Boney, the Transnational Agent of Nationhood: Visual Culture and Total War in 1812

Stephen M. Norris

RESÜMEE

Der Beitrag untersucht englische und russische Karikaturen aus der napoleonischen Ära. Im Vordergrund stehen Zeichnungen von George Cruikshank (1792–1878) und Ivan Terebenev (1780–1815). 1812 markierte für beide den Beginn ihrer Laufbahn als Karikaturisten. Terebenev zeigte sich inspiriert von englischen Karikaturen des 18. Jhs und wandte sich diesem Genre zu, um einen russischen Patriotismus zu motivieren. Noch im Jahr 1812 kaufte Cruikshank Terebenevs anti-napoleonische Karikaturen, zeichnete sie nach und verkaufte sie mit englischen Übersetzungen. Die Tatsache, dass ein englischer und ein russischer Künstler die gleichen visuellen Mittel und Motive anwenden konnten, wenn sie sich mit dem Geschehen von 1812 auseinandersetzten, weist darauf hin, dass die nationalen Diskurse in England und Russland einander ähnelten. Der Beitrag untersucht diese Ähnlichkeiten und stellt die Frage, welche Schlussfolgerungen sich daraus für die Entstehung moderner Nationen ergeben, wie diese mit der Geburt der politischen Karikatur zusammenhängt und welche transnationalen Verbindungen um 1812 in der europäischen Karikatur zu erkennen sind.

By the late months of 1812, the 20-year old English caricaturist George Cruikshank acquired some Russian satirical images. Drawn by Ivan Terebenev, these Russian prints combined the folk tradition of the Russian *lubok* with the elements of caricature associated with English artists such as William Hogarth and Thomas Rowlandson. In a way, therefore, Cruikshank was gazing at just how much his fellow British artists had influenced others.

The young Englishman, seeing an opportunity to make a name for himself and to make some money, responded by committing what would now be seen as an act of plagiarism: he copied Terebenev's prints, changed their Russian texts to English ones, and sold them

Comparativ | Zeitschrift für Globalgeschichte und vergleichende Gesellschaftsforschung 22 (2012) Heft 4, S. 46–70.

for domestic audiences.[1] One of them, entitled "Boney Hatching a Bulletin, or Snug Winter Quarters" and issued in December 1812, directly reproduced Terebenev's earlier 1812 image "Napoleon's Winter Quarters." In it, the French emperor is nearly covered by the Russian wintry snows while his idiotic generals ask what they should write in the next bulletin to the French troops, who are completely buried in the back of the image. The Russian winter, as the print makes clear, has put an end to Napoleon's plans of conquest.

Fig. 1. *Transnational Nationhood: Boney in Russia as Copied by an Englishman.* George Cruikshank, "Boney Hatching a Bulletin, or Snug Winter Quarters." 1812 print. Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[2]

This anecdote reveals another, more historically important, story than just the one of nascent international copyright infringement. Cruikshank's purchase of Russian prints in 1812 tells us a great deal about the growing, transnational circulation of goods and even more about the circulation of visual materials in the Napoleonic era. The fact that English artists could acquire prints from their Russian counterparts – and vice versa

1 See Robert L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times Vol. I: 1792–1835, New Brunswick 1991, pp. 109-110.

2 Brown University Library, Digital Collections: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1137101658150446&view=showmods.

– attests to this burgeoning trade. Cruikshank's act of copying also tells us something significant about the perception of images: the British caricaturist did not have to change Terebenev's image to have it make sense to his domestic audience. Even Cruikshank's changes in language – necessary more for the original's use of Cyrillic than for anything else – did not alter the content of Terebenev's original.

Cruikshank's 1812 copies of Terebenev's images capture an important moment in the processes of both English and Russian nationhood. Napoleon, through his actions and in the symbolic significance he acquired soon after launching his conquests, served as the primary agent for articulating modern Englishness and modern Russianness. On the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the Grande Armée's Russian invasion, we can look back at two prints, one by the Russian caricaturist Ivan Terebenev and one by the English caricaturist George Cruikshank, and use them to get at the larger stories they tell about the significance of visual nationhood in the Napoleonic era.

In order to tell this story, this article will evaluate the scholarly literature on nationalism (particularly in England and Russia) for how it does not entirely capture the meanings of the caricature trade; trace the lives and works of Cruikshank and Terebenev and with them, the histories of caricature in their two countries; and return to December 1812, when Cruikshank made his copy. Boney, it turned out, could be visually ridiculed the same way and for the same reasons in both England and Russia.

1. Cruikshank's Copy: Imagining Nationhoods

Cruikshank made his print in a historical era that has been at the center of scholarly studies on nationalism. The dominant view of the literature has been to argue that nations are imagined constructions that are recent historical phenomena, originating during the French Revolutionary era, the period that saw Cruikshank and Terebenev emerge as caricaturists. Yet the story of Cruikshank's copy complicates this predominant paradigm, one that has also led to a view that England serves as an example of an "early" nation and Russia as a "late" one.

The academic understanding of nationalism was revolutionized in 1983, when Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, and Eric Hobsbawm all published landmark books. Anderson's now-famous definition that a nation is "an imagined political community" has become a *sine qua non* for all scholars to use.[3] Beyond this, *Imagined Communities* – along with Gellner's 1983 *Nations and Nationalism* and Hobsbawm's 1983 edited volume *The Invention of Tradition* – helped to usher in a vociferous debate about the historical origins of "nation-ness," which all three described as relatively recent historical creations.[4] In the eyes of "modernist" theorists (as Anderson, Gellner, and Hobsbawm have been

3 Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism, London 1983, p. 6.

4 Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, Ithaca 1983; Eric Hobsbawm, Introduction: Inventing Traditions, in: Eric Hobsbawm, Terence Ranger (Eds.), The Invention of Tradition, Cambridge 1983, p. 13. Hobsbawm would follow up with his 1991 Nations and Nationalism since 1780.

labeled), the cultural building blocks necessary to make enough people believe in the existence of a national community only developed in the 18th Century and spread in the Napoleonic era. Older, religious and dynastic communities had to die out for new nations and nation-nesses to take their place. No historical force did more to kill off the old and usher in the new than the French Revolutionary era. Other processes helped to bring about the emergence of widespread national consciousness, none more significant for Anderson than print capitalism, which in turn helped to spread vernacular languages (Gellner focused on industrialization as a central process in fostering nation building, while Hobsbawm examined the state's attempts to "invent traditions" that had the appearance of being timeless). Seemingly for the first time, members of a society "became capable of comprehending one another via print and via paper"[5]. These processes, as Anderson explains them, came to a head between 1776 and 1838, when a host of new political entities sprang up in the Western hemisphere and used the term "nation" for the first time.

