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In what sense is the dust-jacket a book part? It is stamped with the book’s title and in that sense belongs to it, yet it remains a separate and separable entity. It is an anomaly: a part apart. The jacket’s strange on-off relationship with the book is its defining feature, as this chapter shows, and one that can be traced throughout its history, from its first appearance. Its precise moment of origin can be hard to determine. It has a long pre-history in the makeshift wrappers fashioned by readers from at least the early modern period to protect their books.[[1]](#footnote-1) It also has a host of close relations in the shape of slip-cases and cardboard sheaths, which narrowly pre-exist it.[[2]](#footnote-2) Nevertheless, dust-jackets as specially made, ‘printed detachable coverings’ mark a distinct innovation in book-design, and it seems clear they emerged as a response to the advent of publishers’ bindings in the 1820s.[[3]](#footnote-3) Previously sold either unbound or in temporary covers awaiting the owner’s choice of binding, books were now issued as standard in permanent, cloth covered boards.[[4]](#footnote-4) Publishers were keen that these bindings reach customers’ shelves in pristine condition, so began to encase them in paper coverings.

Historical evidence of the jacket’s early history in this period is elusive, however. The accolade of oldest dust-jacket was held for many years by one that was not only separated from its book, but missing entirely. It was Heath’s *The Keepsake,* a literary annual published in 1833, and identified almost exactly a century later by the antiquarian John Carter as the earliest specimen of a book encased in a bespoke paper covering. But, during a visit to the Bodleian Library in Oxford in 1951 to exhibit this prize volume to the Society of Bibliophiles, its most notable feature was somehow detached and misplaced.[[5]](#footnote-5) *The Keepsake* itself now sits in the Bodleian in a watered silk binding, but the whereabouts of the jacket remains a mystery. It continued to hold its record *in absentia* for another half a century, a strange situation that was at least partially resolved when an attempt to locate *The Keepsake*’smissing jacket instead uncovered one that was older still. And this, belonging to another literary annual entitled *Friendship’s Offering* of 1829, currently remains the earliest recognised specimen. It, too, has been detached from its book, this time archived in a different location, and held carefully under a separate call mark.[[6]](#footnote-6)

However, these early artefacts are not exactly dust-jackets in the modern sense. Examination of the covering to *Friendship’s Offering*, along with the photographic record of the missing *Keepsake* jacket, reveals that they are all-over wrappings. The placing of the title text, along with the pattern of creases and discolouration shows they initially encased the book entirely and the former was even sealed with wax. According to Mark Godburn, the similarity with gift-wrapping paper is not accidental, since literary annuals such as *The* *Keepsake* and *Friendship’s Offering* were – as their names suggest – primarily intended as gift books. Sealed wrappings invited readers to tear open the paper, and nearly all ‘would have been damaged or discarded when purchasers opened them’.[[7]](#footnote-7) Yet, these particular examples have evidently been retained by their early readers, and *The Keepsake* has clearly been folded around the bindings in order to create a supplementary outer-cover. This early, *ad hoc* book jacket demonstrates not only the resourcefulness of nineteenth-century book-hackers, but also the ambivalence of this object, right from its inception. With its confusing palimpsest of folds and uses, it points to a fundamental uncertainty about what a book jacket is: a disposable wrapper, or an integral part of the book?

