Representations of France and the French in English Satirical Prints, c. 1740-1832

Vol. 1:2

John Richard Moores

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of York

History

September 2011

Abstract

This thesis explores representations of France and the French in English satirical prints in the period c. 1740-1832. This was an era of rivalry and conflict between the two nations. It has been suggested that hostility towards France at this time contributed to the formation of English, or British, national identity. This coincided with England's 'golden age of caricature'. While much of the satirical art produced focussed on France, most studies of this material have dealt with how the English portrayed themselves and each other. Those which have discussed representations of the French have promoted the view that English perceptions of the French were principally hostile. While there is a temptation to employ such prints as evidence of English Francophobia, a closer investigation reveals greater satirical complexities at work which do not simply conceptualise and employ the French 'Other' as target of hatred.

Informed by war and rivalry, as well as by trade, travel, and cultural exchange, the prints projected some positive characteristics onto the French 'Other', they contain varying degrees of sympathy and affinity with the French, and are demonstrative of a relationship more distinct and intimate than that shared with any other nation. At the same time, the prints expose many of the tensions and divisions that existed within Britain itself. French characters were employed to directly attack British political figures, while in other instances domestic anxieties were projected onto images of the French.

Contents

Award of High Commendation.

Christopher Moores and Stephanie King provided valuable advice in the closing stages of the work. Finally, I would like to thank my family for all their patience, support and encouragement, and my partner Stephanie whose contribution to this thesis, and to my life, cannot be put into words.

<u>Author's Declaration</u>

An early version of Chapter Four was presented at the Eighteenth Century Worlds' 'Civilians and War in Europe c. 1640-1815' conference at the University of Liverpool in June 2009. Certain elements of Chapter Two were presented in a paper at the Centre for Metropolitan History's 'Cities and Nationalisms' conference held at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, London, in June 2010. A version of the 'Religion' section of Chapter Three was presented at the 'British Society for Eighteenth Century Studies Annual Conference' at St. Hugh's College, Oxford, in January 2011.

<u>Introduction</u>

Between the years of 1740 and 1832, Britain witnessed what has become known as its 'golden age' of caricature.[1] This period was also characterised by dramatic social and political change both at home and abroad. Britain's relationship with France during this time was particularly turbulent, leading to suggestions that British or English national identity was forged thanks to hostility towards the French 'Other'.[2] Visual prints remain an overlooked area of study, and those scholars who have tackled such material have tended to focus on how the British depicted themselves and each other.[3] The studies which have focussed on graphic portrayals of foreigners and of the French have been too brief to explore the prints and their complexities in detail and have generally promoted the view that English perceptions of the French were defined by hostility, antagonism and derision.[4]

Although British interest in France never disappears, the obsession with that nation was particularly strong during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. By the eighteenth century, France's wealth and influence had superseded those of other continental nations such as Spain. France thus became Britain's most powerful rival. Representations of the French were informed by this rivalry, and by the numerous wars which broke out between the two countries. They were also informed by travel, by an attraction to French fashions and culture, and by a close attention to the interior workings of France. The satirical depictions, which at first appear to be straightforward expressions of Francophobia, also contain evidence of familiarity, empathy, and a kinship with France, one more intimate than that shared with any other nation.

---

[1] Though some might argue that 'London's Golden Age' would be more accurate, and there is also debate over whether the term 'caricature' should be applied to a body of material of such disparate styles - see Chapter One.

[2] Gerald Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1987); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (London: Yale University Press, 2005).

[3] See Chapter One.

[4] Michael Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986); Michael Duffy, 'The Noisie, Empty, Fluttering French: English Images of the French, 1689-1815', *History Today* 32 (1982), pp. 21-26; see Chapter One.

Prints on the French 'Other' also reveal many of the tensions that existed within Britain itself, for domestic anxieties were projected onto images of the French. Sometimes this was done fairly directly, with French characters employed as tools with which to undermine the reputations of British politicians. At other times, attacks on the British political system and on social inequalities, and more general condemnation of subjects such as tyranny, religion, and corruption, were implied through representations of French leaders. Many of the prints on fashion, meanwhile, were less concerned with the actions of Frenchmen than on those of a particular type of Englishman.

This thesis begins by exploring the methodology and historiography of satirical print studies, the advantages of this material and the problems it causes for historians, the methods of production and sale, the reach and diversity of its audience (Chapter One). Focus then turns to imagery on France and French, and is arranged thematically.

Chapter Two looks at cultural and social representations, though of course such depictions were unavoidably tied to the political. This chapter discusses the concerns about diminishing English masculinity that were projected onto representations of Frenchmen and their English imitators, the 'macaronis'. While much of this imagery could be said to have been inspired by fears of a 'dilution of British stock' and of a French cultural invasion, it was also a subject which inspired jovial amusement. These portrayals derided the popularity of French culture in England, but in doing so provided proof of the potency and consistency of this popularity.

Chapter Three moves upwards from the more generic stereotypes of the French 'people' to the political and religious rulers of France. It explores the ways in which images of the French could be used to express dissatisfaction with domestic political and religious leaders (both directly and indirectly). It questions the extent

to which British conceptions of themselves and the French relied on Protestant Anti-Catholicism. It investigates the way French rulers were not necessarily thought to be representative of their subjects, and that it was usually French and British leaders, rather than the French people, who were the targets of hatred. It expands on the ideas concerning sympathy for the French people from Chapter Two and also charts the emergence of less antagonistic depictions of French rulers.

Chapter Four deals with the subject of war with France and transitions from war to peace. It questions whether the satirical images are representative of a nation defining itself through prolonged warfare with the French. Earlier wars were portrayed in a more allegorical style, conceiving war in terms of bestial disorder. Later portrayals tended to define war as a clash of powerful personalities rather than as a conflict between peoples or nations. Prints on war and those on peace treaties were often concerned with attacking domestic ruling regimes and their perceived failures. There was a change, however, as later peace treaties were celebrated and their negotiators (both English and French) treated less harshly. The chapter touches on portrayals of Britain's allies, and shows that the French could be treated with greater generosity and familiarity than other foreigners; this is expanded on in the final chapter.

The theme of Chapter Five is revolution. It discusses the positive early responses to the revolution which began in 1789, and the difficulties involved in interpreting later portrayals; some of the examples could be defined either as attacks on the revolution or on Burkean hyperbole, or even as both at the same time. Nevertheless, war and terror did mean that the stereotyped Frenchman became more repugnant. This change was also informed by the divisions at home which were inspired and exposed by the revolution and, although it cannot be denied that representations changed, there was still some continuity. It was still those at home who were enamoured with France, rather than the French themselves, who were the principal objects of satire; particularly members of the Westminster political

elite. At the same time, the abhorrence of the Jacobin sans-culotte stereotype did not prove so potent or enduring that it lessened sympathy for France's subsequent revolution in 1830. The outbreak of this revolution was also portrayed in a positive and supportive manner. Though they may have stopped far short of radicalism, this chapter suggests that political prints endorsed certain liberal values, and in doing so were not as conservative as has been contended.

The final chapter discusses two smaller themes: women and 'other Others'. Frenchwomen were not etched as regularly as Frenchmen, and their portrayals were fewer in variety. English writers commented on the dangerous supremacy of women in France. Although the stereotype of the foppish Frenchman may have alluded to this, it was not a subject that was dealt with directly in graphic renditions, perhaps because caricatures of certain English ladies were providing an outlet for such gender anxieties. Female participation in the early stages of the French Revolution was celebrated and, although their representations also became more repulsive, in some instances they continued to be portrayed as tragic, sentimental figures. Women were principally used to deride the actions of their men, but they were also figures of sympathy and attraction.

Although they merit deeper investigation, a brief survey of portrayals of other foreigners helps to emphasise the unique position that France held in the minds of the English. The French attracted the most attention, but they were far from the only Other to be attacked. Whereas the French stereotype evolved and was informed by a fascination with that nation, other stereotypes, such as the Spanish, remained noticeably static. Other nations to attract particular hostility were the Scots and the Dutch, whose representations, like the French, were also inspired by familiarity, affinity and intimacy.

Chapter One:

Studying Satirical Prints

This chapter concerns the methodology and historiography of the study of 'satirical prints', the main source material used for this investigation of English representations of the French. It will cover the competing terminologies that have been imposed on this genre, the problems with studying prints and the extent of their value, the difficulties in interpreting them, their audiences and the debates over the scale of their reach, and the nature of their design, production, sale and reception.

Historians apply a variety of terms to this variety of graphic material, 'cartoons', 'caricatures', 'political prints', and 'satirical prints' are particularly common but there is little consensus and often many inconsistencies. Some use these labels interchangeably, in an arbitrary manner, or employ a single term, such as 'caricature' or 'cartoon', to refer to widely disparate graphic forms. E. E. C. Nicholson has argued that both of these habits impede the establishment of a 'sensitive and viable methodology' for handling this material and obscure the 'historical specificity' of the prints.[1] Recently, the application of the word 'cartoon' when referring to pre-mid-nineteenth century imagery has come under attack. Nicholson shows nothing short of contempt for those who continue to use it. She writes that the term is completely inappropriate to the study of seventeenth and eighteenth century prints, and must therefore be avoided. She sees no excuse for its utilisation at the scholarly level, even when acknowledged as an anachronism or adorned with inverted commas, and insists that its appearance in works 'with any pretensions to seriousness' be contested.[2]

---

[1] Eirwen E. C. Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument c. 1640 - c. 1832: a study in historiography and methodology*, University of Edinburgh unpublished Ph.D. thesis (1994), pp. 468-477.
[2] *Ibid*., p. 483.

Vic Gatrell is also among those keen to dismiss the use of this term when referring to eighteenth century prints:

> …we should discard the notion that the satirical prints of this period were regarded as disposable fripperies, as newspaper cartoons are today. Indeed, in reference to a satirical or comic sketch, the word 'cartoon' is anachronistic to our period: we deal with 'caricatures', not cartoons. 'Cartoon' was first coined by *Punch* only in June 1843 in parodic reference to the fresco designs for the new Houses of Parliament exhibited in Westminster Hall: the magazine then published its 'cartoon no.1' by John Leech on 15 July. Thereafter, 'cartoon' came to refer to a genre that was blander, more speedily produced, and less ambitious than the prints we're concerned with, and 'cartoonist' (first recorded as late as 1880) to an artist whose work was evanescent. Moreover, people who spent expensively on prints valued them more than our association of them with cartoons can possibly convey.[3]

Though his point that the eighteenth century versions were less disposable than their later equivalents is a valid one, the fact that the term 'cartoon' became predominant around the time that the genre grew significantly blander does not necessarily make it an inappropriate term. Using this logic, when later, less bland cartoonists such as David Low, Ralph Steadman or Steve Bell emerge should, therefore, the term 'cartoon' be discarded in favour of the application of a different resurrected or newly invented term? Art genres rarely have different categories for blander versions of the same or similar form, and how is it possible to uniformly determine where bland ends and begins? While it is important to be aware of the emergence of the term 'cartoon', its non-existence in the eighteenth century does not itself mean we should avoid its usage. Retrospective labels such as 'ancien régime' or 'total war' which were not used by contemporaries can still be useful in scholars' and students' efforts to understand the past.

Thomas Milton Kemnitz preferred the term 'cartoon' in spite of it being 'an imprecise term which is now applied to a multitude of graphic forms':

---

[3] Vic Gatrell, *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Atlantic, 2006), p. 212.

> 'Cartoon' has the advantage of being a word that did not originally refer to graphic satire at all but rather meant a preparatory sketch for a painting. It took on its new meaning in the 1840s in *Punch*, and has since proved expandable as the forms of cartooning have multiplied. 'Caricature' on the other hand refers to the technique of exaggeration or distortion of features - a technique employed by most political cartoonists but sometimes absent from social and foreign affairs cartoons.[4]

The problem with 'caricature' is that it refers more specifically to a style, or technique, that of exaggerating or distorting the subject.[5] Critics such as E. H. Gombrich trace the roots of caricature all the way back to the ancient Olympians.[6] The tradition of the grotesque and the mocking was maintained by, amongst other forms, effigies and medieval gargoyles. Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) experimented with grotesque sketches, followed by Annibale Carracci (1557-1602), often cited as the pioneer of modern caricature. Carracci developed an exaggerated form of portraiture which by 'loading' the features created a more striking image than a normal portrait ('caricare' being Italian for 'to load'). From Carracci and his circle the technique spread throughout Europe, becoming popular amongst the aristocracies of Rome and Paris.[7] In the early eighteenth century William Hogarth, though personally denouncing caricature, was producing something akin to it in his satirical moral pieces, while the Italian versions began to be imported to England by gentlemen returning from the Grand Tour. With progress in printing technology and growing literacy and political awareness, the form prospered in Britain, and began to be used for more political and humorous purposes.[8]

Unlike 'cartoon', the word 'caricature' was spoken and written by eighteenth

---

[4] Thomas Milton Kemnitz, 'The Cartoon as a Historical Source', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 4 (1973), p. 82.

[5] For discussion of definitions of 'distortion' and varying types, meanings and extent of distortion see Lawrence H. Streicher, 'On a Theory of Political Caricature', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (1967), p. 433.

[6] E. H. Gombrich, *Meditations on a Hobby Horse* (London: Phaidon, 1978), p. 129.

[7] Diana Donald, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 12-14.

[8] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 227.

century English men and women, although its usage by these contemporaries was also broad and arbitrary. Added to older terms like 'emblematic picture', 'hieroglyphic prints', 'curious engravings', 'effigies' and 'prints', by the 1790s 'caricature' could be used to describe all kinds of comic, satirical or grotesque imagery.[9] 'Caricature', however, does imply distortion, exaggeration, and usually that of an individual, given its emergence from the technique of portrait caricature. Yet not every eighteenth century print portrays particular individuals and many do not attempt to distort or excessively exaggerate their subjects' appearances. Before the 1770s and 1780s, in fact, political print artists did not tend to employ the technique of caricaturing their subjects in the sense of distorting their physiognomic features.[10] Even after the 1770s, when the habit became widespread, it was not employed unanimously. Many dealt in metaphors rather than distortions. Take, for example, the practice of portraying certain countries as animals (such as the Russian bear); a technique used regularly by print artists throughout the eighteenth century. It could be argued that these too are caricatures because, although the country or its people's literal physical appearance has not been distorted or exaggerated, its perceived characteristics have. It seems this is stretching the definition of caricature too far, making it a synonym for 'stereotype' or a 'visual metaphor'. Graphic art does not have to resort to caricature in order to be satirical.[11] 'Satirical print' might then seem an appropriate label, but were all these prints strictly satirical? Some appear softer, less opinionated and antagonistic, than the implications of that word, and are merely observations rather than satires as such. The term 'satire', writes Nicholson, needs to be 'restricted to prints whose satirical intent can be convincingly argued.'[12] She sees 'political prints' as 'the most basic and unexceptionable' of the terms, though she would prefer it to be used exclusively for non-satirical prints, which she feels have been neglected by the previous

---

[9] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, pp. 480-481; Draper Hill, *Mr. Gillray The Caricaturist* (London: Phaidon, 1965), p. 1.
[10] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 132.
[11] W. A. Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969), p. 85.
[12] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 485.

modes of categorisation; 'graphic political satires' is also acceptable and, (only for those prints in which caricature can be said have been employed) 'political caricatures'.[13] Some prints, of course, are more directly political than others, and Nicholson is vaguer on those which Dorothy George deemed 'social satires'. While she brushes over the differences between the political and the social, here Nicholson would like to see the term 'social caricature' ascribed to those designs in which 'specific individuals are known to have been intended, as well as where the treatment of the subject represents merely the application of caricature to stock comic genre scenes.' The term 'social satires', meanwhile, should be 'reserved for those prints which register more bite, and in which humorous observation is subordinate to implicit criticism.'[14] Nicholson does not go into the specifics of how we might define or measure this 'bite' or the differences between implicit and explicit criticism. The consensus of terminology desired by Nicholson is optimistic and remains a long way off. She has not completely solved the problems of print terminology, and some of the alternatives she suggests offer their own difficulties. Nevertheless, these problems have been highlighted and it is important that scholars endeavour to be more careful, specific and consistent than they have been in regards to which terms they use, when they use them, and why. It is not the intention of this thesis to make new steps in the terminological methodology of print studies. Effort has been made in trying to respect Nicholson's call for the employment of appropriate terms. As the material studied here is principally that which focuses on and satirises France and Anglo-French relations, terms such as 'political prints' and 'visual prints', 'satirical prints' and 'graphic satires' have been deemed suitable. Care has been taken not to label a print a 'caricature' where no caricaturing has been attempted.

Terminology aside, the question remains, why study this material? One answer, and one that few, if any, historians who discuss visual prints fail to mention, is simply that they have been understudied and underused.

---

[13] *Ibid*., pp. 488, 486.
[14] *Ibid*., p. 486.

'…in general, historians - apt to neglect iconography - disregard the wonderful material buried - the word is hardly an exaggeration - in the great mass of English satirical engravings.'[15]

Dorothy George (1959)

'Political caricature was only a part of the larger journalism which included newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets and books, but it was a rapidly growing and distinctive media outlet for political expression and it deserves closer study.'[16]

H. T. Dickinson (1986)

'There can be few groups of art works so comprehensively catalogued and yet so seldom discussed as the satirical prints of eighteenth-century England.'[17]

Diana Donald (1996)

'The sources… are abundant but woefully under-explored.'[18]

Vic Gatrell (2006)

In the last fifty years or so, despite some scholars' efforts, it appears that not much has changed in the failure of historians to explore the available material. But to say that they have been neglected in the past does not by itself justify their study. Perhaps they have been ignored because they are of little use. The prints were rarely written about by eighteenth century commentators, which might suggest their irrelevance. Writers of diaries and letters may have referred regularly to newspapers, far fewer would mention prints.[19] This scarcity of primary commentary makes the study of prints difficult and is also misleading. The prints were neglected by some contemporary writers because of their status in eighteenth century society. People who enjoyed the prints might not have wished to write or talk about them because of the negative connotations towards crude

---

[15] Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), p. 1.
[16] H. T. Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution, 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), p. 11.
[17] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. vii.
[18] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 9.
[19] *Ibid*., p. 213.

imagery, and laughter, which were inherent in mannered culture. As will be discussed below, not all these prints were humorous, but many were, and laughter was often considered to be unseemly, impolite, uncivil and characteristic of the lower orders.[20] Because of their appearance, their sketch-like quality, their vividness, their frequent rudeness and crudity, they were considered 'low-art' and would have suffered from all the connotations of this, including respectable people's wishes to enjoy them privately. Nevertheless, people did enjoy them, as illustrated by the vast numbers produced and sold, the crowds who were said to congregate outside printshops, and the large collections that some individuals accumulated, which will be discussed below. As Vic Gatrell maintains, 'scarcity of comment is no index of a commodity's cultural consequence.'[21]

On inspection of the prints' audience, artists and sellers, and the prints' role in culture and society, it will become clearer how useful they are. Although there is much speculation and contention over who exactly saw the prints, it is apparent from their prices who could afford to purchase them, and thus to which section of society the prints had to appeal. Cost could vary, but in the earlier years of the century standard price was 6d for a plain print and 1s coloured, by 1800 this had doubled to 1s plain, 2s coloured, with many of James Gillray's larger coloured prints over 3s.[22] The prints, therefore, were out of reach of most individuals. There were other ways for poorer people to access the designs, although the historians of this material are in no agreement over the extent to which the popular classes might have been exposed to the prints. Bound volumes of cartoons were available to rent for an evening's entertainment, though given that in the 1790s the printseller Samuel Fores was charging a half-crown rental fee per night, with a one pound deposit, this was still expensive.[23] Towards the end of the century, printsellers such as William Holland and Fores hosted print exhibitions, charging

---

[20] *Ibid*., pp. 160-165. Gatrell mentions that these strictures did loosen towards the end of the century.

[21] *Ibid*., p. 218.

[22] Eirwen E. C. Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators: The public of the political print in Eighteenth-Century England', *History* 81 (1996), p. 12.

[23] Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in late Georgian England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 8-9.

the public an entrance fee of one shilling, but this too was beyond most people's means.[24] Cindy McCreery speculates that groups of people such as London apprentices, sailors or tavern customers may have clubbed together to purchase prints that could then be displayed in communal areas, their workshop, communal residence, or tavern, in the way that groups might have shared ownership of periodicals or books, though she provides no evidence for such an occurrence.[25] *Gratis* exhibitions could be perused, however, simply by gazing into the windows of the printshops where the latest etchings and satires for sale would be displayed. One French visitor complained that the crowds grew so large that 'You have to fight your way in with your fists'; in 1819 the authorities were forced to clear the street outside William Hone's shop after George Cruikshank's *Bank Restriction Note* attracted such an excessive crowd.[26]

  A small number of prints themselves depict the phenomenon of people assembling outside shop windows, illustrating not only the size but the diversity of the crowd. These include the anonymous *CARICATURE SHOP* [Fig. 1.] [Lewis Walpole Library 801.09.00.01] of 1801, showing a crowd outside the shop of P. Roberts. Members of the group enjoying the display include well-dressed ladies and gents, as well as a hunched old man, a young child, a black man, a beggar with no legs and even a small dog. James Gillray's *VERY SLIPPY-WEATHER* [Fig. 2] [BMC 11100] (1808), a view of the outside of Hannah Humphrey's shop, is another illustration of the printshop as 'a free gallery for the poor.'[27]

  The images were not exclusively available in this format. The designs could appear on early forms of the postcard, medals, coins, ladies' fans, handkerchiefs, playing cards, decorative screens, as illustrations in books, on penny ballads,

---

[24] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 15.
[25] Cindy McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in late Eighteenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), p. 37.
[26] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 13.
[27] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 5.

broadsides, or other publications, or on ceramics such as bowls, plates and cups.[28] Pubs and similar establishments sometimes had prints decorating their walls.[29] These formats extended the audience beyond that which had access to printshops.

The advantages of windows and of reproductions are irrelevant though, at least according to one of E. E. C. Nicholson's admirably cynical articles.[30] Nicholson states that even if the poorer classes had managed to cast their eyes on such works they would not have been able to understand them, despite the image being more universal than the printed word. This was because the pictures were explicitly intended for consumption by wealthy, educated buyers and thus had no incentive to make concessions to a popular audience. Many included significant amounts of text, often employing French and Latin phrases as well as English, and most had what Nicholson calls 'allusive iconography.'[31] This view had also been expressed by H. T. Dickinson, who resolved that 'most prints were not perused by the lower orders. Many prints included some writing and most political prints assumed a high level of political intelligence and knowledge.'[32]

T. L. Hunt disputed this attitude, first by affirming both the literacy and the political awareness of the lower classes in eighteenth century England. Accepting that we have no precise literacy figures for the era, she quotes a foreign visitor to England in the mid-eighteenth century ('Workmen habitually begin the day by going to coffee-rooms in order to read the daily news. I have often seen shoeblacks and other persons of that class club together to purchase a farthing paper.'), refers to varying estimates of rudimentary literacy in her footnotes, none of which, she claims, dismiss the working class as totally illiterate, and emphasises the political debates stirred by the American and French revolutions

---

[28] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 3. Some examples of ceramics are reproduced in David Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine: Britain and the French Revolution* (London: British Museum Publications, 1989), pp. 109, 120, 121, 137, 140, 141,
[29] *Ibid*., p. 13; McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 37.
[30] Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators', pp. 5-21.
[31] *Ibid*., p. 17.
[32] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 15.

and the works published and read in reaction to those events.[33] Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* is said to have sold 250,000 copies within just two years, attesting to a significantly sized and broad readership.[34] The works published in agreement with Paine, as well as the many conservative ones aiming to counter his subversive influence amongst the lower orders, point towards the growing literacy and political awareness of workers and artisans at the time. If the crowds were as large and diverse as is professed, it could also be presumed that a literate individual might read aloud the textual elements of the designs for the benefit of others engaged in this activity of collective enjoyment, in the same way that would happen with newspapers and other documents.

Secondly, Hunt questions whether literary skills and political understanding was even a necessary prerequisite for comprehending and enjoying the prints. Characters and symbols were fashioned in a 'fairly consistent manner' by the majority of artists and the majority of designs were 'intelligible at a glance'.[35] Examples of these consistencies could include stereotypes of foreigners, such as the skinny Frenchmen in long coats that will be discussed later, or the symbols used to depict politicians, such as Henry Fox or his son Charles James appearing as actual foxes. Concepts such as good and evil could easily be conveyed by light and dark or by angels and demons, or Britishness by the figures of Britannia, the British lion or John Bull.

W. A. Coupe tackled the issue from a slightly different angle, dismissing the words used in 'caricature' as largely superfluous. In response to Lawrence H. Streicher's view that the text used either below the images or in speech balloons 'helped give their subjects life and a natural reality'[36] Coupe wrote that

> In many cases this is undoubtedly true; often indeed the cartoon becomes
> completely meaningless without the caption… Elsewhere, however - not least in the

---

[33] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, pp. 10, 318 n.64.
[34] Eric Foner, 'Introduction', in Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man* (London: Penguin, 1986), p. 18.
[35] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 12.
[36] Streicher, 'On a Theory of Political Caricature', p. 438.

work of some of the most celebrated cartoonists - Streicher's thesis scarcely stands

up to the empirical test and the balloons are often no more than an uncomfortable

survival from the detailed verses which in earlier times had always been appended

to satirical prints. Thus to my mind the subtitle which Gillray gives to his famous

The Plumb-pudding in danger, not to mention the highly involved conversation with

which he cumbers all the parts of many another cartoon, actually detracts from the

impact of the engraving; it spoils the 'joke' by explaining it. Even in more modern

times it is difficult to find examples where the text is at best tautologous: a really

successful cartoon can usually speak for itself without the help of the letterpress,

which is, in any case, often not the work of the cartoonist himself.[37]

This argument goes as far as to suggest that, despite the presence of text, the illiterate will actually enjoy the cartoon more than those who can read.

Dickinson and Nicholson are also both keen to point out the limitations of the prints in being able to reach a wide audience in the geographic sense. The prints were produced and sold in London, from a small number of shops in a small area of the city.[38] Gatrell's *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* reproduces a section of the London map, pinpointing the principal printshops' locations, scattered around the Covent Garden area.[39] Dickinson's point that there were fewer than ten printshops which were all located in the same part of the capital is contested in Hunt's *Defining John Bull*, which draws attention to the fact that there were many more printsellers, booksellers and stationers scattered across London who did not specialise in prints but who included smaller numbers of them, or cheaper imitations, in their stock.[40]

McCreery shows that accounts from visitors such as Frederick Wendeborn as well as natives like John Corry attest that the viewing of prints was not restricted to the Westminster elite. Corry's account of 1803 states that

---

[37] Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature', p. 81.
[38] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 15; Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators', p. 19.
[39] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 83.
[40] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 15.

…it is an authenticated fact, that girls often go in parties to visit the windows of
printshops, that they may amuse themselves with the view of prints which impart
the most impure ideas. Before these windows, the apprentice loiters - unmindful of
his master's business; and thither prostitutes hasten, and with fascinating glances
endeavour to allure the giddy and the vain who stop to gaze on the *sleeping Venus*,
the British Venus, and a variety of seductive representations of naked feminine
beauty.

It tells us that people of both sexes, and of relatively humble backgrounds, made
special journeys to the printshops and that they were not exclusively seen by those
who happened to pass by on their daily journeys through that area of the capital.
Corry is also convinced that the printshop window was a morally dangerous
place, drawing truants and prostitutes, but that it was evidently an attractive and
popular one.[41]

  Even if it was a London-centric view that they projected, some images managed
to reach elsewhere. Hunt also states that the prints would have been circulated to
country booksellers and stationers along the usual networks of print media, citing
Leeds bookseller James Mann as an example.[42] In 1793, in Birmingham, the
bookseller James (or William) Belcher was prosecuted by authorities. Though
charged for selling one of Thomas Paine's pamphlets, it was noted that Belcher's
shop-window displayed 'a variety of caricature prints' including Gillray's *A
Voluptuary under the Horrors of Indigestion*.[43] However, the efforts made by
William Hone (1780-1842) and Thomas Jonathan Wooler (1786-1853), the
radical journalists behind the *Reformists' Register* and the *Black Dwarf*
respectively, in expanding, establishing and exploiting print networks in the 1810s
caused much alarm to the authorities[44], suggesting that such proficient and wide-
reaching systems of distribution were a relatively new phenomenon. Sellers such

[41] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, pp. 26-27.
[42] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 16.
[43] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 494.
[44] Ben Wilson, *The Laughter of Triumph: William Hone and the Fight for the Free Press*
(London: Faber and Faber, 2005), pp. 186-189.

as Fores and the Humphreys also sent large numbers of prints out to individual mail order customers, though these would likewise be aristocratic or upper middle-class buyers.[45] Horace Walpole and members of his social circle sent prints as gifts or accompanying their letters.[46] Diana Donald also argues that it is misleading to treat the London population as 'a fixed entity, separate from the rest of the country.'[47] People from all walks of life came and went constantly for all their various reasons, thus spreading the capital's influence and produce across the land.

The prints were not even restricted to Britain. A newspaper in Williamsburg, Virginia advertised the sale of a collection of around 200 prints as early as 1766.[48] Prints proved appealing to Europeans as well, partly because continental censorship and lack of print technology stifled the production of similar works of their own. Wendeborn recorded that caricatures, like other English artistic engravings, were exported 'in great quantities over to Germany, and from thence to the adjacent countries.'[49] Prints could appear in their original form, or sometimes the words would be translated. From 1798 the German periodical *London und Paris* regularly ran copies of works by Gillray and others with extensive commentaries.[50] In 1798 Sir John Dalrymple commissioned Gillray to produce the loyalist propaganda series *Consequences of a Successful French Invasion*, which were intended to be sold cheaply so as to be accessible to the poor. Dalrymple was delighted with the second plate which depicted French Jacobins dragging an Irish Roman Catholic priest from a church; he wrote to Gillray expressing his intention to send the design to Ireland (although the two soon fell out and the series was abandoned).[51] Some prints, such as Isaac

---

[45] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 21.
[46] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 36.
[47] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 19.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[49] Frederick Wendeborn, *A View of England towards the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (1791), vol. ii, p. 155.
[50] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 20; Christiane Banerji, and Diana Donald (ed.), *Gillray Observed: The Earliest Account of his Caricatures in* London und Paris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
[51] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 73-80.

Cruikshank's *Le DEFICIT* [Fig. 3] [BMC 7376] (12 November, 1788) feature non-English titles and text, so may have been produced with the foreign market in mind. In 1808 publishers and purchasers showed an appetite for anti-Bonaparte propaganda, supportive of the Spanish rebels, and Spanish versions of English prints seem to have been circulated in Spain, for example Thomas Rowlandson's *THE CORSICAN TIGER AT BAY* [BMC 10994] (8 July, 1808), which became *El Tigre Corso Atacado*.[52]

If the sheer numbers of prints are observed, it seems difficult to imagine they remained exclusively in eyeshot of an elite. Published between 1870 and 1954, compiled and annotated first by Frederick George Stephens and then Dorothy George, the British Museum's Catalogue hosts some 17,391 prints from 1320 to 1832 (12,543 of these were post-1771). The Museum has acquired more than 1,500 since the catalogue was published, and this is by no means comprehensive. In 1921 9,900 titles collected by George IV were sold to the Library of Congress to help pay for George V's stamp collection. Copies of some 2,000 of these remain absent from the British Museum's collection. Holdings in other American libraries, such as the Lewis Walpole Library at Yale, possibly double this figure, and there were no doubt significant numbers lost and destroyed over time. Vic Gatrell suggests that 'It is probable that between 1771 and 1832 well over 20,000 satirical and humorous print titles were published altogether.'[53]

The British Museum Collection is not without its shortcomings. Despite Nicholson's hyperbolic complaint that 'Continued dependence upon the catalogue can… only be detrimental to research'[54], it has been the principal archive used in the research for this thesis. Nicholson's calls for the BMC to be updated, for the creation of a reference source for British provincial holdings of political graphics, for an up-to-date and comprehensive catalogue of the major American holdings,

---

[52] Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum, Division 1, Political and Personal Satires* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey), [10994]; Matthew and James Payne, *Regarding Thomas Rowlandson, 1757-1827: His Life, Art and Acquaintance* (Cornwall: Hogarth Arts, 2010), p. 273.
[53] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 231-232, 239.
[54] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 500.

for the inclusion in collections of different formats[55], have not yet been met. The bulk of the Museum's items come from the works collected by Edward Hawkins (1780-1867) and sold to the Museum in 1868. Others are from the collections of Sarah Sophia Banks (1744-1818), William Smith (1808-1876) and George Cruikshank. Because the selection of prints in the Catalogue have been determined by the tastes and choices of these individuals, they may not be entirely representative of the larger print market and this must be kept in mind, although the British Museum does have an on-going acquisitions policy.[56] While the BMC 'cannot be assumed to be representative'[57], it is the largest, most comprehensive, most closely annotated, the most representative collection that is currently available. The research for this thesis has not relied exclusively on the British Museum catalogue, however. Also consulted have been works added to the BMC after the completion of the catalogue, prints held in the Lewis Walpole Library at Yale, designs listed by established modern print dealers such London's *Grosvenor Prints*, as well as non-BM prints referenced by secondary sources.