On the surface, Cruikshank's Napoleonic-era copy of Terebenev's caricature seems to be ready-made evidence to prove these views, which have since become something like the holy trinity of modern nationalism studies: the Russian artist mocked the French and his young, English colleague could copy the very same image for the very same purpose. Russian and English consumers could laugh at the puny French Emperor and his army and recognize that they were different from their opponents. Yet underneath the surface, Cruikshank's caricature may also highlight the notion that English nationhood developed far before the French Revolution. England had developed a vernacular early on, its print capitalism was the most fully-formed in Europe, and English caricaturists such as Cruikshank had cast Napoleon and his epoch-changing system as foils for promoting timeless English virtues such as honesty and hard work. Their caricatures were sold to the burgeoning social classes throughout England and, most importantly, by 1800 England had an increasingly literate populace willing to buy caricatures and other items. In fact, for these reasons, some of the most vocal critics of the "modernist" view of nations come from scholars of English nationalism: Liah Greenfeld, for example, has argued that England led the way in developing modern national consciousness and modern nationalism and that these processes date back to the 1500s.[6] By contrast, Russia – which experienced the processes highlighted by Anderson and Gellner later than other European states – seemingly lacked the building materials necessary to imagine a nation. In the schema outlined by Miroslav Hroch, Western European states, including England, were transformed into modern civil societies in parallel with the construction of nation-states; Eastern European states, by contrast, did not go through these simultaneous developments, making their national construction projects more problematic in the 19th century.[7] Cruikshank's copy therefore poses something of a conundrum for the scholar

5 B. Anderson, Imagined Communities (note 3), p. 44.

6 Liah Greenfeld, Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity, Cambridge, MA 1993.

7 Miroslav Hroch, From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe, in:

of nationalism: produced in England, one of the "early" nations, yet produced during the Napoleonic era and from an image originally drawn in Russia, one of the "late" nations. Explaining the similarities in the two caricatured imaginings therefore requires re-thinking traditional scholarly paradigms about "early" and "late" nations.

One further complication in the process of constructing Englishness, at least in the eyes of scholars writing about the process, has been the role of British imperial identity in either fostering a separate English one or preventing one from fully developing. Cruikshank's work – and, for that matter, the work of his fellow caricaturists such as James Gillray – came at the end of a process of forging not just Englishness, but a British nation. In Linda Colley's account, a modern *British* national identity developed between 1707 (the Act of Union with Scotland and Wales) and 1837 (the beginning of the Victorian era). What made it possible for English, British, and Welsh people to think of themselves as a collective, she argues, was "a succession of wars between Britain and France" in this period.[8] Wars and the threat of conflict against France generated a series of "unabashedly chauvinistic" responses in Britain – Colley includes numerous caricatures drawn by Gillray, Cruikshank, and others to illustrate her point.[9] Because the British political system grew more democratic at the time, its rulers tried to mobilize the population for its causes. The effect was that France became the hostile Other, a Catholic nation not like "Britain." "Once confronted with an obviously alien 'Them,'" she writes, "an otherwise diverse community can become a reassuring or merely desperate 'Us.'" The British came to see themselves as such "not because of any political or cultural consensus at home, but rather in reaction to the Other beyond their shores"[10]. Colley argues not only that the British nation was forged out of war, but also that Catholic France served as the basis for defining "us" and "them", and that nations therefore do not have to be culturally or ethnically homogenous. English, Scottish, and Welsh peoples could imagine themselves to be part of an ethnic nation but more importantly forged themselves, as Colley argues, into a British nation: what made this possible was that all three groups were not French. Yet again Cruikshank's copied caricature could attest to this process: applying Colley's formula, what mattered in it was that the cartoon ridiculed the French and that viewers would know they were not like "us," whether that community meant "British" or "English" (or both).

As far as the Russian original that Cruikshank copied is concerned, it seems an anomaly, an early product of that country's late arrival to print capitalism and the forces necessary to make imagined nations. Anderson, Gellner, and Hobsbawm have also had a decisive influence on the way historians of Russia understand Russian nationalism. Before the publication of their books, the only work published on the subject, by Hans Rogger, argued that the 18th century brought the emergence of a clear Russian national conscious-

New left Review 198 (1993), pp. 3-20.

8 Linda Colley, Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837, New Haven 1992, p. 1.

9 Ibid., p. 3.

10 Ibid., p. 6.

ness that defined itself against the Francophone ways of the imperial elite.[11] Rogger's work did not produce follow-ups. After the 1983 works became increasingly influential, the Russian case seemed to prove that imperial constructions could thwart national ones. Geoffrey Hosking famously set the tone in 1997 when he argued that "the theme of this book is how *Rossiia* obstructed the flowering of *Rus'*, or, if you prefer it, how the building of an empire impeded the formation of a nation"[12]. Russia, in Hosking's argument, developed "a fractured and underdeveloped nationhood" that was neither civic nor ethnic because imperial state building got in the way of nation building in the ways Gellner and Anderson have envisioned. Others have followed suit: the wholesale application of the three has produced a view that Russia lacked the levels of literacy and mass education system deemed necessary to foster a universal, unifying vision of Russianness.[13]

Yet the modernist view, while producing a dominant discourse, certainly did not produce unanimity. Gellner's student, Anthony D. Smith, in a series of books and articles beginning with 1987's *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, began to stress the *longue durée* of nation creation through what Smith dubbed "ethnosymbolism"[14]. *Nationalism* was recent, Smith has argued, but *nations* and national identities had deeper roots that were influenced by cultural traditions stretching back to the ancient world. Hobsbawm's most vociferous opponent was Adrian Hastings, who stressed that vernacular language mixed with religion generated a potent mix for the construction of nations after 1500. Following Greenfeld's proposition above, Hastings argued that England in particular proved to be a fertile place for nationhood to develop far before the Napoleonic era.[15] Here English caricatures produced before George Cruikshank's copy could add evidentiary weight to this view. William Hogarth's engravings became popular in the mid-18th Century and in turn inspired other caricaturists. Before George Cruikshank got his start, his father and others such as James Gillray drew prints that frequently cast Napoleon as a devil, visually rendering him as the Catholic Antichrist the faithful of England needed to cast out. Here too Terebenev's original proves problematic; for even Smith and Hastings stress language

11 Hans Rogger, National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia, Cambridge 1960.

12 Geoffrey Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, Cambridge, MA 1997, p. xix. Hosking cites as inspiration Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, and the Hobsbawm/Ranger book, along with other "modernists" such as Miroslav Hroch, on pgs. xxii and xxiii.

