Rowlandson is making
multiple originals, wrought from hybrid processes—printmaking, sketching,
watercolouring, imitations, and original ideas. Hybridity is integral to Rowlandson’s
production of works on paper, evident by *Comparative Anatomy* in which some
duplicates are clearly drawn from other pieces from Rowlandson’s oeuvre. Further,
although they may vary in their instances, the three versions of *Comparative Anatomy* are
still *instances* of the same work and can thus also be classified as multiple.\textsuperscript{166}

**Della Porta, Le Brun, and Lavater: Key examples illustrating *Comparative
Anatomy*’s hybridity**

Although there is evidence that Rowlandson was bringing together book production, text
and image, and historic sources, *Comparative Anatomy* has yet to be explored as a
product of hybridity. This is likely because the innovative experimental projects
Rowlandson worked on late in his career have yet to be fully investigated. An exception
is one of Rowlandson’s most popular works, the *Doctor Syntax* series, produced in a saga
of three books between 1812-1821.\textsuperscript{167} Focusing on the first of the series, *Doctor Syntax in
the Search of the Picturesque* (1812), this satirical progress follows the fictional character
of Doctor Syntax, a rural schoolteacher and pastor, as he travels through the country
writing and sketching his experiences to secure them for posterity. Based on the cleric,
school master, and amateur artist William Gilpin (1724 – 1804),\textsuperscript{168} who is best known for

\textsuperscript{166} Davies, “Ontology of Art,” 158.
\textsuperscript{167} For more on the *Doctor Syntax* series, see B. C. Saywood, “Dr. Syntax: A Pickwickian Prototype?”
\textsuperscript{168} For further information on William Gilpin and his contributions to art history please see, Robert
having developed the aesthetic concept of the picturesque and guided travelers to assess less far-flung landscapes for their aesthetic potential, the *Tour* became a very popular book and one of the first to have a “continuing caricatural figure.”169 By 1819, the *Tour* was in its ninth edition and had been translated into French, German, and Danish, was published in an American edition, and was imitated by Rowlandson and Ackermann’s competitors.170 Rowlandson created sketches that were later sent to the writer, William Combe, who in turn would write the poem to accompany the image. Therefore, Combe textualized the image, rather than Rowlandson illustrating the text.171 This is important to note, not only for Rowlandson’s innovation late in his career, but his continuous ties to the Romantic through the picturesque.

In my research, I have counted eighteen studies found within *Comparative Anatomy* that are imitations from historic sources, or duplicates from his own oeuvre. This is a significant number, but these appearances have been explained away as mere references to these previous works, without providing any deeper analysis on the significance of these appropriations. Rowlandson relied extensively on studies found in della Porta’s *De Humana Physiognomia*, Le Brun’s physiognomic studies and Lavater’s *Essays on Physiognomy* published in four volumes between 1775 and 1778 for *Comparative Anatomy*. In this section, I will begin by explaining and investigating the

ways that della Porta made a significant impact on *Comparative Anatomy* and some of his major teachings, before moving on to the importance of Le Brun’s physiognomic lectures, and ending with Lavater’s contributions. This analysis will determine the duality of the combination of the historic works and Rowlandson’s original works as a pedagogical tool for both learning the tools of expression and learning the history of expression since the Renaissance.

The early-nineteenth-century British fascination with predicting a person’s character or other attributes from their physical appearance is not exclusive to this time period or geographical location.\(^{172}\) The intellectual roots of physiognomy, which I explored briefly in the previous chapter, is the study of the physical characteristics of a person’s or animal’s face in order to determine their personality and/or moral traits, began with the writings of Aristotle.\(^{173}\) The ancient Greek philosopher declared that “art depicts human action” and, according to Melissa Percival, since then “artistic theory and practice has centered on the passions and the expression of the emotions.”\(^{174}\) Influenced by Aristotle, della Porta’s *De Humana* is one of the first theoretical-treatises on physiognomy, and is based upon the Aristotelian theory that the personal and moral characteristics of a human can be found when compared to an animal.\(^{175}\) Della Porta’s theories are, as Sergius Kodera tells us, a type of “cartography… of the outward
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\(^{172}\) Specifically, it was characterized as a central aspect to the sixteenth-century’s Scientific Revolution. For more information, please see, Katherine Hart, “Physiognomy and the Art of Caricature,” in *The Faces of Physiognomy: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Johann Caspar Lavater* edited by Ellis Shookman (Suffolk: Camden House, 1993), 127.


appearance of physical bodies with the aim not only of curing all kinds of physical
diseases, but also of predicting the hidden inclinations or dispositions of the soul (past,
present, or future).”

Appearing free of satirical flourishes, I have identified twelve imitations and
copies from della Porta’s De Humana, which is more than those identified as coming
from either Le Brun or Lavater. The question remains as to why della Porta is the most
copied text found within Comparative Anatomy. Della Porta, a Neapolitan nobleman,
became one of the most prominent and popular scientists in the context of Italian
Naturalist philosophy. The woodcuts in De Humana Physiognomia influenced many
artists and theorists, well before Thomas Rowlandson and beyond the realm of British
illustrative art, including: “Charles Le Brun, Johann Lavater, Honoré Daumier (1808-
1879), and J. J. Grandville (1803-1847), and even the surrealists in the twentieth-
century.” In the context of this thesis, Le Brun and Lavater will also be examined as
key texts used by Rowlandson in Comparative Anatomy. Le Brun’s preoccupations with
physiognomy, as explained in Chapter One, were to codify expression in order to create
an easier experience in “reading” a painting in the seventeenth century. He developed
sketchbooks and delivered lectures on the renderings of comparable physiognomy
between humans and animals that greatly relied on della Porta’s treatise. Eventually, in
the eighteenth-century, Lavater would use the woodcuts and prints from both della Porta
and Le Brun to illustrate his own treatise, Essays on Physiognomy.