The above figures do not give the whole picture, as they exclude the reproductions in other formats and the numbers of copies of each print. The prints were usually produced by applying a needle to etch the design onto a wax-coated plate of copper. The plate would then be immersed in acid, which bit into the exposed metal but not the wax. The wax was cleared, and ink rubbed into the lines cut by the acid. The plate would then be put through the rolling press, transferring the ink onto paper. Some designs would be coloured at this stage, often by colourists employed by the publisher, others remained black and white.[58] Most sources estimate that between 500 and 2,000 copies could be produced from a single design, before the copperplate deteriorated.[59] Nicholson typically questions these figures, writing 'There is reason to believe even this estimate

---

[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 500-510.

[56] http://www.britishmuseum.org/pdf/British%20Satirical%20Prints.pdf

[57] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 503.

[58] Tim Clayton, *Caricatures of the People of the British Isles* (London: British Museum Press, 2007), p. 11.

[59] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 13; Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 234; Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 7.

over-generous, and that prior to c. 1770 and even thereafter figures of c. 500 or less for a first edition of a print were more usual.' Her evidence for this, however, appears to be limited to the sale of just four anti-Hanoverian prints, sold by six printsellers, specifically in the year 1749 and gives no picture for the rest of the century.[60] If there was still demand for a print after the initial plate had worn out, the artist would engrave a second edition or touch up the original, expanding the life of the design.[61] Hogarth was re-engraved and reissued constantly, and as the market expanded so too were the more popular designs from other artists. The early years of the nineteenth century also witnessed numerous advances in print technology (boxwood engraving, the Stanhope iron-press, the Albion press, the introduction of lithography and steam power) which enabled images to be produced faster and in larger quantities.[62]

Scholars such as Donald, Hunt and McCreery have shown the potentially wide reach of prints and that these designs were not completely confined to the eyes of the London elite. With the overwhelming majority of prints having been produced and sold within a small area of the capital for the consumption of the rich, however, it seems convincing that they could not have been viewed by most individuals. While they may not have been widely disseminated, the huge numbers of them that survive are still valuable as sources of cultural expression.

Who designed the prints? Information on this is lacking, in that there is not a great deal known about the lives of the artists, many of the prints are anonymous, and plenty of them were designed by amateurs. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, however, the numbers of anonymous prints decreased, and professional print artists were more common. The artists formed part of the emerging middle class, living a fairly meagre Grub Street existence. Gatrell quotes one estimate of twenty-five to thirty shillings for payment of an engraved print, but this fee had to cover the cost of the copper and other materials. In his later years George

---

[60] Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators', p. 9.
[61] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 7.
[62] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 234.

Cruickshank (1792-1878) could make three guineas per plate, though he still had to provide the copper. Most artists engraved satires as side-lines, with other income provided by trade cards and advertisements.[63]

  The process could often be collaborative. George 'Moutard' Woodward (1760-1809) designed many plates that Thomas Rowlandson and Isaac Cruikshank etched. George Canning, though not directly, made suggestions to Gillray. Amateurs would submit drawings to be perfected before printing. Writers would provide satiric verses to accompany images, or ask for images to accompany their words. Artists borrowed from one another, creating parodies, imitations and sequels.[64]

  Given who engraved and sold the pieces, it might be expected that the prints would reflect the attitudes and opinions of the disenfranchised lower middle class. But it was the upper classes who could afford to purchase them and thus it was to their tastes that the artists had to appeal in order to make a living. The caricaturists certainly lacked any kind of political loyalty. Most, if not all, would produce a satire critical of the government on one day, a satire critical of the opposition, or supportive of the government, the next. From whom they accepted commissions, they were unscrupulous.

  This is unless, of course, one subscribes to the problematic notion of subversion. The radical movement itself, John Barrell has argued, showed very little interest in developing visual propaganda on a par with its vast and varied literary output, since to employ the grotesque and comic genre would undermine the movement's ambitions to be accepted as a respectable, intelligent and polite movement and could inspire easy disgust and dismissal.[65]

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 93.
[64] Robert L. Patton, 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature', *Art Journal* 43 (1983), p. 335.
[65] John Barrell, 'Radicalism, Visual Culture, and Spectacle in the 1790s', *Romanticism on the Net* 46 (2007) 'http://www.erudit.org/revue/ron/2007/v/n46/016131ar.html' (14 September, 2008).

As a lower middle class engraver, producing work for an elite market, if one had the talent and the imagination to include subversive messages, it may have been tempting to do so. Other artists were experimenting with this at the time. Take, for instance, in Spain, Francisco Goya (himself an admirer Hogarth and Gillray[66]), who managed to fill his often realistically ugly official royal and aristocratic portraits with hints at pomposity, stupidity, overindulgence and even incest.[67] Diana Donald's *The Age of Caricature* subscribes to the idea that prints of the 1790s were radical and subversive to the extent that 'for the first time, the aristocracy *as a caste* was under concerted attack.'[68] Others, such as Gatrell, suggest this is going too far.[69] The prints never endorsed an upheaval of the status quo. If the aristocracy was depicted as overindulgent, immoral, or corrupt, these criticisms were recognised by members of the elite themselves. Some were embarrassed by the antics of their less respectable peers. Others revelled in such philandering behaviour. It was more likely that disapprovers of gambling, drunkenness and licentiousness would keep their distance from publications crudely depicting such practices, says Gatrell, whereas those who bought images of such activities engaged in them themselves. The prints therefore, particularly those produced in the decades following the death of Hogarth after which 'overt didacticism was all but discarded', could be read as celebratory rather than satirical.[70]

Nicholson is particularly scathing towards those she feels have overemphasised the subversive and radical nature of eighteenth century political prints. She accusers scholars of singling out the small number of most obviously 'radical' prints, such as George Cruikshank's portrayal of the Peterloo Massacre[71], at the expense of the wealth of 'violent, satirical images which… articulate anti-

---

[66] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 241.
[67] Edward J. Olszewski dismisses Goya's subversive leanings, specifically in *The Family of Charles IV*, but in doing so lists many critics who promote the view. Edward J. Olszewski, 'Exorcising Goya's *The Family of Charles IV*', *Artibus et Historiae* 20 (1999), 169-185.
[68] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 99.
[69] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 141-146.
[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 136-156.
[71] *Massacre at St. Peter's or "BRITONS STRIKE HOME"!!!* [BMC 13258] (George Cruikshank. 16 August, 1819).

"radical" sentiments.'[72] It is also difficult to determine where a satire ends. Should a print lampooning a particular aristocratic buffoon be read as simply an attack upon that individual, or interpreted as a criticism of all aristocracy? Does a satire of a priest implicate disapproval of the entire Church, or even of religion? Do mocking portrayals of royal family members condemn monarchy in its entirety? These questions are often difficult to determine, and the prints are open to interpretation. Certainly some of the more enjoyable prints do work on different levels and contain clever ambiguities and mixed messages.

Besides, to look for clear answers or distinct political loyalties in this material is to arguably misread the nature of satire. Satiric theorists, including those in the eighteenth century, have long made claim to satire's rhetorical and moral value. Dustin Griffin, looking at literary satirical works, in *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*, emphasised that satire inquires, provokes, explores, unsettles and encourages the reader to ask important questions, but it is usually 'open' rather than 'closed', in that it is reluctant to conclude or provide suitable answers. This is equally true of the eighteenth century's visual satires. Irony and subversion should be analysed more carefully, Griffin points out, as 'irony should be understood not simply as a binary switch, either "on" or "off", but more like a rheostat, a rhetorical dimmer switch that allows for a continuous range of effects… The difficulty arises, of course, when we try to determine the *degree* of irony.'[73] Critics should also be careful when claiming a satirist, or one or many of his works, to be either 'conservative' or 'revolutionary'. Most satirists do not fit into either category, or may bounce between the two; Jonathan Swift is a literary example. Additionally,

> …there is little evidence that a satirist is typically motivated by clearly articulated
> political principles, or even by what might now be called political ideology…
> Indeed, it is likely that satirists' concerns are more *literary* than political, that they
> write satire because they think it will advance their careers by winning audiences or

---

[72] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, pp. 307-309.
[73] Dustin Griffin, *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1994), pp. 65-66.

patrons… The satirist's primary goal as writer is not to declare political principles but to respond to a particular occasion and write a good satire. [74]

This seems to apply as aptly to James Gillray as it does to Griffin's examples of Swift or Samuel Butler.

This leads us to the potential purposes, functions and effects of eighteenth century visual prints; what do they actually do? At first glance it might be tempting to suggest their intentions were to make people laugh.

Sending one of George Townshend's caricatures to his friend Horace Mann in Tuscany, he [Horace Walpole] wrote that it so captured the characters that it 'made me laugh till I cried'; and Mann replied that it was 'the most extraordinary caricature I ever saw', and it 'made me laugh most inordinately.'[75]

Without doubt, many of the prints were extremely funny to eighteenth century observers, and remain so today. Yet humour was only one of the functions of some of the prints. Gombrich was keen to point this out, wisely stating

There is danger in discussion of cartoons that we stress the elements of humour or propaganda too much at the expense of the satisfaction the successful cartoon gives us simply by its neat summing up. Humour is not a necessary weapon in the cartoonist's armoury.[76]

This theory was supported by W. A. Coupe, who used the example of John Tenniel's *Dropping the Pilot*, 'surely the most famous of all cartoons,' which 'is not a blow for or against either Bismarck or William II; it neither debunks nor builds them up; it simply offers a polite allegory on a given political situation.'[77] Although this cartoon appears in *Punch*, after Vic Gatrell's supposed watershed for the bland, the same could be applied to certain earlier images. For example, *A*

---

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.
[75] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 213.
[76] Gombrich, *Meditations on a Hobby Horse*, p. 131.
[77] W. A. Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969), p. 87.

GAME at CHESS [Fig. 4] [BMC 9839] (9 January, 1802) on the Treaty of Amiens shows that Napoleon appeared to have the upper hand in negotiations, but is not particularly derogatory to either Bonaparte or the British plenipotentiary Cornwallis.[78]

Annibale Carracci saw his portrait caricatures as a way to portray the truth, to capture not the strict physical appearance of his subject, but the very essence of their personality: 'The caricature, like every other form of art, is more true to life than reality itself.'[79] Aesthetically, the etchings seem to have more life, more energy, in them than 'high-art'. Paradoxically they are less lifelike, yet appear and feel more alive. They 'possess a capacity for vividness and direct appeal to the emotions.'[80] Caricature certainly expressed some 'truths' that were absent in the 'high-art' of the eighteenth century. For example, in a society still learning about medicine, disease and dentistry, virtually everybody suffered from digestive ailments and bad teeth, some wore false teeth made of wood, and smallpox was rife. From standard portraiture and history painting, all this ugliness and smelliness is absent, the subject is flattered, made to appear more beautiful or more handsome than in reality. But in caricature it remains, in all its putrid glory. It could be an exaggerated ugliness, but at least smallpox, bad teeth, wooden dentures are actually visually present.

Aristocratic and middle-class ladies, and also men, might have caked themselves in primitive cosmetics, and sported ridiculous wigs to hide physical repulsiveness, but in caricature even these attempts are exposed. Take Thomas Rowlandson's *Six Stages of Mending a Face* (1792). This shows a bald, haggard and toothless old crone, identified by Gatrell as Lady Archer, transforming herself into a 'society belle'.[81] A wig is placed, false teeth and glass eye inserted, and rouge slapped upon her face. The idea of 'truths' hidden beneath incompetent fronts of grandeur

---

78   See Chapter Four.
79   Quoted in Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature', p. 85.
80   Albert Boime, 'The Sketch and Caricature as Metaphors for the French Revolution', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 55 (1992), p. 261.
81   Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 69.

is something that will reappear when looking at depictions of the French.

As Robert L. Patten wrote, 'Graphic satirists worked at a frantic pace, generating, at times of heightened national tension such as the invasion threat of 1802-03, at the rate of almost one plate per day, if we judge by the numbers of those that survived.'[82] Because of this they give us an excellent picture of the immediate aftermath of an event or reactions to the news, better than other art forms such as history painting. Gatrell even goes as far as to claim that graphic satires came a close second to newspapers in their role as 'communicators'. He says that 'No image caught the fleeting moment or transient sensation as they did. If a sensation was to be commented upon, a point quickly made, it was to the copperplate as much as to newspapers that people turned.'[83] Later, he puts prints on a parallel with newspapers, claiming that each are as central to our understanding of literate Londoners' views of their world, that prints 'speak volumes about attitudes and prejudices that were so taken for granted that they were otherwise rarely expressed, or that lay well below the levels of what could be publicly admitted.'[84] Equating prints with the importance of newspapers is going too far. Newspapers contained more information, artists got much of their material from here, and newspapers maintained much higher prints runs.[85] Without comparing their worth to newspapers, prints were rapidly created cultural expressions on contemporary concerns and opinions and, even when commenting on the same subjects as newspapers, they did it in different ways.

Because the prints needed to sell and did sell, and because 'humour requires that the audience feel an affinity with the artist's point of view in order to achieve its effect' (and those that were less comic also relied on an affinity in order to appeal), it can be argued that they did reflect the opinions of their audience; 'As part of a wider cultural milieu, caricatures were based on currents in public

---

[82] Patton, 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature', p. 335.
[83] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 213.
[84] *Ibid*., p. 230.
[85] Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators', p. 11.

attitudes, and artists shaped their work to reflect what the audience wanted to see.'[86]

   Kemnitz argues that cartoons can equal any other media for invective; they are an excellent method of 'disseminating highly emotional attitudes,' and an 'ideal medium for suggesting what cannot be said by the printed word.' They can reveal the images politicians projected, offer contemporary interpretations of events, provide an indication of the depth of emotion about events and politicians, and provide insights into the 'popular attitudes that underlay public opinion, insights that may be more difficult to glean from written material or from other evidence of behaviour.' He does concede that the cartoon cannot match the printed word for 'dispassionate comment, and is incapable of the reasoned criticism and detailed argument of the editorial.'[87] By their nature cartoons and caricatures tend to be exaggerated, distorted and negative, and thus the 'truth' contained in them must be dissected very carefully. Lawrence H. Streicher claimed that caricatures are always negative[88], but this is not always the case. Even if caricatures were all negative, and lots of them were, this would not make them worthless. Their criticisms provide insights into popular attitudes, and, again, the role of satire to universally question and provoke could be mentioned.

   Sometimes the negative caricature of an individual can actually have the effect of provoking positive, or at least sympathetic, sentiments. George III, for example, could be portrayed as the fat, mad loser of the American colonies and an unintelligent farmer. Whilst this may have undermined his monarchical authority and lost him respect, at the same time it made the king appear more human and thus, perhaps, led to, in the words of Linda Colley, 'an amused tolerance' for royalty.[89] The caricatures of Napoleon Bonaparte printed after his downfall have a similar effect, the melancholic figure of a once powerful emperor reduced to

---

86   Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 21.
87   Kemnitz, 'The Cartoon as a Historical Source', pp. 84-85 and 92-93.
88   Streicher, 'On a Theory of Political Caricature', p. 431.
89   Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (London: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 210.

perching on a small rock clearly evoke complex reactions. A more recent example could be John Major. As he was often depicted by cartoonists such as Steve Bell as a boring, weak, easily-manipulated, grey-clad and grey-skinned nobody, it was, despite whatever disagreeable policy he may have been pursuing, very difficult to really *hate* him.

Appearances in cartoons, even if the depictions are disapproving, also have the positive effect of making the characters in them more famous. On hearing of a recently published caricature satirising him, Samuel Johnson said 'I hope the day will never arrive when I shall neither be the object of calumny or ridicule, for then I shall be neglected and forgotten.'[90] Charles James Fox and Robert Peel were amongst those who were ridiculed by visual satirists, and yet collected prints. George Canning sought to advance his career by asking James Gillray, through an intermediary, to portray him in one of his productions.[91] In Chapters Three and Six it will be suggested that graphic satires could have similar, perhaps unintended, positive effects on the way in which foreigners and foreign nations were conceived.

Though the designs of visual prints were tempered by the need for commercial appeal, they still gave an opportunity for artists lacking any other kind of public outlet for their work. Artists such as Gillray, who had studied at the Royal Academy but had not succeeded in the academic art world, had, through satirical engraving, the opportunity to create. Amateurs were also involved, either by producing infrequent engravings themselves or by volunteering designs to the professional engravers. Some women designed satires too, though amateur female artists did not circulate their designs widely and professional female engravers tended to focus on producing non-satirical prints.[92] The trade gave Hannah Humphrey the opportunity to succeed in running her own successful print business. Women also proved enthusiastic customers of prints, the collector Sarah

---

[90] Quoted in Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 18.
[91] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 16.
[92] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 22-23.

Sophia Banks owned some 1,044 fashion and political satires by the time of her death in 1818.[93] Around the time of Banks' death, however, gender-based cultural ideas centring around feminine sensibility, delicacy and decorum were beginning to take hold, imposing the view of satire as a manly and masculine pursuit.[94]

If prints are 'cultural barometers'[95] which can give us insight into public opinion, some scholars have suggested they may also have conditioned opinion. Caricatures 'not only reflected public interests, they could also influence their audience', insists Hunt. This is difficult to prove, with Hunt citing evidence such as Charles James Fox's lamentation that '[James] Sayers' caricatures had done him more mischief than the debates in Parliament or the works of the press.'[96] He may have been mistaken, of course. However, the lack of available images and representations of politicians and other public figures at this time may well have led the public to think of, and to remember, men like Fox in the terms portrayed in the caricatures. In the 1990s, Steve Bell's portrayal of the Y-front sporting, grey-coloured John Major seemed to cement itself in the public imagination. In nineteenth century France, Charles Philipon's 1831 sketches of the French 'Citizen King' Louis-Philippe turning progressively into a pear became so popular that 'Throughout France to draw a pear, to hold a pear, even to say "pear" became both an act of sedition and a guaranteed laugh-getter. For the rest of Louis-Philippe's reign, the person of the king and the shape of the pear, royal majesty and pyriform succulence, were one and indivisible.' Graffiti pears were chalked upon the walls of the city of Paris, and elsewhere, and 'although the harshly repressive September Laws of 1835 effectively ended the king's *printed* career as a pear, the censors could do nothing to remove the association from the hearts and minds of France's citizens.' Furthermore, it is as a pear that the monarch is still remembered today, 'Louis-Philippe was, is, and forever shall be a pear.'[97] Compared with cartoons of today's public figures, whose caricatures can be

---

[93] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 236-237.
[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 444-447.
[95] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[96] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, pp. 17-18.
[97] Sandy Petrey, 'Pears in History', *Representations* 35 (1991), pp. 54-57.

compared with photographs and television footage, the power of the eighteenth century caricature had more potency as this was the only representation of public figures that many people would ever see. There is evidence of contemporaries expressing a great deal of surprise at meeting or catching sight of much-caricatured individuals and discovering them to appear differently in reality.[98]

Dustin Griffin argues that satire in general has no direct, short-term political consequences, but more subtle and lasting resonances which are difficult to measure. In spite of the numerous occurrences since ancient times of political authorities' attempts to repress, silence and censor such expression, Griffin is not convinced that satire has the power to rouse its audience into action, alter its readers' attitudes, nor bring 'the wicked to repentance'. However,

> By conducting open-ended speculative inquiry, by provoking and challenging comfortable and received ideas, by unsettling our convictions and occasionally shattering our illusions, by asking questions and raising doubts but not providing answers, satire ultimately has political consequences.[99]

On the subject of attempts to repress, silence and censor, it is worth discussing the extent to which political prints were subject to censorship. It might be assumed that censorship is not of considerable relevance to a study on prints relating to France and the French, as it is unlikely that the government would take offence at attacks targeted towards France (though at times of peace or negotiation it might not be desirable). However, it is necessary to highlight the ways in which the reception of images can differ to those of text. Also, British politics and society were so obsessed with France in the eighteenth century that it is difficult to discuss them separately. It will also be suggested in later chapters that graphic satirists at times attempted to cloak implicit disapproval of domestic figures or institutions behind criticisms of the French.

---

[98] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, pp. 17-18.
[99] Griffin, *Satire*, pp. 152-160.

Compared to the restrictions placed upon British written works, and visual satire on the continent, the censorship of British visual works was lax. Printsellers and artists were rarely prosecuted for seditious libel.[100] Does this mean that eighteenth century governments did not see them as a threat or take them seriously? It is more likely that governments did not wish to give additional publicity to defamatory prints and were uncertain that they could secure a conviction against caricature.[101] Even attempts to prosecute textual political pamphlets could prove problematic, not to say embarrassing. In February 1794 Daniel Isaac Eaton (1753-1814) was trialled for publishing in his periodical *Politics for the People* the story of 'King Chanticleer'. Based on part of a speech made by John Thelwall (1764-1834), it concerned a tyrannical gamecock, beheaded for his despotic habits. Eaton was prosecuted on the basis that the cock represented George III. Eaton's attorney, John Gurney (1768-1845), argued that the cock stood for tyranny in general or the King of France more specifically, and even suggested that it was in fact the prosecutor who was guilty of seditious libel for proposing that the cock was a metaphor for the British monarch, much to the hilarity of the courtroom. Eaton was acquitted and the government humiliated.[102] Attempting to prosecute graphic satires, to have to describe rude and comic scenes in legal language, would no doubt invite similar, and probably greater, embarrassments.[103] When printsellers were brought before the law, even if it had been images which had drawn attention and caused offence, they tended to be charged and prosecuted for the seditious texts they were selling, not the visual works. This was true of Belcher in Birmingham, as well as William Holland also in 1793 (loyalists targeted him for selling Richard Newton caricatures, but charged him for selling Paine pamphlets), and William Hone who was tried in 1817 for the textual parodies he published, rather than for prints such as George Cruikshank's *The Royal Shambles or the Progress of Legitimacy & Reestablishment of Religion & Social Order - !!! - !!!*, though Hone also managed to be successfully acquitted for

---

[100]   Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21.
[101]   *Ibid*., p. 21.
[102]   John Barrell and Jon Mee (ed.), *Trials for Treason and Sedition, 1792-1794, Volume 1* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), pp. xxi-xxii, 291-313.
[103]   Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 503.

his written satires.[104]

The establishment did engage in another method of suppression, that of buying all the copies of a seditious print in an attempt to limit its influence. The Prince of Wales, and later as George IV, had agents buy up the plate and all impressions of satires particularly offensive to his person (though he also bought other prints for pleasure).[105] The government also tried the same method rather than risking the publicity of a trial, though this meant that some artists began creating purposefully offensive works in the hope of guaranteeing sales.[106] Because of copies, and the various mediums mentioned earlier, it would be still be difficult to contain an image in this way. George later learnt to bribe artists in exchange for promising not to produce any further caricatures of his person. George Cruikshank, for example, received £100, and his brother Robert £70, in June 1820 for pledging to no longer caricature the monarch 'in any immoral situation.'[107]

H. T. Dickinson suggests that prints were not suppressed because, despite frequently ridiculing the ruling government, they did not go so far as to endorse popular revolution or radical constitutional reform.[108] Nevertheless, the lack of censorship and prosecutions illustrates that images enjoyed greater freedom than that of text, and therefore they had the potential to say that which could not be said elsewhere. Kemnitz, writing in 1973, said that 'Even today the cartoon is used for attacks on politicians that would be difficult to sustain in any other medium.'[109]

There are some instances of the government, or of loyalist associations, attempting to harness the power of the political print. For example, in the 1790s John Reeves' *Association for the Preservation of Liberty and Property against*

---

[104] *Ibid*., pp. 493 and 520-529.
[105] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 20; McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, pp. 33-34.
[106] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 20.
[107] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 538.
[108] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21.
[109] Kemnitz, 'The Cartoon as a Historical Source', p. 85.

Republicans and Levellers subsidised prints aimed against Jacobin subversion, such as Thomas Rowlandson's *The Contrast* [BMC 8149] (December 1792). From 1797 James Gillray was paid a secret government pension, of perhaps £200 per annum, during which his works became more supportive of the Pittites and more strongly and consistently critical of the Whigs and the reformist movement.[110] Hunt suggests that the government's experience in trying to control and exploit Gillray discouraged them from doing the same with other artists, as he still sometimes demanded 'full liberty to chuse [sic] my own subjects and treat them according to my own fancy.'[111] The possible presence of subversion in Gillray's work might also be used to illustrate this point, though scholars such as Nicholson insist on his sincerity.[112]

  Scholars who focus on this kind of material regularly get asked to justify the usefulness of their sources in a way that those who deal with text or with high art do not. The methodology remains in a process of development, there is still little consensus, and still much work to be done. This is in part why the study of print culture can be so exciting and at the same time frustrating. It is not without its problems and uncertainties, but if one considers the histories of art, of journalism, of literature, of cultural responses to the political and social events, developments, and trends of the day as worthy of academic study, it seems unfair to neglect this unique genre in which all of these disciplines are part of its ingredients. Huge numbers were produced and survive, leaving us with a vast body of cultural production. In order to appeal to their customers, the designs had to respond to the themes which contemporaries considered to be of importance, which they enjoyed discussing and debating, the issues which most absorbed and entertained them. They are the product of a certain area of London, it is this region of which they are most representative, their reach is debatable but they were not seen exclusively by people in this area, nor exclusively by those who could afford them. They gave the opportunity for artistic expression, albeit one which was

---

[110] The pension ceased in 1801; Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 67 and 104.

[111] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 20.

[112] Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 311.

dictated by the necessity of commercial appeal, to artists outside of the establishment, both amateur and professional, who would otherwise have had little or no means to disseminate their work publicly. Their relative freedom from censorship or suppression meant that they had the potential to say that which could not be said elsewhere, though how far this went was tempered by their customers, those who commissioned and published prints, and the attitudes of the artists themselves.

Those scholars who have written on political or satirical prints have tended to focus their attention on the ways in which print artists depicted their own political leaders, domestic political and social concerns, and their fellow countrymen.[113] Michael Duffy contemplated images of foreigners in one of the volumes of Chadwyck-Healey's series *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832* and images of the French in an earlier, similar article for *History Today*.[114] In both cases Duffy had only a few pages in which to contemplate his subject (the Chadwyck-Healey volumes consist of article-length introductions, followed by a catalogue of images selected and reproduced from the British Museum collection). Though insightful at times, Duffy did not have the space to investigate some of the themes, significant events or specific images in greater depth or detail. Despite mentioning occasional 'breaches in xenophobia' and accepting the 'immense interest of many Englishmen in foreign matters'[115], in defining the French as 'The Supreme

---

[113] For example, John Brewer, *The Common People and Politics, 1750-1790s* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), H. T. Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution, 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), Paul Langford, *Walpole and the Robinocracy* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), J. A. Sharpe, *Crime and the Law in English Satirical Prints, 1600-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), Diana Donald, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), Mark Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in late Georgian England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), Cindy McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in late Eighteenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), Vic Gatrell, *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Atlantic, 2006).
[114] Michael Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986); Michael Duffy, 'The Noisie, Empty, Fluttering French: English Images of the French, 1689-1815', *History Today* 32 (1982), 21-26.
[115] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 45.

Bugaboo'[116], in highlighting the dehumanised aspects of their various stereotypes, and in neglecting the extent to which portrayals of foreigners were influenced by domestic concerns and the projection of these on to images of the 'Other', he promoted the view that English perceptions of the French were defined by hostility and antagonism. In many ways Duffy seems to have been applying Herbert Atherton's analysis of political prints in the age of Hogarth to the whole of his extended period (1600-1832). Atherton's earlier work saw the political print both reflecting the 'exuberant nationalism' of the mid-eighteenth century and serving as an 'agent for its growth'.[117]

These analyses of political print culture, then, appear to reinforce the idea of a national identity cultivated by antagonism towards a French 'Other'. The concept of 'the Other' and of 'othering' has a long history and its influence is immeasurable, spreading throughout the humanities and further afield. The work of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was crucial in the development of this concept - though Hegel himself built on accounts of recognition fostered by philosophers such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854).[118] In the section 'Independence and Dependence of Self-Consciousness: Lordship and Bondage' (also known as the 'Master-slave dialectic') of *The Phenomenology of Mind* (1807), Hegel wrote of the self-consciousness' dependency on the 'other' and of the self-consciousness' desire to 'sublate' the other in order to 'become certain of itself as true being'.[119]

Perhaps the two most influential texts on the subjects of othering and collective identities in (relatively) recent historiography have been Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) and Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983). Said's book investigated the ways in which the western world (particularly

---

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[117] Herbert M. Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth: A study of the ideographic representation of politics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), pp. 84-85.
[118] Robert R. Williams, *Hegel's Ethics of Recognition* (California: University of California Press, 1997), Chapter 3.
[119] G. W. F. Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Mind* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1910), p. 176.

western Europe) defined itself in contrast to the inferior and indiscriminate characteristics it ascribed to the East and its peoples.[120] Anderson saw nations as communities which were 'imagined' because the individual members of such communities do not all meet or interact with one another on a face-to-face basis, and yet they feel an affinity or comradeship with other members of their nation. As the powers of older systems of authority and sovereignty declined, newer forms of imagined communities were made possible thanks to 'a half-fortuitous, but explosive, interaction between a system of production and productive relations (capitalism), a technology of communications (print), and the fatality of human linguistic diversity.'[121]

  Clearly, both texts influenced Linda Colley's 1992 publication *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. Revising the attitudes promoted by scholars such as E. P. Thompson who had considered the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to be an era of rising radicalism, industrial disquiet and class conflict, Colley emphasised the expansion and intensification of loyalism, patriotism, stability, and the forging of a British national identity which united the English with their Scottish and Welsh neighbours. Among the most crucial factors which contributed to this new sense of 'Britishness' were common Protestantism and war. Britons were united through prolonged warfare with Catholic France and, subsequently, revolutionary and Napoleonic France. Conflict with an 'obviously hostile Other' compelled the English, Welsh and Scottish to define themselves, collectively, as Protestants who were 'struggling for survival against the world's foremost Catholic power. They defined themselves against the French as they imagined them to be, superstitious, militarist, decadent and unfree.'[122]

  Colley's theories have attracted a variety of critical responses. For example,

---

[120] 'Orientalism is never far from what Denys Hay has called the idea of Europe, a collective notion identifying "us" Europeans against all "those" non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures.' Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 7.
[121] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006), p. 45.
[122] Colley, *Britons*, p. 5.

Gerald Newman lamented Colley's neglect towards *English* identity.[123] This was not too surprising given that Newman's earlier publication, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (1987), had expressed very similar arguments to those espoused by Colley, although Newman's had focussed on English rather than British national identity. Surveying a similar period, Newman had contended that English nationalism could be attributed to conflict and rivalry with France, to resistance towards French cultural invasion and to fears of French influence on the English elite initially, and later the reform movement.[124] His was an argument to which Colley was greatly indebted.

  Others have taken issue with Colley's emphasis on a common religion by stressing Protestantism as an international rather than a national calling, citing the numerous breaches in Protestant loyalty (such as Britain's conflicts with America, its allying with Catholic powers in the Nine Years' War, the War of Spanish Succession, and the French Revolutionary Wars, and its allying with France itself in the period 1716-1731), and by describing the numerous denominational differences, disagreements and conflicts that existed not far under the surface of the rather broad category of 'Protestantism'.[125] Some responses have investigated the limitations of British identity and of the continuing importance of regional differences[126]; more intense studies of Scottish and Welsh culture have challenged how smoothly or how fully these fringe nations were included in the wider sense of 'Britishness'.[127] It was troubling for others that Colley gave little thought or attention to Ireland which became united with Britain in the Act of Union of

---

[123] Gerald Newman, 'Nationalism Revisited', *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996), pp. 124-125.
[124] Gerald Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1987).
[125] Steven Pincus, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995), 132-136, J. C. D. Clark, 'Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity, 1660-1832', *Historical Journal* 43 (2000), 249-276.
[126] Laurence Brockliss and David Eastwood (ed.), *A Union of Multiple Identities: The British Isles c. 1750-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).
[127] Prys Morgan, 'Early Victorian Wales and its crisis of identity', in Brockliss and Eastwood (ed.), *A Union of Multiple Identities*, 93-109, Colin Kidd, 'Sentiment, race and revival: Scottish identities in the aftermath of Enlightenment', in Brockliss and Eastwood (ed.), *A Union of Multiple Identities*, 110-126, Richard J. Finlay, 'Keeping the Covenant: Scottish National Identity', in T. M. Devine and J. R. Young, *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 121-133.