13 See, for example, Vera Tolz, Russia: Inventing the Nation, London 2001; and David Brandenberger, National Bolshevism: Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931-1956, Cambridge, MA 2002. Brandenberger writes on page 2: "Underlying much of this study's theoretical frame of reference are the seminal works of such prominent thinkers as Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm, and Miroslav Hroch. These theorists identify print culture and mass education as playing a crucial role in the expansion of a sense of national identity from social elites to ordinary people within society at large." By applying these theorists to the Russian case, Brandenberger, following Hosking, argues that Russian nationhood was "inchoate" or "inarticulate" and that only the Stalin era saw mass education and literacy develop enough for Russian national identity to exist.

14 Smith has usefully summarized his views and other scholars' views in his The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism, Hanover, NH 2000. His most recent book is The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic, London 2008.

15 Adrian Hastings, The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism, Cambridge 1997.

and literacy as important conditions to make nations. Russia again becomes the exception to nation-building, not part of the norm.

Yet the two prints – one Russian, one English – appeared at precisely the same time and for the same purposes: to mock the French, their emperor, their ambitions, and to inspire purchasers. Scholars have more recently adopted the term "nationhood" because, as scholars such as Rogers Brubaker argue, it captures the *process* of building a socio-cultural identity rather than accept it as a given.[16] Adopting this approach allows the scholar to analyze *how* nations are constructed, *what* materials are used in this project, and *who* takes part in the building. Viewing nation building as part of an ongoing, evolving construction project, in short, captures important moments in the process of nationhood. What we can see in 1812 is a particular moment that helps us understand these complicated historical processes. A moment, that is, where particular people made particular decisions that in turn did much to visualize Englishness and Russianness and to do so in strikingly similar ways: not, however, as part of a scholarly formula that in turn produces clear-cut divisions between early and late nation creation. Nations, as Cruikshank's copy indicates, can also be transnational creations. To get a clearer picture of how individuals can participate in moments of similar nation construction projects, we need to look no further than the caricatures of George Cruikshank and Ivan Terebenev.

2. Cradled in Caricature: English Visual Nationhood in the Napoleonic Era

Cruikshank liked to say that he was "cradled in caricature"[17]. He was right: young George grew up surrounded by satirical prints and their business.

George Cruikshank was born on September 27, 1792, the second son of Isaac and Mary Cruikshank. His elder brother, Isaac Robert, was born three years to the day before him and was called Robert – he too would enter the family business. At the time of George's birth, Isaac Cruikshank had established himself as one of the leading caricaturists in England. His youngest son grew up amidst his father's images: it is fair to say that young George was swaddled in caricatures by such renowned artists as William Hogarth, Thomas Rowlandson, and James Gillray. His mother would color prints while his father would jot down ideas for new ones. By five or six, George was drawing caricatures of his own.[18] Cruikshank's training as an artist came from his keen observations (the street was his classroom, he liked to say) and from his immersion in his father's world. He learned to exaggerate anatomical attributes, to use clothing as a signifier, and to use color and patterns from his father.[19] He also followed Hogarth's revolutionary lead in seeing caricature as an abbreviated narrative, a moral tale best expressed with simple, easily

16 Rogers Brubaker, Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe, Cambridge 1996.

17 Quoted in R.L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 38.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., pp. 52-53.

recognizable symbols.[20] Between 1806 and 1811, as his most recent biographer notes, George worked with his father and his brother on so many prints that "it is impossible to disentangle their separate work"[21].

The period mattered both personally and professionally. Isaac Cruikshank was a notorious drunk. His output declined as he turned more and more to the bottle and as his youngest son grew into the family business. In April 1811 he accepted a challenge to take part in a drinking match, fell into a coma, and died a few days later at the age of 48. Before this tragedy, George's collaborative work with his father and brother developed around the central issues of the half-decade; namely, the Napoleonic wars. The Cruikshanks increasingly appropriated that most "English" and malleable of characters, John Bull, in their images. The demand for their prints grew: George got an early sense of how to produce caricatures quickly and on demand and also of their potential power.[22]

Cruikshank was also "cradled in caricature" in another, larger sense: he was born at a time when British satirical prints flourished. Diana Donald has written about the "craze for satirical prints" that occurred in the reign of George III (r. 1760–1801) and that went hand in hand with the burgeoning commercialization of British society.[23] Prints could be bought from travelling salesmen or at the shops that sprang up in England's cities. The works of Gillray, Cruikshank, and others created businesses designed to sell their prints (in one anonymous print from 1801, Britons gape at the windows of a caricature shop, staring at the new prints for sale). The heyday of this visual trade, Donald writes, began "in the early 1790s, when the excitement of the French Revolution and large-scale political sponsorship of prints boosted production and sales"[24]. These prints "formed a living part of the everyday experience in Georgian Britain"[25]. Wars, in other words, were good for business.

Cruikshank's anti-Napoleon images also developed out of decades of caricatures and political writings that portrayed the French as effeminate, frivolous, and duplicitous. The English, by contrast, were honest, masculine, and sincere. "In short," Stuart Semmel argues, "pre-revolutionary France represented the antithesis of England. Even the onions and *soup maigre* its unfortunate subjects were purported to subsist on could not compare with the glorious beef and ale that John Bull enjoyed"[26]. While Napoleon represented a more complex figure, he still served as a symbol through which the British "dissected their own identity, constitution, and history"[27].

The demand grew even more after the 1803 French declaration of war on Britain, the subsequent invasion scare, and the continental blockade, which prevented European

20 Ibid., p. 54.
21 Ibid., p. 60.
22 Ibid., pp. 60-67.
23 Diana Donald, The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III, New Haven: 1996, p. 2.
24 Ibid., p. 4.
25 Ibid., p. 7.
26 Stuart Semmel, Napoleon and the British, New Haven 2004, p. 5.
27 Ibid., p. 7.

prints from entering England in the first decade of the 1800s. Business boomed, in other words, precisely at the time George got involved in it. But it took a particular form: the business of patriotism. Artists such as Cruikshank, as his most recent biographer notes, "were therefore faced with a threefold mission: to ridicule the follies of those governing, to shape and foster antipathy toward the French, and to articulate and imagine English national virtues"[28]. With George III teetering into insanity, the Cruikshanks and Gillray seized on John Bull as an embodiment of Englishness: George and his father endowed him with hardiness and contrasted him to French images using Marianne. Bull's main foe, quite obviously, was Napoleon Bonaparte.