177 Kodera, “Giambattista Della Porta’s Historic Science,” 1.
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What sets the Houghton copy of the Comparative Anatomy apart from the British Museum’s version, and quite possibly the version held in the private collection of Sims Reed Limited, is that Rowlandson inscribed in pencil two block quotes presented in Italian that accompany two specific studies in what appear to be della Porta’s original published text, found on the second verso folio within the sketchbook. On this folio is depicted a man in three-quarter profile facing an owl that is looking towards the viewer, and below is another comparison of a bearded man and a male lion (fig. 14). This is significant: the relationship between text and image is formalized, demonstrating that Rowlandson relies not only on his visual representation of della Porta’s treatise, but on the text as well. Rowlandson is creating a space for the viewer to be confronted by these historical physiognomic texts and images in order to satirically critique these scientific theories, relating back to how Romanticism, including the grotesque, is a reactionary artistic genre and concept.

Le Brun’s lectures on expression and physiognomy were influenced by della Porta’s *De Humana Physiognomia*, which was translated to French in 1655 and 1665. However, Le Brun, drawing upon “Cartesian physiology and the principles of geometry”
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180 There is one other quote that is found within the Houghton copy: “Amongst the numerous religions in the World. There is one which teaches us that the Souls of human beings pass into the bodies of other Animals,” which accompanies the last study in the sketchbook. This quote, credited to Pythagoreans by Rowlandson, is within all three versions of *Comparative Anatomy* albeit on different folios found in different positions within the sketchbook’s structure. The B.M, in their description of each folio places this quote on two folios, the seventh and the twelfth. They note that the seventh folio is the same comparison that appears in the Houghton copy, that which compares a porcupine and a mustached man, along with a pig and a man in a hat. They note that the seventh folio is the same comparison that appears in the Houghton copy, that which compares a porcupine and a mustached man, along with a pig and a man in a hat. The twelfth folio compares heads of a duck, peacock, chamois and an ostrich with human heads; specifically they note that the quote was written “in a later hand.”

goes further in “artistic intensity” than the woodcuts presented by della Porta.\textsuperscript{182} It is assumed that these drawings of human and animal comparisons in which the human becomes more animalistic rather than retain their humanity, were part of a series of lectures given at the \textit{Académie royale de peinture} between 1668 and 1671.\textsuperscript{183} In \textit{Comparative Anatomy}, Rowlandson is giving the modern artist a type of visual literature review on the importance of expression and the theories of physiognomy scholars and theorists throughout the centuries. The book therefore has a duality in its own hybridity: first, to teach the artist how to depict grotesque character and expression and, second, to teach the history of art. As Le Brun’s lecture on expression retained its popularity in the eighteenth century, the lecture on physiognomy was largely ignored and even forgotten until the second wave of physiognomic interest came about with the treatise of Lavater.\textsuperscript{184}

Just as Le Brun lectured for artists, one of Lavater’s concerns was with the representation of physiognomy within various mediums of art, specifically painting and print. Lavater, gaining in the eighteenth century both popularity and condemnation by art theorists and scientists alike, was convinced of physiognomy’s right to be considered a true science. Never fully reaching this goal, Lavater’s books, a compilation of his own visual contributions and those from other artists and treaties, add to Rowlandson’s \textit{Comparative Anatomy} in interesting ways. There are six sketches that are either imitated or copied from Lavater’s \textit{Essays}, including the sketches that Lavater copied from Le Brun. The \textit{Essays}, therefore, also make up a large number of copied images, the second largest collection.

\textsuperscript{182} Percival, \textit{The Appearance of Character}, 44; Cohen, “Searching the animal psyche with Charles Le Brun,” 354.
\textsuperscript{183} Cohen, “Searching the animal psyche with Charles Le Brun,” 355.
\textsuperscript{184} Cohen, “Searching the animal psyche with Charles Le Brun,” 355.
Exemplifying the multiple levels of copying and imitating executed by Rowlandson is a composition in which four male heads of various sizes each face the centre (fig. 15). In the upper-left register of the study, a man is shown supporting his chin with the palm of his hand, his eyes cast down with indifference, yet recalling the iconographical pose of the ‘thinking man.’ This pose’s origin is located in the work of Hans Holbein the Younger (1497-1543), which Lavater included in the first volume of his Essays, acknowledging Holbein as the artist and giving the image the title of “Judas.” Lavater does not spend much time analyzing the face of his Judas, and only provides one short paragraph comprised of three questions, concerning how Jesus could have called upon “such a countenance to the apostleship?”185 However, the importance of analyzing this study lies in the fact that the image presents an example of Rowlandson’s multidimensional hybridity. Rowlandson layers different histories, artistic mediums, devices, and images together into a new work of art. Furthermore, although each page is distinct and could stand on its own, compiled together it becomes, like a new branch of science, a product of hybridity, which would also (eventually) appear in print. These elements have historic importance, and have integrity when separated, a key element in distinguishing a hybrid art form according to Levinson. The hybridized effect of the interpenetration of these three works, and their relation as a model for Rowlandson’s pastiche produces a didactic apparatus that primes the artist in grotesque expression, while simultaneously establishing a lineage for modern practice.

According to Percival, Western art theory is closely tied to the theories of physiognomy in that “[it] conceives of the art object as the embodiment of an ideal form,

185 Lavater, Essays on Physiognomy, 65.
a greater beauty which lies beyond the manifest one.”\textsuperscript{186} In other words, similar to how physiognomy reaches for the deep characteristics or morals of a person based on their outward appearance, Western art theory also teaches that an art object has a meaning beyond the physical formal qualities of the work itself.\textsuperscript{187} Although codified throughout the centuries, because of its connections with caricature physiognomy has been “relegated to the margins of artistic production.”\textsuperscript{188} One explanation as to why Rowlandson would title the book “comparative anatomy,” rather than “comparative physiognomy,” might have been this negative connotation of its relation to ‘non-serious art.’ But Meyer has a deeper theory about the curious title. By 1820, physiognomy was known to be no more than a pseudo-science. However with publications such as Lavater’s and works by phrenologist Franz Joseph Gall\textsuperscript{189}, the study of physiognomy was “linked … to that of anatomy and physiology, [and] face reading gained an undeserved ranking on the scientific scale.”\textsuperscript{190} Comparative anatomy held more authority than physiognomy during the production period of this sketchbook, and titling themselves “comparative anatomists” separated these men from the more general “naturalists,” the most famous being Georges Cuvier (1760-1832), and Etienne Geoffroy St. Hilaire (1772-1844).\textsuperscript{191} I agree with Meyer when she states that the title “Comparative Anatomy” distances Rowlandson from the moralistic realm of the science of physiognomy, but that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{186} Percival, \textit{The Appearance of Character}, 43.
\item \textsuperscript{187} Percival, \textit{The Appearance of Character}, 43.
\item \textsuperscript{188} Percival, \textit{The Appearance of Character}, 43.
\item \textsuperscript{189} Franz Joseph Gall appears in the Houghton copy of \textit{Comparative Anatomy} in a portrait where his name is inscribed on a ribbon beneath his bust as “F JOSPEHEUS GALL MDCCCXX.” A wreath of animal and human skulls surrounds the bust. The sketch also appears in the B.M copy. Matthew Payne, and James Payne, \textit{Regarding Thomas Rowlandson 1757-1827: His Life, Art, & Acquaintance}, (London: Hogarth Arts, 2010) 332.
\item \textsuperscript{190} Meyer, “Man’s Animal Nature,” 123-124.
\item \textsuperscript{191} Meyer, “Man’s Animal Nature,” 124.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
“it signals a scientific kinship in so far as the resemblances he finds are in the functional rather than the structural features of the face.”