January 1801.[128] Scholars such as J. E. Cookson, Nicholas Rogers, and Katrina Navickas have undermined Colley's claims of the ideological and constitutional motivations behind the Volunteer Corps' alleged loyalism.[129] An earlier book by Cookson had also explored the anti-war protest movement that opposed Britain's engagement in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars.[130]

Focussing more specifically on attitudes towards France and the French, Robin Eagles' work reiterated English fondness towards France, although much of his evidence was drawn from the habits of the English elite, a group whose 'Francophilia' Newman and Colley would hardly deny.[131] Eagles' chapter on 'Political Prints and Cartoon Satires', meanwhile, which largely focussed on the period c. 1750-1775, was more determined to place the prints within a loose social and cultural context of elite Francophilia than with closely analysing or dissecting the actual content of specific prints or in charting some of the subtler changes and continuities which occurred over the long-term, and failed to fully engage with more problematic subject matter such as war and revolution.[132]

Duffy's aforementioned works did engage with war, rivalry, and revolution over a longer period. But again eschewing detailed close readings, Duffy took too many of the prints on face value. Displaying little interest in the subtleties, nuances and ambiguities of the designs he selected resulted in an overemphasis on xenophobic attitudes. Read in such a superficial way, the genre of graphic satire

[128] Marc Baer, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *American Historical Review* 98 (1993), p. 120, James Loughlin, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *Fortnight* 319 (1993), p. 50.
[129] J. E. Cookson, *The British Armed Nation, 1793-1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), Nicholas Rogers, 'The sea Fencibles, loyalism and the reach of the state', in Mark Philp (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion, 1797-1815* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 41-59, Katrina Navickas, 'The defence of Manchester and Liverpool in 1803: conflicts of loyalism, patriotism and the middle classes', in Mark Philp (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion, 1797-1815* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 61-73.
[130] J. E. Cookson, *The Friends of Peace: Anti-war liberalism in England, 1793-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
[131] Robin Eagles, 'Beguiled by France? The English aristocracy, 1748-1848', in Brockliss and Eastwood (ed.), *A Union of Multiple Identities*, 60-77, Robin Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society, 1748-1815* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).
[132] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society,* pp. 14-38.

would appear to support the theories of Newman and Colley of an English or British antagonism towards the French 'Other'. Those who have focussed on narrower periods of visual representations of the French, on the other hand, may have implicitly or explicitly overestimated the negativity of portrayals of the French at a particular moment as representative of more general attitudes towards the French because they were not able to properly place such depictions in the context of the broader culture of graphic satire across a protracted period.[133] Both of these approaches fuel other historians' habit of flippantly peppering their texts with occasional, under-analysed reproductions of political or social prints. While this gives illusory support to their arguments, the prints are not awarded the more rigorous assessment they deserve, which perpetuates prints' misuse or misrepresentation.[134]

This thesis will survey representations of France and the French from the outbreak of the War of Austrian Succession in 1740 to 1832, the year of Britain's 'Great Reform Act'. This era coincided with that known as the 'golden age of caricature'. In addition to the more evolutionary social, political and economic changes which occurred at this time, this period also saw several international wars, France's revolutions of 1789 and 1830, and the dramatic political ruptures from the *ancien régime* through revolutionary republicanism, the Napoleonic era, Bourbon restoration and overthrow. Graphic satires on the subject of France, and those featuring French characters, are often used to illustrate the Francophobia supposedly inherent in British society. However, by surveying a substantial body of these prints over a significant period of time in order to achieve a sense of the occurring continuities, changes, evolutions and fissures, in conjunction with close readings which utilise attention to the details of designs and consideration of their

---

[133] For example, Stella Cottrell, 'The Devil on Two Sticks: Franco-phobia in 1803', in Raphael Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity, Volume 1* (London: Routledge, 1989), 259-274, John Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene": British Reactions to the French Revolution', in Bindman (ed.), *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, pp. 24-25.
[134] For example, Robert and Isabelle Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (London: Pimlico, 2007), pp. 204, 233, 246.

ambiguities in light of recent satirical print historiography[135], and supported by considerable primary and secondary textual evidence, it is possible to expose further the mistaken notions of Newman and Colley, and to demand that historians take greater care with their employment of this material.

This thesis will argue that despite some impressive continuities, the conventions of English 'caricature' on France and the French were not static, but were a fluidly evolving convolution of elements; that attitudes towards France and the French revealed in graphic satire are more complex, ambivalent and multifaceted than has generally been recognised; and that visual satire purportedly dealing with the French was also often commenting pointedly on English politics, society or culture, often in ways which revealed cultural insecurity rather than confident superiority. In investigating the range of graphic imaginative constructions of Frenchness, in exploring the numerous complexities and contradictions therein, the conclusions will have implications on the intricate psychologies of the viewers of such prints, proposing that the astuteness of these intellectually complex beings has been erroneously underestimated.

---

[135] Such as Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference* and Gatrell, *City of Laughter*.

Chapter Two:

Frenchmen, Food and Fashion

Before exploring the more directly political imagery associated with France, it is worth investigating the more generic and social aspects of stereotypes of the French, although these of course had political implications. Fashion and food were used to deride France, although such portrayals also reveal empathy for the French people and an English obsession with French culture. They could simultaneously undermine idealistic conceptions of England and were closely inspired by domestic concerns.

 In eighteenth century English graphic satire, the generic representation of the Frenchman living under the *ancien régime* was that of a tall, bony-faced, emaciated figure, usually dressed in a long coat, hat, with a pony-tail or other fashionable accessories, often wearing a pair of wooden shoes. The skinniness and poor shoes indicated the poverty of the French, their attire referred to their vanity and light-headed preoccupations with fashions and fripperies.

 This stereotype insinuated that the French were dominated by the twin evils of absolute monarchy and Catholicism. For example, the print *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] [BMC 2849] (Daniel Fournier. 14 February, 1747) shows two foppish courtiers chained to the foot of the throne of Louis XV. Louis' crown is supported above his head by the characters 'Pride' and 'Treach'ry'. To his right, a demonic figure hovers with a torch, and a Jesuit stands with a scroll reading 'Persecution'. On the right-hand side of the design, a cardinal is shown bearing a crucifix, rejoicing at the sight of Justice, recognisable from her set of scales, in the process of being hanged by a winged demon. Below this is a scene depicting several monks carrying out executions, burnings and torture. One of the monks, holding aloft a crucifix, says 'One K__g one R_l___n'. In prints such as this the king and the Church are united in their pleasure of oppressing and punishing their

subjects. France having overtaken Spain as the leading Catholic power in continental Europe, the French had inherited in the prints many of the characteristics of the cruel Spanish Inquisition. The concept of France's religious and monarchical tyranny was used to emphasise England's superiority. Where France had religious persecution and superstition, England had its supposedly rational and tolerant Protestantism. France had an all-powerful and greedy monarchy, England a political system checked by its constitution and the ideals of 1688. This idealised concept of England may not have been entirely accurate but it illustrates the way in which, in some instances, the English defined themselves against the French. The implications of representations of France's rulers will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter. Here, the focus will be on stereotypes of France's people and on the social and cultural aspects of these, though they are of course closely tied to the political.

These types of scenes, in which France's churchmen and regents persecute their populace, as well as making the viewer glad that he or she does not live under such rule, might arouse feelings of sympathy for the people of France. They imply that England's 'natural enemy' was not the French themselves but their rulers. If an English audience sees an image of Frenchmen being treated brutally and recognises this as a bad and unjust situation, does this mean they wish to see the French a free and happy people? In opposing the rulers of France, does England support the French populace?

It is possible that English audiences found images of suffering Frenchmen to be merely amusing. Simon Dickie has explored the cruelty of the humour that can be found in eighteenth century jestbooks. Jokes, says Dickie, were frequently at the expense of the weak and vulnerable, taking delight in human suffering. This cruel humour was also evident in people's actions; victims such as the deformed and the disabled were known to endure verbal taunts and violent practical jokes.[1] This

---

[1] Simon Dickie, 'Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humor', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (2003), 1-22.

was also a time, however, of rising sympathy and sentimentalism. Adam Smith had argued that sympathy for one's fellow human beings was crucial to proper conduct in society.[2] Slave narratives were beginning to ask readers to sympathise with humans of different races.[3] Even cross-species sympathy was on the rise. Whereas in the seventeenth century expressions of sympathy that crossed boundaries of species were viewed as excessive, the eighteenth century witnessed a great change in attitudes, so that in Hogarth's *Four Stages of Cruelty* (1751) the abuse of animals is intended to shock and to illustrate that the consequences of indifference to animal cruelty would be more general moral failures.[4] In relation to France, Laurence Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* attacked the curmudgeonly approach of Tobias Smollett's accounts of foreign travel both in the parodic character of 'Smelfungus' and in its broader, dissentingly positive attitude towards France and its people.[5] Smollett himself had written of the regrettable poverty and oppression suffered by the French peasantry.[6] The celebratory reactions in print culture to the French Revolutions of 1789 and 1830 also suggest an affinity with the French.[7]

Whereas some observers, such as Philip Thicknesse, considered French national characteristics to be 'not so much the consequence of their being Frenchmen, as men living under the laws of France'[8], some satiric renditions blamed the French population for their predicament. Frenchmen's poverty was the result not only of Louis XV's taxes and the tithes of the Church, but of their own preference for spending their small income on clothes and fashionable accessories, instead of on sustenance for themselves and their families. There were attempts by some to

---

[2] Paul Goring, 'Introduction' in Laurence Sterne, *A Sentimental Journey* (London: Penguin, 2005), p. xxi.

[3] Jonathan Lamb, *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), p. 69.

[4] *Ibid*., pp. 106-111.

[5] Laurence Sterne, *A Sentimental Journey* (London: Penguin, 2005).

[6] In Constantia Maxwell, *The English Traveller in France, 1698-1815* (London: Routledge, 1932), pp. 93-94.

[7] See Chapter Five.

[8] Philip Thicknesse, *Observations on the customs and manners of the French nation, in a series of letters, in which that nation is vindicated from the misrepresentations of some late writers* (London: 1766), p. 69.

depict the French as a naturally slavish people. 'Subjection… of some kind or other seems necessary for a Frenchman,' wrote John Andrews (1736-1809). 'Whether in love or in politics, he is always ready to bend the knee before some favourite idol.'[9] The wooden shoe itself not only demonstrated poverty, but acted as a metaphor for slavery, claims Michael Duffy, in that 'whereas a leather shoe yielded to the shape and movement of the foot, the wooden shoe forced the foot to yield to it.'[10] The French were foolish for allowing themselves to be dominated by the Bourbons for so long, and for remaining Catholic. As one of the courtiers in *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] exclaims, despite being enchained, 'Oh! wht. a great Monarch!' This not only imposes a sycophantic voice onto the French but provides the sarcastic voice of the artist, juxtaposing the positive phrase with the oppressive vision he has created. Prints such as these do not, however, suggest what exactly the French should have done about their dilemma. Should they have violently risen up against the Church and monarchy? Staged a 1688-style 'Glorious Revolution'? Initiated reforms somehow? The French, it seemed, did not possess the spirit to be free; they were naturally subservient, preoccupied with their own pleasures, they 'fiddled and danced while being plundered by their own king. Vain, obsequious, scraping for favours from the all-powerful monarch, their levity and folly made them oblivious to their own debasement.'[11] They were, as the text accompanying *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* testifies, 'A dull, tame race whom nothing can provoke, / Fond of the chains that binds them to the yoke.'

  It should be acknowledged that this particular print was produced by Daniel Fournier (c.1711-c.1766), the son of French refugees. A number of engravers working in London in the 1740s were in fact French, or of French origin. Though not all permanent residents, these included Fournier, John Simon, Claude Dubosc, Bernard Baron, Paul Fourdrinier, Hubert Francis Gravelot, Simon Ravenet, Simon Ravenet II, Gerard Scotin, Pierre Charles Canot, Louis Philippe Boitard, Francois

---

[9] John Andrews, *Remarks on the French and English ladies: in a series of letters: interspersed with various anecdotes, and additional matter arising from the subject* (1783), p. 184.
[10] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p.34.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Vivares, Antoine Benoist, and Charles Grignion.[12] Their presence could be explained by the rapidly growing print trade in London (business there was better than in Paris); the market for French products in England; or the artists' own political or religious convictions; engravers such as Simon, Fourdrinier, and Grignion came from Huguenot families. In the words of Herbert M. Atherton, 'Some of the best anti-French prints were done by artists such as him. *The GLORY OF FRANCE* is Fournier's bitter testament to the nation of his origin.'[13] Fournier may have been as disgusted by France as his print suggests; he was 'probably a member of a French Protestant refugee family'.[14] He may also have been pandering to the English market for anti-French satires during wartime and in the aftermath of the Jacobite rebellion, or may have received commission to produce such an image. For Robin Eagles, although the involvement of French artists declined in later decades as English print production grew more confident and independent, the very presence of these early French engravers undermines the authenticity of the Francophobia present in eighteenth century graphic satire: 'It is… not sufficient to state that English social and political satire scorned France, whether meaning the country itself, or a loose concept of foreign influence, when so much of the material made use of in the satirical industry was either influenced or produced by French craftsmen.'[15]

It might also be noted that once a stereotype was established, when the artist needed to include a Frenchman in his work, this was the easiest way to do so, using iconography that the audience were accustomed to, could recognise and understand. To portray the average Frenchman as anything other than tall, skinny, and so forth might be confusing, or at least would be employing a relatively complicated ironic reversal of expectations. Not all caricatured stereotypes are loaded with the negativities that the particular representation might imply, nor do

---

[12] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, p. 44.
[13] *Ibid*.,. 45.
[14] L.H. Cust, rev. Tessa Murdoch, 'Fournier, Daniel (c.1711-c.1766)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press, 2004) http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10001 (accessed 13/03/11).
[15] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 23.

they necessarily contain the same message as the original image from which they evolved. As we shall see, the stereotype of the Frenchman developed and evolved over the course of our period and, although certain characteristics such as skinniness remained, some of the connotations such as religiosity diminished.[16]

   Along with the skinniness of the generic Frenchman, many images on the differences between France and England contrasted national food and diets. William Hogarth's *THE GATE OF CALAIS* or *O THE ROAST BEEF OF OLD ENGLAND* [Fig. 6] is one of the most famous examples of English culinary prejudice towards the French. Produced in 1749, the painting, also engraved and sold as a print[17], was not the first graphic satire to define the French in terms of their food, but it is probably the most well-known, would be a constant source of inspiration for later graphic satirists and was, it would appear, the first to feature roast beef.

   Hogarth was one of the many individuals who saw the peace of 1748 as an opportunity to travel to France. In the closing stages of his trip as he was waiting at Calais for his boat home, Hogarth began to make sketches. He was arrested and charged with spying. After convincing the authorities that he was an innocent artist, he was placed under house arrest until his boat was ready to set sail.[18] It was this incident that inspired Hogarth's visual tirade against France. Hogarth even included himself within the picture; there he stands, in the background on the left, sketching, as the hand of authority is placed upon his shoulder.

   In the centre staggers a skinny French cook, straining under the immense weight of a great sirloin, destined for consumption by English tourists. On the left of the picture, stands a ragged Frenchman, on sentry duty. He stares in disbelief at the size of the joint. On the opposite side is another tall, skinny French soldier,

---

[16] See Chapter Three.
[17] [BMC 3050].
[18] Ben Rogers, *Beef and Liberty: Roast Beef, John Bull and the English Nation* (London: Vintage, 2004), pp. 98-99.

inadvertently spilling the contents of his soup bowl as his distracted eyes gaze longingly at the meat. A smaller soldier, an Irish mercenary, also stands, his toes poking through his bad shoes, soup bowl in one hand, spoon in the other, looking sideways towards the sirloin. In front of him, two French chefs carry a big bowl of 'soupe maigre', the insufficient French equivalent to England's mouth-watering roast beef. In the foreground, on the right, sits a poor and hungry tartan-clad Jacobite, beside him lies a piece of dry bread and a single onion. Across the way, a trio of old hags are positioned, marvelling at a flatfish.

Behind the beef stands a fat monk, one hand lies upon his own breast, the other reaches forward, touching the joint. It is feasible that he is blessing the meat. He might also be groping it a perverted, masturbatory fashion. Reminiscing on the work later in the century, Francis Grose asked 'In the gate of Calais, how finely does the fat friar's person and enthusiastic admiration of the huge sirloin, mark that sensuality so incompatible with his profession; the fundamental principles of which dictate abstinence and mortification?'[19] With Hogarth, as with other artists, monks, priests and clergymen prove to be, aside from monarchs, the only overweight French characters. This again indicates the nastiness of the Catholic Church, its greed, its corruption, its falsity, its wealth in comparison to its exploited worshippers.

Ben Rogers even goes as far as to say that Hogarth's gate represents a mouth, the portcullis is its teeth, the drawbridge its tongue:

> Understood in this way, the 'stage' on which the main action takes place is in fact the inside of a mouth, and the darkened arch at its forefront, a throat. *The Gate of Calais* is clearly about food - everyone in it, apart from Hogarth is hungry. It is not so often recognised, however, that it is painted, quite literally, from the stomach's point of view.[20]

---

[19] Francis Grose, *Rules for Drawing Caricaturas: with an essay on comic painting* (1788), p. 25.
[20] Rogers, *Beef and Liberty*, p. 100.

This artwork took established means of criticising France, its oppressive government, its Church, its starving, yet servile, population, and interpreted them all through food. It set a precedent that would inspire, and be imitated by, numerous future artists.

Yet Hogarth's Francophobia was not as zealous as this painting suggests. This was the second time he had visited France. He had travelled there in 1743, apparently having enjoyed himself and appreciated the paintings produced there[21], enough, at least, to rush back when peace was made. He employed French engravers.[22] Some of his best friends, André Rouquet for example, were French, and he was keenly attentive and heavily indebted to French artistic practice and theory.[23] Hogarth himself was outraged that people mistook his disappointment with the 'connoisseurs' who celebrated European culture without giving English cultural achievements their rightful credit (they 'depreciate every English work… and fix upon us poor Englishmen the character of universal dupes') for a more general hatred of Europe and its artists: 'The connoisseurs and I are at war… and because I hate them, they think I hate Titian – and let them!'[24]

Hogarth's frustration with perceptions of England as artistically inferior to France, and the images throughout this chapter which depict France as contagiously effeminate and Englishmen as stocky and well-fed, reveal more about England's feelings of jealousy and inferiority towards France than they do about its supposed hatred of the French. They are indicative of a 'cultural cringe', to borrow the term coined by A. A. Phillips in describing post-colonial Australia's feelings of inadequacy to England.[25] In many ways England was overcoming this during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The establishment of the Royal Academy in 1768 and the subsequent successes of its artists, the rise of

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[22] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 23.

[23] Robin Simon, *Hogarth, France and British Art: The Rise of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Hogarth Arts, 2007), pp. 1-2.

[24] Quoted in Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, p. 64.

[25] A .A. Phillips, 'The Cultural Cringe', in A. A. Phillips, *On the Cultural Cringe* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006), 3-9.

literature and the achievements of British writers, the growth of empire and the defeat of France in various wars and battles (if countered by the humiliating loss of the American colonies and the arduous difficulties in defeating Napoleon) all contributed to the growth of national confidence. Although representations of France were not static, and stereotypes of the French changed, as we shall see, over time, expressions of jealousy, of inferiority and of admiration for French cultural achievements were constant, and continued to be expressed well into the nineteenth century. In 1824 the National Gallery was established and housed at 100 Pall Mall. A print from around this time contrasts the national galleries of England and France [Fig. 7].[26] At the top of the design is an image of the Louvre, a glorious, majestic building on the bank of the Seine. Below this is Pall Mall's equivalent; a dilapidated three-story house with broken window panes, its sides buttressed with timber as if it is prone to collapse at any moment. The cultural cringe endured.

There was an element of truth behind the stereotypes of the malnourished Frenchman and his well-fed English counterpart. Hunger, of course, was common in eighteenth century England, but France suffered sixteen nationwide famines between 1700 and 1789 in addition to frequent local famines.[27] Prints directly contrasting those in Britain with those in France were common throughout the century. Often these appeared in wartime with propagandist attitudes, an example being *RECRUIT FRANCOIS/RECRUIT ANGLOIS OR THE CONTRASTED RECRUITS* [Fig. 8] [BMC 5862] (Thomas Colley. c. 1781), in which recruits of each nation face up to one another. The grotesque Frenchman is described in the accompanying text as 'Monsieur all ruffles no Shirt Wooden Pumps and Stockingless'. The plump, red-cheeked Englishman is 'Jack English with Ruddy face and belly full of Beef'. In the background, behind the former stand frogs and rodents, behind the latter cows and sheep, emphasising and contrasting the diet of each. The French had not yet transformed into frogs themselves, in the eighteenth

---

26 *THE LOUVRE, or the National Gallery of France./ NO. 100, PALL MALL, or the National Gallery of England.* [Fig. 7] [BMC 17388] (c. 1832).
27 Colley, *Britons*, p. 37.

century they were only shown to consume them. The Dutch at this time were more likely to be symbolised as frogs; John Arbuthnot's Dutch character in *A History of John Bull* (1712) had been 'Nic Frog'.

Contrast prints also appeared in peacetime. *FRANCE. ENGLAND.* [Fig. 9] [BMC 5081] (25 June, 1772) is a design of two compartments. On the left, in France, a lean cook is putting a scrawny cat on a spit. On his table are fish and a piece of meat, mostly bone. From the border of this side of the design hang a string of onions and a bunch of frogs. In the compartment on the right stands a fat, grinning English cook. A huge sirloin lies upon his table, a foaming tankard of beer rests by his foot. The foaming tankard made regular appearances in prints as a sidekick to beef and another symbol of the supposed good health and affluence of England. Hanging from the Englishman's border are a large ham and an equally large fowl. Whereas the point being made of the prosperity and happiness of England compared with the often starving conditions under *ancien régime* France is obvious, what is also interesting is that the heavy, swollen, bulging image of the English butcher or commoner, and later the character of John Bull, is hardly a flattering one.

It might be argued that older notions of the larger body as an indicator of good-health, well-being, and fertility, still had their place in the eighteenth century. However, this does not seem to be the case. French kings, French monks, as we have seen, were depicted in caricature as overweight in order to accentuate their oppressive nature and unjust wealth; the Prince of Wales, and later as George IV, was regularly etched as obese, in order to articulate the view that he was an opulent, debauched, and lethargic drain upon the country's finances.[28] Satirical prints increasingly 'equated slimness with youth, virtue, and political innocence', says Cindy McCreery, while fatness evoked 'age, decadence, and political

---

[28] For example, James Gillray's *A VOLUPTUARY under the horrors of Digestion* [Fig. 78] [BMC 8112] (2 July, 1792), George Cruikshank's *THE PRINCE OF WHALES OR THE FISHERMAN AT ANCHOR* [BMC 11877] (1 May, 1812).

(particularly Whig) corruption.'[29] Caricaturists would portray certain individuals, such as the Prince's consort Maria Fitzherbert, as fat when wishing to deride them and thin when emphasising their decency. Whereas the unpopular Prince's heaviness indicated his political and moral decadence, his mother, Queen Charlotte, often appeared thin indicating her dignified temperance and frugality.[30]

'Much like us,' wrote Roy Porter, 'the Georgians binged on diet books.' George Cheyne's best-selling *Essay on Health and Long Life* (1724), which enjoyed some twenty editions in fifteen years, recommended that 'Poultry, hares and rabbits, and other young and tender white flesh were better than the traditional English roast beef, but healthiest of all was a greens-and-grains diet.'[31] The ideal body image in the eighteenth century therefore, amongst the upper classes at least, had already shifted towards slimness, and it is interesting that experts were advising against the consumption of roast beef.

It made a difference what type of person was being portrayed as overweight, and fat aristocratic figures seem to have been more objectionable than poorer fat individuals. Aristocratic fatness implied excess and moral laxity, setting a bad example to the rest of the nation; workers had less choice in regards to their body image, their largeness came less from gluttony than from the requirements and effects of strenuous physical labour.[32] The image of the fat English yokel may also represent wishful-thinking on the part of print producers and purchasers. Although England suffered from fewer famines than France, in reality observers noticed the similarities between the people of each nation. Louis Simond, for example, had expected to see everywhere he looked examples of 'Jacques Roast-Beef', yet on visiting England found none: 'the human race is here rather of mean stature, less so, perhaps, than the true Parisian race; but there is really no great

---

[29] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 241.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 241.
[31] Roy Porter, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001), p. 84.
[32] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 242.

difference…'[33] Perhaps John Bull was overindulged in caricature in a way that could not be achieved in reality, because a hungry, impoverished John might be something rather scarier. A well-fed population was a happy population, and a starving one could be frightening, particularly after the French Revolution which inspired images of hungry, cannibalistic sans-culottes ferociously devouring the bodies of the elite.[34] Yet the image of John Bull was not entirely a positive one. He was sturdy and blunt but he could also be unintelligent and crude - like the Australian commoners that exist in the imaginations of Phillips' 'Cringers'.[35] Occasionally, John Bull acquired more troubling connotations, such as in *JOHN BULL taking a Luncheon: - or - British Cooks, cramming Old Grumble-Gizzard, with Bonne-Chére* [Fig. 111] [BMC 9257] (James Gillray. 24 October, 1798).[36] The real ideal body image would be somewhere between the impoverished Frenchman and his obese English equivalent.

Whereas the food of France was frequently unfavourably compared to that of England, its drink was not. Englishmen in prints often have large, foaming tankards of beer with which to wash down their massive cuts of beef, yet the French characters are not assigned an equivalent drink to accompany their insubstantial soup and frog foodstuff. The obvious choice would be wine but the French sections of contrast prints are usually absent of liquid. This may have been because, unlike soup or frogs, the English rather appreciated French wine. In *The TREATY OF COMMERCE OR NEW COALITION* [Fig. 10] [BMC 7144] (26 February, 1787), a response to the Anglo-French commercial treaty signed in 1786, Frenchmen joyously feast upon their newly acquired roast beef. The Englishmen ignore the influx of small frogs but get drunkenly stuck into the French wine. While the print retains some cynicism in its attitude towards Louis XVI, the portrayal of the Englishmen enjoying the wine is more celebratory than

---

[33] [Louis Simond], *Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain during the years 1810 and 1811 by a French Traveller: with remarks on the country, its arts, literature, and politics, and on the manners and customs of its inhabitants. Volume first* (1815), p. 11.

[34] *Un Petit Soupèr, a la Parisiènne; - or - A Family of Sans Culotts refreshing after the fatigues of the day* [Fig. 121] [BMC 8122] (James Gillray. 20 September, 1792).

[35] Phillips, 'The Cultural Cringe', pp. 5-6.

[36] See Chapter Four.

sceptical and is a long way from the condemnation of the enjoyment of foreign alcohol that had epitomised Hogarth's *Gin Lane* (1751). Thus, not all French produce was universally condemned, as wine appears to have been admired and enjoyed.

France and England were not as different or as distant from one another as contrast prints suggested. What lies behind many representations of the French is the fear that foreign culture, habits, practices and characteristics would spread across the Channel, decaying English identity and values. In 1747 Anthony Walker produced *The BEAUX DISASTER* [Fig. 11] [BMC 2880], which features a 'beau' or 'macaroni' character helplessly strung on a butcher's hook, to the amusement of an assembled crowd. The macaroni represented the eighteenth century English aristocrat obsessed with the fashions, food and fripperies of Parisian society. Despite the word 'macaroni' clearly having Italian origins, it came to refer almost exclusively to French tastes.[37] The fashions and culture of France were held in high regard by certain sections of English society, primarily the upper classes, who visited Paris on their Grand Tour, and brought home the latest tastes.[38] Money which could have been nourishing British industry was being spent abroad and such habits could be cited as evidence of a French cultural invasion. There were fears by some that imitation of foreigners in dress would lead to imitation of foreigners in all other respects, and that there was actually a danger of the English transforming into equally skinny, frivolous slaves. The adoption of foreign customs was attacked by the press, which claimed that such practices would result in the tolerance of foreign political, religious and social ideas and that the 'British stock' would be diluted. Having a French hairdresser, therefore, 'might be the precursor of a Bastille in Hyde Park, eating a ragout an intimation of a conversion to Catholicism.'[39]

---

[37] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 27.
[38] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 37.
[39] Jeremy Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986), p.176.

The effeminacy of Frenchmen, and their English imitators, is a defining, and constant, theme in satirical prints. Though writing principally on effeminacy in literature, Susan C. Shapiro explained that

> 'Effeminacy' traditionally was associated with weakness, softness, delicacy, enervation, cowardice, delight in luxurious food and clothing - all those qualities which oppose the essential attributes of the warrior, the most 'manly' of men.

Rather than implying homosexuality as it came to in the Victorian age, effeminacy was used to connote subservience to wives or mistresses, or the compulsive pursuit of sexual activities, or, paradoxically, asexuality.[40] Effeminacy, therefore, could be used by satirists to accentuate French weakness as a contrast to English strength and masculinity. Yet there was simultaneously a threatening element evoked by the implication of the effeminate's high libido, indicating one of the dualities that emerge in portrayals of the French.

   Effeminate stereotypes of the French were not a new phenomenon; thirteenth century xenophobic insults listed by the scholar Jacques de Vitry defined the English as drunkards, the Germans as obscene and angry, and the French as 'proud, effeminate, and carefully adorned like women.'[41] Eighteenth century England was different in that fear of the influence of the effeminate French on English males appears to have been stronger than at other times. If this is not exactly representative of an English crisis of masculinity – 'it would be rash to assume that men at other times are consciously serene, or that there is a precise correlation between anxiety levels and verifiable data'[42] – for Michele Cohen it signifies a moment in which anxiety about masculinity was articulated specifically in terms of the influence women and effeminate French culture had

---

[40] Susan C. Shapiro, '"Yon Plumed Dandebrat": Male Effeminacy in English Satire and Criticism', *Review of English Studies, New Series* 39 (1988), p. 400.
[41] Quoted in Eugen Weber, 'Of Stereotypes of the French', *Journal of Contemporary History* 25 (1990), p. 169.
[42] Caroline D. Williams, *Pope and Manliness: Some Aspects of Eighteenth Century Classical Learning* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 3.

over gentlemen.[43] France's culture and language were viewed as the most civilised in Europe but, because of this, it was also the most effeminate.[44] The Grand Tour was seen as essential to the education of young men, although it risked making them effeminate.[45] The anxiety was personified by the character of the fop.[46]

The Francophilic fop had developed in the theatre, in plays such as George Etherege's *The Man of Mode* (1676) which featured 'Sir Fopling Flutter', and was adopted by caricaturists.[47] *The BEAUX DISASTER*'s fop is named 'poor Fribble' after the character of the same name written and portrayed by David Garrick in his theatrical farce *Miss in her Teens*.[48] Caricatured Frenchmen often appear ape-like, with simian features, but in this type of portrayal it is the Englishman who has become the monkey, aping the ways of the French. As Fribble, Garrick was imitating an Englishman, imitating a Frenchman. It is not always clear in prints such as these whether the mincing character dressed in French cloth is a bona fide Frenchman, or an artificial English dandy. Macaroni prints mock French modes, and the imitating of them, but they also illustrate the prominence of these modes in English society. It could be argued that macaroni prints suggest that the English fashion victim who thinks he is French is a much worse character than the genuine Frenchman.

It is tempting to read *The BEAUX DISASTER* in terms of class. The no-nonsense people of the street are celebrated for having taught the preposterous and pretentious Fribble a lesson. Were they to exist, however, the ragged citizens depicted would never have been able to afford the print in which they featured.

---

[43] Michele Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National identity and language in the eighteenth century* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 8-9; Gary Kates, 'Review of *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and language in the eighteenth century* by Michele Cohen', *Journal of Modern History* 71 (1999), p. 954.
[44] Gary Kates, 'Review of *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and language in the eighteenth century* by Michele Cohen', *Journal of Modern History* 71 (1999), p. 954.
[45] Michele Cohen, 'Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England', in Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen (ed.) *English Masculinities 1660-1800* (Essex: Longman, 1999), p. 58.
[46] Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity*, p 9; Cohen, 'Manliness, Effeminacy and the French', p. 51.
[47] Rogers, *Beef and Liberty*, p. 53.
[48] Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference*, p. 187.