Fig. 2. *John Bull as the Embodiment of Englishness (Us and Them).*
In this Isaac Cruikshank caricature, the malleable Bull is muscular and masculine. He refers to "Old England" and takes care of Boney by playing skittles.
Isaac Cruikshank, "John Bull Tipping All Nine." 1803 print. Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[29]

Isaac Cruikshank drew the first British caricature of the French First Consul (soon to be emperor) in 1797. He is, as Robert Patten has astutely noted, "unrecognizable," ex-

28 R.L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 71.
29 Digital Collection, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1131120742313227.

cept for his "absurdly large cocked hat," which would become a staple in later satirical prints.[30] In the images that followed, Isaac and his fellow English caricaturists established visual patterns for drawing Napoleon: they captured the Frenchman in the act of committing some atrocity and depicted him as a demonic figure.[31] These adaptations matched George's talents for drawing monstrous creatures: Napoleon became a beast, an inhuman monster that threatened Britons.

At the same time, Isaac Cruikshank also cast Napoleon as a magician of sorts; one who could point out just how much England had declined by adopting continental manners. His 1803 "The Phantasmagoria – or a Review of Old Times" features the French Emperor as a bearded conjurer (still unrecognizable) who has called up an Englishman and a Frenchman from the past in order to meet their present-day counterparts. The obese Englishman is surprised to see "my Grandson Jack" who looks like "a skeleton" because he – and with him, his generation – has adopted French ways. Meanwhile, a skeletal Frenchman from the past is just as shocked to see that "mon Cousin" is fat from eating beef and plum pudding. As Semmel has argued, the "physical decline in English character seems to be a consequence of cultural degeneracy, of the adoption of continental costume and cuisine"[32]. If England wanted to defeat the phantasmagoria, the image implied it needed to get back to national basics: "as long as we remain united and true to ourselves," one contemporaneous broadsheet proclaimed, "we need never fear the threats or the attacks of France"[33].

The caricatures of the early 1800s, the very ones young George cut his teeth on, also depicted Napoleon as a Lilliputian insect, a monster, or a devil (often linked to his Catholicism or the view that he was the Antichrist).[34] They also warned that English women were threatened by the French and needed to overcome their traditional passivity. And finally, food served as "a principal imaginary dividing line between British and French cultures" in these prints: French cuisine could not compare to English staples.[35]

30 R. L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 85.

31 See also S. Semmel, Napoleon and the British (note 26), p. 46. His 1798 caricature "Plunderer Beating Duplicity," which features Napoleon in his Egypt campaign, captures many of the ways the French and the French General came to be viewed in England. Cruikshank's 1808 caricature (completed with George's aid), "Apollyon the Devil's Generalissimo" represents a snarling Napoleon and his beastly troops as the devil's minions (at least in language). Both prints can be found in the Brown University Library's Digital Collection, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?collectionid=2&verb=browse&task=get&letter=C&fieldgroup=9&valueid=51723&valuename=Cruikshank%2C+Isaac&browsename=Creators+and+Contributors.

32 S. Semmel, Napoleon and the British (note 26), p. 48.

33 Quoted in S. Semmel, Napoleon and the British (note 26), p. 51.

34 George's father Isaac would cast Napoleon in these guises. His 1797 "The French Bugaboo Frightening the Royal Commanders" drew the soon-to-be emperor as a monster, while his 1803 "John Bull and Bonaparte!!!" makes Napoleon smaller than his hat. Isaac Cruikshank's 1808 "Apollyon the Devil's Generalissimo Addressing His Legions" depicted Napoleon as the devil's minion. All three can be viewed at Brown University Library's Digital Collection, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?collectionid=2&verb=browse&task=get&letter=C&fieldgroup=9&valueid=51723&valuename=Cruikshank%2C+Isaac&browsename=Creators+and+Contributors.

35 S. Semmel, Napoleon and the British (note 26), p. 62.

By 1812, with his father dead and Gillray insane, the name "Cruikshank" on a print could only mean one person: George, who had become the king of English caricature at the age of 20.[36] He would maintain that unofficial title until his death in 1878. The renowned writer William Makepeace Thackeray did much to promote Cruikshank's greatness when he published *An Essay on the Genius of George Cruikshank* in 1840. Thackeray noted that he and other Britons would pass up sweets in order to buy his caricatures from shops where crowds gathered and laughed.[37] The writer also argued that Cruikshank's Napoleonic caricatures, while borrowed from Gillray's depictions of "the little upstart Corsican" are less political than "the expression of the artist's national British idea of Frenchmen" and that he held "considerable contempt" for the French nation.[38] The caricatured images of the French drawn during the Napoleonic era, Thackeray muses, endure.[39] So too do the "thousand truths" Cruikshank has told through his images, which speak to "the extraordinary power of this man"[40].

The moment when Cruikshank first exhibited his power and emerged as the king of English caricature was also the moment when the international trade in satirical images skyrocketed. The Grande Armée's retreat from Moscow in late 1812, as Patten has written, "evoked an unprecedented international exchange of prints, with England taking the lead in exportation and adaptation"[41]. German states and the Russian Empire both entered into this trade: Johann Michael Voltz's 1813 "Napoleon the First and the Last," a "hieroglyphic" portrait that featured Napoleon's head made up of corpses became a transnational bestseller in this time: the original sold 20,000 copies in a week and other German editions appeared alongside five French, eight Italian, six English, several Dutch, two Swedish, one Spanish, and one Portuguese versions.[42] The Russian copy was drawn by Ivan Terebenev.[43]

It was in the midst of this renewed transnational caricature trade that Cruikshank acquired Terebenev's 1812 image "Napoleon's Winter Quarters." He copied the Russian artist's image and made a new text:

> *Say We have got into* Comfortable *Winter Quarters, and the Weather is ver fine & will last 8 days longer. Say we have got plenty of Soup Meagre plenty of Minced meat – Grilld Bears fine eating – driving* Cut-us-off *to the Devil Say we shall be at home at Xmas to*

36 R.L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 107.
37 William Makepeace Thackeray, An Essay on the Genius of George Cruikshank, London 1840, pp. 5-7.
38 Ibid., p. 11.
39 Ibid., p. 12.
40 Ibid., p. 59.
41 R. L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), pp. 108-109.
42 Ibid., p. 109. The German edition can be viewed on Brown University's Napoleonic Satire collection: Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1132592889712119. One English version can be viewed at the Brooklyn Museum's digital collection site: http://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/170277/Napoleon_the_First_and_Last#.
43 NYPL Digital Collections: http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1242036.

dinner – give my love to darling – don't let John Bull know that I have been Cow*poxed – tell a good* lie *about the Cossacks – D----e it tell any thing but the Truth.*[44]

Cruikshank did not just copy Russian prints (although he did a lot of that). He also drew on his experiences working with his father and his life cradled in caricature to launch a career that would make him famous. Yet the influence of the Russian caricatures remained with him in the short term: Cruikshank would follow up "Boney Hatching a Bulletin" with an 1813 sequel entitled "Cool Summer Quarters, or Going on Swimmingly." This time Napoleon finds himself in trouble at the Bober River (Bóbr in Polish). The French emperor is still, however, wearing the oversized hat Isaac Cruikshank first made famous.