Publishers may indeed have assumed that these sealed wrappings would be discarded once the book reached the shelf, but it seems readers were not quite so sure. Clearly, if their disposability was taken for granted, then no examples would remain. The eventual transition to modern jackets, with flaps folding inside the book’s covers, may have been in part a bid to catch up with the behaviour of some readers, who were already adapting, rather than throwing away their wrappings. There are even instances of a kind of ‘hybrid’ wrapping, incorporating dotted lines and instructions to cut and fold the paper around the bindings into a jacket, if the reader so wished. John E Wheelock’s *In Search of Gold* (1884), for instance, was printed with the instruction ‘cut open at this line and use wrapper for outside cover’, demonstrating not only that sealed wrappings were the direct precursors of modern, flap-style jackets, but that there was even a degree of crossover between them.[[8]](#footnote-8) Nevertheless, the transition from one to the other is not seamless, since what we might call the material affordances of the two are different: custom-made flap jackets did not have to be torn off, and permitted the book to be read with the covering *in situ*. They suggested – or at least allowed for – a greater degree of permanence. But, as they came to be the norm from the 1860s onwards, they raised a new set of questions about the relationship of jacket and book.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The range of different approaches to design and format shows that there was initially no consensus about even basic features. Evidently, when Lewis Carroll made a special request for the title to be printed on the spine of his book jackets, this was not yet common practice. Carroll took a particular interest in the physical presentation of his books, writing to his publishers, Macmillan, in the mid-1870s, with detailed instructions about the wrapper for the forthcoming *Hunting of the Snark* (1876).With the title on the spine of the jacket, he argued, ‘it can stand in bookstalls without being taken out of the paper and so can be kept in a cleaner and more saleable condition’*.*[[10]](#footnote-10) Carroll’s intervention illustrates the extent to which books were exposed to the soot and grime of Victorian London, especially on its many street bookstalls. It also shows that the flap jacket was at this stage considered *more* disposable that the sealed wrapping, not less, since it was frequently discarded even earlier. Jackets were routinely removed by booksellers, who regarded them as an obstacle to the easy identification and display of books. They were issued as part of the book by publishers, but customers may seldom have seen them.

By the end of the century, this had changed. Printing title on both spine and front became standard, along with other developments indicating that jackets were being retained rather than removed by sellers. What had previously been a largely plain protective layer began to fill with text and illustration. The jacket now displayed the price and the various binding options available (buyers could sometimes choose between cheaper ‘illuminated board’ or a deluxe, more expensive cloth edition). It trumpeted the book’s popularity: ‘Fifty thousand copies sold!’ It became a space for promotional quotes and endorsements (the term ‘blurb’ emerged around this time, as discussed in chapter 22 of the present volume by Abigail Williams, giving a name to new kinds of jacket text). It was a sales pitch for the book beneath, but also for other books from the same publisher. Publishers’ lists had featured on all-over wrappings, too, but flapped jackets went for the hard-sell. William Hamilton Gibson’s *Highways and Byways* was issued by Harper Brothers in 1883 in a jacket that that did not carry the volume’s own title, but instead reprinted a glowing review of a different book by the author. Printed in two lengthy, dense columns and set horizontally so it wrapped around the book, it resembles a separate single page broadside or advertising leaflet rather than a jacket.[[11]](#footnote-11) Some publishers even printed advertisements for other commodities too. The back of an 1885 edition of *Paul and Virginia* was emblazoned with advertisements for pianos and miracle nerve-cures.[[12]](#footnote-12) Dust-jackets represented premium advertising space, ‘hoarding[s] that did not sit still, but travelled into the very homes of potential customers’.[[13]](#footnote-13) Where they had once been apologetic and austere, they now competed for attention alongside newspapers, magazines and posters in the noisy visual world of late-nineteenth century print.

The innovation of flapped jackets even provided a brand new kind of space, folded inside the cover yet not inside the book itself. These were at first blank, as if publishers were not sure what use to make of them, but in the 1890s promotional text began to migrate onto the flaps. Other uses were tried, too. Harper Brothers gave the back-flap of its jackets over to detailed guidance on ‘How to Open a Book,’ instructing readers to ‘[l]ay the book back downward, on a table or smooth surface’ to avoid damage. Within the space of a few years, the new conventions and layout of the dust-jacket were sufficiently familiar to be the subject of parody. The front of the 1906 jacket for Gelett Burgess’s *Are You a Bromide?* spoofed the hyperbolic clichés of the blurb, along with its then-customary accompanying image of a woman, dubbing her ‘Belinda Blurb’. On its front inside flap, Burgess’s jacket satirised Harper’s instructions, comically confusing the position of the reader with the book itself, resulting in a series of physical contortions: ‘Lay on your back, on a table or smooth surface. Place your feet on the chandelier, then, holding the Book in one hand, look it over with the other’.[[14]](#footnote-14)