This may suggest that Walker's work is an example of the upper classes laughing at themselves, or at the more ostentatious among them. It is not, after all, an exclusively proletarian crowd in the print. On the left-hand side pass three wealthy and fashionable figures, also finding much glee in Fribble's predicament. As Mark Hallett explained, 'Walker picks on someone who had become a stereotypical butt of polite as well as plebeian laughter in the period…' and the theatrical influence and nature of print meant that

> The focus on the representatives of a particularly independent sector of popular culture is re-articulated in the playful formulae of theatrical comedy, in which the plebeian participants and protagonists are recast as cheerful performers and audience, rather than as figures with any real grievance against the polite or the fashionable; indeed, their target, the fop, is redefined as someone who can be laughed at by both classes at once.[49]

The print *WELLADAY! is this my SON TOM!* [Fig. 12] [BMC 4536] (Samuel Hieronymus Grimm. 25 June, 1773) and its companion, *Be not amaz'd DEAR MOTHER - It is indeed your DAUGHTER ANNE.* [Fig. 13] [BMC 4537] (Samuel Hieronymus Grimm. 1774) highlight the regional and generational elements of the macaroni satire. Each shows a shocked and shamed provincial parent gasping at the appearance of a son or daughter, either having returned from a trip to France or from an English city where French dress was in vogue. They wear elaborate clothing and exaggerated toupees, several times the size of their heads, which tower above them. Lynn Festa has investigated the almost universal wearing of wigs in this period and the criticism that surrounded this habit. Accusations made against wig-wearing, like those made against other fashions, included its unnaturalness, its falsity, the threat that it posed to the 'God-given integrity of the body'.[50] The French-influenced macaroni style by which 'Hair could attain heights of up to two feet, often embellished with ribbons, living flowers (with vials of water nested in the hair to keep them fresh), pearls, models

---

[49] *Ibid*. pp. 188-189.
[50] Lynn Festa, 'Personal Effects: Wigs and Possessive Individualism in the Long Eighteenth Century', *Eighteenth Century Life* 29 (2005), p. 48.

of ships, coaches, and windmills'[51], was ludicrously exaggerated by satirists. Wig-wearing in general was rumoured to have begun with the bald Louis XIII and the balding Louis XIV. There were stories of Versailles courtiers gathering false hair and anecdotes of Louis XIV's barber Binet being the only person to see the King wigless (despite the fact that Louis XIV actually wore his own hair into the 1670s, after the fashion took off in both France and England). It was not merely the corrupting importation of styles that was railed against, but also the literal importation of foreign hair. For example, tracts appeared in the 1730s which insisted on the use of British hair over that which was imported, equating it with any other home-grown product. Wigs worn by men but crafted from women's hair contributed to concern about gender distinctions and the rise of effeminacy.[52] Wigs made of foreign hair therefore, or styled in continental mode, represented further danger of corruption of national character and interest.

The FARMER'S DAUGHTER'S return from LONDON [Fig. 14] [BMC 5456] (14 June, 1777) shows shocked members of a humble country family recoiling at the horrible sight of their fashionably mutated relative returning from the city. Here, the flinching pets emphasise the role of fashion as a perversion of nature, the hook that catches the daughter's ridiculously tall wig recalls that of the butcher's. There are implications that this disease could be spread from the metropolis to elsewhere and that it could act as a threat to the family as a unit. The daughter's affection for her family, however, has clearly survived the corruptions of London, as exhibited by her mannerisms and expression. This and the jocular nature of the print suggest that Francophilia was seen as an urban problem and one that could be viewed with light-hearted derision, rather than as a threat to the English way of life that could potentially engulf the entire nation.[53] In this kind of portrayal, the fear of French influence appears not to have been taken as seriously as Cohen suggests. Its potency and its reach do not come across as particularly

---

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[52] *Ibid.*, 47-90.
[53] Diana Donald, *Followers of Fashion: Graphic Satires from the Georgian Period* (London: Haywood Gallery Publishing, 2002), p. 25.

threatening. 'Neither caricatures exhibited at the windows of printshops, nor satirical paragraphs in newspapers, against ridiculous fashions prove of any effect,' observed the German pastor Frederick Augustus Wendeborn while residing in London; 'The former are stared and laughed at... without effecting the least reformation.'[54] The principal purpose of prints such as *The FARMER'S DAUGHTER'S return from LONDON* was to entertain, not to inspire moral panic. They humorously rendered changes in fashion to the amusement of those in the capital, while for provincials they 'evoked the pleasantly shocking delirium of life in the far-off metropolis.'[55]

Macaroni prints were particularly popular in the 1770s. That this coincided with a sustained period of peace with France (1763-1778) is significant. Due to the relative political and international tranquillity, printmakers such as Matthew Darly virtually abandoned political graphic satire, choosing instead to concentrate on lampooning social trends and fashions. Amongst the most obvious figures to mock were the fops who could now embrace and celebrate French fashion more openly and freely due to the fact that France was no longer, for the time being, a warring foe. The macaronis, thus, 'fully came into vogue about 1770-1772'.[56] It was Darly who was to prove the most prolific producer of macaroni prints. Many of Darly's macaroni prints are rather bland illustrations of the single figure of a foppishly-dressed Francophile simply standing or walking, with little or no background, and with slight variations in their particular occupation or engagement. For example, see *The NEW MARKET MACARONI* [BMC 5025], *The MACARONI AUCTIONEER* [5001], *A MACARONI in Morning Dress in the Park* [4690], *A MACARONI WAITER* [4661], or the dozens of others from Darly's series. *THE MACARONI PRINT SHOP* [BMC 4701] (1772) depicts a number of these designs on display in the windows of Darly's shop, with various men observing them and reacting with either laughter or disgust. Despite the

---

[54] Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[56] George Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum, Division 1, Political and Personal Satires* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey) [4520].

onlookers' excitable reactions, Darly's macaroni prints are not the most stimulating prints of the period. Nevertheless, these productions did differ from previous macaroni satires in that most of Darly's ridiculous characters came not from the aristocracy but rather from the 'middling sort'; 'the law macaroni', 'the macaroni bricklayer', 'the macaroni schoolmaster', 'the grub street macaroni' and so on.[57] Even if the majority of the macaronis in society remained upper-class, and the humour evoked perhaps comes from the unlikely absurdity of witnessing a macaroni bricklayer, Darly's prints do signal the increasing prosperity of the middle classes, a widening in the audience of satirical prints, and the continuing and disseminating enthusiasm for French modes.

   Obviously, English infatuation with French taste and fashion became more notorious and suspicious during periods of war with France. For example, during the Seven Years' War *The IMPORTS of GREAT BRITAIN from FRANCE* [Fig. 15] [BMC 3653] (1757) was produced by Louis Philippe Boitard, the son of the French François Boitard. It shows the quay at Custom House, where French produce is being unloaded. A variety of stock French stereotypes are also flocking ashore: abbé, dancing master, cook, actors. Both the material imports and the immigrants are embraced by the English crowds, as described in the accompanying text:

> …Several emaciated high liv'd Epicures, familiarly receiving a French cook, acquainting him that without his Assistance they must have Perish'd with Hunger. - A Lady of Distinction offering the Tuition of her Son & Daughter to a cringing French Abbé, disregarding the Corruption of their Religion, so they do but obtain the true French Accent; her Frenchified, well-bred Spouse, readily complying… Another Woman of Quality in Raptures caressing a French Female Dancer, assuring her that her Arrival is to the Honour & Delight of England…

Along with similar graphic satires of the period, *The IMPORTS of GREAT BRITAIN* mocks the high-regard felt by fashionable Englishmen and women

---

[57] Shearer West, 'The Darly Macaroni Prints and the Politics of "Private Man"', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25 (2001), pp. 172-173.

towards all things French, a trait deemed particularly unpatriotic during wartime. Again, there are concerns resulting from the perceived notion that cultural habits could have an influence on social or political habits. M. John Cardwell has described the anxious nature of cultural Francophobia in wartime:

> Some of the most paranoid cultural patriots even went so far as to claim that the degeneration of British morals and manners represented the preparatory phase in a far-reaching French scheme of domination, which was so cunning and meticulous, as to be almost satanic. Like the venom of a snake paralysing its victim, the French cultural invasion would so enfeeble British resistance, as to make the final military invasion an almost bloodless occupation.[58]

Similarly, prints produced during the American War of Independence, which France joined in 1778, mocked contemporary English enthusiasm for French entertainment. For example, numbers 5903-5911 in the British Museum Catalogue all focus on the Vestris. Gaëtan Vestris and his son Marie-Jean-Augustin (known as 'Auguste') were dancers from Paris who enchanted London high society in 1780-1. The popularity of the French dancers and the riches they were accruing during wartime attracted hostility.[59] One example is *A VESTRICIAN DISH, OR, CAPER SAUCE for a GOOSE PYE* [Fig. 16] [BMC 5907] (16 June, 1781). The picture shows the stage at an opera house, on which a dancer is performing. He has the head and tail of a fox, another bestial representation used for France and the French, and is posing on one foot, arms extended. The audience consists of men and women with the necks and heads of geese, who are watching the performance with enthusiasm, or gaggling with one another about the marvellous sight they behold. In the verses below, animosity is expressed towards the French dancer for making such money whilst the two countries fight and particularly towards his treacherous goose-like patrons. A selection of them read:

---

[58] M. John Cardwell, *Arts and Arms: Literature, Politics and Patriotism during the Seven Years War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 79.
[59] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [5903].

If a Fox should appear from a pilfering band,

Who has rifl'd your Roots and have damag'd your Land,

What Loons wou'd allow such a Thing still to fleece,

If they were not a meer Set of Cackling Geese. …

Or is it because that he wears a Goose-Cap,

That they cackle and flutter and all their Wings clap;

So long as I live, I shall never sure cease

To express my Surprise at the Thoughts of the Geese.

To me it has ever been well understood,

When a Fox has secreted himself in a Wood,

That the Neighbours around it cou'd ne'er sleep in peace,

For fear of their Goslins, their Ganders and Geese.

I now have a Guess at the Reason, I vow;

So the longer we live, still the wiser we grow;

It is a French Fox, all Pomatum and Grease,

That so prettily tickles our English Geese.[60]

   The Vestris prints are similar to those of the Seven Years' War which although classifying it as unpatriotic, highlighted that many English peoples' infatuation with France's fashions and culture did not evaporate in times of war. Even amidst the Francophobia of the Revolutionary Wars, there appeared prints testifying to London's enthusiasm for French culture. Richard Newton's *MADAMOISELLE PARISOT* [Fig. 17] [BMC 8893] (1796) depicts Rose Parisot, wife of the Swedish-born French dancer Charles Didelot. She stands on one leg, with the other extended, the toe just above right-angles to her waist; in the box to the left sit two figures, greatly caricatured in contrast to the more portrait-like rendition of Parisot. One is the Duke of Queensberry (1725-1810), a patron of the opera, though one whose 'musical interests seemed keyed more to opera singers and ballet dancers… some of his better-known mistresses, such as Teresina Tondino

---

[60] The fox and the gaggling geese may also have evoked the Francophilic Charles James Fox and his Whig followers, intentionally or not. The politician had appeared in caricature, like his father before him, as that very animal.

and Anna Zamparini, were divas.'[61] The other character, a fat bishop, is 'perhaps Barrington, the Bishop of Durham, who led the outcry against the scanty dress of opera dancers in 1798'.[62] This satire attacks both those who were drawn to the scantiness of French dancers, and those who objected to it, as each man uses an opera-glass or quizzing-glass to gawp leeringly up the skirt of the dancer. Isaac Cruikshank's *A PEEP at the PARISOT! with Q in the corner!* [Fig. 18] [BMC 8894] (7 May, 1796) is a similar design in which assorted men, including Queensberry again, gaze up Parisot's skirt. This time the audience includes such political enemies as William Pitt the Younger and Charles James Fox, the Duke of Bedford and Edmund Burke. Pitt is even holding Fox warmly round the shoulders as he leans further in from behind, to get a better glimpse. The presence of not merely the pro-French Whig crowd but also the anti-French Pitt and his supporters, makes the suggestion that opponents were willing to put aside their differences and animosities when it came to mutual appreciation of the French art of dancing or, rather, the ladies employed in it. Though Pitt would not actually embrace Fox in this manner, and despite these prints of imports and dancers voicing disapproval towards those who embraced French commodities and entertainments, it is clear that even in years of conflict the English fascination with French modes and goods remained and that Francophobia was not all-encompassing. This continued into the Napoleonic era. In 1810, Samuel Taylor Coleridge reiterated the sentiments that lay behind earlier representations such as *The IMPORTS of GREAT BRITAIN from FRANCE* [Fig. 15]. Having by this time become disillusioned with French politics, he warned that

> The language and peculiar customs of a country are an important part of its
> fortifications; and a Briton taught from his infancy to speak the French language,
> admire French books, and imitate French manners, is already half a Frenchman in
> his heart. Nay, a country in which, as was the case in Prussia, a majority of the
> higher ranks consisted of persons thus *Gallicised*, was subdued in effect, before the

[61] William C. Lowe, 'Douglas, William, fourth duke of Queensberry (1725–1810)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7937 (accessed 30/03/08).

[62] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [8893].

French army put the last seal on the conquest by the battle of Jena.[63]

Evidently, fear of French culture persisted but this was because others' enthusiasm for it had remained so potent and resilient.

Both Hogarth's *THE GATE OF CALAIS* and Walker's *The BEAUX DISASTER* inspired another trend of late 1760s and early 1770s prints, which stress the role of England's lower-class sturdy defenders, rather than her population of Francophilic fops; those of Frenchmen being beaten in the street by English butchers. In 1770, John Collet produced *The FRENCHMAN in LONDON* [Fig. 19] [BMC 4477], in which an English butcher is stoutly raising his fists to a tall, skinny Frenchman, who holds up his open hands in defence, stepping back in fear. Two women look on, laughing; one pulls upon the Frenchman's pigtail. Above the door in the background, a sign reads 'Foreign Gentlemen Taught English'. While the butcher remains distracted, a dog steals meat from his tray. Collet's print inspired another engraving, by an artist named Adam Smith. *The Frenchman at Market. Intended as a Companion to the Frenchman in London, by Collett* [Fig. 20] [BMC 4476] (1770), is a cruder drawing, showing a butcher pounding a Frenchman in the belly, while a boy chimney-sweep, mounted on a friend's shoulders, drops a mouse into the Frenchman's wig bag. A woman carrying a basket of vegetables on her head laughs from behind. This time it is a lean, hungry, thieving Scotsman who pinches the distracted butcher's meat, rather than a dog. A dog still makes an appearance, however, relieving itself on the Frenchman's leg. An impression of this design was included in the *Oxford Magazine*, which also featured the following letter:

> Passing one day through a street near Clare-market, I saw a very curious encounter
> between an English butcher and a French valet de Chambre. The butcher happened
> to rub against Monsieur, which gradually enraged him - 'Vat you mean, b___e, said
> he, to rub your greasy coat against my person?' The Butcher, like a true bull-dog,
> without any kind of preface, put himself into a posture of attack, gave the

[63] Quoted in Michael John Kooy, 'Coleridge's Francophobia', *Modern Language Review* 95 (2000), p. 935.

Frenchman two or three blows, and obliged him to ask pardon for the insult.[64]

   Seeing as this second print declares itself a companion to John Collet's original, we might want to question the authenticity of this letter; though whether or not these images were inspired by a genuine encounter, we can see how the character of the butcher had become an assertive, patriotic, John Bull-esque symbol of English low-level heroism. Despite this, and despite the anti-French rhetoric of the letter, to assume that viewers of *The Frenchman at Market* would be rooting for the butcher would be to neglect of an important aspect of the piece's composition. As the Frenchman and the butcher are engaged in their altercation they have become oblivious to what occurs around them. The woman and the mischievous sweeps stare knowingly out from the picture, creating and cementing a bond between themselves and the audience, a bond at the expense of the excluded Frenchman, unaware of the mouse he is soon to receive and the dog's gift upon his leg. Our eyes are also drawn, however, to the left, the less populated side of the print, where the lone figure of the Scotsman places his hand on the meat. Significantly, the Scot also stares out from the print. Raising a forefinger, he creates a bond between himself and the viewer, silently appealing for cooperation. If the audience is made to feel complicit in the assault on the Frenchman, they are equally complicit in the thievery of the English meat.

   If the Frenchman and the butcher are taken to be symbols of their respective nations, the print could even be interpreted as a warning against continued antagonism and renewed conflict between the two countries. The distraction of conflict with the French could inhibit domestic prosperity and be exploited by untrustworthy forces at home or abroad, here it is the Scots.

   Macaronis were prone to similar graphic attacks. In a slight variation on these scenes, *ENGLISH FUNN or DOCKING the MACARONI* [Fig. 21] [BMC 4619] (14 September, 1774) has the butcher cutting at the macaroni's pigtail with his

---

[64] Quoted by Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [4476].

knife, to the delight of two female observers. A large cut of beef hangs proudly in the background, as the English butcher literally attacks French fashion and further emasculates the fop by shearing the phallic tail from his head. A dog bounds freely in the foreground, emphasising the leashing of the fop and, like the many other animals that appear in similar prints, the unnaturalness of fashion.[65]

It was not only butchers who assaulted the foppish Frenchmen, nor was it exclusively men. *BILLINGSGATE TRIUMPHANT, or - POLL DAB a Match for the FRENCHMAN* [Fig. 22] [BMC 4541] (1775) has a Billingsgate fishwoman battling a Frenchman, amusing the English onlookers. This time the Frenchman is not cowering in fear, he is looking more confident and involved in the altercation. Nevertheless, he is already bleeding from his face, unlike the woman who has no injuries, so it is clear who will eventually triumph. A second Frenchman cowers behind holding the first's coat. The removal of the fighting Frenchman's coat has revealed his lack of shirt or vest, his upper body is bare but for a detached collar at his neck and sleeves at his wrists. His breeches have no seat, exposing his posterior. This not only looks amusingly absurd, but exposes the superficial nature of the Frenchman's extravagance, fitting the stereotype of poverty accompanied by vain pomposity. This joke survived the century as, for example, Napoleon can be seen bare-chested with amputated shirt-ruffles, nose-bleeding, as he battles Jack Tar atop the globe in James Gillray's *Fighting for the DUNGHILL: _ or _ Jack Tar settling BUONAPARTE* [BMC 9268] of 20 November, 1798.

In another such print, *Sal Dab giving Monsieur a Receipt in full* [Fig. 23] [BMC 4623] (29 May, 1776), the Frenchman, again bleeding, bottom exposed, shirt consisting of nothing but collar and sleeves, waves his fists in futility as he is beaten back by the virago, with her exposed chest and strong arms. Again, a second Frenchman stands behind, with coat in hand, quivering. A fat English publican smiles on, whilst a second fishwoman holds up a lobster, perhaps to

---

[65] Donald, *Followers of Fashion*, p. 10.

pinch the Frenchman with, to add further pain and humiliation, although it appears more likely that she is amusing herself by comparing the physicality and the situation of the creature to that of the foreigner. Whilst these fishwomen prints clearly depict the French as weak, effeminate, fraudulent slaves to fashion, they also have the effect of making English women seem rather bawdy, aggressive and masculine, not the ideal of English femininity. If images of Frenchmen and macaronis expressed anxieties about increasing effeminacy, it is a little strange that these characters should be combated by relatively masculine Englishwomen, while their men stand by impotently chuckling.

   An Engagement in Billingsgate Channel, between the Terrible and the Tiger, two First Rates [BMC 5956] (1781) should also be mentioned, as in this variation of the scene the French are absent, the fisticuffs being exchanged between two fishwomen. Again, men observe the incident, while two small children try to break up the fight. This illustration of fighting between people of the same nationality, class, and gender helps to highlight the possibility that these fishwomen prints can be as derogative to the lower classes as they are to the French. Thomas Rowlandson's *BILLINGSGATE* [Fig. 24] [BMC 6725] (1784) has a gang of gross fishwomen mocking a gouty Englishman as, on the right, one fishwife ties a flatfish to his wig whilst a small urchin tugs his coat-tails. Thus, the women of Billingsgate are also represented as bullies of their own countrymen, and in this print are hardly romantic English lower-class patriot heroines. They are fat, grotesque, and drunk; one reclines in the bottom left-hand corner, bare-breasted, vomiting over herself. Clearly fish did not have the same robust image as beef, with its connotations of pride, patriotism, affluence. In fact, Hogarth had used the flatfish as one of the antitheses to his hunk of British roast beef. His witch-like cackling fishwomen, though French, are no more grotesque than Rowlandson's English ones. Thomas Pelham-Holles (1693-1768), the Duke of Newcastle, whilst in office was drawn in prints dressed as a Newcastle fishwife, in order to undermine his authority.[66] That beef was portrayed as a superior

---

[66] For example in *THE DEVILS DANCE SET TO FRENCH MUSIC BY DOCTOR LUCIFER OF*

foodstuff to fish, that beef was sold by male butchers, fish by often ugly female vendors, indicates the misogynistic aspects of eighteenth century satire. It is also, however, one area in which characters of different nationalities, employed in the same occupation, French and English fishwomen, are portrayed in very similar ways.

Whereas Walker's *The BEAUX DISASTER* had a theatrical nature[67], these later butcher and fish vendor prints, if still somewhat theatrical, are cruder and more aggressive. Walker's print depicted the humorous aftermath of the violence enacted on Fribble the fop, in these examples we witness the violence itself. Walker's depiction of the London crowd also seemed much more celebratory than Thomas Rowlandson's fish-selling ruffians. This may indicate a growing fear of the lower classes which would become more resolute following the increasing radicalisation of the early stages of the French Revolution, and which becomes more apparent in English prints of the 1790s. The fact that the butcher and fishwomen prints tend to coincide with periods of peace between Britain and France (1763-1778 and 1783-1793) may also have some significance, perhaps there was a void of violent images that needed to be filled in order to satisfy the wishes of the caricature audience in the absence of war prints.

Like macaroni prints, however, it is possible to take images of Frenchmen being attacked too seriously. The contemporary Louis Simond (1767-1831) was keen to point out the important differences between the things people laughed at and their actual actions. After attending the play 'Hit and Miss', in which one of its characters, an old woman, was run over by an attorney's tandem, he wrote that this was

> a joke by no means congenial, I really believe, with the real manners and feelings of
> the English people, but which, however, excites powerfully their mirth. It has
> occurred to me, that this circumstance, so little to the credit of their taste, might

PARIS [Fig. 26] [BMC 3373] (August 1756).
[67] Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference*, pp. 187-188.

afford a favourable interpretation to their apparently illiberal treatment of foreigners on their stage; for we find here that they can relish ill-nature and brutality in fictions, although not in reality.[68]

Simond also felt the need to describe the differences between the amiable treatment he received from Englishmen in contrast to the way his countrymen were portrayed in caricature, and considered that the English were equally enthusiastic to lampoon themselves:

> The people of London, I find, are quite as disposed to answer obligingly to the questions of strangers as those of Paris. Whenever I have made inquiries, either in shops, or even from porters, carters, and market-women in the streets, I have uniformly received a civil answer, and every information in their power. People do not pull off their hats when thus addressing anybody, as would be indispensable at Paris, a slight inclination of the head, or motion of the hand, is thought sufficient. Foot-passengers walk on with ease and security along the smooth flag-stones of the side-pavement. Their eyes, mine at least, are irresistibly attracted by the allurements of the shops, particularly print-shops; not that they always exhibit those specimens of the art so justly admired all over Europe, but oftener caricatures of all sorts. My countrymen, whenever introduced in them, never fail to be represented as diminutive, starved beings, of monkey-mien [sic], strutting about in huge hats, narrow coats, and great sabres; an overgrown awkward Englishman crushes half a dozen of these pygmies at one squeeze. …It must be owned, however, that the English do not spare themselves; their princes, their statesmen, and churchmen, are thus exhibited and hung up to ridicule, often with cleverness and humour, and a coarse sort of practical wit.[69]

The extent to which Simond's Frenchness was apparent to Englishmen is uncertain, he had emigrated to America before the French Revolution, had lived there for over twenty years, and was married to an Englishwoman with whom he travelled[70], though he certainly considered himself a Frenchman and, while his émigré status probably helped, he does not appear to have needed or wanted to

---

[68] [Simond] *Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain... Volume first* , p. 99.
[69] *Ibid*., p. 21.
[70] *Ibid*., pp. ix-x.

conceal his nation of origin in the course of his wartime visit.

The graphic satirists of eighteenth century London represented the French in a variety of sometimes contradictory ways. The French were effeminate and simian, depictions which could seem harmlessly comic but could also intimidate. Their malnourishment had political implications; it was used to expose the cruelty of French rulers. In doing this, audiences were asked to sympathise with the oppressed Frenchmen, although this was sometimes counteracted by suggesting that the French were naturally slavish and that they chose to spend what little they had on fashion instead of sustenance. There were suggestions that French habits, fashions, and even political systems might spread across the Channel to corrupt English society, institutions and ideals. Those in England who were thought to be welcoming this cultural invasion were ridiculed throughout the century. However, they were often portrayed as foolish figures rather than as serious threats to the state and the consistent presence of these types of characters can be used to illustrate that many individuals and groups did in fact remain enamoured with French culture throughout the century, even in times of war. 'Francophilia' was derided but it prevailed. Other, lower-class, English characters could be portrayed as sturdy buttresses to the cultural invasion, attacking Frenchmen or macaronis, yet the portrayals of these gouty butchers or boisterous fishwomen were not entirely positive. Satiric depictions of the French 'Other', therefore, illustrate the ways in which England was defined against France as well as the constant fascination that the English held for their neighbouring country. Domestic anxieties were also projected onto images of the French and on renditions of English interactions with the French. Political leadership and political events such as war and revolution affected portrayals of the French and the stereotype would fluctuate accordingly. The English obsession with France and the feelings of empathy and affinity which accompanied those of animosity are, as we shall see, consistent themes of this period. So too are the projection of internal anxieties onto the French Other, and the use of French characters and subject matter to criticise and comment on, both implicitly and explicitly, the English figures who

were the more genuine or more urgent objects of derision.

Chapter Three:

Kings and Leaders

Much of the graphic satire produced in eighteenth century England on the subject of France was not targeted towards the French people as such, but against their rulers, primarily kings and later Napoleon who arguably aspired to become a king in all but name. Religious leaders also featured, depicted as generic malicious monks, although these became less prominent in the second half of the century, undermining the pertinence of anti-Catholicism and common Protestant identity in conceptions of British identity. Depictions of French leaders were used to emphasise and articulate the perceived superiorities of British rulers and the British system of government. They also, however, made more general comments about the nature of power, authority, religion and legitimacy, and regularly highlighted and criticised the inadequacies of domestic monarchs and statesmen, both explicitly and implicitly, and at times unintentionally perhaps, as satirists projected British failings onto images of the French 'Other'. Along with the projection of British anxieties onto images of France, and the constant contrasts and comparisons between British and French rule, the prominence of France in graphic satire gave observers at home the opportunity to share and experience France's political turbulences (albeit in a skewed and often inaccurate form). There emerged many parallels by which images of each nation and their rulers developed. They continuously informed and influenced one another, and if conceptions of British kings and leaders had been redefined over the course of our period, as is contended, then so too, and in very similar ways, had British conceptions of French figures.

1) Pre-Revolutionary Kings and Politicians

In some instances, French kings were depicted in English satirical prints in much the same way as the stereotypical Frenchman discussed in the previous chapter.

For example, in *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly* [Fig. 25] [BMC 2659] (1745) the 'King of France' looks typically tall, skinny and vain. He has long hair, wears a hat and long coat, but other than the fleur-de-lis adorning coat, monarchical symbols are noticeably absent; he has no crown, no throne, nor do his features resemble in any obvious way those of Louis XV, as seen in the official portraiture of artists such as Maurice Quentin de la Tour.[1] Louis' personality is lost, as well as a sense of his role as monarch, for this is an example of the king as an embodiment of France itself, and perhaps also his subjects; he is less simply the 'King of France' than France, or the French threat, as a whole. This raises the question of the extent to which kings were thought of as representative of their country or their subjects; were they considered the personification of their entire nation? At times, certainly, this was how kings were employed in caricature. But was this because kings were thought of as intrinsically part of the nation, or because when in need of a symbol for 'France' in a print, the artist might, almost instinctively, etch the monarch as the most obvious and easily recognisable symbolic personification for that nation?

At other times, and increasingly so as the century progressed, the French monarchs were depicted as separate entities to that of the people and the lands they ruled over, with greater attention given to the physical features of each individual monarch. Partly this can be attributed to changes in the art of caricature over the period, though the development of this art form also coincided with, and absorbed some of the ideas championed by, the Enlightenment, with influential writers such as Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) questioning the authoritarian nature of monarchy and emphasising the advantages of the people as sovereign, or, closer to home, David Hume's (1711-1776) analysing and dissecting of the nature and workings of government.[2] Certainly, the portrayal of the French monarch as a despotic oppressor of his people, rather than of being more closely associated with or representative of his subjects, is

---

[1] Adrian Bury, *Maurice-Quentin de la Tour* (London: Charles Skilton , 1971), Pl. 1.
[2] David Williams (ed.), *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 25-30, 252.

common. Again, we could look to Daniel Fournier's *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] [BMC 2849] (1746) as emphasising the cruel, tyrannical nature of the French monarchy. Here, Louis XV sits arrogantly on his throne in the centre of the picture, surrounded and bolstered by evil forces, in league with an inquisitorial Catholic Church, complicit in the murder and torture of his own subjects; depictions which may potentially evoke feelings of sympathy in the viewer, although these might be counteracted by the representation of his slavishly natured chained-yet-content courtiers. This type of iconography borrowed heavily from the English image of Catholic Spain, which by this time had been overtaken on the Continent in terms of wealth, power, and influence by France; the clearest turning point having been Louis XIV's seizure of territory in the Spanish Netherlands in 1667. The rapid collapse of the Spanish resistance in this sensitive area of English continental interests meant that 'Englishmen at last woke up to the fact of French military preponderance in Europe'; this was confirmed when the French attacked and quickly overran most of Holland in 1672.[3] There followed the subversive, devious acts of the French purportedly instigating the Civil Wars, the Great Fire of London, and the Chatham Naval Disaster, drawing England into wars with the Dutch, supporting Charles II and James II against their Parliaments in exchange for trade benefits, exploiting the peace made with William III in 1697 in order to seize more easily the Spanish empire, and encouraging Jacobite rebellion. 'The crime of seeking after Universal Monarchy,' writes Jeremy Black, 'was compounded in English eyes by it being intended to be a Universal *Catholic* Monarchy. The Kings of France replaced those of Spain as the scourge of Protestant Europe.'[4]

Thus the French inherited much of the imagery that had been used to depict Spain, as demonstrated in *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] by the inquisitorial scenes of torture and murder occurring on the right-hand side of the piece. However determinedly or appropriately these means of representation were

---

[3] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 32.
[4] Duffy, 'The Noisie, Empty, Fluttering French', p.22.

transferred from the Spanish to the French, the relative ease and smoothness with which it was done indicates the temporary and malleable nature of xenophobic stereotypes. Did it really matter whether the enemy was Spanish or French or of another nationality, as long as there was some object of aversion to focus upon? And why was this needed? One reason, no doubt, was the reinforcement of national confidence, to evoke feelings of superiority. This was done, partly, through the means of depicting the French regime as despotic, as oppressive and, crucially, as backward or archaic. Thanks to developments such as the 1688 Glorious Revolution, the British could argue that their political system had progressed further than those of comparable states. Although there was still much debate over the relative strengths and weaknesses of the constitution, it has been contended that by the eighteenth century most people, from the political elite to the lower orders, believed that the British constitution was the best in the world. Its combination of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy promised to exploit the advantageous aspects of each form of government and evade their flaws, achieving a laudable balance of liberty and authority.[5] This sentiment had also been fuelled by what is now considered the 'Whig' interpretation of British history inscribed by men such as Paul de Rapin de Thoyras (1661-1725)[6], ironically perhaps a Frenchman.

Yet if we consider further the implications of English representations of oppressive foreign tyrants, we may discover an anxiety that runs deeper and closer to home. In Michael Pickering's book *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation*, he mentions the tendency of groups to highlight their own perceived state of advancement by depicting others in a primitive way.

> What the Primitive represented was 'our' historically defined advancement over the
> ages. …different 'tribes' might represent different levels of advancement, but the
> Primitive existed in a state of fundamental 'undevelopment', and therefore in

---

[5] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution, 1760-1832*, p. 23.
[6] M. G. Sullivan, 'Rapin de Thoyras , Paul de (1661–1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, 'http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23145', (6 May, 2010).