Fig. 3. *The Sequel (of Sorts)*
George Cruikshank, "Cool Summer Quarters, or Going on Swimmingly." 1813 print. Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[45]

Cruikshank's remarkable copy, though, has to be explained better by delving more into the original Russian version. This story reveals how it came to be that an Academy-

44 Loc image: cph 3b48529 http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/cph.3b48529; LC-USZC2-628 (color film copy slide); Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division.

45 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1137108509431264.

trained sculptor in St. Petersburg, inspired by notions of Roman civic patriotism, helped to establish Russian visual nationhood that would be so familiar to George Cruikshank.

3. Terebenev's ABCs: The Birth and Growth of Russian Visual Nationhood

George Cruikshank may have been born into the caricature business, but the Russian artist whose prints he acquired in late 1812 were part of the emergence of a distinctly Russian caricature tradition. It is striking, therefore, that in 1812 the established English tradition and the new Russian caricature art could look so similar. As John Bowlt, the doyen of Russian art historians has rightly claimed: "before 1800 a tradition of professional caricature did not exist" in Russia.[46] The St. Petersburg Academy of Fine Arts, established in 1757, taught Western graphic arts and, when engraving was taught, imposed the methods of French masters such as Louis-Joseph Le Lorrain and his pupil, Jean-Michel Moreau, both of whom moved to the Russian capital and taught at the Academy. In many ways, the world of graphic arts perfectly encapsulates much of cultural life in Petersburg by 1800: after Peter the Great had called for Russians to become "European," Russian elites adopted French ways and French traditions. This would be the milieu that produced the explosion of Russian caricature in 1812. It was the world of Ivan Terebenev.

Born in 1780, Terebenev was also cradled in art from an early age. His father, Ivan, was an artist and sculptor who enrolled his son Ivan at the St. Petersburg Art Academy when the boy was only five. Young Ivan would study sculpture there, but also become immersed in the classical traditions stressed in the Russian capital's art school. He did not, however, care much for his studies, perhaps because his father pushed him into sculpture and away from his first love, painting.[47]

After graduation in 1800, Terebenev took up a post at a gymnasium in Tver'. It was a heady time to be part of the provincial elite. Alexander I had ascended to the throne in 1801 after the regicide of his father, Paul I. The young tsar had been schooled in the Enlightenment ideas his grandmother, Catherine the Great, embraced. With the militaristic Paul dead, many young, educated Russian elites hoped for reform. Ivan Terebenev was one of these young hopefuls: his 1912 Russian biographer stated that he was filled with the "sensibilities of the Alexandrine era"[48]. In Tver' he joined a society devoted to arts and literature headed by Nikolai Radishchev, the son of Aleksandr. It was while taking part in this group, the Free Society of Lovers of Literature, Science, and Art, that Terebenev began to indulge his love for painting. His intellectual interests can be detected in one of his earliest images from his Tver' days, a painting of Gaius Mucius Scaevola, a Roman

46 John Bowlt, Nineteenth-Century Russian Caricature, in: Theofanis Stavrou (Ed.), Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia, Bloomington 1983, p. 224.

47 V. A. Vereshchagin, Russkaia karikatura Vol. II, Otechestvennaia voina, St. Petersburg 1912, p. 8. See also A. Kaganovich, Ivan Ivanovich Terebenev, 1780–1815, Moscow 1956.

48 V. A. Vereshchagin, Russkaia karikatura Vol. II (note 49), p. 10.

youth who thrust his hand into an Etruscan fire to prove his bravery and commitment to fighting Rome's enemies. Scaevola's form of civic patriotism provided the sort of model behavior beloved by the anti-serfdom, reform-minded young patriots among whom Terebenev counted himself: Aleksandr Radishchev famously likened himself to Cato the Younger and may have committed suicide in 1802 as an act of patriotism.[49]

Terebenev went back to St. Petersburg in 1807 and moved in similar intellectual circles. He also continued to draw, producing paintings of Scaevola yet again and Pygmalion (an appropriate subject, given Terebenev's past work on sculpture).[50] More importantly, Terebenev took part in discussions about Russian history, Russian culture, and the debates of Gavrila Derzhavin (who hosted meetings of the Lovers of the Word society), Nikolai Karamzin, and Aleksandr Shishkov.[51] It was in this period when Terebenev became familiar with English caricatures, particularly the work of Thomas Rowlandson, whose style would later influence Terebenev's.[52] This background certainly helps to explain Terebenev's reaction to the Napoleonic invasion and his decision to produce the caricatures for which he would become famous.

Ivan Terebenev also drew inspiration from his contemporary, Aleksei Venetsianov, who established the short-lived *Journal of Caricature* in 1808 [*Zhurnal karikatur na 1808 god*], the first of its kind in Russia. Venetsianov, a bureaucrat who tried to gain entry into the Art Academy, began to criticize Russian officialdom and chose to do so using English-style satirical images. The government shut down Venetsianov's journal because it featured a caricature of a fat, Francophilic Russian bureaucrat lounging with his mistress while a line of ordinary Russian petitioners stood outside his office. Venetsianov was criticizing the Europeanized elites in Russia and contrasting them with their ordinary, more "authentically Russian" subjects. Terebenev, as well as other elites that moved in the same circles, also criticized the French culture, language, and ways that dominated Russian society. His 1812 caricatures, as his imperial-era biographer claimed, stemmed from these issues and sought to delineate the line between "Russian" and "French." In doing so, V. A. Vereshchagin argues, he "created the first national and political Russian caricatures"[53].

Terebenev focused on Napoleon in his patriotic images. The Russian artist cast the Emperor as the embodiment of all things "French" and therefore as the antithesis of all things "Russian." His "N____n with the Russians in the Banya [N____n u Russkikh v bane],"

49 Iurii Lotman, The Poetics of Everyday Behavior in Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture, in: Lidiia Lotman Ginsburg, Boris Uspenskii, The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History: Essays, Ithaca 1985, pp. 88-92.