The front of the dust-jacket, previously minimal – featuring only the title or else a reproduction of the title page – gradually became a space for illustration. Here, though, it entered into a fraught relationship with what lay underneath. Its ostensible purpose was to protect rather than compete with cloth bindings, which had grown increasingly ornate over the second half of the nineteenth century, featuring expensive gilt decoration, coloured illustration and embossed designs. Jackets, by contrast, were made of cheap, buff-coloured paper. Their illustrations at first tended merely to replicate the binding, careful not to upstage it. Some designs even allowed the binding itself to be seen directly. Kipling’s *Jungle Book,* published in 1894, has a handsome navy cloth cover with a gilt engraving of elephants, visible through a jacket made of semi-transparent glassine. Margaret Turnbull’s *Looking After Sandy* (1914) has holes cut in the jacket revealing the cover illustration beneath.[[15]](#footnote-15) Similar windows were sometimes cut in the jacket’s spine, too, making titles visible and allowing the identical jacket design to be used for an entire series. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the jacket’s increasingly prevalent promotional function meant that slavish fidelity to what was underneath was largely abandoned. It began to carry quite different illustrations, showing publishers’ willingness to experiment with different aesthetic strategies. Where the cover art may be relatively restrained, the outer jacket needed more eye-catching and instant appeal. The relationship between ornate cloth cover and plain paper jacket gradually reversed itself, and by the interwar period the golden age of illustrated bindings had come to an end.

With the visual emphasis now on jackets, publishing houses invested in their design and impact.Victor Gollancz’s bright yellow jackets, designed by typographer Stanley Morison, were instantly recognisable and stamped the books with a uniform house style in the interwar period. Faber and Faber also broke new ground in the same period, commissioning emerging artists Rex Whistler, Graham Sutherland and Ben Nicholson to produce designs, and over the following decades the jacket became a vehicle for more established figures, indicating its rising cultural status. Sidney Nolan provided the artwork for C. P. Snow’s novels in the early 1960s, endowing the books with the cachet of artist as well as author. On occasion these two roles overlapped: Evelyn Waugh designed his own jacket art for his early comic novels in the 1920s and 30s. Usually, though, the jacket design was beyond the creative jurisdiction of the author. Ernest Hemingway was famously unhappy with the jackets for *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell To Arms*. The ensuing wrangles with his publisher confirmed the jacket as the province of marketing departments rather than writers.[[16]](#footnote-16) The jacket had selling power, and publishers sought to maximise its potential in a variety of ways. Simon and Schuster published Alexander King’s *Mine Enemy Grows Older* in 1958 with not one but two jackets, advising readers that if they didn’t like the top one, they could take it off to reveal a more ‘conservative’ one underneath.[[17]](#footnote-17) And while the author may not have control of this branding strategy, he or she nevertheless became frequently represented on it, as the rear and back flap began to carry author biography and image.

In the era of the paperback, dust jackets may no longer an unavoidable part of the reading or book-buying experience but it’s arguable that their function as advertising space has given way to a different kind of marketing role. Trade books now commonly have two incarnations, published initially in more expensive hardback, then later in a cheaper paperback edition. This two-stage publication model not only allows the paperback to carry the reviews and blurb from the first edition, but it also elevates the hardcover – complete with its jacket - to the status of a premium product. The jacket has become either a sign of luxurious expense or else a fussy excess, as its ubiquity wanes. Its decline has not been universal though. In some publishing contexts, notably Japan, the dust jacket has not disappeared but migrated onto the paperback, creating a peculiar doubled paper wrapper. Japanese books are also typically sold wrapped not only in a dust jacket but in an *Obi* or ‘belly band’, a strip of paper encircling the book to keep it closed. And in France, another kind of hybrid between the paperback and hardback can be found. The so-called ‘French fold’ incorporates the dust jacket’s flapped design into the paperback cover.