'societies without history', for a history as progressive evolutionism belonged to 'us' and was about where 'we' had come to at this pinnacle of social improvement and civilisation. The Primitive Other was in this way divested of his or her 'difference' and petrified into the sameness of 'our' early origins. Whatever is regarded as 'petrified' cannot, by definition, be historical, cannot belong to historical process and change. The Primitive was therefore historicised out of history in order to be made to represent and show 'our' progressive history.[7]

Although the 'petrified' nature of primitive stereotyping does not quite apply to the depictions of eighteenth century Frenchmen (as we shall see), Pickering's stress on the tendency of groups to represent 'Others' as primitive versions of themselves is significant, and representations of *ancien régime* France may reveal how Englishmen felt about their own history, as well as their wish to escape it. England had endured its own share of unpopular monarchs in the past, and recently had endured the rule of the Stuarts, who had been removed from the British and Irish thrones in 1689-90 and who clung to the hope of restoration until the 1760s.[8]

  Produced in 1745, the year of the attempted rebellion of Charles Edward Stuart, or 'Bonnie Prince Charlie', *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly* [Fig. 25] envisages such a situation. Accompanied by 'Folly with Poverty on her Back', the 'King of France', wielding a fiddle, leads Britannia astray; she has discarded her shield and is skipping forward merrily, 'dancing to a French tune'. Her features are dopier here than in more traditional classical portrayals, she appears intoxicated and easy to manipulate. The image of Britannia duped or wronged, injured or abused, is commonplace in caricature, a way to rouse patriotism and emphasise foreign, or at other times internal, threats to the nation. On the right-hand side of this print, towards which Britannia is being directed, stands the devil, who is stroking the chin and holding the hand of Charles Edward Stuart, the 'Pretender'. Stuart's other hand is held by the Pope. Devils, and

---

[7] Michael Pickering, *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 56.
[8] Stephen Conway, 'Continental Connections: Britain and Europe in the Eighteenth Century', *History* 90 (2005), p. 356.

demonic minions, make regular appearances in prints, in league with the Pope, with France, and with other followers of Catholicism. The satirists used the hellish creatures to mock Catholicism's obsession with sin and Satan, insinuating collusion with him to illustrate the English Protestant perception of the falsity and nastiness of that particular brand of Christianity. The presence of the Pretender adds an additional threatening element; Louis XV was portrayed as 'a despot who had established an arbitrary tyranny over France and was encouraging the Stuarts to do the same in England.'[9] Following the defeat of the rebels, appearances of Stuart and his followers in satirical prints declined, although prejudices against the Scots remained, as did the premise of Bourbon scheming to spread universal Catholic monarchy to England and elsewhere, as well as the fear that Britain's political progress could be reversed.

Indeed, as explanation for the autocracy and the cruelty of the French system,

> Much of the blame was attached to past rulers and ministers who had suppressed the original Gothic liberties of and institutions of the people. The Tory paper 'Fog's Weekly Journal' [in April 1729] argued that Richelieu and Mazarin were responsible for the development of French absolutism: 'If France was once that free country, and is not so at present, the miserable change was chiefly owing to the fatal maxims of those famous Ministers.'…
>
> These historical arguments were based on the view that national character, far from being immutable, could alter as a result of social and political changes, such as the spread of corruption. This analysis was advanced most frequently by the opposition press, which argued that Britain could readily follow the example of the Continent and that the Revolution Settlement of 1688-9 had failed to safeguard Britain against despotism, because no one event could preclude the evil consequences of bad ministers. Europe was a stage depicting what would happen to Britain were it to be misgoverned; the price of liberty was eternal vigilance.[10]

The example, and interpretation, offered here by Black is interesting on a number of levels. It tells us that national character was not necessarily deemed to be

---

[9] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 34.
[10] Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies*, p. 187.

innate, fixed or 'petrified' in the eighteenth century. It indicates the supposed lost liberties of the French, and the fact that this was attributed to their rulers, if not the monarch then his manipulative ministers at least, and relatively recent ministers at that, Cardinals Richelieu (1585-1642) and Mazarin (1602-1661). Thirdly, it shows us the fragility, rather than the strength or solidity, associated with the British Parliamentary system and the concept of the constitution, and the apprehension that these could easily collapse or become exploited or diluted. The prints, therefore, as well as evoking past moments of British history in which liberty was lacking and kings ruled absolutely, also gazed pessimistically into the future, a bleak future where tyranny ruled once more. The fragility of the constitution, and the potential destruction of it, is not only implied in depictions of the French system, but rendered in numerous prints in explicit, even sadistic, forms.

The constitution can be seen, in its document form, trampled underfoot by the enemies of England - often the nation's internal enemies. For example, in *THE DEVILS DANCE SET TO FRENCH MUSIC BY DOCTOR LUCIFER OF PARIS* [Fig. 26] [BMC 3373] (July 1756) the Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768) treads over the 'Magna Char'[ta], and [Con]'stitution as established - so help me g__'. Co-traitor Henry Fox (1705-1774) stands upon 'Honesty', 'Justice', 'Law', 'Liberty', 'Property', and 'Honour', while another Englishman, identified by George Stephens in the British Museum Catalogue notes as 'Admiral Byng, or perhaps Lord Anson', does the same to 'M-hone quite gone', '1588 Drake Sir Geo 1739 Adm. Vern.'.[11] All have cloven feet and dance to the music of a French horn played by a devil in a French cloak. On the opposite side to the Devil is a Frenchman, exclaiming in his ridiculous French accent, 'Dis is D' Diable's Hobbla Allons A Paris dere is de grand Dance de Wooden Shoes Dance.' We

---

[11] These more specific references allude to Port Mahon, and the loss of Minorca to the French in the opening stages of the Seven Years' War, Francis Drake's role in the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, Sir George Rooke (?), the Admiral responsible for the capture of Gibraltar during the War of Spanish Succession in 1704, and Admiral Vernon who had captured the Spanish colonial possession of Porto Bello in 1739 during the War of Jenkins Ear. Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [3373].

shall return to the treacheries of subversive English politicians below. In terms of the constitution, it can be seen that, despite its virtues being vague, undefined, debatable, it was considered the best in the world and the buttress of English domestic rights, freedoms, and liberties. Yet it was also recognised that this buttress had not always existed, and that it might not always be there to provide protection; it was not indestructible, it was not infallible, its delicacy and possibly temporary nature were cause for concern. Conversely, this also implies the temporary nature of French absolutism; just as the English might one day lose their constitution, the French, who in the view of Black's source had once experienced the joys of liberty, might once again enjoy freedom. As we know, this eventuality would occur towards the end of the century, the results and representations of which will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Despite the evolutionary political occurrences such as 1688 which had produced a version of constitutional monarchy, the British of the Georgian period were still ruled by kings with considerable power and influence. Significantly, these kings were foreigners, those of the House of Hanover, and 'uncharismatic foreigners'[12] no less. George III, as Linda Colley has argued, was 'different' for a number of reasons, including his younger age of accession, the political circumstances during his reign both at home and abroad, wiser guidance from his advisors, and the symptoms and effects of his debilitating bouts of illness.[13] He was also the first King George to be born in England and to be considered English, the previous Georges having retained their German identity in their subjects' eyes. The first George visited Hanover five times whilst on the throne, he died and was buried there, whereas his son, George II, took extended summer vacations to his homeland a dozen times. Neither bothered to waste their time and energy on visiting Wales, Scotland, North of England or even the Midlands.[14] As was the case with his father (who had died during a visit to Hanover in 1727), George II's

---

[12] Colley, *Britons*, p. 201.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 204-212.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

funeral was not well attended by his subjects nor his servants.[15]

Though generally considered preferable to their Stuart rivals, it has been argued that this resentment to being ruled by a foreign royal family, and the sentiment that their rulers may not have had the people's best interests at heart, is crucial to expressions of English Francophobia. This was alluded to in depictions of oppressive greedy French monarchs, such as *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5], but it also informed many of the fashion and society prints mentioned in the previous chapter. Disparaging French fashions was 'to make specific and readily comprehensible accusations that the Hanoverians were misusing British resources for foreign ends.' While there was little German influence on British society, other than in the field of music, attacks on French influence articulated 'the strongly felt, but rather unspecific, feeling that the British heritage and British interests were being betrayed.'[16] Condemnations of Frenchness, then, expressed and vented antipathy not just towards the French or their rulers, but towards England's Hanoverian dynasty.

It is also conceivable that this indirect criticism of the monarchy was a technique employed by caricaturists to avoid censorship or prosecution. Print artists and publishers rarely incurred this kind of wrath, partly because of the advantageous ambiguity that images seem to have over the printed word, partly because those in government did not want to fuel publicity for offensive prints and were unsure they could guarantee a conviction.[17] Was it also because defamatory visual attacks on the particular monarch, or the institution of monarchy in general, were cloaked in criticisms of that of the French? In Daniel Isaac Eaton's trial for seditious libel in 1794, the defence claimed that the gamecock character that had featured in Eaton's publication represented general tyranny, or more specifically the French monarch. While the gamecock had in fact been intended for George III, this could not be proven by the prosecution; the government was humiliated during the trial,

---

[15] *Ibid*., pp. 229-30.
[16] Black, *Natural and Necessary Enemies*, pp. 178-179.
[17] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution, 1760-1832*, p. 21.

and Eaton was acquitted.[18] The case shows how useful it may have been to be able to insist that one was attacking the French rather than the English establishment.

The British royal family was not exactly spared from direct lampooning, however. *Tempora mutantur, et Nos Mutamur in illis* [Fig. 27] [BMC 3015] (8 December, 1748), a print voicing dissatisfaction towards the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle which concluded the War of Austrian Succession, depicts Lord Cathcart (1721-1776) and the Earl of Sussex (1727–1758) confined within a small, walled enclosure. Under the terms of the treaty, these two individuals were held hostage in France until the return of Cape Breton. To the right, an effeminate Frenchman gestures towards them, and says, 'Dis be for de Glory of de Grand Monarch'. If the Frenchman comes across as somewhat haughty, he is not nearly as despicable as the Earl of Sandwich (1718-1792), the plenipotentiary who negotiated the treaty on behalf of England, who kneels stabbing the British Lion with his knife. 'Dam Posterity I'll get Money', he says, with '£1000 pr Ann' sticking out of his pocket. The Lion's spilt blood is lapped up, not by the French Cock who simply flaps and crows mockingly, but by the Hanoverian Horse, expressing English bitterness towards their own 'Grand Monarch', whose loyalties and priorities, it was believed, lay elsewhere. To the left stand the resurrected spirits of historic English leaders. Edward III, Henry V, and Oliver Cromwell show their disgust at what has become of their country, thereby illuminating the supposed past glories of England and the nation's recent or current decline under the House of Hanover. The inconsistency of coupling the republican Lord Protector with these monarchical figures seems to have been deemed immaterial so long as past glories were emphasised. 'Was it for this I sought the Lord & Fought' laments Cromwell, 'Hold Nol you are not Master now', a small demon reminds him. Another Englishman looks longingly towards the bleeding British Lion, his hands grasped in prayer as he pleads, 'Kind Heavens Recover Him.'

---

[18] Barrell and Mee (ed.), *Trials for Treason and Sedition, Volume 1*, pp. xxi-xxii.

Although George III was, as Colley correctly asserts, 'different', he did not entirely manage to escape the implications of his Hanoverian origins. 'It is somewhat curious to observe,' wrote Thomas Paine in *Rights of Man*, 'that although the people of England have been in the habit of talking about kings, it is always a Foreign House of kings; hating foreigners, yet governed by them. - It is now the House of Brunswick [or Hanover], one of the petty tribes of Germany.'[19] Despite his dismissal of Hanover as 'that horrid electorate' while prince, George III showed little genuine interest in eschewing the ties of his homeland. He continued to engage in extensive correspondence (in German) with his Hanoverian ministers in the 1760s. He patronised, like the Georges he succeeded, German tradesmen in London. Even as late as the mid-1780s, with his involvement in the Fürstenbund (or 'League of Princes'), he 'was enthusiastically playing the part of a German prince and displaying almost as much solicitude for Hanover as his grandfather had done before him.'[20]

Attacks on George III, as well as his son both as Prince of Wales and later as sovereign, tended to emphasise their buffoonery rather than malevolence, but their Hanoverian ancestry was not forgotten. In Thomas Rowlandson's *THE HANOVERIAN HORSE AND THE BRITISH LION* [BMC 6476] (31 March, 1784), William Pitt the Younger rides the kicking horse of Hanover, as it tramples upon the 'Magna Charta BILL OF RIGHTS CONSTITUTION'. In Gillray's *LIGHT expelling DARKNESS, _ Evaporation of Stygian Exhaltations, _ or _ The SUN of the CONSTITUTION, rising superior to the Clouds of OPPOSITION* [Fig. 28] [BMC 8644] (30 April, 1795) Pitt rides a chariot drawn by the British Lion and the Hanoverian horse, scattering the forces of the opposition. Diana Donald reads this print less as an attack on the unchecked power of the Prime Minster than on the continued dominance of the monarch, on account of the sun in the background displaying the word 'KING' above those of 'COMMONS' and

---

[19] Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 170.
[20] Conway, 'Continental Connections: Britain and Europe in the Eighteenth Century', p. 356; T. C. W. Blanning, '"That Horrid Electorate" or "Ma Patrie Germanique"? George III, Hanover, and the Fürstenbund of 1785', *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977), 311-344.

'LORDS' and the fact that the reins which Pitt holds in his limp wrist are subtly, but noticeably, slack.[21] It is possible that Pitt here is in fact employing the equestrian technique known as 'giving them their head' and that the Prime Minister therefore is still very much in control. *Presages of the MILLENIUM…* [Fig. 29] [BMC 8655] (4 June, 1795), on the other hand, another Gillray print, does contain a sinister portrayal of the Hanoverian horse as well as a much less flattering portrait of Pitt. Here, Pitt jockeys the horse over the bodies of pigs (Edmund Burke's 'swinish multitude') and prominent Whigs. The Prime Minister is scrawny, holding no reigns at all, but rather waving a flaming sword and serpent-like monster, while a little imp, the Prince of Wales, clings to his back, kissing his behind and holding a paper inscribed 'Provision for the Millenium £125,000 pr Ann' (a reference to the country's finances that were being continuously wasted on the prince's debts). The horse, meanwhile, is strong and determined; an allusion to continuing dominance of Hanover.

If eighteenth century graphic satirists were free to openly mock the Hanoverian monarchs, can it still be proposed that they were doing it indirectly through depictions of the French? Scholars have emphasised Georgian graphic print culture's essentially loyalist standpoint, sometimes oppositional in nature, but rarely revolutionary, critical of individual leaders, but not of the larger systems, institutions, structures and workings of government.[22] This is true to an extent, and true of prints on English rulers, where personal characteristics, facial features, and particular failings or errors tended to be selected and highlighted, but it was in depictions of French kings, with their lack of individuality, their relative lack of variation, the uses of monarchical figures as symbols, that English print satire was freer to attack or to question the actual institution of monarchy. Fournier's *THE*

---

[21] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 164.
[22] 'They ridiculed the failings of the governing elite, but they did not endorse popular revolution or radical constitutional reforms.' Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21; 'To constitution and hierarchy the printshops were steadfastly loyal. They ridiculed the royal princes, but pulled their punches on the king. They mocked the Prince of Wales [later George IV] for his profligacy, mistresses and Foxite friends, but it was his comic potential that they exploited mainly: and nothing was said about him that Tory loyalists would have deplored.' Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 143-144.

GLORY OF FRANCE [Fig. 5] depicts not just the problems which the French were perceived to have had with their monarch at the time, but the potential problems that could arise with any monarch, in any country, were their powers unchecked, their decisions influenced too feebly by reasonable forces such as parliament and too strongly by surreptitious forces such as grovelling, self-serving ministers or the Church. Overzealous monarchs were not an exclusively French phenomenon, and the problems with French kings could represent the problems with monarchy, with excessive power, with hereditary succession, in a more general sense; the kinds of problems, again, articulated later by Paine in writings such as *Common Sense*.[23]

  Indeed, certain satires painted the heads of differing kingdoms as distinctly similar entities. In, for example, *Picture of Europe for July 1772* [Fig. 30] [BMC 4957] a group of seven monarchs surround a 'MAP of the KINGDOM of POLAND'. Stanislaus II of Poland is seated, head bowed, hands tied behind his back. Behind Stanislaus is Mustafa III of the Ottoman Empire, his wrists and ankles chained. Opposite are seated, studying the map intensely, (left to right) Catherine the Great, Frederick II of Prussia, and Joseph II of Austria (Holy Roman Emperor). Behind these stand the concerned Louis XV and Charles III of Spain. On the far right slumps George III, asleep in his throne, oblivious to the important discussion and partitioning taking place under his nose. Above Stanislaus and the map hang a set of scales, 'The BALLANCE of POWER', the lighter side inscribed 'GREAT BRITAIN'. Despite representing the different situation of each sovereign in terms of European influence in 1772, each character appears remarkably similar. Mustafa, granted, wears a turban and long beard, Catherine's crown is slightly smaller, Joseph's more mitre-like, yet the others' crowns are the same (Louis' fleur-de-lis adorning his), the sovereigns' features all appear to be very similar, and all wear the exact same ermine-trimmed robes around their shoulders. Like their robes, these monarchs are all, it is suggested, cut from the same cloth.

---

[23] Paine, *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings*, pp. 11-19.

Louis XVI and George III even began to resemble one another in certain caricatures. This was not the case in the earlier years of their respective reigns, or even in the second half of the 1780s; Louis XVI often appeared in the manner that his grandfather and predecessor had done in *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND* [Fig. 25], a generic emaciated French stereotype. See, for example, *The Commercial Treaty; or, John Bull changing Beef and Pudding for Frogs and Soup Maigre!* [Fig. 31] [BMC 6995] (25 November, 1786) in which Louis is engaged in the exchange described by the title, hungrily lurching towards the English king and queen's offerings. But as the Revolution drew closer, and eventually erupted, Louis and George began to appear twinned or, rather, Louis began to resemble George. In Isaac Cruikshank's *Le DEFECIT* [Fig. 3] [BMC 7376] of 12 November, 1788, Louis' body has expanded, and looks as though it is trying to burst from his now overly tight attire. He turns his head towards his minister Jacques Necker (1732-1804), displaying podgy cheeks, flabby neck and chin. He now has short cropped hair instead of a ponytail. His nose is less sharp and pointy, it has become curved, slightly hooked: Hanoverian. Were it not for the French text emerging from his lips, his profile could easily be confused with that of George. James Gillray's *FRENCH DEMOCRATS surprizing the Royal Runaways* [Fig. 32] [BMC 7882] (27 June, 1791) is a more famous example. Inspired by the 'Flight to Varennes', the French royals' failed attempt to flee revolutionary France, it illustrates a mob bursting into a humble hiding place to arrest Louis, Marie Antoinette, and the Dauphin, who has fallen, or been dropped, in the commotion. Again, Louis XVI is fat and swollen, his face and vacant expression etched in accordance with the features of caricature impressions of George III; he wears similar clothes, even up to the soft farmer's hat sported by George in, to pick a straight-forward example, *Farmer George & his Wife* [BMC 6934] (1786). Marie Antoinette, too, is not unlike Queen Charlotte, although her nose seems to have been modelled in accordance with Louis' (or, rather George's), curved and Hanoverian, instead of the upturned snout that more

regularly distinguished Charlotte in caricature.[24] This technique of (literally) drawing similarities between the monarchs of Britain and France, in the revolutionary era at least, could be employed, and interpreted, as either royalist or antiroyalist. Gillray's print could act as a warning that events in France were in danger of spreading or being repeated in Britain. Or perhaps the print was 'antiroyalist propaganda', which 'conflated' the British and French monarchs in order to undermine them both,[25] their figures and their situations, maybe even their institution itself, were fair targets of mockery and derision. Both interpretations, however, diminish the potential differences between the British and French, both imply that all monarchs are the same.[26]

With some exceptions, such as the Hanoverian horse examples, English kings tended to embody the more docile elements of the monarchical persona in print satire. George III is particularly true of this, asleep in 1772, later bemusedly exclaiming 'What! What! What! - what's the matter now' as the Cromwellian Charles James Fox prepares to behead the monarch with the help of his Whig cronies in Gillray's *The HOPES of the PARTY, prior to July 14th* [Fig. 33] [BMC 7892] (19 July, 1791), a print which derives much of its humour from the Whigs' absurd determination to decapitate a creature so inconsequential and harmless. Depictions of those sovereigns on the other side of the Channel, however, voiced concern over the more ambitious, crueller, less sympathetic, greedy and manipulative ways that kings could, would, and had behaved on both sides of the water. That is not to deny that the caricatures were about the differences between England and France and the superiority of the former, but that they also

---

[24] See, for example, James Gillray's *FRYING SPRATS, Vide. Royal Supper* [BMC 7922] (28 November 1791) and *ANTI-SACCHARRITES, _ or _ JOHN BULL and his Family leaving off the use of SUGAR* [BMC 8074] (27 March 17920) in both of which Charlotte is caricatured particularly cruelly, or the anonymous *THE QUEEN OF HEARTS COVER'D WITH DIAMONDS* [BMC 7882] (c. 1786), in which the invisibly miniscule smidgen of snuff Charlotte holds daintily up to her face with pinched fingers is dwarfed by the huge, gaping nostril she is in the process of applying it to.

[25] Alexandra K. Wettlaufer, 'Absent Fathers, Martyred Mothers: Domestic Drama and (Royal) Family Values in *A Graphic History of Louis the Sixteenth*', *Eighteenth Century Life* 23 (1999), p. 2.

[26] Ronald Paulson, *Representations of Revolution (1789-1820)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), p. 195.

contained, whether intentionally or not, underlying concerns about the remaining injustices of the English system and the flaws still present within. Like *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5], another print, *The Grand Fair at Versaile, or France in a Consternation* [BMC 3679] (July 1759), shows victims hung from gibbets, beaten, strapped to the wheel as France chaotically attempts to deal with the internal and external disasters of that year.[27] Despite its supposed evolutionary position ahead of France in terms of constitution and civilization, eighteenth century Britain was still a nation ruled by its elite, still a nation subject to a relatively powerful monarch, and still a nation very much subjugated by capital punishment. Hanging rates in England, in fact, were on the increase from 1750 and remained high in the early decades of the nineteenth century. The frequency of English hangings was widely noted by foreign visitors and although the French were crueller with their stretching, flaying, burning and suchlike, the numbers condemned to death in the years before the Terror were significantly less than those in England. Around 1770 there were approximately three hundred condemned per year in the French nation, whereas England's capital city alone annually condemned twice that amount between 1781 and 1785.[28] The people of England would not have had access to these figures, and most would not generally have objected to, or even questioned, the authority of the gallows, but it was the English scaffold which informed the depictions of French cruelty, as it informed so many other aspects of culture, 'The scaffold loomed hugely in the popular imagination before 1830. We meet it at every turn: in ballads, Punch and Judy shows, broadsides, and woodcuts. It appeared in stick-gallows scratched on urban walls and, in smaller communities, in the punitive rituals of the skimmington ride as well, when transgressors against communal norms were hanged in effigy…'[29] The sight of bodies hanging limply from gibbets as they do in the backgrounds to these prints was an emblem not alien, but in fact very familiar to those in

---

[27] Britain's 'Year of Victories' in the Seven Years' War contributed to and coincided with near bankruptcy for France, which was forced to suspend naval building; Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, pp. 129 and 138.

[28] Vic Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People 1770-1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 7-9.

[29] *Ibid*., p. 112.

England.

Although the French were portrayed as living under a primitive or degenerated political system, if one which, before the invention of the guillotine, used similar methods of punishment as the English, their political leaders themselves were shown to be far from primitive, usually in possession of intelligent, manipulative, devious characteristics, characteristics which George and his ministers were portrayed as lacking. In *THE GRAND MONARQUE in a Fright: Or the BRITISH LION rous'd from his Lethargy* [Fig. 34] [BMC 3284] (4 April, 1755) Louis XV steps away from the growling British Lion, assuring the creature, and Britannia, 'Me make de restitution; Me give up de Virginia, Nova Scotia, and every ting in de East & de West &c. &c. &c., upon my Royal word & honour'. This perfidious king, however, has literally two faces beneath his crown, and with the second he explains to his minister 'Here, Monsr. d'Argenson, take dis Chain du Forts on de Ohio and chain him down when he's put to sleep; den all de English plantations will soon be mine.' D'Argenson, smiling and narrow-eyed, replies 'Let de Court de Londre be amus'd with de appearance of great sincerity as your most Christian Majesty knows how on your part & leave de rest to me.' To the right, two English merchants debate Louis' integrity; 'The grand Monarque's fears have extorted a great many fair promises from him; do you think he'll be as good as his Word?' one asks, the other replying, 'Surely you can't be so weak as to believe a Word he says; dont you know that the Kings of France had a dispensation from Pope Clement VI in 1351 to break their most Solemn Oaths & promises when ever they should find it incommodious to keep them?' The Duke of Newcastle, however, proves more gullibly optimistic, stroking the British Lion in order to pacify the beast, he says 'Peace Peace my brave Fellow, be quiet, rely on the equity & Veracity of the most Christian King and all things shall be adjusted by the Commissaries of both Nations.' Though the monarch still maintains an air of subtlety and deviousness here, the detrimental influence of France on Britain is more directly articulated than that alluded to in the fashion prints mentioned in the previous chapter; in further prints it would become even more obvious.

In *Birdlime for Bunglers, or the French way of Catching Fools* (November 1756) [Fig. 35] [BMC 3434] Louis XV takes the more direct action of simply pouring masses of coins and tickets with inscriptions such as 'Cooks', 'Valets', 'Dancers', 'Fiddlers' onto the floor. Scrambling to grab these treasures are Henry Fox (Secretary of State for the Southern Department, and Leader of the House of Commons under the Duke of Newcastle's government), Lord Hardwick (1690-1764) the Lord Chancellor, and Admiral John Byng (1704-1757). Byng was the admiral who was blamed for the loss of Minorca to the French in the early stages of the Seven Years' War and who, for his incompetence, would be court-martialled and shot.[30] Here, he is being crushed by the greedy ministers, Fox and Hardwicke, and exclaiming, 'Oh the Devil take your lime I am limed & twigg'd too with a P_x to you Murder Murder was it for this that I had the pleasure of saving the K__gs Ships'. This demonstrates a little more sympathy towards Byng than most prints of the time and indicates the way in which he was used as a scapegoat, although Byng, too, is reaching out for some 'Wine'. Henry Fox, a victim of his own name in caricature, possesses the features of a Fox. His son, Charles James Fox, would sometimes be caricatured in this manner later in the century. The fact that France, and the French, would sometimes be characterised as foxes proved a convenience to the caricaturists who wanted to blame Henry for French victories. Portraits of Fox reveal a fairly bulky, hairy man, an image which could have been exploited by caricaturists to great effect. Instead, his image was 'squeezed into the linear outline of a Fox' in order to stress his craftiness and self-sufficiency.[31] The Duke of Newcastle, meanwhile, stands on the left, with a fish tub on his head. The Duke tended to be portrayed accompanied by his fish tub prop, or as a Newcastle fishwife; in this respect he is a victim of his title, as Fox is of his name. He is holding a purse of '8,000,000' which rests upon a French treasure chest, decorated with the fleur-de-lis. As George Stephens explained, 'The indignation of the public at the loss of Minorca, and Byng's unsatisfactory

---

[30] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p. 123.
[31] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, pp. 245, 250-251.

engagement, was so great that men attributed both these events to bribery by the French government.'[32] Louis wears the wooden shoes in accordance with the stereotypical Frenchman, usually a signification of poverty of the king's subjects rather than the king, who implicitly protects his wealth from the population, and here he is rich enough to casually heap bribery money on the floor. As well as etching Louis in accordance with stereotype, there is the implication in this piece that his money is being spent on wiser purposes than comfier footwear. Not only is this scheming figure attributed an intelligence generally absent from depictions of the bumbling Hanoverian Georges, the English politicians he so ably entices are the truly guilty characters.

'Oh! How are the Mighty fallen?' is the subtitle to this print, and it was common in graphic satire for the pathetic British leaders involved to be the real objects of derision, rather than the interfering French who, although providing the opportunity for the ministers to defect, understandably are acting in the interests of their own nation, something which the Hanoverians and their ministers cannot be trusted to do. At times these ministers are bribed, as in this print or, like the Earl of Sandwich in *Tempora mutantur* [Fig. 27], they are foolishly distracted, enabling France to take advantage. *A View of the Assassination of the Lady of John Bull Esqr Who was barbarously Butcher'd Anno 1756 & 57 &c.* [Fig. 36] [BMC 3548] (1757) depicts a beach on which the giant Britannia has been murdered and is being chopped up, her amputated body parts carried off by nasty little Frenchmen resembling the Lilliputians of *Gulliver's Travels*. Here the French appear sadistic, self-congratulatory ('We shall humble her & spoil her Beauty' says one, dragging off Britannia's detached leg), and possibly cannibalistic. However, in the foreground, blame is again attributed to the Englishmen deemed responsible. The British Lion lies asleep, 'Brutus thou Sleep'st'; on the left ministers squabble amongst themselves, oblivious to the murder and dismemberment occurring behind them. Above them sits the text, 'A House divided against itself can never stand.'

---

[32] Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [3434].

At other times, English Francophilic politicians appear more active and culpable in their treachery. *England Made Odious Or the French Dressers* [BMC 3543] (1756) imagines Fox and Newcastle dressing Britannia. She wears a restrictive, tight French dress, embroidered with fleur-de-lis, and has a shield (half English, half French) resting on her leg. On the wall behind hang pictures of an axe and halter, instruments of punishment deemed suitable for the two traitor politicians. In these examples, therefore, the French are not the principle objects of hostility and ridicule, but rather act as useful tools with which to expose the inadequacies or failings of the ruling British political elite.

Although these personalities were not as subservient to the Gallic nation as the prints liked to imagine, there was an element of truth behind the representations of the Francophilic elite. Holland and Newcastle were 'reputed Francophiles'. Charles James Fox from a young age visited France with his father and 'strongly identified with the world of the French nobility, later owning a string of race horses… in partnership with the duc de Lauzen'. Newcastle, the Earl of Suffolk and Lord Shelburne employed French chefs and servants, which if not an absolute indication of Francophile tendencies, certainly attracted derision.[33] Indeed, Pierre Clouet, who had been employed in London by Newcastle since 1737 on the 'princely salary' of £105 a year[34], was immortalised in the anonymous 1745 print *The Duke of N_____tle and his Cook* [Fig. 37] [BMC 2684] which applies both the upper class infatuation with France and the English culinary patriotism discussed in the previous chapter to attack the Duke. The scene takes place in Newcastle's kitchen, where Clouet is declaring his distress towards the government proclamation of December that year which threatened the enforcement of the Elizabethan and Jacobean anti-Catholic laws. If enforced, the laws would see Clouet, a Catholic, sent back to France.[35] 'Bégar,' he says, holding a copy of the document in question, 'me can no rélish dis dam Englis

[33] Eagles, 'Beguiled by France?', p. 63.
[34] Gilly Lehmann, 'Politics in the Kitchen', *Eighteenth Century Life* 23 (1999), p. 76.
[35] Rogers, *Beef and Liberty*, p. 71.

Proclémacion!' The effeminate Duke clasps his hands together in alarm and exclaims 'O! Cloe if you leave me; I shall be Starv'd by G-d!' The bill of fare, on the table behind the two figures, lists dishes such as 'Woodcocks Braines', 'Carps Tongues', and 'Popes Eyes'. These dishes 'made up of absurdly small anatomical parts (a pope's eye was a small, tender nugget from the middle of a leg of mutton) are emblematic of the precious and insubstantial nature of fashionable French cuisine.'[36] The Pope's eye, too, had the convenient association to Catholicism.

A Scene in HELL, or the Infernall JUBILLEE [Fig. 38] [BMC 3378] (August 1756), another reaction to the embarrassing loss of Minorca in the Seven Years' War, uses ungodliness, cookery, communion, and anxieties about the human body and of its flesh to devastating effect in its condemnation of the trio of Byng, Fox, and Newcastle. On the right, in the 'GREAT HALL IN PANDEMONIUM' a host of demons are seated at their dinner table, feasting on the hearts of 'Byng', 'Fox', and 'N'. Their goblets contain the 'T__t_rs Bl__d'. The figure at the head of the table points to Byng's heart, and announces, 'On this Heart depended a Nations Hopes, now baffled by its Cowardice, O Princes spare it Not.' The others make announcements such as 'Why should we spare a Heart so vile, That did a Nation's Hopes beguile.' One of the minions points towards the heart of Fox, and says 'This subtle Heart no Honour knew, But made a K__g and C__ntry rue.' The minion gesturing to the Duke of Newcastle's heart says, 'As sure as Newcastle's on Tyne, This Heart with t'other Two did join.' At a side table, an imp is decanting the traitors' blood, and, looking at the liquid, says, 'Not clear', insinuating its impurity. Below, Cerberus, the hound of Hades of Greek mythology is licking up blood with his two heads, as an imp brings a dish through from the kitchen, 'Tis Hellfired hot.' At the left-hand side of the print is the scene of hell's kitchen, which contains some amusing anti-French dialogue. One devil is roasting the bodies of Byng, Newcastle and Fox. Newcastle's is marked 'Luxury', Byng's 'Cowardice', and Fox's, conforming to the wily characteristics of the Fox persona, is marked 'Subtlety'. On the table in the kitchen are dishes of

---

[36] *Ibid*., p. 71.

'Friggassee' and 'Popes eyes'. One of the kitchen demons states, 'Though I'm no French Cook, I know Whats What as well as Cloe'. One of the other demons exclaims, 'Dam the French and their Cooks too', to which a further one cautions him, wittily, 'O Dont dam em for If they come to Hell they'll poison the Devil'. Another agrees, 'No lets have none Here We shall be as bad of as Engl__d if they was'. This manages to insult French cookery, objects to its popularity in England, and expresses that it is so dreadful as to exclude the French from Hell. Yet the fact that Byng, Fox, and Newcastle all deserve to go to Hell, and that French cooks will be spared (even if it is to avoid the poisoning of Satan), helps illustrate the way in which English 'traitors' were treated with a greater degree of hostility in some of the prints than the military enemy of France. The French are often present or referenced, goading these traitors, or delighting in their desertions, but the blame and disgust is attributed more to the English who are selling their country out to the enemy who are, after all, loyally carrying out services to the benefit of their homeland, actions which their British counterparts were perceived to be failing in.