50 V. A. Vereshchagin, Russkaia karikatura Vol. II (note 49), p. 25.

51 Ibid., p. 29. The best examination of these societies and their significance is Alexander Martin's Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries: Russian Conservative Thought and Politics in the Reign of Alexander I, DeKalb, IL 1997. Martin evaluates the "romantic nationalism" of Shishkov, the "gentry conservatism" of Karamzin, and also covers the Lovers of the Russian Word and Tver' society. For more on the role of literature and culture and how they influenced Russian foreign policy in the era, see Andrei Zorin, Kormia dvuglavogo orla: literatura i gosudarstvennaia ideologiia v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII – pervoi treti XIX veka, Moscow 2001.

52 J. Bowlt, Nineteenth-Century Russian Caricature (note 48), p. 227.

53 V. A. Vereshchagin, Russkaia karikatura Vol. II (note 49), p. 33.

for example, placed the French emperor in a Russian bathhouse. A Russian soldier and a Cossack, bigger and stronger than the tiny French Emperor, shave their guest violently while a peasant partisan throws water onto the fire to create more steam (just to be sure, Terebenev emphasized in his text that Napoleon was in a *Russian* bathhouse).[54] The juxtaposition of Napoleon with Russian cultural traditions was one Terebenev turned to often in his 1812 images: "Napoleon's Treatment in Russia" had three Russian soldiers stuffing the emperor into a barrel and draping him with bubliki, while "Russians Teaching Napoleon to Dance" featured two Russian peasants forcing Napoleon and a fellow French general to do a Russian peasant dance. The text declared that "if you are going to trespass on our ground, you must dance to our tune"[55]. The image proved to be an irresistible one to caricaturists across the continent: Terebenev's competitor, Ivan Ivanov, produced a similar one, while George Cruikshank also copied Terebenev's original and translated the text verbatim. Terebenev visually rendered the essence of modern nationhoods (not on purpose, of course): he clearly divided the "us" and "them," depicting the French Emperor as small and weak and his Russian counterparts as strong and vibrant. The Russian artist also contrasted Napoleon's professed aim to export French revolutionary culture with more "authentic" Russian traditions: bubliki, folk dances, peasant clothes, and the Russian banya. Cruikshank would copy these visual themes and even adapt them to "English" traditions, seen most clearly in his 1814 caricature "The Corsican Whipping Top in Full Spin"[56]. His English compatriots would also draw images that visualized nationhood similarly to Terebenev: S. Knight's 1813 "The Allies Shaving Shop," for example, resembles Napoleon in the banya; this time, however, he's getting a shave and a haircut.[57]

Terebenev did not just castigate the French emperor; he also visually chastised all Frenchmen. His caricature "The Retreat of the French Calvary Who Ate Their Horses in Russia" contains a motley assortment of the Grand Army brought up by a Mameluke wearing a woman's coat.[58] While the French and their leader were small, effeminate, and freakish, Terebenev's Russians were masculine, strong, and patriotic. The Petersburg resident celebrated Cossacks, peasants, partisans, and everyday Russians in his images. Here too Terebenev's visualization of "them" proved to be applicable to the English view: Cruikshank copied it, further underscoring the French enemy as weak, effeminate, and ridiculous.[59]

54 Slavic and Baltic Collections, New York Public Library, Available on NYPL Digital Gallery: http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1242076.

55 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1130438021632227.

56 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1130419507119990.

57 Digital Collections: http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1162365.

58 Digital Collections: http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1162612.

59 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1137107999605358.

Fig. 4. *"Us" and "Them": Two Russian peasants force Napoleon to perform a Russian folk dance.*
Ivan Terebenev, "Russians Teaching Napoleon to Dance." 1812 Print. Oxford University Digital Library.[60]

The Russian caricaturist returned to themes he had nurtured during his years in Tver' and Petersburg. "The Russian Hercules" transforms the Russian peasant into a larger-than-life embodiment of Russian masculine, heroic virtues and contrasts his patriotism with French cowardice. "The Russian Scaevola" updates the Roman lesson on civic patriotism by transforming Gaius Mucius into a Russian peasant partisan in 1812 who is willing to cleave off his arm branded with "N" rather than leave the initial of the French Antichrist on his limb.

60 Bodleian Russian Caricatures: http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/csb/RussianCaricatures.htm. Ivanov's copy of this image is also located at this site.

Fig. 5. *Replicating Russianness in England: Boney dances a Russian folk dance.*
George Cruikshank, "Russians Teaching Boney to Dance." 1813 Copy of Russian prints. Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[61]

And then there was "Napoleon's Winter Quarters," in many ways a perfect summary of all that Ivan Terebenev drew in 1812. His first biographer, writing in 1912, even noted that the "famous Cruikshank in England" made copies and variations of Terebenev's Napoleonic images.[62]

Terebenev's 1812 caricatures proved popular: he initially worked with the Petersburg publisher Ivan Glazunov, who paid the artist for each image produced. In March 1813, however, Terebenev switched to another publisher, Slionin, because he paid better.[63] One reason for Terebenev's success was his ability to marry the satirical style of English caricature to the look and salty humor of the Russian folk print known as the *lubok*: this combination proved to be a critical and commercial success.[64] He also successfully visu-

61 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1137106863337958.

62 V. A. Vereshchagin, Russkaia karikatura Vol. II (note 49), p. 45.

63 Marina Pel'ttser [Peltzer], Russkaia politicheskaia kartinka 1812 goda: usloviia proizvodstva i khudozhestvennye osobennosti, in: Mir narodnoi kartinki, Moscow 1999, p. 177. Peltzer's article is the best account of the way government censorship and commercial interests shaped the 1812 images.

64 See Bowlt's article (note 48), Peltzer's article (note 67), and Chapter 2 of my A War of Images: Russian Popular Prints, Wartime Culture, and National Identity, 1812-1945, DeKalb 2006.

alized many of the patriotic feelings he and his fellow elites had shared in their cultural societies: the adaptation -of "French" (or "European") culture, Terebenev and his fellow Russian patriots felt, had led many to lose their innate "Russianness."

Fig. 6. *The Original Winter Quarters*
Ivan Terebenev, "Napoleon's Winter Quarters." 1812 Print. Author's Collection.

Napoleon's quest to transform Europe and to eradicate the vestiges of the Old Regime threatened these traditions further; in Terebenev's eyes, Russian audiences needed to be reminded of "their" culture, "their" traditions, and "their" heritage. To do so, the French Emperor and the society he headed needed to be mocked and contrasted with strong, masculine Russian peasants, Cossacks, and soldiers who all embodied national traits. This patriotism – which contained more than a little bit of anxiety and fear – resembled that felt by Gillray, by Isaac Cruikshank, and by his son George. No wonder Terebenev's images could be copied outright and sold to English consumers.