**Conclusion**

Rowlandson expounds on the theories of art in *Comparative Anatomy* not only by the caliber (and abundance) of the sources he integrates throughout the various sketches, but also by including himself in this history of expression. This has been overlooked in the study of his oeuvre, and demonstrates that, at the end of his life, he was attempting to permanently mark his significance as an artist who was a master of exaggerated, grotesque expression, to the same degree that he was a master of Neoclassical pose, and fine line through *Comparative Anatomy*’s sister book, *After the Antique*. In the former, he dissects the sources of physiognomy and expression and places them sporadically throughout the folios, interpolating or interspersing them with each other, and his own pastiche, and by doing so brings forth a primer that looks to the past, the present, and anticipates the future.

---

Chapter Three
The Skin Histories of a Woman and Satyr:
A Microcosm of Comparative Anatomy.

This chapter examines one didactic juxtaposition within Comparative Anatomy that Rowlandson presents featuring a Black woman and three satyrs (fig. 16). In many ways, this individual page can be viewed as a microcosm of the book’s function in its entirety. While any composition could have been chosen to investigate how the book’s grotesque and hybrid intentions reside on each folio, this particular pairing of a Black woman and these mythical hybrid creatures was selected because it has recently inspired excitement in scholarly literature as it intersects with the history of racism, multi-culturalism, colonialism, scientific theory, visual culture, and the position of classicism in these arguments. Through detailed visual analysis of this composition, this chapter aims to investigate why Rowlandson would place these figures together, and how the grotesque and hybridity are employed. I argue these figures share a skin history that becomes visible only when placed side by side and, using the theories on performativity developed by Judith Butler, I examine what these skin histories reveal about Rowlandson’s decisions to bring these figures together. The concept of a skin ego was first developed by Didier Anzieu, but I apply it in this chapter to bring to the surface a relationship between these figures that has been concealed for so long.

Alison E. Wright speculatively identifies the Black woman in this imaginative space as Sara Baartman, a Khoisan woman from the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa who performed as the “Hottentot Venus” in Britain and France between 1810 and 1815. I expand on her excellent work by specifically looking into the skin histories of Baartman and the satyr beside her whom I identify as the mythical beast Marsyas. Assuming that the Black woman depicted is Baartman, Rowlandson portrays a figure with both confidence and agency. She gazes back at her audience inquisitively, with what Wright calls a “sardonic smile.” Her face features a wide nose and large full lips, but Rowlandson imbues her brown skin with the blushed cheeks you would expect to find on any English beauty. The study includes her neck, but stops with a thin line delineating the shoulders—the artist has chosen not to include her body. If this is Sara Baartman, it is one of the few portraits of her that does not focus (or in this peculiar case, even include) her body. Baartman’s performances as the “Hottentot Venus” emphasized her large buttocks, which had been codified to represent her in visual culture by her arrival on the
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194 Her name has various spellings, and had changed throughout her own lifetime. In South Africa she was most likely regarded to as Saartjie or Sartjee meaning “little Sarah.” Although the diminutive can be seen as affectionate, it was often used by slave owners to diminish their slaves intellectually as well as hierarchically. Upon her arrival in Europe, her name was anglicized to Sarah Baartman, but her name went through another change in 1812 when she was baptized as Sarah Bartmann. However, the spelling Sarah Baartman, is not widely used in literature, and therefore will be used throughout this chapter and thesis. Clifton Crais, and Pamela Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus: A Ghost Story and a Biography*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009), 107.
Wright bases this assumption on a single drawing that is labeled in pencil on the mount “Hottentot Venus” in the Menil Collection.
London “freak show” circuits in 1810. Although Wright concentrates on the source material for this interpretation of Baartman, I argue that this departure from the body, and his emphasis on her rosy cheeks, points to the skin as the prominent feature.

In the top register, Baartman is displayed beside a male satyr depicted in side profile, allowing the artist to present the creature in great detail; however, only an outline of his shoulders is included in this portrayal. Rowlandson leaves out the lower extremities that this hybrid beast is normally distinguished by, his goat legs and erect penis, and instead places considerable emphasis on his face, horns, and beard. The features rendered showcase the satyr’s humanity more than his bestiality, although his long, donkey-like ears and goat-like horns still place this beast between the realms of human and animal. I suggest that the satyr is the mythical beast Marsyas, who was skinned alive by Apollo after he lost a musical contest, which set the Sun-god’s lyre against the superior notes of the beast’s flute. In punishment, Marsyas’ skin was placed at the foot of a citadel, but the villagers recognized the skin’s power and prayed to the husk for musical excellence.

In the pages that follow, I examine both Baartman’s and Marsyas’ violent skin histories to investigate their relationship in *Comparative Anatomy*, and Rowlandson’s motivation for pitting these grotesque figures against normative standards of beauty. I argue that the grotesque is a source of intense aesthetic potency, so powerful that a performer in a freak show can be re-cast as a goddess than can challenge the very science that has diminished her.