Gerald Newman, who decided that the critical years in the formation of English nationalism were those 'between the mid-1740s and the mid-1780s'[37], declared this association between the elite in England and the French abroad to be an important factor in the rise of England's national identity: 'the identification of domestic rulers with the foreign enemy is a characteristic of nationalism, one of the key characteristics in fact which help to distinguish it from mere patriotism. And this explains why, in innumerable prints, we discover absolutely laden with symbols of Frenchness the Quality and nearly all politicians with the exception of Pitt [the Elder]…'[38] There is a lot to be said for the fixation of English satirists on the supposedly treacherous habits of the political and social elite, but whether this is a clear indication of the emergence of English nationalism is questionable. The infatuation of the English upper classes with France and Frenchness was not a

---

[37] Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, p. 67.
[38] *Ibid*., p. 78.

new phenomenon, nor one unique to this supposedly critical period; Newman himself, earlier in his book, traces it back to the Norman Conquest.[39] The same could be said of another of Newman's significant ingredients of nationalism: war. Anglo-French conflict was hardly a rarity before the mid-1740s, and Newman's pinpointed epoch contains a decade and a half of peace between the two nations, the years book-ended by the end of the Seven Years' War (1763) and France's entry into the American War of Independence (1778).

   Speaking of the Francophilic English, it is worth noting those prints which specifically attack Lord Suffolk (1739-1779), who in 1771 was appointed by Lord North as Secretary of State for the Northern Department. These satires on Suffolk focus on his inability to learn or speak the French language. *THE ILLITERATE MACARONI. of 21 Learning his A. B. C.* [BMC 4652] (1 July, 1772) from Matthew Darly's macaroni series is possibly one of these. It illustrates a man dressed in French fashion, with a sizeable bunch of hair at the back of his head. He squints into a large reading-glass, holding it up to a book, the pages of which read 'A B C D', with smaller, illegible symbols beneath. In his British Museum Catalogue notes, George Stephens wrote that this print 'may represent the Earl of Suffolk, Secretary of State, who incurred much satire on account of his alleged inability to speak French…'[40] However, Matthew Darly had at this time distanced himself from political satire, and given that Suffolk would have, on publication of this print, been much older than the age of '21' mentioned in its title, it is likely that this was a more general caricature, or one of somebody else. Suffolk or not, it has a similar message. A clearer example is the anonymous *Ld S_____k and his Secretary learning French* [BMC 4875] of 1 August, 1771. This shows Lord Suffolk seated at a table concentrating on an open book, he scratches his head with his left hand, announcing 'D_m the French and their language too.' His French instructor sits opposite, 'Oh Mondieu,' he says, 'you no Improve at all…' The closed book underneath the one being read by Suffolk is a French Dictionary.

---

[39] *Ibid*., p. 14.
[40] Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [4652].

The Distrest Earl of the Southern Folk prating French to his French Servants, is by them Misunderstood of August 1771 is on the same subject. There are two versions of this print in British Museum Catalogue, listed as BMC 4876 [Fig. 39] and BMC 4876a [Fig. 40], one a revised version of the other, though which came first is unclear. 4876 shows Suffolk seated on his chair, surrounded by his French servants. His expression and mannerisms indicate his frustration, and he calls out 'Zounds! how I am Plagued with these Blockheads. I can speak French well enough, but they will not understand me.' At his feet lies a book inscribed 'The Grammar'. One of the servants, entering from the left, carrying a saddle on his shoulders, exposes the Lord's delusion by stating 'begar de Spanish Cow Speak better Franch. me no understand him.' A maidservant, also on the left, says 'What! will he learn French before he can Speak plain English!' In the foreground, a monkey sits, paper and quill in hand, having inscribed 'The Modern Secretary'. BMC 4876a is slightly different, one of its variations is Suffolk's utterance; this time he says 'They have not the Least Idea, of the Paris Idiom. - oh! mon Dieu!' These caricatures of Lord Suffolk, his inability to become proficient at French, his deluded arrogance in thinking he can speak it and that it is in fact his servants who are the fools, are curious. Many prints had poked fun at Englishmen intoxicated by French fashions and goods, and many had mocked the French, often parodying their way of speaking through the use of speech bubbles and exaggerated, phonetically-inscribed accents. These particular examples, however, attack Lord Suffolk for failing to properly embrace French culture, due to his inability to adequately master the French tongue. They demonstrate a certain degree of respect for the French and for their language, and express the opinion that if there is one thing worse than a Francophilic Englishman, it is a Francophilic Englishman who, despite his most determined efforts, could not even utter basic French. The monkey who has scrawled 'The Modern Secretary' also seems to express a disappointment with Suffolk, indicating that the British expect more from an individual in such an esteemed position. The chimp who has learned to write, of course, acts as a parallel. French was the language of

diplomacy, French appeared in English law, in the royal motto, the royal ascent and descent on parliamentary bills came from the French, as did English noble titles. 'Jack would be a gentleman if he could speak French', a Medieval proverb which survived into the nineteenth century[41], if not unequivocally denoting respect for the French language, at least acknowledges its significance on the road to success. The Earl of Suffolk clearly suffered from similar difficulties to 'Jack', though not from want of privilege or opportunity.

While adamant to refute that French was the best language, John Andrews was forced to concede that it was the most widely spoken:

> familiar in every court; [French] is deemed a necessary appendage of polite
> education, and used for commercial correspondence in every part of Europe; it is
> now so universally taught and studied grammatically, that it may be confidently
> asserted there are foreigners of different countries as critically conversant in it as the
> French themselves.[42]

Other caricatures, as we have seen in Cruikshank's *Le DEFECIT* [Fig. 3], employed French words or phrases, in their characters' speech or in labels. *Le DEFECIT* employed French words and phrases exclusively, which might indicate that it was produced specifically with the French print market in mind. Others, which include a mixture of French and English terms, rely on the audience's basic understanding of the tongue of the supposed object of hostility, the French.[43]

Caricatures of French kings might at first glance appear as triumphant, patriotic assertions of the superiority of the British system of rule, in contrast to the illiberal atrocities occurring across the Channel. On closer inspection, however, there emerge misgivings on the fragility of the British system, expressions of its current weaknesses, as well as, sometimes thinly veiled, attacks on the

---

[41] Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, p. 14-15.
[42] John Andrews, *A Comparative view of the French and English nations, in their manners, politics and literature* (1785), pp. 316-317.
[43] For example, *A French Gentleman of the Court of Louis XVIth/A French Gentleman of the Court of ÉGALITÉ, 1799* [BMC 9410] (James Gillray. 15 August, 1799).

Hanoverian dynasty and the problems with monarchical authority and succession, and political power in more general terms. Similarly, prints featuring Frenchmen were often a tool with which to attack the actions or weaknesses of British politicians, usually employing wily and intelligent French stereotypes in contrast to the gullible British elite. Yet the extent to which conceptions of a Francophilic elite contributed to the clear emergence of nationalism in this period is questionable, and, as caricatures of Lord Suffolk illustrate, inadequate familiarity with French was also open to disapproval.

2) Religion

  As mentioned earlier, the association of the French and their leaders with the Catholic Church was employed in print satire to emphasise both the rival nation's inferiority and the potential threat that it posed. *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly* [Fig. 25] [BMC 2659] (1745) shows the Pope, and the devil, holding hands with Bonnie Prince Charlie as the King of France leads Britannia in a dance towards them. In *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] [BMC 2849] (1746) despicable monks enact inquisitorial torture on the populace whilst hollering 'One K__g one R_l___n'. Religious leaders do not appear as caricatured individuals, they are virtually all symbolic stereotypes, often opulent monks as in Hogarth's *THE GATE OF CALAIS* [Fig. 6], in contrast to their hungry, docile flock. Popes, too, were largely generic, and until Napoleon's Italian Campaign we find little difference in how they were etched. There is scarcely much to distinguish, for example, Pope Benedict XIV in *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND* from Pius VI in *The Times* [BMC 5643] (26 February, 1780) published thirty five years later. This might be attributed to prints artists' lack of source material on the appearance and policies of Popes. Even if this was attainable, however, to adapt caricatures to the specific policies, personalities, actions and features of individual popes would undermine the determination to portray the Catholic Church as stunted and archaic. Implicitly unlike Protestant England, the French, and to an extent their leaders, were represented as slaves to the superstitious and oppressive

Catholic Church. The Catholic clergy were portrayed as corrupt, self-serving, false, exploiting their flock for their own wealth and advantages; their followers were starving and servile.

   Representations were borrowed from those of Inquisition Spain. Spain was a lesser threat in the eighteenth century than it had been previously. Anti-Catholic sentiment was also closely tied to the Jacobite threat. It was thought that, were the Stuarts successful in imposing their rule upon England, they would enforce popish idolatry. The close association between Jacobitism and Catholicism was evoked by English papists' support for James Edward Stuart's cause earlier in the century. Many had refused to swear allegiance to George I, they had also dominated the upper ranks of the 1715 English rebel forces, and perhaps made up the majority of the army as whole.[44] Anti-Catholicism, therefore, not only represented antipathy towards a powerful rival nation, but trepidation of disloyal and subversive forces at home. It also served a political function in countering the anti-Hanoverian sentiment which arose upon George I's accession to the throne, and which re-emerged in the early 1740s when George II's loyalties were perceived to swing too far in favour of his electorate during the War of Austrian Succession. The first two Georges were German-born and uncharismatic, the former perceived as Lutheran, the latter latitudinarian; but at least they were not Catholics backed by foreign popish powers.[45] According to Colley, Protestantism is a crucial factor in eighteenth century British national identity:

> Britons defined themselves in terms of their common Protestantism as contrasted
> with the Catholicism of Continental Europe. They defined themselves against
> France throughout a succession of wars with that power. And they themselves
> against the global empire won by way of these wars. They defined themselves, in
> short, not just through an internal and domestic dialogue but in conscious opposition

---

[44] Colin Hayden, "'I love my King and my Country, but a Roman Catholic I hate": Anti-Catholicism, xenophobia and national identity in eighteenth-century England', in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (ed.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 37.
[45] *Ibid*., p. 43.

to the Other beyond their shores.[46]

   In travel literature, as well as visual satire, Catholicism was portrayed as a mistaken religion. In *The Gentleman's Guide in his Tour through France, Wrote by an officer in the Royal-Navy…*, first published in 1766 and republished in several further editions until 1788, the author emphasises, in several places, the irrational, superstitious nature of Catholicism, and the French people's awe of it. He states, for example, that 'they seem in this country so wholly taken up with the care of their souls, that they totally neglect the good of their bodies; being often on knees, when they ought to be earning their bread.' He concludes his guide by

> …most earnestly recommending it to all Protestant parents, to be extremely cautious
> to whose care they intrust their children, when sent early into France for their
> education, as I can with confidence assure them, that the Catholicks [sic] (ever so
> strenuous to make converts) use all their specious and ostentatious arguments to
> impress their idolatrous, and irrational religion into their tender minds.[47]

Whilst some held suspicions that Catholics wished to convert and brainwash Protestants, many English parents remained content to send their children to be educated in France by Catholic tutors. The reason why parents proved enthusiastic to have their children taught on the Continent was, in Robin Eagles' view, often to avoid that embarrassment experienced by the maligned Lord Suffolk; it was to adequately master the French tongue: 'Many travellers took their families with them depositing their daughters in convents and Parisian schools, in the hopes that they would have mastered the language by the time of their return.'[48]

   Philip Thicknesse (1719-1792) did this very thing, and confessed that although the convents 'do not attempt to convert the children by any direct means, there are

---

[46] Linda Colley, 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), p. 316.
[47] [Philip Playstowe], *The Gentleman's Guide in his Tour through France. Wrote by an officer in the Royal-Navy, Who lately traveled on a principle, which he most sincerely recommends to his Countrymen, viz. Not to spend more money in the Country of our natural enemy, than is requisite to support with decency the character of an English Man* (1766), pp. 52 and 124.
[48] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, pp. 131-132.

many indirect methods…'[49] Despite this risk, however, Thicknesse felt comfortable enough to leave his daughter at a convent in Ardres at the age of fifteen, whilst mentioning that she had already 'been six months in the Benedictine convent at Calais.'[50] For Thicknesse, as for others, the worry of an offspring's possible conversion to Catholicism was displaced by an enthusiasm for the benefits of a French education. Newman might suggest this as evidence of the hypocritical selfishness of the upper classes, of their enthrallment with France, and of their flippant attitude towards the threat of France and of its Catholicism, attitudes which would fuel the emergence of English nationalism. It also, however, demonstrates the ease with which people in the eighteenth century could drop or contradict their prejudices or identities at certain times or in particular circumstances.

British national identity, then, may not have been so stringently based upon the Protestant versus Catholic emphasis so central to Colley's thesis. What we also find by studying visual depictions of the French is that, despite there being at times much (anti)Catholic imagery, there is a noticeable lack of significant Protestant symbolism. Protestantism was endorsed in prints only by silent implication. It was a sensible alternative to the oppression of the Catholic Church, but it was an alternative which was not etched in comparison with France. Many satires, as we have seen, depicted comparisons between the two nations of Britain and France; plump, lower-bred, sturdy butchers fighting tall, foppish, pretentious and emaciated Frenchmen; the Englishman's fulfilling diet of hunks of beef and foaming tankards of ale contrasted with the Frenchman's frogs and watery soup. Of course, these images had obvious political implications. Why were the French so underfed? In part, the French populace were to blame, for their stupidity, their vanity, and their apathy, but it was also due to the regime under which they were unfortunate enough to live: the autocratic monarchy and the Catholic Church with their tithes, taxes, and cruelty. The English, in turn, physically bulged from the

---

[49] Thicknesse, *Observations on the customs and manners of the French nation*, p. 11.
[50] *Ibid*., pp. 10 and 12.

benefits of their superior political system, and more liberal, more 'logical' religion. Contrasted caricatures of those in England with those in France would continue to be used in print culture to illustrate political points, and would be adapted to become a staple part of the propaganda war against revolutionary France, and against English radicals, in the 1790s when chubby Englishmen were contrasted with scrawny Jacobins, and noble Britannia with the hideous snake-haired harpy of 'French Liberty'.[51] Yet at no point between 1740 and the end of the *ancien régime* do we find an opulent, fat French monk compared, pictorially rather than implicitly, with whoever his English counterpart may have been; a stereotyped down-to-earth Anglican pastor, perhaps? Nor do we find rosary beads, mitres, crosiers, or crucifixes, all used as symbols of religious power, oppression and superstition, juxtaposed with any visible Protestant equivalents. With all the genre's jibes at superstition, at fat monks, at cruel popes and bishops, and at their flocks' imbecilic servitude, and with no Protestant symbols on offer to demonstrate the 'correct' alternative, one might look at eighteenth century English satirical depictions of France and the French and mistake England at this time for being a completely enlightened, or even atheist, secular society. This was, of course, not the case. Spirituality may have declined since earlier ages, it may have become splintered and remoulded by events such as the Reformation and the Enlightenment, but as John Miller explained,

> …it would be wrong to see this as an irreligious age. That arch electoral organiser, the Duke of Newcastle, worried greatly about spiritual matters and took great care preparing for communion. The leaders of society still believed in God and attended church, albeit less assiduously than in the past, but the emotional intensity and excitement of religion had declined. The Latitudinarian approach had triumphed, with its reliance on reason and its undemanding, prudential moral teaching.[52]

So why are there no depictions of good-natured Protestant priests, churches,

---

[51] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, pp. 151-157. See, for example, Isaac Cruikshank's *French Happiness/English Misery* [BMC 8288] (3 Jan,1793) and Thomas Rowlandson's *THE CONTRAST 1792/WHICH IS BEST* [BMC 8148] (Dec 1792).

[52] John Miller, *Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986), p. 31.

worshippers or their emblems to set against the French in these prints? The role of Protestantism as a break from the symbolism and idolatry of Catholicism could be one element. William Hogarth, principally bemoaning the lack of work for British artists, wrote that 'our religion forbids nay doth not require Images for worship or pictures to work up enthusiasm.'[53] However, it was hardly the case that Protestantism shunned every kind of iconography, even if there were fewer commissions available for Protestant artists than for their Catholic counterparts. Hogarth himself painted the triptych altarpiece for the St Mary Redcliffe church in Bristol and, 'contrary to common perception, there was actually a good deal of figurative and narrative art deployed in many churches in this period.'[54] Coming back to our particular genre, one reason that might be suggested is the negative tendency of caricature to focus on criticisms of its figures of objection rather than on constructive suggestions for alternatives or on those whom may offer more agreeable systems or philosophies. Prints on other topics however, such as those on society, food, and politics, as we have seen previously and will see again in following chapters, were keen to include some positive figures or allegories in contrast with the French ones being attacked: roast beef, the constitution, Britannia, British war heroes, and John Bull, for instance.

At the same time, prints which focused on the condition of the English Church tended also to be critical and portrayed English priests in similar ways to those of their French counterparts. If not exactly inquisitorial in nature, then they were at least overweight, wealthy at the expense of the lower classes, and corrupt. See, for example, *The rising of the inferior Clergy* [Fig. 41] [BMC 4236] (1768) in which portly, rich bishops stand on a high, protective wall ignoring or mocking the grievances of the underfed, poorly clothed peasants and parsons who stand below. See also the numerous variations of the 'Vicar and Moses' illustrated song-ballads, the success of which offended Vicesimus Knox:

---

[53] Quoted by Clare Haynes in *Pictures and Popery: Art and Religion in England, 1660-1760* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 5.
[54] Haynes, *Pictures and Popery*, p. 6.

I mention one instance of a print, which would hardly deserve notice, if it had not become popular among the vulgar. The print of the Vicar and Moses is often hung up on the walls of the farm-house, where the clergyman of the parish used to be reverenced as a saint, and consequently was able to do great good; but is it to be supposed that this reverence will not be diminished, among the children at least, who from their infancy are accustomed to behold the parson an object of derision, a glutton, and a drunkard?[55]

The prints are less about religion or spirituality itself than about the bad practice of it; the power, corruption, and hypocrisy of the Churches on both sides of the Channel, and particularly those in the higher ranks of each, the representations of which bleed into one another, their characters being differentiated merely by their slightly altered uniforms or hairstyles. In this respect the prints mirror David Hume's thinking, whose 1748 essay 'Of National Characters' suggested that

priests of all religions are the same; and although the character of the profession will not, in every instance, prevail over the personal character, yet it is sure always to predominate with the greater number. For as chymists observe, that spirits, when raised to a certain height, are all the same, from whatever materials they be extracted; so these men, being elevated above humanity, acquire a uniform character, which is entirely their own, and which, in my opinion, is, generally speaking, not the most amiable that is to be met with in human society.[56]

As J. C. D. Clark has argued, eighteenth century antagonism was focused less against Roman Catholicism than in opposition to 'popery', and that the concept of popery encapsulated the ingredients of power, luxury, uniformity, universal monarchy, and pride, which could be identified in a number of enemies, even

---

[55] Vicesimus Knox, 'On the effect of caricaturas exhibited at the windows of print sellers', in *Winter Evenings: or, lubrications on life and letters, Volume 1* (Third Edition, 1795), p. 143. Examples of 'Vicar and Moses' include BMC 6130 (21 Jan 1782), Thomas Rowlandson's version BMC 6721 (8 Aug 1784), BMC 3771 (c. 1790s), and the plates labelled I and II by D. Madan in the Lewis Walpole Library 08591 (c. 1790s).

[56] David Hume, *Essays, moral, political, and literary*, (Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1987), p. 199. Incidentally, the nineteenth century poet, journalist, critic, and caricature enthusiast Charles Baudelaire (1821-67) considered laughter itself to be intrinsically 'satanic', Charles Baudelaire, 'Of the Essence of Laughter', in Charles Baudelaire, *Selected Writings on Art and Literature* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 145-146.

Protestant ones: 'some Englishmen saw it in the United Provinces in the 1660s, some colonial Americans saw it in George III's rule in the 1760s.'[57]

It may seem obvious, but one reason as to why the two religions were never contrasted directly in caricature was because they were not two different religions at all, but merely separate branches of Christianity. The symbolism of Catholicism may have been far too close to the symbolism of Protestantism to be employed effectively in the medium of print satire, with its reliance on easily recognised and interpreted iconography and need for obvious dichotomies. The maintenance of the French 'Other' in terms of religion, therefore, proved difficult for English print artists, as they found themselves unable to etch an English equivalent in direct contrast to the French clergy because the faiths of the two nations were actually more similar, both intrinsically and in terms of their failings and weaknesses at the time, as well as in their iconographies, than print artists and Francophobic propagandists were willing to openly admit.

Confusion over what Protestantism actually was, or what it meant, helps to explain its absence in prints. It was never a fixed concept with a uniformly agreed definition, it splintered into numerous subsets in various different ways, and there were divisions within different denominations. One could be episcopalian, presbyterian, congregational, trinitarian, arian, socinian, predestinarian, arminian, solafidian, and so on. Some argued that the Church of England was not Protestant at all, it was claimed that the Church remained 'compromised by popish survivals' and that it 'possessed continuity with the medieval church.'[58] The similarities between the Catholic and Protestant Christian faiths, in conjunction with, paradoxically, the disparities within Protestantism itself provided the difficulties in finding universal symbols with which to represent the faith which supposedly defined the age.

---

[57] Clark, 'Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity', p. 262.
[58] *Ibid*., p. 272.

These problems might also explain why the French were defined less frequently in terms of faith, and more in terms of fashion, diet, and politics, as the eighteenth century progressed and as the Jacobite threat dwindled and memories of the attempted 1745 rising faded. John Miller stated that 'After 1746 Jacobitism largely disappeared from the prints and for thirty years anti-Popery appeared mainly in propaganda against France.'[59] What he failed to notice, however, is that religious definitions of the French also diminished in the prints, not immediately after 1746 but certainly post-Hogarth. Similarly, in Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, which puts such emphasis on the suggestion that eighteenth century Britain defined itself, and became united, by its Protestantism against the threat of Catholic France, the examples cited of British anti-Catholic sentiment in the chapter entitled 'Protestants' are largely pre-1760.[60] From around this date, Hogarth's hunks of British beef and his emaciated Frenchmen (which imply only in part an oppressive Church) were etched regularly by his successors in the art of caricature, but the vicious monks as featured in *THE GATE OF CALAIS* [Fig. 6] and in *The Invasion* (1756), and the instruments of torture, crucifixes and other objects of superstitious idolatry that the monk assembles in the latter, were not. The French Other came to be defined by the fashionable macaronis discussed in the previous chapter, characters lacking religious symbolism and accessories, and perhaps acted with such vacuous vanity exactly because they lacked the grounding, guiding hand that even a mistaken religion might provide.[61] We should remind ourselves of Gerald Newman's book for a moment here, where it is also claimed that 'The National Identity had become increasingly definite and glorious in the English mind just as the vision of the French character had become more abhorrent, for the one myth was projected against the other, the self-glorifying national abstraction against the horrid foreign counter-abstraction.'[62] As we can see, although there was a continued English obsession with France, the

---

[59] Miller, *Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832*, p. 38.
[60] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 11-54. In an earlier article Colley does admit that British anti-Catholicism's "utility and attractiveness waned" following the Seven Years War, though in *Britons* this is largely ignored in the interests of her Protestant identity thesis; Linda Colley, 'Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain 1750-1830', *Past and Present* 113 (1986), p. 108.
[61] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 21.
[62] Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, p. 124.

'abhorrence' of the Gallic stereotype ascended and descended depending on a variety of circumstances, it was not on a continuously rising axis, as Newman seems to suggest. The period which Newman believed to be so crucial was the mid-1740s to the mid-1780s, yet it was evidently in the middle and latter half of this period that the French stereotype seems to have become rather less abhorrent, sillier, and more harmless. There may have been the implication that Britain was at risk of becoming similarly weak and ridiculous, or that the upper classes already were thanks to their infatuation with French fashions and commodities. Nevertheless, the French stereotype clearly became less religiously manic, less directly political and less violent, only to get more abhorrent during the revolutionary era and to become more pitiable again under Napoleon's military dictatorship.

Returning to Colley's thesis, even when popular anti-Catholicism re-emerged, in 1778-1780 with the Catholic Relief Act and the ensuing infamous Gordon Riots, it was anti-Catholicism directed against a domestic Catholic Other, rather than that of the French. Besides, the riots were not prompted entirely by religious grievances but contained numerous social, political, and economic elements, the violence was not targeted on Catholic areas of London exclusively, and Horace Walpole was prompted to write 'The Pope need not be alarmed: the rioters thought more of plundering those of their own communion than His Holiness's flock.'[63] More recently, Clare Haynes has highlighted the continuation of anti-Catholicism and its influence on British Protestant identity after 1745, using derogatory comments selected from elite Grand Tour literature as her evidence.[64] The wealth of her material, however, comes from discussions not of France, but of Italy, which if attempting to back Colley's anti-Catholicism thesis simultaneously undermines her emphasis on the French enemy and on war. It also leads one to consider the varieties of continental Catholic Others, and leaves us

---

[63] George Rudé, 'The Gordon Riots: A study of the rioters and their victims', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, Vol. 6 (1956), 93-114, Walpole quoted on page 106.
[64] Clare Haynes, '"A Trial for the Patience of Reason"? Grand Tourists and Anti-Catholicism after 1745', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33 (2010), pp. 195-208. "Satirical prints" are also mentioned, but no examples are cited, p. 200.

wishing to know more about the variety of ways, and points at which, stereotypes of different types of Catholics developed.

At the same time, the presence of Protestant Others in eighteenth century satirical prints undermines the idea that British national identity may have been defined so stringently in opposition to that of the Catholic. For example, *The Consequences of Naturalizing Foreigners, The Dreadful Consequences of a GENERAL NATURALIZATION, to the NATIVES of Great Britain and Ireland* [BMC 3124] (April 1751), etched in response to a bill proposing the naturalisation of foreign Protestants displays a submissively seated Britannia, gazing sympathetically upon a gang of scruffy immigrants who flatter her and bear gifts while, on the right, a group of honest English citizens are forced to set sail. Satirical prints also derided Protestant Others such as the Dutch, as can be seen in Chapter Six.

The French may have been a Catholic Other, and at certain times irrefutably defined and portrayed as so, but they were also a *Christian* Other, and the similarities between the two nations' established Churches could evoke elements of familiarity and kinship as well as those of differentiation. The proximity between the two branches of Christianity and their followers can be demonstrated by the ease with which the very same symbols which had been employed in the first half of the eighteenth century to represent Catholic oppression, cruelty and irrationality, could be lifted and reemployed with fresh, positive associations. This occurred in the revolutionary age as the new threat of supposed atheism reared its blasphemous head, and it soon became the French accusing the English of irrational belief: 'Superstitiously attached to their Constitution and their Religion,' declared the Committee of Public Safety, 'they [the English] have never liked, and can never like, French principles.'[65] In James Gillray's *The Zenith of French Glory: - The Pinnacle of Liberty* [Fig. 42] [BMC 8300] (12 February, 1793) a bare-legged sans-culotte sits upon a lantern, playing a fiddle, whilst gleefully

---

[65] Quoted in Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p. 213.

observing the execution of his king. His bony foot rests upon the head of a bishop, who dangles, along with two other dead figures, monks, their hanged heads bowed in expressions of regretful, noble solemnity. The top of the bishop's crosier has been covered with a cap of 'LIBERTAS'. Next to this, an indent in the wall of the building contains a crucifix, to which has been attached a note reading 'Bon Soir Monsieur', with a skull and crossbones at its base. In the background is the smoking and flaming dome of a church, the subtitle of the piece reads 'Religion, Justice, Loyalty, & all the Bugbears of Unenlighten'd Minds, Farewell!' The same artist's *Destruction of the French Collossus* [BMC 9260] (1 November, 1798) imagines a snake-haired, skull-faced colossus, with blood-drenched hands and feet, the decapitated head of Louis XVI dangling like jewellery from its neck. The arm and shield of Britannia emerge from dark clouds above, smiting the colossus with thunderbolts as it tramples upon the 'HOLY BIBLE', a cross, and the dismantled scales of justice.

  William Dent used similar techniques in his satire of the events of 10 November, 1793, the Festival of Reason held at Notre-Dame (the Cathedral having been reinvented as a 'Temple of Reason'), during which an actress was dressed as a Goddess of Reason and led ceremonially to a throne, where she received worshippers 'with an intimate kiss.'[66] *The French Feast of Reason, Or The Cloven-foot Triumphant* [Fig. 43] [BMC 8350] (5 December, 1793) depicts the interior of the temple, desecrated by sacrilegious Jacobins who surround, worship, and kiss the hoofed foot of Liberty, a snake-haired grinning harpy seated upon 'PANDORA'S BOX'. In the left-hand foreground, one Frenchman snaps a crosier in two, while his companion does the same to a cross, simultaneously stamping on a mitre. 'CONTRAST this,' appeals the text in the top left corner, 'with HAPPY ENGLAND Where a Man may serve God without offending his neighbour and where Religion and Law secure real Peace and true Liberty'. The text on the opposite side reads 'NO RELIGION Death is only eternal Sleep'; a reference to

---

[66] Ruth Scurr, *Fatal Purity: Robespierre and the French Revolution* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2006), p. 267.

the motto 'Death is but an eternal sleep' which Joseph Fouché (1759-1820) wanted inscribed over the gates of cemeteries in the Nièvre department.[67] These types of pro-Catholic representations continued long into Napoleon's reign, and in *SPANISH-PATRIOTS attacking the FRENCH-BANDITTI. - Loyal Britons lending a lift* - [Fig. 44] [BMC 11010] (15 August, 1808) Gillray transforms Spanish nuns, monks, and bishops - Catholic leaders who had previously been symbols of greed, oppression, and inquisition - into gallant defenders of their country. They bear their crucifixes and charge forward heroically, using 'British Gunpowder', a symbol of British aid, and accompanied by a token British soldier as they battle the scrawny, panicked soldiers of Napoleonic France (though at this time no British soldier had in fact reached Spain[68]). Once confronted with a different political threat, still France, but now a republican, secular France, Christian imagery in print culture came to represent virtually the opposite of what it had traditionally denoted. French Catholicism could be viewed as a lesser of two evils, but the fact that symbols with such strong previous negative connotations in caricature could be so easily transformed into signifiers of high morality demonstrates that English satirists felt able to articulate affinity and identification with their Christian, even if Catholic neighbours, despite this having been largely suppressed by print satires in the past. It also shows the fluidity of the French stereotype, which was far from concrete in the eighteenth century; though some characteristics remained almost constant, representations were quickly adapted in reaction to events in France and the changing political climate.

   The emphasis which was put on religious desecration in prints of Revolutionary France was also inspired by religious disagreements at home, and the fact that the most enthusiastic British adherents of the revolution tended to be religious Dissenters, many of them Presbyterian. Unitarian ministers like Richard Price and Joseph Priestley and political adherents such as the Duke of Richmond and the Duke of Grafton saw the revolution as 'a Providential blow against Popery and

---

[67] Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London: Penguin, 2004), pp. 656-657.
[68] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [11010].

state religion.'[69] As the revolution grew increasingly extreme, violent, and expansionist, fear of these radicals rose correspondingly, and conservatives looked to religion to buttress the existing order, arguing that an integral feature of the existing constitution was Christianity.[70] Thus, even when Charles James Fox and his associates failed to appear in a print depicting revolutionary acts of blasphemy, their reputation was undermined by association and for their supposed support of the scenes of atheistic brutality such as those featured in *The Zenith of French Glory* [Fig 42]. Eighteenth century and early nineteenth century satirical prints on the French are often better at exposing the tensions that existed not between the two neighbouring countries, but those which existed within Britain itself. This was arguably never truer than during the revolutionary period, as will be discussed in Chapter Five. These dissenters were, however, still Protestants, even if mischievous ones. The presence of a Protestant domestic Other, illustrates further the haziness of religious identities and undetermined definitions and divisions of British Protestantism and of Christianity.

Whereas the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (12 July, 1790) had proved one of the most controversial and divisive internal issues in Revolutionary France, plunging the country into violent strife, it 'would later be regarded (by the Abbé Sieyès among others) as the [National] Assembly's first really serious mistake,'[71] Napoleon Bonaparte sought to reconcile the nation's religious differences in the interests of domestic stability. Whilst avoiding the assignment of an official religion of the state, his Concordat with Pope Pius VII of 1801 recognised that Roman Catholicism was 'the religion of the vast majority of French citizens', and the Napoleonic Code officially granted freedom of religion to all faiths in 1804.[72] Having witnessed from afar the rabid antitheism of the revolutionary governments and the preceding stringent Catholicism of the *ancien régime*, and having interpreted them largely in terms of these extremes, British observers could find

---

69 Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p. 194.
70 Miller, *Religion in the Popular Prints*, p. 46.
71 Scurr, *Fatal Purity*, p. 112.
72 Geoffrey Ellis, *Napoleon* (London: Longman, 2000), pp. 62 and 65.

themselves perplexed by Napoleon's secular, liberal religious policies, bringing as they did a new ambiguity to France's religious identity.[73] Once again, representations of the French Other had to be reassessed.