Terebenev died of a cold in 1815. He was just 35 years old. He left his homeland one final gift: an alphabet book for children that featured his 1812 images. "Terebenev's ABCs" would teach generations of Russian schoolchildren to associate "F" with "Frenchmen" and to connect these textual messages with the visual image of a Russian peasant woman imprisoning a group of marauding soldiers in her hut and burning it down. To help with the learning, Terebenev updated the original text, having it read: "Frenchmen

just like vermin I have caught; to rid Russia of their smell I guess we'll have to burn them." "M" was for "Moscow" and had the ditty: "Moscow is not Berlin, Vienna, or Madrid; here a coffin welcomed the French army with a wide open lid"[65].

4. Cossacks across Cultures: Visual Nationhood and 1812

And so in late 1812 certain trends coalesced: English nationhood, which developed under the umbrella of a larger British nationhood, looked the same as Russian nationhood, which developed under the umbrella of a larger Russian imperial identity. The exact moment when young George Cruikshank, recognizing his chance to turn a profit and a chance to demonstrate his patriotism through the artistic form his father had favored, represented a moment when the process of nation construction can literally be "seen." Chance, unintended circumstances, and transnational cultural influences help us see 1812 as an important moment in the processes of English and Russian nationhood, a moment when they converged.

Cruikshank grew up in the world of caricature and his motivations by 1812 – insofar as we can grasp them – were as much commercial as anything else: with his father dead and Gillray insane, he seized a chance to become the best-selling caricature artist in England. Terebenev's motivations were intensely personal: he saw a chance to give up the sculpting career he disliked and to vent his budding patriotism.

Caricature in the Napoleonic era was truly collaborative. Cruikshank's biographer has noted this fact in terms of how much George relied on his father, on masters such as Gillray, and how the Engraving Acts of the 18th Century fostered a healthy competitive spirit that allowed artists to be inspired by each other but also to mark their images as their own. At the same time, however, no binational copyright agreements covering prints existed in Europe.[66] Collaboration in the Napoleonic era could also lead to outright copying.

The collaborative caricature business was also transnational. Taking a transnational approach to the caricature trade allows the historian to compare groups, technologies, and goods across national borders. It also helps to reveal the complex linkages, networks, and actors behind historical processes, including the circulation of objects and ideas.[67] In the case of 1812 caricatures, the images that circulated from England to Russia helped, however paradoxical it sounds, to construct transnational nationhoods.

As imagined communities, nations are constructed through comparisons with other nations.[68] They can also be imagined, as Cruikshank's copy illustrates, through the circulation of similar imaginations across borders. In his 1813 print "Boney Tir'd of

65 The Azbuka 1812 god is now available online: http://www.museum.ru/1812/library/Azbuka/index.html.

66 R. L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 79.

67 For more on transnational approaches - and the inspiration for my approach - see AHR Conversation, On Transnational History, in: American Historical Review 111 (2006) 5, pp. 1441-1464.

68 Glenda Sluga, The Nation and the Comparative Imagination, in: Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (Eds.), Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective, New York 2004, pp. 103-114.

War's Alarms," for example, Cruikshank depicts the diminutive French Emperor with his oversized hat riding on top of a devil. Napoleon is arriving home in Paris after his disastrous Russian campaign, begging to be thawed out and to be welcomed home by his loving family. While his wife, Marie Louise, does so, the nurse who cradles the heir to the throne understands the situation. The young child asks if Papa "has cowed the Russians like the English cowed us," to which she responds, "No, your majesty, the Russians fought like bulls and their nobility proved staunch patriots." On the wall above the fireplace someone has hung a caricature of a Cossack with Napoleon's head on his pike.[69] The image resembles Gillray's famous 1803 caricature, "Buonaparte, 48 Hours After Landing," which featured John Bull hoisting Napoleon's head on his pitchfork.[70] Cruikshank's 1813 print also resembles the numerous Russian images of Cossacks spearing French soldiers on their pikes. And that is precisely the point.

Cossacks could literally and figuratively cross European borders: throughout 1813 and 1814, the Russian army moved through Europe, eventually entering Paris itself in March and April 1814. Popular images of Cossacks also moved across Europe: Cruikshank's copies of Terebenev's images ensured that Cossacks gained popular introduction to England.[71] Copying across borders seemed to be the name of the game in the late Napoleonic era. Perhaps the best summary of the way in which national images crisscrossed English and Russian borders by the end of the Napoleonic era can be seen in William Elmes's 1813 caricature "The Cossack Extinguisher." In it, a giant, bearded, grinning Cossack holding a spear catches a tiny Napoleon simply by placing his cap over the Emperor. The Cossack declares that "I'll extinguish your little French … Master Boney" while the French emperor laments that those "contempable [sic] Cossacks has Clouded all my hopes"[72]. In the background one can just make out Leipzig, site of the "Battle of the Nations" in October 1813. An English flag flies over the walled city.

The Cossack – borderland builders of empire under Peter the Great and a symbol of imperial identity – became a "Russian" national figure and transnational symbol for Russia itself in 1812 largely through the popular prints such as the ones above.[73] Ivan Terebenev and his fellow Russian caricaturists would cast Cossacks as national heroes in their 1812 images. George Cruikshank and his fellow English caricaturists would cast the Cossack as an international hero in theirs. In 1814, Cruikshank produced "Snuffing Out Boney," which featured an enormous, gleeful Cossack using a pair of candle snuffers

69 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1131114147117584.

70 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=113086187616354.

71 R.L. Patten, George Cruikshank's Life, Art, and Times (note 1), p. 111.

72 The British Museum, Prints and Drawings, BM Satires 12097, 1948,0214.787.

73 See S. M. Norris, A War of Images (note 68), Chapter 2, for more on how the Cossack became "national" in 1812. Judith Deutsch Kornblatt also describes how the Cossacks became "Russian" and how they came to embody the "Russian soul" in popular imagination during the 1820s in her The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology, Madison 1992. For the Cossacks as imperial people, see Brian Boeck's Imperial Boundaries: Cossack Communities and Empire-Building in the Age of Peter the Great, Cambridge 2009.

to extinguish Napoleon. Elmes's "The Cossack Extinguisher" hangs on the wall behind the Frenchman, a nod to Cruikshank's commercial rival's abilities. German and French caricaturists would in turn copy Cruikshank's print.