---

Iconography of Skin Violence

The study of skin violence refers to what is perhaps the most controversial example of scientific aggression against the ‘Other’ in the history of comparative anatomy, when practitioners’ objects of analysis were subjugated human specimens.\(^{199}\) Baartman’s story, which began in France, is of particular interest to this analysis because it is here that she was shown to a group of emerging scientists and artists as a racial Other, and where her face became a subject of “intense interest.”\(^{200}\) In tracing the significance of this face, and its juxtaposition with Marsyas, a deeper understanding of the iconography surrounding the two figures is helpful.

The Khoikhoi, the true name of the cultural group that colonial Europeans titled “Hottentot,” became “the most renowned, [and] the most notorious, of all African societies.”\(^{201}\) According to Z.S. Strother, they were depicted in travel diaries and contemporary literature as,

> [p]eople who gobbled like turkeys, who dressed in entrails, who anointed themselves with animal fat, who exposed both infants and the elderly, who worshipped a June bug (or nothing at all), whose women bore an “apron” of skin covering the pubis, and who transformed their men into half-eunuchs.\(^{202}\)

The Khoikhoi therefore were a people in the European consciousness without language, religion, or culture and whose bodies were transgressive to aesthetic norms. Once a very successful nomadic society, the Khoikhoi had repeated, though largely superficial, interactions with Europeans, arguably more than any other African population in the

---


period. As their society broke down in part due to the diseases brought into the community by this contact, they subsequently became dependent on the colony. Soon the Khokhoin were claimed to be the “most debased group on earth” and the myth of a hybridity between human and animal was, by the eighteenth century, “institutionalized” in colonial rhetoric.204

The artist Hans Burgkmair the Elder of Augsburg (1473-c.1531) is suspected of being the first to depict a Khoikhoi person, which he portrays in an animal skin robe in his woodcut Natives of Africa and India/In Allago (In Algoa) (1508) (fig. 17).205 This mantle of animal skin, typically a sheepskin, draped around the shoulders of the Khoikhoi, became codified as a symbol of Hottentot iconography in European visual culture. The convention of depicting a Khoikhoi with minimal clothing (a loincloth or belt, and a sheepskin)—which became evidence of a lack of culture—was deepened to include a pipe, which was interpreted as a symbol of laziness. Baartman’s performance as the “Hottentot Venus” pulls from this established iconography. Giving the illusion of nudity, she performed in a tight skin-toned bodysuit, with a large animal skin draped across her back, as shown in her advertisement (fig. 18). In her performance, she was compelled to sing, to dance, and to play a musical instrument, so as to emphasize her otherness. Within the scientific community in Europe, most prominently in France, her elongated labia and her large protruding buttocks were a source of entertainment, curiosity, and anxiety. These physical differences, and the manner in which she was displayed, emphasized these differences, and were interpreted to be physical

205 For a good discussion of her representation, see Strother, “Display of the Body Hottentot,” 4-7.
characteristics of her animalistic sexuality. Yet, this sexuality was treated carefully—satire helped to distance Baartman’s beholders from the very sexual power that both defined her and posed her as a threat to fascinated European men. Her stage name, “The Hottentot Venus,” both acknowledges this sexual power and undermines it with a satirical hint to the European view of her ‘grotesque’ body. For an audience classically educated, Venus would signify a beautiful and sexually appealing woman, yet Hottentot, as “the most debased group on earth,” challenged this hyper-sexuality, which was not seen as a product of civil society, but a specimen from a society that was interpreted to be animalistic.

Baartman’s image had become largely codified in her caricatured appearances in multiple satires dating between the 1810s and 1820s. We know that Rowlandson was aware of the Baartman phenomenon, as she was depicted in one of the artist’s satirical prints, *Exhibition at Bullocks Museum of Bonepartes Carriage taken at Waterloo* (January 1816) (fig. 19 & 20). Although clearly a more subtle attempt to cash in on the prevailing interest in her body, he portrays Baartman with a softness that was not customary. In a print within the print and titled the “Hottentot Venus,” her shameless gawkers are drawn with astonishing economy, but her signature buttocks are rounded, and her pipe smoke curls as sensuously as the lines of her body. Even with this more sympathetic and aesthetically pleasing approach, Baartman nonetheless shared much of the iconography of classical satyrs, similarities that were not lost on Rowlandson. By
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comparing the iconography of satyrs and Baartman, similar modes of representation can be found—the appearance of hyper-sexuality, hybridity, performative gestures, and excessiveness encourage a deeper investigation into their juxtaposition.

Representing the amalgam between the human and animal realms, the satyr is a mythical creature derived from Greek lore that appears from the naval up as a human man with donkey-like ears and horns on his head, while his lower extremities are imagined to be in the form of a goat. The creature is associated with the god Dionysus, and represents excessive sexuality, corruptness, and drunkenness. It is these characteristics, which inform their interpretation as uncontrollable beasts that act on their immediate pleasures, impulses, and emotions. In the context of *Comparative Anatomy*, the satyr mirrors the conflict between the civilized human and the irrepressible and insatiable appetites of the animal realm combined in one body. This creature can be classified as neither human nor animal and therefore lies in a liminal state that defies the categorization with which nineteenth-century scientific communities seemed to be consumed. The satyr, along with other monstrous beings found within the sketchbook, disrupts these neat categories and, in the process, challenges what constitutes human and animal. The very term *satyr* has had multiple definitions and has had many connotations through time. Between 382 and 405 CE, St. Jerome wrote about satyrs who lived apart from society in his translation of *The Bible.*

This distance from society was useful and these mythical beasts came to represent the ‘Other’ and, as Kaufman argues, became “a natural candidate for [...] races of people to be found on distant shores.”

---

Satyrs, which became “one of a host of zoological oddities,” have over time been represented through extremes, as uncontrollable beasts, as well as devoted patriarchs of the family. In Northern European art of the early sixteenth century, satyrs were represented as loving fathers within families, the benchmark example being Dürer’s interpretation in his engraving *Satyr’s Family* (1505). It is evident that Rowlandson knew of this duality of representation, as he depicted satyrs in multiple works as tame, non-threatening, and loving creatures. Rowlandson was also a collector of Dürer’s work, and would therefore be aware of the Northern traditions.