This range of approaches shows shifting, often conflicting attitudes to the jacket throughout its history. If it is no longer simply a disposable wrapping, then what exactly is the function of this paper covering? The term ‘jacket’, which entered popular usage in the 1890s, doesn’t so much define its object as question its status. In the first place it oscillates awkwardly between two interchangeable compounds: book-jacket and dust-jacket. One seems to position the jacket in relation to the book, and continuous with it, while the other suggests something outward rather than inward facing – its defining relationship is with the dust which it repels. In the second place, the metaphor pulls in different directions. A jacket is a particular kind of garment. Not quite a coat, it can be worn inside as well as out. It is nevertheless an outer layer, which can be taken off without actually being in a state of undress. But this clothing metaphor has been developed in other ways. In 1929, *Publishers’ Weekly* defined it as ‘mere overalls for the book’, implying that these are rough temporary clothes and not proper attire.[[18]](#footnote-18) Jacob Schwartz described them as ‘chemises’, suggesting a different, more lightweight and intimate garment, part of the wearer’s outfit rather than an outer protection for it.[[19]](#footnote-19) The artist Rockwell Kent (himself a notable designer of book jackets) declared in 1930 that ‘the real purpose of the paper jacket is to conceal the drab cloth cover of the book…to dress up a sorry article. Its function is exactly that of clothes, rouge and powder to plain women’.**[[20]](#footnote-20)** The emphasis switches here from covering to disguise. Books are not only dressed in jackets but ‘dressed up’.

Underlying these varying images are questions about the nature of the jacket’s relationship to the book. Is it an extension of the book or an advertisement for it? Is its function to protect, conceal, decorate or reveal what was underneath? Should it be worn or taken off? To put things in theoretical terms, how does the jacket work as a paratext? Gérard Genette defines this concept as the ‘threshold’ that frames a text and governs its interpretation. A paratext is made up of the ‘accompanying productions [enabling] a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers’.[[21]](#footnote-21) However, these accompanying productions come in two distinct forms. The peritext exists as a physical part of the book, as with the title page, colophon or index. The epitext, meanwhile, is outside the book’s covers but still shapes its reading, as with the reviews and advertising that surround a book. The jacket makes this distinction a difficult one to maintain. It is both inside and outside. It can be physically contiguous with the book or it can be separate. As both an advertisement *for* the book and part *of* it, it conflates peritext and epitext. It is conventionally outside the space of the literary text, yet the words of authors are found all over it in the form of blurb and review quotations. Sometimes the book’s internal content even spills over onto the jacket. E. E. Cummings’ play *Him*, published in 1927, used the inner flaps of its jacket for a drama in miniature, entitled ‘Imaginary Dialogue between an Author and a Public’. In the 1881 edition of Disraeli’s *Endymion*, published by Belford Clarke, the front of the jacket includes a key to the characters of the novel so that a paratext usually found within the covers is positioned outside them.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Where to draw the boundaries of the book, then? This is not merely an abstract point of principle, but shapes the practices of book collecting and archiving. For libraries, the status of the dust-jacket is a long-running and unresolved issue. It is ironic that the jacket to *The Keepsake* was misplaced in the Bodleian, but also symptomatic of an institutional blind spot. While the precise details of its disappearance remain a mystery, one hypothesis is that it was simply discarded by someone who saw it as worthless.[[23]](#footnote-23) This was common practice. Up until the 1970s the Bodleian, like most research libraries, simply discarded jackets.[[24]](#footnote-24) This part of *The Keepsake* could not be kept simply because there was no place for it, and even today, it isn’t always clear what the correct place for jackets is. The Bodleian continues to separate books and jackets on acquisition. Books belong on the shelves, jackets are flattened out and placed in boxes, where they occupy an institutional limbo; retained, but no longer part of the book.[[25]](#footnote-25) Moreover, they are not catalogued individually, but in batches according to acquisition date, so it is no simple matter to reunite book and jacket. The British Library similarly separates its jackets, as do other research and university libraries.[[26]](#footnote-26) One resulting irony is, of course, that G. Thomas Tanselle’s *Book Jackets*, which argues for the central importance of jackets as bibliographic data, must itself be encountered in its naked, unjacketed state by those researching the topic. To see the two together in the Bodleian, readers must find its acquisition date, call up the appropriate box-file, and retrieve the jacket from a pile of others. In the British Library, it is (at the time of writing) pinned to a notice board at the entrance to the Rare Books reading room, publicising recent acquisitions. Tanselle’s readers can – just – glimpse book and jacket at simultaneously, but not physically unite them.