The first British caricature of Napoleon, published 12 March, 1797, while the future emperor was establishing himself as a talented military general under the government of the Directory, depicts the general seated arrogantly with folded arms, knocking off the Pope's triple-crown with his foot as the Holy Father kneels and surrenders the keys of St. Peter. The print, Isaac Cruikshank's *BUONAPARTE at ROME giving AUDIENCE in STATE* [Fig. 45] [BMC 8997], was produced in reaction to the successful Italian campaign, of which Napoleon was supreme commander in charge of 50,000 men, his success providing him with his first opportunity to oversee and dictate peace terms to a defeated enemy.[74] The scene also features a bishop kicked towards Napoleon by an ugly Jacobin soldier, with another standing behind Napoleon, urinating into a receptacle for 'HOLY WATER'. Although Napoleon's facial features are recognisable, he is portrayed, as he was in many early caricatures, as 'a stereotypically crass, uncouth and bloodthirsty Jacobin general.'[75] Despite his further achievements and subsequent variations in his representations, Napoleon never entirely shook this Jacobin association, and where religion was concerned prints often cited not only his power over the Catholic Church, but a continued revolutionary atheism. Gillray's *The ARMS of FRANCE* [BMC 10090] (6 September, 1803) places a medallion containing Napoleon's profile within an elaborate set of arms which include a guillotine at the centre. On the floor below are piles of decapitated heads, including those of a bishop and a nun. On the left an ape wearing a tricolour sash and a large bonnet rouge shaped like a fool's cap waves a tricolour flag inscribed 'ATHEISM' as he sits upon two thick books, 'ROSSEAU', 'VOLTAIRE', and a slimmer, sinister pamphlet, 'Tom Paine'. As late as 1814,

---

[73] Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (London: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 74 and 76.
[74] Ellis, *Napoleon*, pp. 27-28.
[75] Simon Burrows, 'Britain and the Black Legend: The Genesis of the Anti-Napoleonic Myth', in Philp (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon*, p. 143.

the first panel of George Cruikshank's *BUONAPARTE! AMBITION AND DEATH!!* [BMC 12171] (1 January, 1814) imagines the Emperor trampling towards a globe over a pile of bodies, from which protrude a cross, a crosier and a mitre, as he is cheered on by grotesque, grinning Jacobin soldiers who wave a tricolour flag inscribed 'Empreur Napoleon Honor'.

At the same time as being associated with the atheistic imagery inspired by the French Revolution, Napoleon became linked to that old satirical associate of *ancien régime* France: the Devil. The infernal character that appeared in earlier prints such as *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly* [Fig. 25] as partner to the pope, or in *THE DEVILS DANCE SET TO FRENCH MUSIC BY DOCTOR LUCIFER OF PARIS* [Fig. 26] wrapped in a fleur-de-lis cloak and playing the French horn in order to undermine France's religion and monarchy acquired a new partner in crime: Napoleon Bonaparte. Satan can be witnessed supporting the actions of Napoleon in the anonymous *THE CORSICAN CONJURER raising the Plagues of Europe* [BMC 10083] (c. August 1803), Thomas Rowlandson's *NAP AND HIS FRIENDS IN THEIR GLORY* [BMC 11038] (1 October, 1808) and *THE CORSICAN AND HIS BLOOD HOUNDS AT THE WINDOW OF THE THUILLERIES* [BMC 12529] (16 April, 1815), to name but three. Later, as the news broke of Napoleon's remarkable return from exile on Elba in March 1815, it was common to see his character in prints being transported back to France by the antichrist. In George Cruikshank's *Escape of Buonaparte from Elba* [BMC 12518] (March 1815) he sits on the shoulders of the devil who flies from the island towards France, clutching baskets of munitions, soldiers and revolutionary and imperial flags. In J. Lewis Marks' *The Devil to Pay or Boney's return from Hell-bay* [BMC 12516] (March 1815) Satan handles the oars of Napoleon's boat, allowing the general to stand triumphantly at the bow, shooting the dove of peace with his pistol.

Although the association of an enemy with the beast may be a common and obvious technique in any wartime propaganda, conceptions of Napoleon's ties to

Hell were made more popular by the coinciding of his rise to power with the turn of the millennium. The millennium inspired much writing on eschatology, on prophetic scripture, on the possibilities of impending rapture or apocalypse, and into these ideas were incorporated musings on the most powerful man in Europe, and the fates of Britain and France. In attempting to associate Napoleon with Biblical descriptions of the apocalypse, propagandists 'performed arithmetical exercises upon his name or personal history to reveal "the number of the beast", as described in Revelations: 666, a number that British Protestants had long associated with the Roman Catholic Church.'[76] Thus, pamphleteer Lewis Meyer calculated an arbitrary list of Roman emperors and popes, which came to the total of 665, with Bonaparte as the 666th in line. 666 was the same figure the *British Press* came up with by calculating as Roman numerals the Latin abbreviations 'DUX CL I' (which represented Bonaparte's roles as leader, consul and imperator).[77] The manipulation of the letters of Napoleon's name was also used in this way in prints, such as *THE BEAST AS DESCRIBED IN THE REVELATIONS, Chap. 13. RESEMBLING NAPOLEAN BUONAPARTE* [BMC 11004] (Thomas Rowlandson. 22 July, 1808) below the title of which numbers have been ascribed to the letters of the alphabet, those of Bonaparte's misspelled name adding up to the number of the beast. It was perhaps wise and appropriate to reassign the devil of caricature's allegiances given that Britain had become allied with and supportive of Catholic dynasts, even if it proved confusing or evocative of Britain's own reassigned allegiances given the traditional association of Satan and his three sixes with the injustices of Catholicism.

Whereas the French monarchs had danced with both Satan and the pope, however, Bonaparte danced with Satan while bullying or abusing the pope. Although these depictions emphasised Napoleon's illegitimate and military-based power, the sight of this Holy figure, who until recently had been something of a bogeyman in English print culture, being beaten or humiliated, coupled with the

---

76 Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 83.
77 *Ibid*., p. 83.

tradition of depicting most religious leaders of any denomination as greedy and corrupt, may have aroused gleeful rather than sympathetic feelings in their audiences. Similar unsympathetic emotions may have been stirred by pictures of bishops hanged, Notre Dame vandalised, and bibles and crosses trampled underfoot. We shall see further examples of the difficulties in sneering at a regime which had destroyed or superseded a regime previously sneered at.

  Other prints took an alternative route in undermining Napoleon in theistic terms, by defining him as a follower of Islam. This definition emerged as a consequence of Napoleon's arrival in Egypt in 1798, whereupon the general 'Apparently prompted by a combination of cynical calculation and Enlightenment naïveté,' had 'announced to the people of Egypt that the French, too, were Muslims. While he did not persuade the Egyptians, this act convinced many Britons of Napoleon's true foreignness (this French general of Corsican birth was apparently even more exotic than he seemed) and of his shiftiness.'[78] The proclamation, though cynical and opportunistic, had in fact referred to the French as 'muslims' with a small 'm', meaning the French believed in only one God, as deist unitarians, unlike Christians who believed in the Trinity. In Arabic the word 'muslim' could be used for anybody who had submitted to the one God, and non-Muslims are represented in the Qur'an as calling themselves 'muslim'. Napoleon's assertion was 'absurd, but not as absurd as the English rendering makes it appear.'[79]

  An early graphic response to this matter, Thomas Rowlandson's *FRATERNIZATION in GRAND CAIRO or the Mad General & his BONNY-PARTY likely to become tame Musselmen* [Fig. 46] [BMC 9253] (9 October, 1798) imagines Napoleon's plan to backfire. A Frenchman in the background is being strangled by two Turks, while in the foreground more Turks pull off the distressed Bonaparte's long coat, place a bow-string over his neck, and gesture towards the 'TEMPLE of EUNUCH'S'. Later prints show Napoleon as more

---

[78] *Ibid*., p. 20.
[79] Juan Cole, *Napoleon's Egypt: Invading the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave, 2008), p.31.

comfortable with his role as Muslim convert. The fourth panel of Gillray's *DEMOCRACY; - or - a Sketch of the Life of BONAPARTE* [Fig. 47] [BMC 9534] (12 May, 1800) is inscribed 'DEMOCRATIC RELIGION. Buonaparte turning Turk at Cairo for Interest; after swearing on the Sacrament to support ye Catholic Faith.' A Turkish priest places a turban on Napoleon's head, who is sitting cross-legged on a sofa, smoking a hookah pipe. He is surrounded by French soldiers, as well as other Turks, one of whom reads from a book, 'Alcoran'.

Napoleon continued to be associated with Islam through his mameluke bodyguard, Roustam Raza, who accompanies Napoleon in numerous prints.[80] Often he is accompanied not just by the single figure of Roustam, but surrounded by several other mamelukes as well.[81] In George Cruikshank's *The HERO'S RETURN* [Fig. 48] [BMC 12012] (22 February, 1813) a frail, bruised and bandaged Napoleon, his emaciation a sight of horror to his wife and sisters, has been escorted home from Russia, not by Frenchmen, but by a loyal gang of mamelukes, one of whom carries the Emperor on his back as two others support his injured body.

Certain progress had been made in the late seventeenth century in terms of Britain's interactions and relations with, and conceptions of, the Islamic world and its peoples. John Locke's *A Letter on Toleration* (1689) had advocated that 'Neither Pagan nor Mahometan nor Jew ought to be excluded from the civil rights of the commonwealth because of his religion', and drew comparisons between the

---

[80] *NAP REVIEWING the GRAND ARMY or the Conquest of Russia Anticipated* [BMC 12035] (April 1813), *REVIEW of the FRENCH TROOPS on their returning March through SMOLENSKO* [BMC 12051] (George Cruikshank. 27 May, 1813), *Boney receiving an account of the Battle of Vittoria – or, the little Emperor in a Great Passion* [BMC 12069] (George Cruikshank. 8 July, 1813), *PREPARING JOHN BULL for GENERAL CONGRESS* [BMC 12077] (1 August, 1813), *Comparative Anatomy or Bone-ys new Conscripts filling up the Skeletons of the Old Regiments* [BMC 12087] (George Cruikshank. 1 November, 1813), *NAP DREADING HIS DOLEFUL DOOM OR HIS GRAND ENTRY IN THE ISLE OF ELBA* [Fig. 68] [BMC 12232] (Thomas Rowlandson. 25 April, 1814).
[81] *Introduction of Citizen Volpone & his Suite, at Paris* [BMC 9892] (15 November, 1802), *BRITANNIA in tribulation for the loss of her ALLIES or IOHN BULLS advice* [BMC 10757] (August 1807), *THE PARTING OF HECTOR-NAP and Andromache or Russia threatened* [BMC 12034] (April 1813), *GASCONADING – alias – The Runaway Emperor Humbuging the Senate* [BMC 12111] (1 December, 1813).

moral ideas followed by Christians and those proclaimed in the Qur'an.[82] Trade with the Islamic world had increased, and assistance from North African Muslim countries had contributed to British successes in the Nine Years' War (1689-97) and War of Spanish Succession (1702-13), assistance which was crucial in solidifying British imperial dominance of the Mediterranean.[83] Nevertheless, the Muslim Other, in eighteenth and early nineteenth century Britain, remained for many an unfamiliar and uncivilised savage. As one publication on Islam, published in 1784, put it:

> The Arabs are now, as they were in ancient times, of two sorts; some of them inhabit towns, maintaining themselves by their flocks, agriculture, the fruit of their palm-trees, by trade or merchandise; others live in tents, removing from place to place, as they find grass and water for their cattle, feeding chiefly upon the milk and flesh of camels, a diet which is said by an Arabian physician to dispose them to fierceness and cruelty: these latter, though strictly just among themselves, often commit robberies upon merchants and travellers…[84]

It is interesting that, like the French we observed in the previous chapter, the source of the Arabs' negative qualities was attributed to their food. It is also notable that they are considered not to have changed since ancient times, they are a 'petrified' primitive. Thus, satirists had found a definition of Napoleon which avoided relating the ambiguous French leader to older images of the French, be it in associations with the Devil or the Pope or with revolutionary dechristianisation. They had also discovered an Other to connect to the emperor which was evidently more static than that of the French which under recent events had been modified accordingly and regularly.

Islam did not just tie Napoleon to this group which had been defined by its

---

[82] Nabil Matar, 'Islam in Britain, 1689-1750', *Journal of British Studies* 47 (2008), pp. 284 and 286.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 285.

[84] *The Life of Mahomet, the Imposter; with the pretended miracles said to be wrought by him and his disciples; his wonderful ascent to heaven, description of paradise, and a relation of his death* (1784), p. 3.

'fierceness and cruelty', however. The Islamic Napoleon also evoked contemporary conceptions of the prophet Mohammed. Mohammed had been a military leader who, like Napoleon in 1804, 'took it upon himself the authority of a king' and, driven by the 'governing principles of his soul…ambition and lust', asserted his power by 'attacking, murdering, enslaving, and making tributary his neighbours, in order to aggrandize and enrich himself and his followers: and without scruple making use of assassination to cut off those who opposed him.'[85] He had been described as an illegitimate impostor, similar to Napoleon's common prefix of 'usurper', and ruled over a hungry, servile population: 'A craving stomach spoke louder than religion, and the loaves and fishes wrought wonders in his favor.'[86] Like Bonaparte, Mohammed had also reached out to flirt with Christianity, with only self-interest in mind:

> The sixth [heaven visited by Mohammed] was of carbuncle, the abode of John the Baptist; and the seventh of divine light, where he found Jesus Christ. It is worthy of observation, that all whom he saw in each heaven recommended themselves to the efficacy of his prayers, but he confesses that he himself requested the prayers of Christ. I do not suppose that his humility was genuine, but that he paid him this compliment to flatter the Christians, who had always greater indulgences from him that the Jews, and whose favor and friendship he studiously courted.[87]

Eighteenth century derisive writings on the prophet, therefore, conceivably provided a precedent for how Bonaparte could be represented in print without having to recycle past stereotypes of French leaders or people. His role as a Muslim made him even more alien, even more Other, than the French citizens over whom he ruled, and thus his illegitimacy became worse still, for he was neither Catholic autocrat nor revolutionary Jacobin leader. Additionally, to portray him as a tyrannical Islamic ruler distracted from the reality of his

---

[85] *Ibid*. pp. 53 and 74.
[86] *The Life of Mahomet; or, the History of that Imposture, which was begun, carried on, and finally established by him in Arabia; and which has subjugated a larger proportion of the globe, than the Religion of Jesus has yet set at Liberty. To which is added, an account of Egypt* (1799), p. 26.
[87] *Ibid*., p. 46.

reasonably tolerant, popular and orderly religious policies.

To portray Bonaparte negatively in religious terms was not an easy task for the British, given that he had managed to largely reconcile his nation's religious differences, had reintroduced (yet imposed restrictions on) the Catholic Church, a force previously derided in British satire, and had asserted the rights of religious minorities. He could be accused of having a disingenuous relationship with religion, surreptitiously using it as an instrument of power and stability, as in the ballad-sheet *A KING or a CONSUL? A NEW SONG to the tune of Derry Down* ('No Corsican Despot in England shall rule, / No Disciple avow'd of the Musselman school; / A Papist at Rome, and at Cairo a Turk, / Now this thing, now that thing, as best helps his work'[88]), but this was hardly criminal and, moreover, it appeared to work rather well. Napoleon also exhibited a French government more religiously tolerant than England (where Catholic Emancipation would not be granted until 1829), with none of the controversies of the revolution's more destructive religious programs. These difficulties were addressed either by appropriating older images evocative of French evil, such as the devil or the more recent symbols of violent atheism, or by turning Bonaparte into an even more alien and more stagnant Other, the Muslim of the East.

There was great turbulence in religious definitions of the French in the second half of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth. English satirical prints on the subject of France maintained the anti-Catholic themes inherited from the Early Modern period, but these faded in the decades after the failure of Bonnie Prince Charlie's Jacobite rebellion and William Hogarth's patriotic artworks. They were replaced by images which focused primarily on political issues, political leaders, on war and empire, or on social and cultural topics such as fashion. The absence of archetypical Protestant symbols or characters with positive connotations which could have been used in comparison to depictions of gluttonous Catholic priests, and the fact that Protestant

---

[88] *A KING or a CONSUL? A NEW SONG to the tune of Derry Down* (1799?).

churchmen in prints on domestic religious issues tended to be etched in very similar ways, overweight and disproportionately wealthy, indicates the way in which both branches of Christianity were conceived to be tools of power, this power being easily abused by each faith's leaders. The ease with which, in response to antitheist events of the French Revolution, Catholic symbols could be reapplied as emblems of respectable morality and victims of mistreatment, despite imaginings of hanged monks and trampled bibles perhaps containing an element of awkward, sneering satisfaction, reveals that the French may have been a Catholic Other, but that they were also a Christian Other, and thus one that could, at times, be empathised and identified with. Napoleon Bonaparte's reconciliations of France's religious splits, his tolerance of both Catholicism and religious minorities, his success and popularity in doing so, and the ambiguity of his own beliefs made it difficult for English satirists wishing to attack him in theistic terms. They did this at times by allying the new ruler with the Devil, as they had the monarchs of the old regime, or by continuing to depict him as a bloodthirsty Jacobin crucifix desecrator. They also, however, drew new associations between the French leader and the world of Islam, the Muslims being an Other much more alien than the French and distinctly non-Christian, while eighteenth century British texts on Mohammed provided a comparable ambitious military leader who illegitimately ruled over his savage, gullible followers.

The Protestant versus Catholic and Britain versus France theses neglect the deeper difficulties and complexities of British popular conceptions of the French. Although these prints concentrated on visualising the conflicting natures of Britain and France, and the perceived and articulated pre-eminence of the former, they also reveal the difficulties found by satirists in searching for and manufacturing differences between these two countries which in reality were exceptionally similar to, and familiar with, one another. This is demonstrated by the way in which satirists had to continually adapt their imagery of the French Other. Anti-Catholicism faded after the '45 and Hogarth's patriotic artworks, whereas alternative positive Protestant imagery was never properly articulated.

The two nations' old religious disagreements were revealed as a shared ideology, Christianity, when faced by the new threat of revolutionary principles. Napoleon then reversed the dechristianisation of the revolutionary governments, but his regime remained more religiously tolerant than that of England, requiring the image of France to be once more reassessed. Anti-French imagery, therefore, had to be continuously adjusted and remoulded in reaction to events across the Channel. This often meant contradicting earlier representations and stereotypes, altering allegiances and sympathies (there was usually some element of French society with which to sympathise), greatly exaggerating differences between the two nations which were actually more similar than the print artists were willing to openly admit (but which is revealed in closer study of their works) and, with Napoleon, having to introduce a more alien and more static Other, the Muslim, perhaps because the stereotype of the French had become too confusingly malleable. In doing this the print artists also accordingly had to adapt conceptions of the British and their loyalties, the most obvious example was the transition from being expected to deplore Catholic wealth and greed to being expected to deplore attacks on that very same Church. This identity crisis was accompanied by other anxieties over predicaments within Britain itself, which were reflected onto portrayals of the French. These included anxieties about abuses of power, corruption, the legitimacy of religious leaders, the validity of religion itself, the insecurity and tensions caused by the actions and presence of domestic Catholics, religious dissenters and minorities, and even, during Napoleon Bonaparte's sovereignty if not at other times also, the frustrating apprehension of French superiority.

3) Napoleon

Before discussing further representations of Napoleon Bonaparte's rule, a few words on revolutionary France are required, the leaders of which are noticeable by their absence in satirical print culture. Although revolutionary generals such as Bonaparte and Charles François Dumouriez (1739-1823) appeared in imagery on

the subject of war, the political leaders of the revolution rarely feature. This may come as a surprise, given that French political power was so often embodied in English caricature through personal representations of particular leaders. One might also assume that the leaders of the revolution were particularly prone for caricature for a variety of reasons: their grasp upon strong, centralized power, power which became increasingly centred around one select group, the Committee of Public Safety, and around one infamous individual, Maximilien Robespierre (1758-1794); their programs of revolutionary war and terror; their policies or methods which were arguably at odds with the original ideals of the revolution; and, if nothing else, their bodily and facial features. As cruel as it is, one cannot help but notice that even flattering portraits of Georges Danton (1759-1794) display an individual whose appearance a caricaturist might consider a gift. Can the absence be explained by the presumption that English caricaturists were not adequately primed or up to date about with the turbulent events in France or the actions and appearances of the revolution's principle players? Evidently not; English newspapers kept people informed of domestic political events in France, and there survive a small number of prints which do experiment with personally caricaturing certain revolutionaries, demonstrating that it was a conceivable option.

Isaac Cruikshank's *The near in Blood, the nearer Bloody* [Fig. 49] [BMC 8292] (26 January, 1793) shows the duc d'Orléans bearing an axe with which to decapitate Louis XVI, whilst Robespierre, dressed as an old woman, 'Roberspierre en Poissard', kneels with a basket to catch the king's head. Though Robespierre is inscribed with his name to clarify his identity, his exaggerated facial features are clearly informed by reality. Jean-Paul Marat (1743-1793), influential journalist and member of the National Convention, if not one of the principal political leaders of the Revolution, appears in caricature too, albeit only after his martyring. In Isaac Cruikshank's *A Second Jean D'Arc or the Assassination of MARAT by Charlotte Cordé of Caen in Normandy on Sunday July 14 1793* [BMC 8335] (26 July, 1793) he lies screaming, bleeding, as his

killer Charlotte Corday (1768-1793) stands with her knife exclaiming 'Down, down, to Hell & say A Female Arm has made one bold Attempt to free her Country'. Gillray's *The heroic Charlotte la Cordé, upon her Trial, at the bar of the Revolutionary Tribunal of Paris, July 17th 1793. for having rid the world of that monster of Atheism and Murder, the Regicide Marat, whom she Stabbed in a bath, where he had retired on account of a Leprosy, with which, Heaven had begun the punishment of his Crimes. -* [BMC 8336] (29 July, 1793) shows Corday, surrounded by crowds of Jacobins, making a speech at her trial in front of three judges, the centre judge resembles Robespierre. Between Corday and the judges lies Marat's blemished, lifeless body on a small wooden bedspread, his bloody shirt raised on a pike, these details simulating elements of the separate occasion of Marat's funeral.[89] Other prints contain small, background allusions to the leaders of the revolution, such as the painting on the wall in the house of 'Citizen Coupe' which displays the tiny half-length figures of Marat and Robespierre as well as Thomas Paine.[90] In 1794 James Sayers attacked the Whig party by producing portrait prints of Fox, Sheridan (1751-1816), Lauderdale (1759-1839), Lansdowne (1737-1805) and Stanhope (1753-1816), comparing them to the prominent revolutionary figures Robespierre, Barère (1755-1841), Brissot (1754-1793), Chauvelin (1766-1832) and 'Anacharsis Cloots' (baron de Cloots, 1755-1794), respectively, as part of his series *Illustrious Heads designed for a new History of Republicanism in French and English dedicated to the Opposition*.[91] These prints however, are exceptions. As we shall see when contemplating the revolution specifically, the characters involved were more commonly portrayed as a rabble of generic sans culottes. Stella Cottrell mentions that the revolution 'threw into doubt the whole stereotype' of the French which, set against a background of royal absolutism, had been based upon their supposed 'slave-like qualities and character deficiencies which predisposed them to adore despotism and made them incapable of liberty'.[92] Yet, certainly under

---

[89] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8336].
[90] *CITIZEN COUPE TÊTE in his MISERY* [Fig. 142] [BMC 8293] (T. Ovenden. 1793).
[91] BMC 8449, 8451, 8453, 8456, 8452 (12 May, 1794).
[92] Cottrell, 'The Devil on Two Sticks', p. 265.

Robespierre's Reign of Terror, if not earlier, there is little reason why this stereotype could not necessarily continue, why the French could not have been portrayed as slaves to the dictatorial Committee of Public Safety and the threat of the guillotine. Whilst 'onto the Frenchman were projected all the forces, fantasies, contradictions and fears with which the English ruling classes, at least, were ill at ease and needed to repress'[93], with the propagandist intention of fuelling fear of British supporters of the revolution, of British reformists, and of the lower orders of society, the lack of revolutionary leaders in caricature also discloses a certain acknowledgement and acceptance of the new ideals of France. Ideals such as those written in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* in 1789; that men are 'born and remain free and equal in rights' and that 'the principle of all sovereignty rests essentially in the nation.'[94]

In Michael Duffy's view the rise of Napoleon gave English satirists a figurehead to focus on while maintaining continuity of the representations they had employed in depicting the revolutionary French[95], but this neglects the extent to which Napoleon came to eclipse the French.[96]

Thomas Rowlandson certainly recognised the change from revolutionary to Napoleonic France, in light of Napoleon's coronation as Emperor at least, having etched *THE DEATH of MADAME REPUBLIQUE* [Fig. 50] [BMC 10285] (14 December, 1804) in which 'Madame Republique' lies lifeless in bed, as John Bull quizzes the Abbé Sieyès, '…what was the cause of the poor Ladys Death? She seem'd at one time in a tolerable thriving way.' Sieyès, an important revolutionary figure but, again, one whose appearance in caricature was extremely rare, hence the need for John Bull to address him explicitly, explains that 'She

---

[93] *Ibid.*, p. 267.

[94] 'The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, 26 August 1789', 'http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/295/' (Accessed 30 August, 2010).

[95] 'The advent of Bonaparte failed to alter the general picture of the new France except to provide the desperadoes with a bandit chief, but it gave the caricaturists the chance to personalise hostility to France.' Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 38.

[96] 'Napoleon comes first to epitomize and increasingly to displace France, becoming the most consistent object of fascination, fear and fun…'Mark Philp, 'Introduction: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion, 1797-1815', in Philp (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon*, p. 8.

died in Child-bed - Mr Bull - after giving birth to this little Emperor.' He holds the baby out uneasily, it has Napoleon's mature profile, wears a crown, and waves an orb and a sceptre like rattles. The portrayal of Madame Republique is strangely peaceful and melancholic. Whether or not this displays a sympathy for the revolutionary regime which had been repressed in English political prints during the revolution's heyday, it again illustrates the tendency of English print artists to portray the contemporary regime as inferior to that directly preceding it, despite the contradictions in doing so. Although Duffy notes that during Bonaparte's reign, the First Consul and then Emperor was 'assailed by a mountain of personal vilification paralleled only by that of Louis XIV before him', it is worth thinking further about the similarities not between the revolutionary and the Napoleonic periods, but between the leaders of *ancien régime* and the new 'Chief Gaoler of the Holy Father and of the King of Spain, Destroyer of Crowns, and Manufacturer of Counts, Dukes, Princes, and Kings'.[97]

The return in caricature of a dictatorial 'tyrant' as leader of France meant that the people reverted, to an extent, to being the victims and objects of oppression. In Charles Williams' *NATIONAL OPINIONS on Bononaparte* [BMC 10980] (20 April, 1808) a collection of national stereotypes is assembled, each offering their opinion of the French ruler. The representative of the French waves his bonnet rouge whilst exclaiming 'Long live the Emperor - Vive La Liberté!!' He remains, however, heavily shackled at his arms and his feet, the ancestor of *THE GLORY OF FRANCE*'s [Fig. 5] courtier who announced 'Oh! wht. a great Monarch!' while held in chains. Whether his declaration of love for his emperor is intended to be genuine, or whether he has been forced to assert such statements by his oppressor, is unclear. Whichever the case, the dictator's presence meant that Frenchmen, after their brief run as revolutionary cannibals, could return to being the skinny slaves of yore. 'Napoleon's accession to power allowed the pre-revolutionary image of a naturally subservient French population to resurface,' explains Stuart Semmel, thus the French again could be described in terms of 'a

---

[97] *Napoleon* [BMC 12202] (c. 1814).

nation fitted only to be Slaves', as an 1803 broadside put it.[98]

   Like the oppressed and starving minions under the old French regime, however, the printed images of those ruled by Napoleon may also have evoked feelings of sympathy in British viewers. In *The COFFIN EXPEDITION or BONEY'S Invincible Armada Half Seas Over* [Fig. 51] [BMC 10222] (6 January, 1804) the British navy are at liberty to float idly by as the French succumb to the fate ascribed to them by their true enemy, their very own master. The French, some perched in their inadequate gunboats, some already overboard, screaming, drowning, have been betrayed by their leader's impractical scheme to invade Britain without control of the seas, using these small, fragile vessels. 'Oh de Corsican Bougre,' says one, 'was make dese Gun Boats on purpose for our Funeral.' Their masts are surmounted by skulls and their boats are shaped as coffins. If the date inscribed on this print is correct, it was still seven months before the embarrassing demonstration held at Boulogne on Napoleon's birthday, 15 August, during which the emperor personally distributed the Légion d'Honneur before a flotilla of gunboats rehearsed embarkation. Unfortunately, as described by Madame Junot,

> It was soon ascertained that the officer who commanded the first division of the flotilla had run foul of some works newly erected along the coast. The shock swamped some of the boats, and several of them jumped overboard. The cries of the people on the seashore, who hastened to their assistance, exited much alarm. The accident was exceedingly mortifying, happening, as it did, in the full gaze of our enemies, whose telescopes were pointed towards us, and it threw the emperor into a violent rage.[99]

If *The COFFIN EXPEDITION*'s date is accurate, then, it neatly predicts the Boulogne incident, and is more about the futility of Napoleon's plans and proposed methods to invade Britain than about actions yet taken. Nevertheless, as

---

[98] Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 47.
[99] H. F. B. Wheeler and A. M. Broadley, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England* (Stroud: Nonsuch, 2007), p. 389-391.

well as celebrating British control of the seas, it demonstrates the potential woes of subservience to the emperor and, although the drowning French are mocked by the British navy witnesses, the desperation in their faces, their contorted, writhing bodies, and the dooming skulls which surround them, maintain an air of tragedy and echo the unfair fate of the French populace who endured torture and execution under the old regime.

  Napoleon's alleged disregard for the lives of his own men had emerged, like the image of him as a Muslim, largely as a result of the Egyptian expedition and the reputed atrocities which had occurred there. The allegations were that Napoleon had ordered both the massacre of Turkish prisoners as well as the poisoning of his own plague-stricken and wounded French troops. Robert Wilson's 1802 publication *History of the British Expedition to Egypt* cited exaggerated numbers, claiming that 3800 prisoners had been killed along with 580 ailing Frenchmen, and ignored the extenuating circumstances that led to the decisions, which could have been viewed as having humane as well as merely pragmatic reasons behind them; ill French soldiers' death by poison meant eluding a painful and lingering death either from plague symptoms or at the hands of the Turks.[100] The reports solidified Napoleon's reputation as violently cold-hearted, and the events were referred to in British propaganda for the continuation of his reign. *BUONAPARTE Ordering Five Hundred & Eighty of his wounded Soldiers to be poisoned at JAFFA* [BMC 10063] (12 August, 1803), designed by Robert Ker Porter, depicts Napoleon giving instructions to a reluctant and horrified doctor who holds a bottle of opium, as sick and wounded soldiers lie in the background. George Cruikshank produced a version of the same scene, *POISONING THE SICK AT JAFFA* [BMC 12466] in 1814, featuring a doctor more sadistic in appearance, and numerous British political prints referred to the poisoning in the years in between, as did much literature.[101]

---

[100] Burrows, 'Britain and the Black Legend', pp. 144-145.
[101] 'A survey of 250 pieces of British patriotic literature from 1803 to 1815 found that 177 mentioned French atrocities, and 162 featured events in Egypt and Syria.' *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Further scenes of tragedy, if burlesqued tragedy, occurred when printmakers provided etchings of those forced to fight in the disastrous Russian campaign thanks to the emperor's conscription policies. George Cruikshank's *Boney Hatching a Bulletin or Snug Winter Quarters!!!* [Fig. 52] [BMC 11920] (December 1812) mocks Bonaparte's propagandist bulletins from Russia which contradicted the problems being reported from other sources. Bonaparte, neck deep in snow, dictates to an officer what should be included in the latest bulletin. It should say, he explains, that 'we have got into Comfortable Winter Quarters, and the Weather is very fine & will last 8 days longer', they have 'plenty of Soup Meagre', 'plenty of Minced meat', and 'grilld Bears fine Eating'. This embellishment is humorously exposed by his surroundings; his army having sunk even deeper than he into the snow, the only part of them left visible are their bonnets rouges and bayonets. One soldier, at the bottom right, has managed to peek his eyes and nose above the surface, he peers up at Napoleon quizzically, a look which powerfully undermines the emperor's claims. Another version of this scene has a much more melancholic atmosphere. *BONEY Returning from Russia Covered with GLORY - leaving his Army in COMFORTABLE Winter Quarters* [Fig. 53] [BMC 11991] (1 January, 1813) shows Napoleon departing his army in a sledge, inventing similar false reports ('…tell them we left the Army all well, quite gay in excellent Quarters, plenty of provisions - that we travelled in great style, - recieved every where with congratulations…'). The lifeless bodies of horses and soldiers lie around him, while a small number of wretched survivors feed on the carcasses of the fallen animals. There is a cruel irony here that, after decades of their stereotypes being shown as skinny and emaciated, living off soup and frogs, at a time when these Frenchmen are clearly, genuinely starving, they are given more to eat in satirical prints; bears and horses. Possibly the same artist, in an even more sober and less caricatured style, etched the soldiers, now abandoned by their emperor, in *GASCONADERS or the GRAND ARMY RETREATING from MOSCOW* [Fig. 54] [BMC 12050] (May 1813). A barefooted infantryman tugs on the reigns of his fallen horse to try to pull it to its feet. Other men, themselves visibly wounded, attempt to help their prostrate dying comrades.