Like Dürer, Rowlandson does not consistently represent the grotesque bodies in a “frenzy” of animalistic behaviour, but rather gives human-like emotions to these hybrid creations and places them in human-like circumstances. For example, there is a composition of a beast that appears to be primarily humanoid, despite its monkey face, furry legs, and claws for feet, in *Comparative Anatomy* (fig. 21). It is through the poses that Rowlandson privileges the human-like qualities of this creature, which he shows cradling a baby and posed with another child, who sits on her right. This study becomes a kind of family portrait and demonstrates a dramatically different sensibility, provoking feelings of warmth, sympathy, love, and compassion by composing a scene that is iconographically similar to the Madonna and Child. It is one of the few studies within *Comparative Anatomy* that portrays the subject’s whole body, which suggests that pose is a key element that Rowlandson teaches in this didactic folio. However, the three grotesque heads floating above this family, and providing different facial views, remind
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213 Kaufmann, *The Noble Savage*, XIX.
the viewer that this is not a normal human experience being shown. The middle head strikingly resembles the monstrous vegetable head previously described from Chapter One (fig. 1), and the faces flanking it appear to be satyrs, with large ears, horns, and wild expressions. Here, Rowlandson is providing the student artist with two very different ways to express the grotesque in their practice. One is the more typical, fearful monstrous grotesque in a hybrid body, and the second is a calmer scene in which the effect of the grotesque is not as immediate or obvious. Taken together, they express the duality of the Romantic Movement.

Looking back at this chapter’s prime object of analysis, there are two satyrs depicted in the lower register, below the figures of Baartman and Marsyas: an adult satyr with an exposed tongue, and a child who has not yet grown a full beard, horns, or the distinguishable long ears. The exposed tongue contradicts the social norm, and in this period was in some cases interpreted as aggressive, intimidating behaviour, animalistic in nature. Iconographically, when depicted on a humanoid face, visible tongues hint at uncontrollable insanity. This gesture provokes fear, terror, and uncertainty in the viewer, particularly paired with a hybrid monstrous body because it reflects the social anxieties of strangeness, and the Other. In some ways, the anxiety is distanced from the viewer because of the very hybridity of the figures. They are not humans, so this is not a human drama. However, the pose, like that of the hybrid family, and the expressions, including those of anger, and fear, complicates this distance. The exposed tongue can be seen as a counter to the rationality provided by science, by exemplifying the monstrous and potentially the insane on a humanoid form. This is furthermore significant to the

pedagogical nature of *Comparative Anatomy* because Rowlandson is taking this grotesque motif, and creating a new and innovative use for it to counter the emerging reliance on scientific lenses through which to view nineteenth-century knowledge and society.

Although published after Rowlandson’s death, and it could not therefore have an influence over his renderings of the grotesque in *Comparative Anatomy*, John Ruskin’s (1819-1900) *Stones of Venice* (1851-53) describes the grotesque architecture of Venice and provides an insight on how the grotesque, specifically the physiognomy of grotesque faces on the facades of churches, were regarded in nineteenth-century aesthetic theory. As he describes one face in particular, he writes, “This head is one of many hundreds which disgrace the latest buildings of the city, all more or less agreeing in their expression of sneering mockery, in most cases enhanced by thrusting out the tongue.”

This identifies the exposed tongue as a common characteristic of grotesque physiognomy, often used by Rowlandson in *Comparative Anatomy*, appearing within sixteen of the sketches within the book, some more or less aggressive.

**Violent skin histories represented by the shared shoulder**

Baartman and Marsyas merge within the composition by way of two intersecting lines located at her left shoulder and Marsyas’s right. This subtle intersection, which is the type of meaningful economy that Rowlandson was famous for as a draughtsman, both
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separates and joins their invisible bodies.\textsuperscript{217} This merging of the skin is an allusion to the myth of the Marsyas, which made its first appearance in ancient Greek literature in Athens in the middle of the fifth century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{218} The story begins with Marsyas finding a flute along a river, which he starts to play, soon discovering his love and talent for playing the instrument. Apollo, who learns that the village people prefer Marsyas’ flute over his lyre, becomes enraged. Apollo invites him to a musical contest where the winner could inflict any punishment on the loser that they saw fit, and Marsyas consented. Initially both Marsyas and Apollo charmed the muses who judged them equal. Further irritated by the satyr’s prowess, Apollo then suggested that both he and Marsyas turn their instruments upside down to play and sing at the same time. As this was an impossible feat to do with a flute, the muses gave Apollo the victory. As punishment, Apollo hung Marsyas up by his arms, or in other versions by his feet, to a pine tree, and while still alive, Apollo flayed Marsyas, leaving his empty skin hanging on the tree. But the emotional response of the people of the village was so great, it changed the landscape. Their tears became the river “Marsyas,” and they preserved his skin at the foot of their citadel.

A typical visual representation of the myth of Marsyas is depicting the moment of the ritualistic violence of Apollo skinning the satyr. Apollo is often shown wearing a red cape, which merges with the blood of the satyr. This is exemplified in the analysis that Rikke Hansen conducts of the Spanish painter Jusepe de Ribera’s history painting \textit{Apollo

\textsuperscript{217} For more information on Rowlandson’s praised draftsmanship please see, Robert Wark, \textit{Drawings by Thomas Rowlandson in the Huntington Collection.} (London: Huntington Library Press, 1975); Ronald Paulson, \textit{Rowlandson: A New Interpretation,} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.)

\textsuperscript{218} For a good source of the myth of Marsyas please see, Anzieu, \textit{The Skin Ego,} 46-54.

For a history on the changes and original sources this myth can be found please see, Laurie Adams, “Apollo and Marsyas: A Metaphor of Creative Conflict,” \textit{Psychoanalytic Review} 75, no. 2 (1988): 319-338.
Flaying Marsyas (1687). The skin, Apollo’s cape, and Marsyas’ blood begin to “merge into one” representing the transfer of skin from Marsyas to Apollo through this violent act. In Rowlandson’s signature economy of line, he alludes to this traditional symbolism and the shoulder of Baartman becomes one with Marsyas’s, fulfilling the fantasy of shared flesh. However, it is unclear in Rowlandson’s sketch if it is a transfer of skin from one to the other, like in the visual representation of the myth of Marsyas, or a sharing of flesh, which opens up other avenues of exploration and, for the period, potential controversy. If it is the latter, this sharing rather than transfer, could serve as a reminder to the viewer that Marsyas and Baartman share similar skin histories.