Clearly, the reasons for this practice involve practicalities of storage and maintenance of books. Removing the jackets allows space for one more book per forty others, according to one calculation.[[27]](#footnote-27)But there is another assumption at work, too. The jacket is not part of the book proper, and perhaps there is even something about it that does not belong in the august surroundings of the research library. Even in the twenty-first century such institutions still bear the traces of earlier archival policies, which viewed the jacket as a tawdry trace of the bookshop, removed in order that the book could assume the sober appearance appropriate to the library shelves. The jackets of scholarly texts may carry illustration but the binding underneath is often notable for its lack of adornment, puritanically guarding against anything so crass as judging a book by its cover. The jacket’s superficial charms must be discarded in order for an authentic encounter with the book to occur, in other words. According to such institutional logic, the book starts on page 1, or with the colophon or title page. If Harper’s used to include instructions on ‘How to Read a Book’ on their jacket flaps, this absence of jackets implies a less explicit but equally emphatic reading lesson. Reading does not – or *should* not – involve perusal of the jacket or blurb. The removal of the jacket is when consumers become readers.

In the policies of public libraries, by contrast, blurbs, plot-teasers and jacket illustrations are retained, precisely because they are what readers need in order to make a choice. The issue is one of genre as much as location, in that the jacket is considered a legitimate or even necessary aspect of fiction reading. Cambridge University Library, while it removes jackets from scholarly books, stores its ‘supplementary’ material (its non-academic books) in their jackets, suggesting there is a different logic at work for different kinds of books. But the matter is more complicated still, since public libraries not only retain jackets but then often encase these in the extra protection of transparent mylar sleeves. And if the jacket is given a jacket, does this mean it is considered to be the book’s *de facto* cover rather than merely an outer layer? The trial of the playwright Joe Orton and his lover Kenneth Halliwell indicates this is indeed the case. The pair were jailed in 1962 after spending years doctoring books from Islington libraries, the jackets of which they would alter with surreal collaged additions, before returning them to the shelves. Agatha Christie’s *The Secret of Chimneys* has giant cats looming over a Venetian scene, and a biography of John Betjeman replaces the cover portrait of its subject with a heavily tattooed man in his underwear. They would also replace the blurb text, pasting over the jacket flaps with outrageous and lewd alternatives. The plot of Dorothy L. Sayers’ *Clouds of Witness*becomes hilariously smutty, involving a lost pair of knickers and a phallus. From a historical perspective, their harsh six-month sentence undoubtedly reflects the persecution of homosexuality in the period, but from a bibliographic one, it constitutes what is probably the one and only legal ruling on the status of the jacket. The pair’s crime of defacing books incorporated what they did to dust-jackets. Jackets must therefore be a part of the book.

Bibliographers and book collectors, meanwhile, have been surprisingly reluctant to think about dust-jackets at all.[[28]](#footnote-28) What Tanselle characterises as a ‘general neglect’ is based on the assumption that jackets were ‘somehow unworthy of serious attention – that in fact they were not bibliographical objects at all’.[[29]](#footnote-29) Yet ‘neglect’ seems too weak a word to describe the kind of visceral distaste shown by many collectors and dealers in the first half of the twentieth century. They ‘should be discarded the moment a book is received,’ according to the collector Morris Parrish.[[30]](#footnote-30) Richard de La Mare, despite commissioning some of the century’s most iconic jacket art while at Faber and Faber, nevertheless dismissed the jacket as ‘that wretched thing, of which we sometimes deplore the very existence’.[[31]](#footnote-31) ‘It’s a piece of wrapping with which the author had nothing to do’, declared the bibliographer Charles Beecher Hogan.[[32]](#footnote-32) Even as late as 1970, the bibliographer Edwin Gilcher insisted the dust-jacket ‘can in no sense be considered an integral part of the book they serve to protect’.[[33]](#footnote-33) A rare defence came from Ralph Strauss in *T. P. Cassell’s Weekly*: ‘Don’t throw away these gay covers in which they are generally encased. One day they may be of considerable value. […] I am convinced the jacket in some form or another will be required at future book sales, and perhaps some ingenious collector will devise a plan for its preservation.’[[34]](#footnote-34)