Fig. 7. *The Cossack as International Hero*
William Elmes, "The Cossack Extinguisher." 1813 print. Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[74]

74 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=113102910362506.

Fig. 8. *George Cruikshank, "Snuffing Out Boney." 1814 print.*
Bullard Napoleon Collection. Brown University Library.[75]

75 Digital Collections, Napoleonic Satires: http://library.brown.edu/cds/catalog/catalog.php?verb=render&id=1132320154995426.

The 1812 circulation of caricatures makes this a useful date for evaluating how Napoleon helped to crystallize nationhoods across the continent. The fact that the French emperor served as such a useful symbol for articulating Englishness, Russianness, Germanness, Spanishness, and other national construction projects also provides a chance to compare scholarly debates on national identity.[76] In the English case, many scholars focus on whether or not English national identity or British national identity was the more potent force. Gerald Newman sees English; Linda Colley sees British.[77] Both believe that the Georgian era was a crucial one for how modern nationhood got constructed. In his study of Napoleon in British culture, Stuart Semmel criticizes the scholarly literature that attempts to define identities at the time as either national or supranational, arguing that "identity (local, ethnic, regional, and national identity – indeed imperial identity as well) is not a zero-sum game"[78]. English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, and British identities developed alongside each other and connected with each other in complex ways, making "the threads of national development intertwine in a fashion that ultimately defies extrication"[79]. One thing is certain: the Napoleonic era was a time when definitions of British identity – and with it, definitions of English identity – were in flux.[80] Yet this state of anxiety only highlights one of the central aspects of nationhood: it is always under revision, always in flux, and its cultural constructors are always redefining it. In the English case, the Napoleonic era – the era of Cruikshank's emergence – proved to be one more moment when "Englishness" got defined alongside "Britishness." Cruikshank's September caricature from the other theater in the English war, America, illustrates how the artist could employ both terms: "British Valour and Yankee Boasting" features a landing party, including John Bull, boarding the American ship *The Chesapeake* and dispatching its crew. The same spirit and heroism that Cruikshank illustrated as "English" in his Napoleonic prints characterize the "British" in this caricature.[81] As Krishan Kumar describes this relationship, patriotic emotions tended to build up around the concept of "Englishness" while "Britishness" represented something cooler, something larger, and not necessarily an identity in conflict with an ethnic English one.[82] In Cruikshank's Napoleonic cartoons, however, the two terms could be employed to convey patriotic emotions.

If Cruikshank's prints illustrated notions of Englishness and Britishness and therefore help us understand these national constructions as mutually supportive, not mutually

76 For the German case, see Karen Hagemann, Francophobia and Patriotism: Anti-French Images and Sentiments in Prussia and Northern Germany during the Anti-Napoleonic Wars, in: French History 18 (2004) 4, pp. 404-425. Hagemann traces processes very similar to the Russian situation; namely, how nascent German nationhood exploded through contact with the French forces and even more broadly through broader understanding of Germanness as distinct from Frenchness. The primary historical actors in her account are also cultural figures, especially writers such as Ernst Moritz Arndt.

77 Gerald Newman, The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History, 1740-1830, London, 1997.

78 S. Semmel, Napoleon and the British (note 26), p. 8.

79 Ibid.

80 Ibid., p. 38.

81 Library of Congress (LoC), Prints and Photographs Division, Online Catalog: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/99471628/.

82 Krishan Kumar, The Making of English National Identity, Cambridge 2003.

exclusive, ones, perhaps the same could be said of Russian national and imperial building projects. In her study of Nikolai Gogol, Edyta Bojanowska seeks to understand the writer's conflicting views of his Ukrainian and Russian identities. For many subjects of the Russian empire in the age of nationalism, Russia's status as a multiethnic empire had profound repercussions for the development of Russian and other national identities and how these identities evolved.[83] In a similar vein and invoking both Benedict Anderson and Homi Bhabha, Simon Franklin and Emma Widdis have argued, that nations are cultural creations, best located in its texts, flags, symbols, anthems, monuments, and literature. These creations, the two argue, "embody and make real the abstract ideas of Russia and 'Russianness,'" thereby creating identities.[84] Russian nationhood, they argue, constantly shifts, takes multiple forms, and creates multiple symbols. It is therefore "a process rather than a result"[85]. One of the complicating factors in this construction, though not one that excludes nationhood from developing is the fact that "Russia is not and has never been a 'nation-state,' where the geo-political boundaries and the ethno-cultural boundaries coincide. More or less from the start it has been a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual polity"[86]. Russian national identity, Russian nationhood, and Russian nationalism: all of these variations naturally developed in concert with, rather than in spite of, the existence of a Russian empire.

These complicated historical processes of transnational nationhoods coalescing in 1812 become a bit clearer and more understandable from the perspective of individuals. Franklin and Widdis note that while it would nice to "know what proportion of the wider population might have heard of or associated themselves with which aspects of which type of identity at which time," attributing a single identity to an entire population is a dangerous trap to fall into.[87] Instead, it is wiser to focus on individuals, the producers of culture and the builders of their own national projects. Both Terebenev and Cruikshank took part in these projects. Both of their lives illuminate larger historical processes. Yet both also shaped these very same processes. Both men turned to caricature in order to make names for themselves, make money, express their pent up patriotism, and to imagine what it meant to be "Russian" or "English" (or even ""British") and how these identities differed from being "French." Both, in short, used Boney as a means to build their own national edifice. And these national construction projects, at least in 1812, looked quite similar.

One hundred years after Cruikshank copied Terebenev's print, the Moscow publisher S. S. Vasil'ev wanted to make some money by commemorating the anniversary of Napoleon's Russian campaign. He decided to issue postcard reproductions of 1812 caricatures.

83 Edyta Bojanowska, Nikolai Gogol: Between Ukrainian and Russian Nationalism, Cambridge, MA 2007, Chapter 1.

84 Simon Franklin, Emma Widdis, All the Russias…?, in Simon Franklin, Emma Widdis (Eds.), National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction, Cambridge 2004, p. 2.

85 S. Franklin, E. Widdis, All the Russias…? (note 91), p. 2.

86 Ibid., p. 4.

87 Ibid., p. 3.

Terebenev's images, by then well-known, appeared on several: Russians again taught Boney to dance in these products. This time, however, the international plagiarism went the other way: Vasil'ev included Elmes's "The Cossack Extinguisher" and the frequently-copied "The Extraordinary French Post in Paris" as two of the postcards 1912 consumers could purchase.[88]

88 1812 Online Museum: http://www.museum.ru/1812/memorial/postcard/karicatura.html.