Many Greek myths were designed to act as metaphors for historical events. Historians have been able to locate the myth of Marsyas at a time in ancient Greek history when the Greeks were struggling to conquer Asia Minor. In particular, the Greeks were concerned with the conversion of the village people. “Marsyas’ foreign ancestry (Phrygia), capacity (satyr), and other characteristics can also be seen as the intrinsically Greek expressions of his being ‘different’ and even ‘opposite’: ‘non-Greek,’ ‘non-divine,’ ‘non-civilized,’ ‘presumptuous,’ ‘ugly.’” Therefore, the myth of Marsyas can be interpreted to be one of European colonization, forced acculturation, and of the ‘Other.’

Similarly, the history of Baartman also resides in a story of colonialism. The Cape of Good Hope was first colonized by European nations in 1652 when the Dutch East India Company formed a settlement at Table Bay, and the British followed nearly 150 years later.
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221 Anzieu, The Skin Ego, 46.
years later, in 1795, However the Cape was fought over by the two nations throughout the interim.\footnote{Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 22; Andrew B. Smith, “Different facets of the Crystal: Early European Images of the Khoikhoi at the Cape, South Africa,” \textit{Goodwin Series} 7 (1993): 13.}\footnote{Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation,” 21-22.} The Khoikhoi became one of the main sources of labour for the Europeans; this dependence on the colonizers led to the cultural breakdown of their society and a near cultural extinction by the late 1600s.\footnote{Sadiah Qureshi, “Displaying Sara Baartman, the ‘Hottentot Venus,’ \textit{History of Science} 42, no. 2 (2004): 234.}\footnote{Qureshi, “Displaying Sara Baartman, the ‘Hottentot Venus,’ 234.} Representations in contemporary travelogues that, like other commodities, vied for consumer dollars and imagined and perpetuated the myth of Africa as a continent filled with what Sadiah Qureshi calls “brutish and ‘uncivilized’ people believed to be without, or worse still, incapable of religion.”\footnote{Sadiah Qureshi, “Displaying Sara Baartman, the ‘Hottentot Venus,’ 234.} The emphasis on the conversion of a colonized people is held in both the myth of Marsyas and the history of South Africa. Qureshi tells us that it is through the “missionary objective” of both the Greeks and the Europeans that “presented an opportunity to effect a reclamation of souls in the interests of both… faith and empire.”\footnote{Qureshi, “Displaying Sara Baartman, the ‘Hottentot Venus,’ 234.}

While the myth of Marsyas states that he consented to the musical contest, Baartman’s history is more ambiguous. In some accounts she is depicted as an agent in her own display and consented to traveling to Europe and performing. One example of support for this argument is her having an understanding of both Dutch and English, by her name being printed on her advertisements as the publisher, and by the statement of Clifton Crais and Pamela Scully that her owners would not have known traditional Khoikhoi costume and so she must have chosen her own costume. However, the above analysis of Khoikhoi iconography challenges this. Further, there was a court case against
her owners by abolitionists that argued for Baartman’s repatriation to South Africa on grounds that she was being abused. Here, her understanding of various languages was recognized, as she stated that she was performing of her own free will, and the court ruled in her favour, although scholars still debate whether she was forced to say this by her owners. The long history already briefly explored of Khoikhoi iconography in Europe that outlined exactly what she wore on stage strongly diminishes the strength of this statement. However, like Marsyas, she performed without a true chance of survival.

The contest between Marsyas and Apollo is relevant to the swaying of opinion on whether Baartman represented the bestial other or a sexually appealing body, which concluded with the opinion that she was a hybrid sexual creature, an organism found on a spectrum between humans and apes, therefore creating a socially (and scientifically) acceptable space in which to admire her body. The dissection of her body by Cuvier, the creation of a cast of her genitalia, and the removal of her brain and skeleton, is a kind of modern-day flaying, which brings more focus to the comparison between Baartman and Apollo’s flaying of Marsyas. What has been helpful in examining the eventual display of these parts of her body in a French museum, which was exhibited until 1976, and the hanging of Marsyas’ skin in the citadel, is Carol Duncan’s argument that museums act as ceremonial spaces. However, each of these comparisons suggests stronger juxtapositions between their skin histories.

---


228 Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*, 75.

Marsyas consented to the terms of the contest, and was flayed as a consequence. His followers cried for him, and they respected his skin as a representation of his psyche, which hung in a citadel to be contemplated and prayed to. Baartman was sold to an animal trainer in France who forced her to display herself for three days straight to curious scientists. She was (after her death) dissected, and the display of her body in these dissected parts is a constant re-enactment of this dissection.

Rowlandson plays with this arc between comparison and juxtaposition in the very composition of the sketch. The sharing of the shoulder that was previously mentioned physically links their skins and their history together. But it is the position of her face, not in profile, that breaks this comparison. Having her in frontal orientation forces the viewer to look directly at her, figuratively facing this history, while only displaying her head and shoulders also creates a departure from the comparison between her physical traits and those of this mythological creature. The inclusion of the two bottom satyrs also further breaks the comparison between Baartman and the sexualized creature. These satyrs change the composition of the sketch to resemble a family, drawing on the iconography of the satyr, which emphasizes human (and more importantly) civil aspects of the creature. Although one could say that the difference of her pose distances Baartman from this scene, the sharing of the space on the page, and the shoulder to shoulder placement in the composition, humanizes and civilizes both subjects, challenges the iconography of Sara Baartman and excessive satyrs equally. Rowlandson’s use of classical motifs, Renaissance iconography, and hybridity as devices affect the ways in which beholders interpret the representation of a Black woman anatomically. In portraying her in the form
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of a portrait bust (which was often reserved to depict great intellectual leaders from the classical past), he was thwarting the beholder’s urge to see her body, fully or in fragments, instead considers her agency. Rowlandson’s modern approach to nineteenth-century preoccupations with comparative anatomy has been perplexing to critics who expect to see less in these works.