Strauss’s prediction was correct, as the sums paid for rare books in more recent decades testify. In 1986, when Kipling’s *Just So Stories* sold with its jacket for £2,600, Sotheby’s declared it ‘the highest auction price […] for a dust-jacket’, based on the logic that that the unjacketed version was worth a mere one hundred pounds.[[35]](#footnote-35) In 1998, Conan Doyle’s *The Hound of the Baskervilles* in a rare 1902 jacket sold for £72,000, ‘more than one hundred times the price of an average copy without one’.[[36]](#footnote-36) For collectors – or at least investors – the book without the jacket is not the complete article. ‘The unjacketed copy is […] a defective copy,’ and the higher price is required for a ‘perfect copy’.[[37]](#footnote-37) Here, the jacket begins to operate less like a paratext and more as what Jacques Derrida calls a ‘supplement’ which ‘adds in order to replace’.[[38]](#footnote-38) In other words, it is an addition, but one which paradoxically indicates a lack in the original object. Auction prices manifest this logic in bald numerical terms, but they also reflect a wider sense that the jacket’s absence renders the book somehow incomplete. Its illustration and design, blurb and author biography are now considered part of the experience of the book. It provides something indispensible to the book’s meaning yet not present inside its covers. As in the earlier examples, readers of Disraeli’s novel *Endymion* would be in the dark without the jacket’s key to the characters, and to take away E. E. Cummings’ jacket would be to subtract part of the work of the author.

However, this logic has a further twist, since the supplement comes to achieve a kind of autonomy from the book. The dust-jacket also now has value in its own right. It was first accorded institutional recognition at the Victoria and Albert Museum’ exhibition, ‘The Art of the Book Jacket,’ in 1949. When it belatedly entered the academy and the cultural canon, it was under the aegis of art history (or the ‘decorative arts’) rather than bibliography or literature. And since then, with only a few exceptions, scholarship has approached dust-jackets in aesthetic terms, so that they have become significant as part of the story of graphic design, rather than the story of the book.[[39]](#footnote-39) The jacket has acquired cultural status as an artwork, but also as a sought after collectors’ item. The Bodleian, though it consigns new jackets to obscurity in storage, archives rare and notable nineteenth century examples in the John Johnson collection of Printed Ephemera. They belong to a set of disposable printed paraphernalia and curios archived because of their rarity and historical interest. As ephemera, they have value precisely *because* of their disposability, placed alongside visiting cards, bookmarks, postcards and matchboxes. Whether they are categorised as Art or ephemera, however, the effect is the same. They are pronounced worthy of attention while detached (conceptually and physically) from books.

While they were once taken off for disposal, jackets are now just as likely to be removed for display. Those vandalised by Orton and Halliwell are now framed and proudly put on show by the same Islington libraries that once retained them as evidence of wrongdoing. At a 2017 exhibition, Finsbury Library marketed postcards of all the designs, celebrating them as ‘unique and rare artworks’.[[40]](#footnote-40) Like other notable jacket illustrations by famous artists, these peculiar subversions of the originals have become iconic and recognisable examples of the form. Meanwhile, the books they protected – and which Orton was imprisoned for damaging – have long disappeared into obscurity. It seems dust-jackets are given most attention when they part company from the book, as demonstrated by the industry of merchandise that trades lucratively on their iconic, retro aesthetic. Their images adorn posters, t-shirts, mugs, tote bags, pillows and a host of other non-book objects. Jackets might not be easy to find in the Bodleian Library reading rooms, but in the gift shop they are everywhere. Children’s book jackets are depicted on gift-wrapping paper, 1940s pulp jacket illustrations adorn notecards, and repurposed or ‘upcycled’ jackets enclose blank notebooks.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The jacket has acquired a life of its own, and its relationship to the book has shifted yet again. Debates have previously centred around whether or not it is ‘integral’ to the book, but this now seems the wrong question. Rather than acting *as* a frame for the text, it is often found *in* one, displayed in isolation on gallery and museum walls. Instead of asking whether the jacket really belongs to the book we might just as well pose the question the other way around, enquiring if the book is a necessary part of the jacket. Beyond this, however, this supplementary element disturbs the idea of the book as a self-contained and self-evident whole. In its absence, the book is missing something. But its presence makes things complicated, since book-plus-jacket add up to something more than a single, complete entity. The jacket subtly changes the book’s identity, confusing boundaries and muddying the issue of what is inside and outside. It constitutes an uncertain border of both the physical object and the literary work, confronting us with the question of where the book begins and ends.
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