**Display of Skin**

A key player in the myth of Marsyas is Apollo, a part which, in Baartman’s drama, could be played by Georges Cuvier. Cuvier was first introduced to Baartman as the “Hottentot Venus” by the zookeeper/animal trainer to whom she was sold in Paris in 1814, S. Reaux. Not interested, he refused the meeting.231 A year later, perhaps with the rise of her popularity as a spectacle in France, Cuvier took the second chance offered by her managers to analyze her as a scientific specimen.232 At the time of this first meeting with Baartman in 1815, Cuvier worked in the Museum of Natural History as a professor of comparative anatomy. He also served on the council of the University of France, which was a political appointment made by Napoleon, and was Vice Rector of the Faculté des Sciences at the Université de Paris.233 Cuvier became an important anatomist, and one of his key contributions was proving for the first time the extinction of certain species of animals.234 Unlike some of his contemporaries, Cuvier did not believe in what was known as the Great Chain of Being, rather, he believed that each species was unrelated to

---

231 Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*, 123.
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any other.\textsuperscript{235} However, when he examined Baartman and analyzed her characteristics, his commitment to this theory wavered. In the end, he seems to place her in between the animal and human realms, creating a ‘missing link’ in the Great Chain.\textsuperscript{236}

Baartman was first brought before a group of zoologists, anatomists, physiologists, and artists in March of 1815 in Paris at the Jardin des Plantes.\textsuperscript{237} Over the course of three days, she was examined, naked, so that they could investigate every part of her body.\textsuperscript{238} A watercolour made by Léon de Wailly, \textit{Portrait of Saartji Baartman} (fig. 22) was used by Geoffroy Saint-Hilarie and Frédéric Cuiver (Georges Cuvier’s brother) in their \textit{Historie naturelle des mammifères} published in 1824. This is both the first image of the book and the only one that represents a human being.\textsuperscript{239} The opening note reinforces the idea that she was perceived to be more animal than human. It exclaims,

\begin{quote}
Our drawings present each animal in a simple state and always in a profile because it is in this position that one can best seize the totality of the form and physiognomy; and we have taken care to provide a frontal drawing when necessary in order to better see and judge the animals.\textsuperscript{240}
\end{quote}

In light of this emphasis on her body, Rowlandson’s departures in \textit{Comparative Anatomy} are significant. In essence, Rowlandson did not allow the audience to make comparisons between her body and their own. Instead of being fascinated or even aroused by her body, the viewer was forced to look at her inquisitive eyes.
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Although she was coerced into posing naked, Cuvier noted that she hid her labia from the men.\textsuperscript{241} This irritated the scientists as they were especially intrigued by her labia minora, which they concluded was evidence that Africans, and the Khoikhoi in particular, had hyper animalistic sexuality. This informed their categorization by these scientists as the lowest order of humans, a judgment that had remarkable longevity.\textsuperscript{242} Cuvier waited until December of 1815, after Baartman’s death, to fully conquer her body through dissection. Geoffroy Saint-Hilarie, Cuiver’s assistant, wrote to the minister and prefect of police Comte Anglés in order to obtain her corpse with the intention of dissecting her cadaver.\textsuperscript{243} He sought her body on behalf of the Muséum d’Histoire Naturelle on the “grounds that it was a singular specimen of humanity.”\textsuperscript{244} Placing Baartman on the fringes of humanity, as the only example of her ‘type,’ this statement isolates Baartman as a grotesquely unique body.

The importance of this act of dissecting Baartman recalls Judith Butler’s theory of performativity. Butler outlines two major types of performative acts, the illocutionary and the perlocutionary. An illocutionary can be described as an act that builds a reality, for example a judge who rules in court and keeps the law’s standards. While a perlocutionary act is one in on which the illocutionary depends on and either accepts or declines the conditions needed to build the illocutionary reality.\textsuperscript{245} In regards to the judge, the defendant and a plaintiff who accept the ruling of the judge would fulfill the judge’s
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reality and therefore be fulfilling the perlocutionary act. Without this acceptance, the judge could not rule.

In relation to Cuvier, I suggest that he is performing an illocutionary act of the nineteenth-century scientific discourse on race by first dissecting Baartman as a scientific specimen and further by publishing in his *Observations* that Baartman is a “Bushwoman” and therefore an inferior human. However, Butler warns us not to take the illocutionary performative act on its own, but in relation to the discourse in which it speaks.\(^ {246} \)

Therefore, Cuvier is not only performing an illocutionary act of self-fulfillment in his dissection of Sara Baartman, but also that of the racial theoretical discourse that was developing in the nineteenth-century. This performance represents the physical creation of a new reality that emerging racial theory develops and self-supports in order to sustain the falsehood of superior and/or inferior human races. Likewise, Apollo’s flaying also operates as an illocutionary act of taking command over Marsyas’ body, creating a new reality in which Apollo, despite Marsyas’s proven musical superiority, becomes nevertheless superior? to his opponent, as the god was able to change the rules of the game to suit his own idea of himself. Both Apollo and Cuvier ought not to be contested as they hold command over the body, the skin, and the existence of European superiority.

Instead of a citadel, Baartman was placed in a museum in order to serve as a reminder, not merely of what a European does not look like, but that the European would set the standards for normativity. There are similarities between a religious shrine and a museum for, as Carol Duncan reminds us in “At Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship,” they perform similar ceremonial functions in societies as monuments. Baartman’s body cast and skeleton were first exhibited in the Muséum de l’Histoire Naturelle and moved

\(^ {246} \) Butler, “Performative Agency,” 148.
to the Musée de l’Homme in 1937, where her skeleton remained on display until 1974. The case of her body was removed two years later due to public outcry.\textsuperscript{247} I argue that this shared ceremonial function of the citadel and the museum further ties the cultural history of Baartman to that of Marsyas and that these performative acts of hanging or displaying their skins in ceremonial spaces create a stronger link to the Rowlandson’s comparison between these figures in \textit{Comparative Anatomy}.

As Duncan states, “like ceremonial structures of the past,” museums also carry out “broad, sometimes less obvious political and ideological tasks.”\textsuperscript{248} The Musée de l'Homme was designed to display the people of the colonies, their weapons, and way of life, placing the European colonial victories into the “museum of man.”\textsuperscript{249} The visitors to the museum often are also taking part in a type of performance associated with the ritual of the ceremonial building, such as being a “witness to a drama-often a real or symbolic sacrifice – or hear a recital of texts or special music.”\textsuperscript{250} In the case of Sara Baartman, it was a kind of bodily sacrifice and subsequent dissection, a colonial body that the visitors were participating in when they viewed the case in which her remains were displayed.

Baartman’s body also toured around the city of Paris in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but, rather than a relic of a saint, she was a relic of the Absolute Other, “always a symbol and never a human being,” displayed to entertain white Europeans and ease their own sense of anxiety about the colonial project and their need to cast themselves in the superior racial role. In 1889 her body was exhibited at the Universal Exhibition of Paris, which celebrated the French Revolution’s centenary and
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millions of people visited. In 1994, her remains were taken out of storage, which had become her temporary resting place, when protestors rallied against her exhibition and forced the museum to remove her from the case where she had been on display for a century. She was then exhibited at the Musée d’Orsay in the exhibition titled “La Sculpture Ethnographique au XIXème siècle, de la Venus Hottentot à la Tehura de Gauguin.”\textsuperscript{251} The cast of her body along with her skeleton were turned so that the viewer could continue to view unchallenged the large protruding buttocks that were her claim to fame, recalling her performances as the “Hottentot Venus.” However, Rowlandson places her beside the mythical beast Marsyas in his primer examining the grotesque. As Baartman’s companion, the artist chose the beast that bested Apollo, the quintessential model of the human form. Although he does not offer a solution to either of their violent skin histories, Rowlandson uses this comparison to celebrate the creatures who took on the gods and, in the process, inspires the intellectual transformation of the grotesque body to the body of the revered.

**Conclusion**

The sketch under scrutiny in this chapter is comprised of a Black woman, which faces the beholder, and three satyrs, two adults from different angles, and a child. Wright argues that Rowlandson based his sketch of Baartman on sketches of Khoisan young men from an 1820 sketch by the landscape and marine artist, William Daniell (1769–1837), who was known in the period for bringing home authoritative views of far-off climes (fig. 23).\textsuperscript{252} Wright recognizes that this does challenge the identification of the figure as

\textsuperscript{251} Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus,* ” 142.

\textsuperscript{252} Wright, “The Face of Saartji Baartman,” 120-121.
Baartman, but argues that Rowlandson presents intriguing changes to the original drawing that places the figure in *Comparative Anatomy* as a separate depiction. But this only tells a part of the story. Although no one has been clear on the purpose of Rowlandson’s book, which the artist was clearly preparing for publication, the evidence points to the conclusion that it may have been didactic in intention. But what was he teaching? Like other books intended for artist study that demonstrate the results of representing faces at different angles with different expressions, or presenting different types of humans or animals, Rowlandson provides two different angles of the satyrs’ physiognomy for artists to work from, as well as a difference in scale made possible by the inclusion of young satyr child. In doing so, he is effectively creating a modern iteration of the northern European tradition of the satyr family. Furthermore, the type he offers by comparison is not simply a Black woman, but a Black woman who is represented alongside satyrs, and thus examined and presented as a hybrid creature (part human but, like the satyr, liable to be both wild and lazy). But, also like the satyr, Rowlandson suggests that the Black woman represented also has a history of subjugation. Rowlandson’s *Comparative Anatomy* is complex, particularly for its hybridity in subject and object. The book both functions satirically, and didactically, and reveals that Rowlandson does not only teach how to draw, but also how to interpret.

---

Conclusion

In this thesis, I argued that hybridity was a significant device that Thomas Rowlandson relied upon, not merely for his work in graphic satire, but also for his didactic work. Upon close inspection the sketchbook, *Comparative Anatomy*, which has been puzzled scholars for two centuries, functions as a pedagogical tool of the Romantic grotesque for the modern, nineteenth-century artist. Influenced by Arline Meyer’s work on Rowlandson and his importance as a Georgian satirist, this thesis intervenes in the literature surrounding Rowlandson and his circle by underscoring his innovative work in the nineteenth century, a period of his work that has until recently been virtually ignored as late-life peculiarity. Rowlandson’s employment of the grotesque was often discerned as a slipping of talent, and not as an artistic contribution to this genre of considerable note. This thesis urges for the continued scholarship on Rowlandson as an artist of the grotesque.

The scope of this thesis was in part defined by the availability of primary source material and, as such, I concentrated on the Houghton Library version of *Comparative Anatomy* at Harvard University, where I was able to perform close analysis of the work. However, I believe it would be productive to broaden this research, which can expand in many directions. Some lines of inquiry include more scholarly attention to the examination of all three known versions of the sketchbook, to investigate how the sketchbooks relate to each other, their chronology through watermark analysis, and for interest to be given to how the folios interact with the sketchbooks individually as well as cross-examination of how they perform across all three sketchbooks, as well as how they
correspond to the function of the book itself. The individual case study of the composition consisting of the Black woman and the satyrs must warrant excitement for further research to explore social, political, and religious complications and implications of the other individual compositions.

Moreover, further analysis ought to be conducted to see if relationships exist between *Comparative Anatomy* and *Studies After the Antique*. I have suggested in this thesis that they act as sister sketchbooks that retain an important relationship to each other, and to the art community of nineteenth-century Britain, in that they illustrate, and prime, contemporary artists with two major artistic genres popular at the time. There are strong connections to Rowlandson’s use of hybridity in both these sketchbooks that I believe needs more attention As this thesis demonstrated, this device is certainly found during the last years of his career, which would be an interesting starting point to go back to compare his hybridity to the beginning of his career. Moreover, in order to gain stronger support of Rowlandson’s hybridity, more comprehensive research is needed in Rowlandson’s production process and its implications to their critical reception.

Rowlandson created a space in which amalgams between humans and animals not only reflect contemporary society and its anxieties regarding emerging science and how it was used for the identity politics of growing imperialism but are tools to teach artists a modern way to interpret the Romantic grotesque. Rowlandson strongly employed the devices of comparison, juxtaposition, and contrast within this sketchbook; however, I also suggest that this research could delve deeper into developing reasons why these are seen throughout the artist’s career, and why he continuously returned to these devices within his graphic social commentary. As this thesis has shown, Rowlandson prepared
drawings in preparation for disseminating his ideas in print through the medium of
ingraving, and used themes from literature, classical motifs, and renaissance iconography
to create a primer for the modern artist, exemplifying that Rowlandson did not need paint
to be a Renaissance Man.
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