In the background a small unit desperately flees from Cossacks.

Defeat in Russia lost Napoleon 570,000 men; 370,000 through death in battle, sickness or frost, and 200,000 taken prisoner. He also squandered over 200,000 trained horses and eighty per cent of his army's artillery in the venture.[102] This loss of men and resources led Napoleon to recruit inexperienced men, often very young or very old, who were given little training and supplied with inadequate equipment.[103] George Cruikshank appears to have held particular zeal for depicting the sorry state of Bonaparte's latest recruits. In one print, Marshal Joachim Murat (1767-1815) despairs at the sight of the pathetic remnants of the army, a row of nine emaciated wretches in tattered rags and scraps of uniform [Fig. 55][104]. He complains to nobody in particular, perhaps to his decrepit steed:

> If I be not ashamed of my Soldiers I'll be D__d, by Gar they are truly Miserable!
> the very scum of the Earth: the Refuse of Mankind the Sweepings of Hospitals &
> Workhouses! Dunghill Cocks, not fit to Carry guts to a Bear!! Wretches with Hearts
> in their bellies no bigger than pin's heads Slaves as ragg'ed as Lazarus - there isn't
> half an inch of Shirt amongst them all!! Zounds the Russians will think I have
> unloaded all the Gibbets, & prest the dead bodies. But - however the Crows & the
> Cossacks will soon put an end to them.

Despite the glee that might be held by patriotic British audiences in observing this print, with its sight of the reduced and impoverished enemy army, the print also evokes pity not only for the miserable, reluctant recruits but also for their dejected commander who, it is implied, deserves better, and perhaps even for France in a wider sense, whose once impressive and formidable *Grande Armée* has been reduced to a laughable shadow of its former self. This, it seems, was not through the fault of any individual present within the borders of this print. The blame rests on the invisible person of the neglectful emperor. In another print, Cruikshank morbidly dresses his fresh conscripts in the uniforms and even the skeletons of the

---

[102] D. M .G. Sutherland, *France 1789-1815: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (London: Fontana, 1985), p. 420.
[103] *Ibid*., p. 420-421.
[104] *Murat REVIEWING the GRAND ARMY!!!!!!* [Fig. 55] [BMC 12002] (January 1813).

deceased members of the French army who they have been rallied to replace.[105]
As Napoleon coldly addresses them, the members of this 'Boney-party' look
appropriately distressed. As with past portrayals of monarchical France inflicting
inquisitorial torture upon its chained populace, these prints might suggest the
superiority of the British situation and derive some voyeuristic humour from the
misery of the French. Nevertheless, the intention and the method of satirising the
leader in these terms, as a cruel, uncaring tyrant, imply that the continual suffering
of Frenchmen is objectionable. Empathy or sympathy are strong terms to use
when analysing this kind of material, but the moral message of such prints relies
on the recognition that for the French to endure such cruelty at the hands of their
government is a disagreeable notion.

One minor difference in the depictions of the French people suffering under
Napoleon and those etched during previous regimes, is that those endured under
Napoleon tend usually to appear in the theatre of war. This might be expected
under a warmongering military dictatorship, but the lack of lampoons on the
domestic situation in France suggests that British satirists had difficulty in finding
ways to criticise the internal mechanisms of the state which, with its popular if
curious mixture of liberal republicanism and authoritarianism, had pacified the
previous divisions and civil violence which had previously blighted the country.

Among the significant differences between Napoleon and the French kings
which preceded him were that Napoleon had not been born into his role, and that
he had not been born in France, two aspects of his person that satirists were
determined would not be forgotten. Napoleon's illegitimacy was evoked almost
constantly in order to undermine his authority and to reemphasise the need to
fight him. One of the most common insults directed at him was 'usurper',
'upstart' was also popular, and both were regularly prefixed by the word
'Corsican'.[106] Napoleon had decided to change his surname from 'Buonaparte' to

---

[105] *Comparative Anatomy or Bone-ys new Conscripts filling up the Skeletons of the Old Regiments* [BMC 12087] (1 November, 1813).
[106] Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p.110.

'Bonaparte' in March 1796, as he marched towards Nice to assume his Italian command,[107] distancing himself from his homeland and affirming the French aspect of his identity. As can be seen in many of the prints of Napoleon already mentioned, however, graphic satirists in England vehemently refused to adhere to the new spelling, the presence of the 'u' a constant reminder of the illegitimacy and foreignness of 'Buonaparte'. In part, this may have been to dispense further humiliation onto the French people; they were so weak, docile and prone to servitude that they would let themselves be ruled not only by an oppressive autocrat, but an oppressive autocrat who was not even French. Yet the determination to define Napoleon as *not* French also further undermines the theory that British identity was built on opposition to France and to Frenchness. Like the monarchs before the revolution, though they were French at least, antipathy is expressed not so much towards the French themselves, but towards the ruler of France, the real enemy. Although the French could at times be blamed for their own predicament, in their perceived slavishness, in their support for the regime, or in their apathy to change it, in both the pre- and post-revolutionary periods there are sustained efforts to define French rulers not by association to their subjects but by their distinction from them.

  The insistent and continuing identification of Buonaparte the Corsican is also indicative of the view of Southern and Mediterranean Europeans as inferior to the more civilised peoples of Northern Europe, including France. Alan Forrest's work has discussed the occasional affinity shared between those French and British troops who came into contact with one another during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. The French found that the British were ordinary soldiers just like themselves, with whom they could sympathise, whose wounds and sufferings they could understand, with whom they could fraternize when, for example, in the grim process of clearing bodies from the battlefield in momentary truces, 'shaking one another's hands like real friends', as one conscript put it.[108] Other Europeans,

---

107 Ellis, *Napoleon*, p. 29.
108 Alan Forrest, *Napoleon's Men: The Soldiers of the Revolution and Empire* (London: Hambledon and London, 2002), p. 122.

however, did not receive nor bestow similar respect. French soldiers considered the Italians to be untrustworthy villains, and found the Spanish even worse:

> Spain was widely believed to be a savage and inhospitable country where French soldiers were left to die by callous villagers set on vengeance, where local people refused to sell them foodstuffs, and where they were virtually prisoners in their own camps because of the activities of local 'brigands'. Even in hospital beds they were not safe, since in Spain public morals were such that no form of brutality or deception could be ruled out…[109]

It might be expected that this kind of view was taken towards a difficult, guerrilla warfare-employing enemy, but it was one which was shared also by Spain's allies, the British. The British saw the Spanish as 'treacherous, vain, and feckless', they were unwilling to contribute to their own liberation, denying the British the aid and supplies they felt they were owed. Both British and French in the Peninsular War considered themselves, and indeed each other, as culturally and politically superior to the Spanish, and both British Protestants and French anti-clericals looked down on Spanish Catholicism. 'Both treated the civilian population as fair game, and each other with relative respect, even with a friendliness that infuriated their respective Iberian allies,' explain Robert and Isabelle Tombs. 'One Ensign Wheatley put it bluntly: "I hate a Spaniard more than a Frenchman."'[110] While much of this refers to guerrilla warfare and the events of the Peninsular War, in the lack of respect the Spanish displayed towards the established 'gentlemanly' rules of warfare, these issues are symptomatic of the more general feelings of superiority that North-Western Europeans shared towards their Southern and Mediterranean neighbours. Napoleon's Corsican identity, therefore, was not just a method of ascribing him illegitimacy. It was also a way of associating him with a less civilised, and more alien, category of European Other than that of the familiar and relatively sophisticated French.

---

[109] *Ibid.*, pp. 123-124.
[110] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p. 280.

The question of Napoleon's legitimacy, however, also brought to mind certain events in British history and the undeniable fact that 'the British crown had not exactly passed from head to head in an orderly fashion.'[111] There were echoes of Oliver Cromwell, the popular military leader who had overthrown Charles I and established himself as 'Lord Protector'. There was the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 which had ousted James II and replaced him with his daughter, Mary (who was not next in line to the crown) and her husband William. There was the Act of Settlement of 1701 which prohibited the throne to Catholics, and ensured the accession of George I, the Elector of Hanover. As we have already seen, the rule of the uncharismatic Germans informed xenophobic print satires earlier in the century, and the insistence that Napoleon was a foreign despot governing a country which was not his place of birth contained a similar subtext of discomfort with Britain's own political situation. France's ceding of Hanover to Prussia was portrayed in *THE EVACUATION of HANOVER or the Prussian Eagle at Feed* [Fig. 56] [BMC 10568] (May 1806), a crude scene in which Napoleon bends down to 'evacuate' Hanover, a pile of steaming excrement which is gobbled up by the Prussian eagle to the disgust of John Bull. Disparaging as it is towards both France and Prussia, the item used to symbolise it indicates that Hanover was still not held in particularly high regard. Radicals in England could use the parallels between the British crown and the French imperial one either to undermine George III's legitimacy or to defend Napoleon's, whereas loyalists had to tread carefully when lambasting Napoleon's claims to sovereignty so as not to undermine the British king by association. In 1804 a masquerade coronation held in Soho parodying Napoleon's promotion from First Consul to Emperor of the French led William Cobbett to deliberate whether it was possible to lampoon Napoleon's authority without also implicating George III's.[112]

At the same time, there were also exciting, romantic, and admirable elements in the alluring story of a man who had emerged from relatively humble beginnings

---

[111] Stuart Semmel, 'British Uses for Napoleon', *MLN* 120 (2005), p. 741.
[112] Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, pp. 118, 120 and 146.

to become the Emperor of the French, and the dominant personality in the whole of Europe, and these were acknowledged in print culture, even in caricatures with the principal intention of deriding the French tyrant. Many prints, or series of prints, chose to depict this story, using proto-comic strips with several panels, each displaying a different significant stage of Bonaparte's life, creating an accessible and entertaining history of the man, if one that defamed his character. In May 1800, only six months after Napoleon's coup d'état of 18 Brumaire (9 November), James Gillray's *DEMOCRACY; - or - a Sketch of the Life of BONAPARTE* [Fig. 57] [BMC 5934] (12 May, 1800) illustrated, in eight panels on one printed sheet, significant stages in the general's life, from his childhood in Corsica, through his attendance at military school, his service under the revolutionary government both on 13 Vendémiaire and in Egypt (where he is shown embracing Islam), his abandonment of Egypt to return to France, his overthrow of the Directory, to his establishment as First Consul. The final panel is more speculative, a spoof of Henry Fuseli's *The Nightmare* in which Bonaparte is haunted by ghosts of the murdered, the head of his bed shaped as a guillotine. Over the next few years Thomas Rowlandson, William Heath, and George Cruikshank produced similar pieces of work which charted the progress of Bonaparte's life and career.[113] Cruikshank also produced highly detailed single-page illustrations to *The Life of NAPOLEON, a Hudibrastic Poem in Fifteen Cantos, by DOCTOR SYNTAX, embellished with Thirty Engravings, by G. Cruikshank*, published by Thomas Tegg in 1815. There was no other figure depicted in the print culture of the age who excited this much interest and who was portrayed so commonly in this manner. Most caricature victims appeared in single-sheet prints focusing on recent criticism, rather than featuring in attempts to chart a stage-by-stage summary of how the individual had got to his or her present position or situation. There was a remarkable interest in Napoleon's life and background. It was a good story after all, and it was one which fascinated the

---

[113] *THE PROGRESS OF THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON* [BMC 11053] (Thomas Rowlandson. 19 November, 1808), *THE GRAND EMPEROR'S Grand Campaign Dedicated to the Russian Cossacks* [BMC 12036] (William Heath. 18 April, 1813), *BUONAPARTE! AMBITION AND DEATH!!* [BMC 12171] (George Cruikshank. 1 January, 1814).

public. Napoleon's presence as this proto-comic strip hero, or anti-hero, thus betrays the awe felt towards the undeniably talented general who had achieved his position through personal merit rather than through effortless inheritance.

Along with 'usurper' and 'Corsican', another word which often crops up in association with Bonaparte is his 'ambition'. In *Napoleon, the Corsican Phoenix* [BMC 12535] (1815?) 'His Coat is embroidered with a Chain, representing that chain of incidents of Tyranny and Slavery, which many nations have experienced and groaned under, by his boundless Ambition.' Elsewhere, he is a fat spider devouring two 'Spanish Flies' before moving on to the other various flies of Europe caught up in his web; his abdomen is inscribed 'UNBOUNDED AMBITION'.[114] A less sinister, more ridiculous use of Bonaparte's 'ambition' is displayed in *LUNAR SPECULATIONS* [Fig. 58] [BMC 9988] (3 May, 1803) in which Napoleon peers through a telescope and ponders aloud the possibility of invading the moon, 'I wonder the Idea never struck me before, - the place would easily be taken, and has undoubtedly great capabilities - besides they would make me Emperor, and then the sound of the Title, Emperor of the Full Moon - oh delight-full - I'll send for Garner[115] and his Balloons, and set about the scheme immediately.' The accompanying John Bull laughs at the absurdity of the idea, explaining to Napoleon that he has about as much chance of achieving this ambition as he has of fulfilling his desire of 'paying a visit to my little island'. Bonaparte's ambition, his arrogance, and his achievements were, nonetheless, impressive, and without the acknowledgement of these this design would make little sense. It is only through achieving in the first place that one can go too far. It is also possible that, as potential emperor of the moon, Napoleon is here destined to become a modern, or an inverse, successor to Louis XIV, the 'Sun King'.

Despite his illegitimacy, there were implications that Bonaparte was better, or at least worthy of greater degree of begrudging admiration, than the old Bourbon

---

[114] *THE CORSICAN SPIDER IN HIS WEB!* [BMC 10999] (Thomas Rowlandson. 12 July, 1808).
[115] French balloonist and parachutist André-Jacques Garnerin (1769-1823).

monarchy of France which the English had found themselves fighting to restore. Were merit and ambition such terrible personality traits for a leader to possess, when hereditary succession had, in the words of Thomas Paine, so frequently provided 'an ass for a lion'?[116] In some respects Bonaparte commanded more veneration in caricature than George III. The Corsican appears, more often than not, disarmingly handsome, similar to official portraiture, with 'his high cheekbones, his finely chiselled Roman nose, his hair fashionably cut *à la Titus*, his altogether classical profile.'[117] In terms of his looks at least, Napoleon was treated more generously than either the bumpkin volunteer Englishmen, or his bumbling Hanoverian ruler George III. He may not have been monarch by blood, but his image tends to have more dignity, more gravitas, more intelligence than George's, even when being lampooned.

Gillray may have created a lasting, humiliating image of Napoleon as 'little Boney' in *The KING of BROBDINGNAG, and GULLIVER* [Fig. 59] [BMC 10019] (26 June, 1803), and provided a role for George in contrast to the tiny upstart, but even this famous portrayal had its problems. Napoleon is not, as is sometimes mistaken, 'a Lilliputian character'[118], the Lilliputians being Swift's petty and quarrelsome race of tiny people. Gillray had, as he makes clear in the title of his print, imagined Napoleon as Gulliver, thus casting him as the hero of Jonathan Swift's novel. Gulliver may not have been a typical, traditional hero, but the reader was encouraged to root for him, and he went on to have several further adventures in various other imaginative lands. The King of Brobdingnag, George III's role, was more of a cameo, a fleeting appearance, at times gross, at times grand, in one section of the larger story.[119] Additionally, to depict Napoleon as a minute, yapping pest undermined the threat that he posed, that which was emphasised in other prints, as well as all the effort, money, and lives which Britain had expended in trying to defeat him. If he was so tiny and insignificant

---

[116] Paine, *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings*, p. 15.
[117] Colley, *Britons*, p. 283.
[118] Mark Bryant, *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons* (London: Grub Street, 2009), p. 9.
[119] Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (London: Penguin, 2003).

then why had the giant King of Brobdingnag not already squashed him? In Gillray's etching, the dopey George inspects 'Gulliver' through a spy-glass, more a curious and apathetic observer than a patriot defender of his lands. The distracted nature of the King's mind was confirmed by his own reaction to this particular print, as recorded by Lord Holland, which took issue with the inaccuracy of his caricature's dress: 'quite wrong quite wrong no bag with uniform', he complained.[120] Napoleon's small stature makes him the underdog in this piece, as it does in the imitations of this scene that were subsequently created by other print artists as well as by Gillray himself. Gillray's own sequel, *The KING of BROBDINGNAG and GULLIVER. (Plate 2d.)* [Fig. 60] [BMC 10227] (10 February, 1804), sees the king, queen, princesses, and others of their circle, amusing themselves by observing Napoleon's attempts to sail his tiny boat within a trough, as in Swift's original.[121] The viewer's eyes, implored by the gazes of the larger characters in the print, are drawn towards Napoleon, surrounded by the ogling giants, making it easy to feel empathy for the little Gulliver and his valiant efforts in the face of adversity.

In a similar print, *The LITTLE PRINCESS and GULLIVER* [Fig. 61] [BMC 10112] (21 October, 1803), Napoleon is in greater trouble, splashing helplessly in a bowl, essentially drowning. He is watched and mocked by Princess Charlotte, 'There you impertinent boasting swaggering Pigmy, - take that, - you attempt to take my Grandpap's Crown indeed, and plunder all his Subjects, I'll let you know that the Spirit and Indignation of every Girl in the Kingdom is roused at your insolence'. Charlotte's appearance is more mature than her actual age; she would only have been seven at the time of publication. She is perhaps an amalgamation of the Princess and her mother, or an embodiment of 'every Girl in the Kingdom' of which she speaks. Yet, for those familiar with Swift's work, this personification of national womanhood brings to mind Gulliver's disgust at observing the females of Brobdingnag and his realisation that their qualities are

---

[120]   Quoted in George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [10119].
[121]   Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, p.112.

shared with those of his homeland:

> The Mother out of pure Indulgence took me up, and put me towards the Child, who presently seized me in the Middle, and got my Head in his Mouth, where I roared so loud that the Urchin was frighted, and let me drop, and I should infallibly have broke my Neck if the Mother had not held her Apron under me. The Nurse to quiet her Babe made use of a Rattle, which was a kind of hollow Vessel filled with great Stones, and fastened by a Cable to the Child's Waist: But all in vain, so that she was forced to apply the last Remedy by giving it suck. I must confess no Object ever disgusted me so much as the sight of her monstrous Breast, which I cannot tell what to compare with, so as to give the curious Reader an Idea of its Bulk, Shape and Colour. It stood prominent six Foot, and could not be less than sixteen in Circumference. The Nipple was about half the Bigness of my Head, and the Hue both of that and the Dug so varified with Spots, Pimples and Freckles, that nothing could appear more nauseous… This made me reflect upon the Fair Skins of our *English* Ladies, who appear so beautiful to us, only because they are of our own size, and their Defects not to be seen but through a Magnifying Glass, where we find by Experiment that the smoothest and whitest Skins look rough and coarse, and ill coloured.[122]

More work needs to be done on the relationship between literary and graphic satire, they are too often treated as separate worlds and studied in different disciplines, but it is likely that literary-minded observers of prints would have understood and appreciated the influence of Swift's inventively created lands, characters, and words, as well as multilayered, cynical satiric intentions and techniques. John Gay wrote of *Gulliver's Travels* in 1726, 'From the highest to the lowest, it is universally read, from the Cabinet-council to the Nursery.'[123] The book has never gone out of print.

There were different stages to Napoleon's accession and permanence as leader of France, as First Consul in 1799, First Consul for Life in 1802, Emperor of the

---

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 87.
[123] Quoted in Christopher Fox, 'Introduction: Biographical and Historical Contexts' in Christopher Fox (ed.), *Gulliver's Travels by Jonathan Swift* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1995), p. 21.

French in 1804, a title he shared with that of King of Italy from 1805. In 1810 he wedded Marie Louise, daughter of Francis of Austria, thus positioning himself further in alignment with the traditional ruling elites of Europe. In 1811 Marie Louise bore him a son, the legitimate heir to his throne. The interest in this latter stage of Napoleonic permanence was illustrated in a number of caricatures of that same year, and thereafter Napoleon's son made regular appearances as a little sidekick to the Emperor. The heir is a repulsive, disruptive brat, usually with the body of a child and the head or facial features of his father.[124] Although he remained 'Buonaparte the Usurper', each stage further stressed his role as a threat, yet at the same time drew him closer in identity to other rulers of Europe, and with this there was revealed a degree of envious acceptance of Napoleon's role in both France and in Europe. Much like the portrayal of George III in the aforementioned *Picture of Europe for July 1772* [Fig. 30], in *POLITICAL QUADRILLE* [Fig. 62] [BMC 10602] (October 1806) Napoleon's appearance is remarkably similar to the other rulers of Europe with whom he plays cards. Though slightly smaller in stature, he wears the same uniform as the other card players, in an understated scene which recalls much older satires which featured the various dynasts of Europe bickering over certain territories, such as *The C_rd_n_ls MASTER-PIECE, or EUROPE in a FLURRY* [BMC 2503] (1741) produced during the War of Austrian Succession. In *POLITICAL QUADRILLE* Napoleon seems to have slotted comfortably into the role of a grand European ruler and into the pattern of traditional European history; the upstart usurper persona is not accentuated here. At times, then, the gravitas of European Emperor that Napoleon had been so determined to create for himself was recognised by British observers. At the same time, this print could even be interpreted as representative of a certain disillusionment with Bonaparte, at first he seemed different, exciting, exotic, and new (if somewhat unpredictable and dangerous), but he has become just like the others. Perhaps his power and his eagerness to establish an Empire modelled on aspects of the *ancien régime* had corrupted him,

---

[124] For example in Thomas Rowlandson's *BONEY THE SECOND OR THE LITTLE BABBOON CREATED TO DEVOUR FRENCH MONKIES* [BMC 11719] (9 April, 1811).

and he was shedding the aspects of his character that had made him unique. He did not maintain this image, however. In the sequel print, *POLITICAL QUADRILLE - the GAME UP* [Fig. 63] [BMC 11015] (August 1808), produced two years later, which envisages the difficulties which the Spanish rebellion would cause him, the civil game of cards climaxes in a brawl, Napoleon has regressed to an individual once more. His uniform and bicorne are uniquely his own, there is no mistaking him here for one of the figureheads of the older leading families of Europe.

Evidently, Napoleon's image sold extremely well. Around the time of his ascension from First Consul to Emperor, Napoleon came to dominate British caricatures, broadsides and songs:

> …selling the bogeyman Napoleon was good business for many printers, print sellers
> and publishers, and they produced attractive commodities - good to look at,
> reassuringly cutting the tyrant down to size (once Gillray had successfully portrayed
> him as 'little Boney') and emphasizing the redoubtable qualities of the English
> yeomanry who would form the backbone to resistance.[125]

And a bogeyman he was, even if this did contradict somewhat the impish 'little Boney' character, as in the following nursery rhyme which 'short-tempered nursemaids nearly scared fractious children out of their wits by continually dinning into their ears':

> Baby, baby, naughty baby,
> Hush, you squalling thing, I say;
> Hush your squalling, or it may be
> Bonaparte may pass this way.
>
> Baby, baby, he's a giant,
> Tall and black as Rouen steeple;
> And he dines and sups, rely on't,

---

[125] Philp, 'Introduction', p. 8.

Every day on naughty people.

Baby, baby, he will hear you

As he passes by the house,

And he, limb from limb, will tear you

Just as pussy tears a mouse.[126]

Bonaparte was more than a straightforward bogeyman. Uncomfortable feelings of admiration or sympathy towards him were only hinted at when British people were losing their lives in battling his armies in Europe. These sentiments were permitted to be more openly expressed in the aftermath of his defeat, once the threat that he posed to Britain had subsided, and once Britain's traditional enemy, the Bourbon monarchy, had been restored to the French throne.

Prints made on the subject of Napoleon's defeat in 1814, and his subsequent banishment to the Island of Elba, despite celebrating the victory triumphantly also contain a strangely melancholic, bittersweet air. Some prints imagined the journey of the fallen emperor to his new homeland. *A GRAND Manoeuvre! or, The Rogues march to the Island of Elba* [Fig. 64] [BMC 12221] (George Cruikshank. 13 April, 1814), for instance, shows a ragged and weeping Bonaparte being pushed and dragged towards the seashore where a boat manned by a demon, like the Charon of Greek mythology, waits to transport him to the underworld that is Elba. This print, however, seems less concerned with mocking the fate of Napoleon than with highlighting supposed French fickleness. The most prominent French figure is Talleyrand (1754-1838), the wily bishop and statesman who managed to serve and survive under Louis XVI, the National Assembly, the Directory, Napoleon I, Louis XVIII, Charles X, and Louis-Philippe.[127] He prods his old ruler with a broom labelled 'Allied Broom', laughing and pointing. He is followed by a procession of French people, some Jacobins wearing bonnets

---

[126] Wheeler and Broadley, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England*, pp. 282-283.

[127] 'Talleyrand or Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de', *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, Columbia University Press, 2008, 'http://www.credoreference.com/entry/columency/talleyrand_or_talleyrand_p%C3%A9rigord_charles_maurice_de', (7 September, 2010).

rouges, who jostle forward, flinging missiles at Napoleon, shouting such phrases as 'Vive Louis', and waving a tricolour flag onto which has been inscribed 'Vivent les Bourbons'. This representation was not exactly inaccurate; on his escorted journey from France the once-popular figure was greeted with hostility by the public, particularly in Provence where angry mobs cried 'Death to the Tyrant!', threatened to attack him, and hung him in effigy,[128] although elsewhere there were instances of pro-Bonapartist demonstrations.[129] Even so, while attempting to reveal the fickleness of the French people, and the treacherous opportunism of Talleyrand, prints such as this one also disclose the inconsistencies in British attitudes towards the French and their leaders when viewed in the wider context of graphic satire. The French, recently portrayed as expendable pawns in Napoleon's unrestrained imperial ambitions, are now, suddenly, actively harassing their fallen emperor, and in doing so seem to have regressed to the revolutionary stereotype, while at the same time celebrating the monarchy once more. Meanwhile, if there is a character here necessitating compassion, it is Napoleon; the man who until recently Cruikshank, among others, had been depicting as a bloody, satanic tyrant. At the same time, a revived demonising of the Bourbon monarchy has started to emerge, and which will become more outspoken in subsequent examples, the monarchy having been given the opportunity of restoration thanks to British support. The French may well have been fickle, but what did this make the British?

Satires which were set on the island itself seem to have emphasised the tragedy of Napoleon's downfall and the ex-Emperor of the French's humanity even further. In such prints, he is depicted in one of two ways. Firstly, a solitary figure, left alone on his island or rock, sentenced to endlessly reflect on his failures. One of the most famous of these images is *THE SORROWS OF BONEY, or Meditations in the Island of ELBA!!!* [Fig. 65] [BMC 12223] (15 April, 1814), showing Napoleon, sitting on a rock marked 'ELBA', staring lugubriously at the

---

[128] Bryant, *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons*, p. 134.
[129] Sutherland, *France 1789-1815*, p. 429.

'CONTINENT OF EUROPE' in the distance, head in his hands, weeping, as three birds of prey and three bats circle above him. In his *Champion: A London Weekly Journal* John Scott's account of observing a caricature of Bonaparte 'seated on a lump of rock smaller than himself, in the midst of the sea, apparently in most melancholic mood' illustrates that such images could evoke the pity of contemporaries. Scott wrote that the 'great disproportion between the size of the place and of its inhabitant' meant the print had 'a very touching character.'[130] The 'tragic meditation', as Dorothy George described *THE SORROWS OF BONEY*[131], was actually an appropriation of a much earlier print. The image had been lifted from *CROCODILE'S TEARS: OR, BONAPARTE'S LAMENTATION. A NEW SONG.* [Fig. 66] [BMC 10119], the verses dropped, and the inscriptions added. The original image was printed circa 1803, the heading to a song sheet mocking Napoleon's inability to invade the British Isles, the rock on which he sat was part of the French coast, whereas on the horizon was Britain. The appearance of this melancholic depiction in 1803, alongside the ambiguous Gulliver prints, suggests there may have been empathy for the French leader much earlier than might be expected. It could be presumed that admiration or empathy for Napoleon might emerge, or be permitted to be openly expressed, once the return of the Bourbons was enacted or envisaged and once Napoleon himself was no longer a threat, but as we can see here these feelings were present beforehand.

The second category of Elba-based satires involves the once supreme general reduced to commanding the cretinous populace of his new home, or insanely crafting new armies from any available inanimate objects. Of the latter, *BONEY at ELBA or a Madman's Amusement* [Fig. 67] [BMC 12229] (20 April, 1814) imagines that Napoleon has constructed straw effigies of his enemies, Alexander I, Frederick William III, Francis I, and Marshal Bernadotte. Wearing a daft crown made of straw, and waving a straw sceptre, he attempts to fire a straw cannon at the figures, simply setting the cannon itself alight. This futile, desperate and

---

[130] Quoted in Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 157.
[131] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [10119].

insane attempt to relive his glory days and prove his supremacy is cruelly amusing. But there is also a poignancy in seeing the man of such renowned mighty ambitions who, as we know from previous caricatures, had worked his way up from relatively humble origins to become the most powerful individual in Europe, reduced to playing games of toy soldiers with straw, a seemingly sad end to a story which was thought to be over.

J. Lewis Marks, meanwhile, imagined Napoleon as burlesqued 'Emperor', the title which he retained under the Treaty of Fontainebleau[132], trying to organise, discipline and command the hapless peasants of his new domain.[133] He wears a chamber-pot as a crown, a broom instead of a sword, as he stands outside his wooden shack attempting to stimulate the docile islanders. 'Gentleman my friends,' he says, 'despise & d__n England Russia Prussia germany & Sweden & obey me & I will make kings of you all.' His chances seem unlikely, however, given the blank stares and broken, improvised weapons wielded by his recruits. One moronically bangs a saucepan with a bone and a spoon whilst wearing a spurred boot instead of a hat. Thomas Rowlandson's *NAP DREADING HIS DOLEFUL DOOM OR HIS GRAND ENTRY IN THE ISLE OF ELBA* [Fig. 68] [BMC 12232] (25 April, 1814) depicts an even more grotesque rabble of indigenous peasants lining up to greet Napoleon on his arrival. In the absence of Maria Louisa, who neglected to join Napoleon in Elba[134], a gross, bloated crone puts her hand on his shoulder and offers, 'Come cheer up my little Nicky I'll be your Empress.' The Emperor, dejected and depressed, mutters 'Ah Woe is me seeing what I have and seeing what I see', paraphrasing *Hamlet* [Act III, Scene I]. Whilst the French had been portrayed as similarly grotesque ruffians under Napoleon's regime, this scene infers, in retrospect, that to rule over France, and the French, is admirable, and something to be proud of, at least in comparison to this tiny, insignificant island in the Mediterranean. Certain prints, therefore, as well as revealing a certain degree of respect or admiration for Bonaparte, do the

---

[132] *Ibid.*, [12286].
[133] *BONEY and his new Subjects at Elba* [BMC 12286] (J. Lewis Marks. c. June 1814).
[134] Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 149.

same for the nation and the people he had ruled over.

  Obviously, prints such as these would not have aroused sympathy from all who viewed them. There were many who thought that Napoleon had been handled too generously in the event of his defeat. Dorothy Wordsworth wrote of how Bonaparte should have fought to the death, and in failing that should have been imprisoned, whereas Walter Savage Landor recommended execution or life imprisonment (though Wordsworth wrote this privately and Landor's pamphlet was pseudonymous).[135] That these prints evoke a mixture of mirth and pity is not, however, merely a modern or post-modern interpretation in the eyes of those detached by the years, decades and generations from a long and bloody war, as clarified by the above testament of John Scott.

  As might be predicted given the assortment of strong opinions and feelings that he aroused and the popularity of his image in caricature, Napoleon's remarkable return from Elba in March 1815, and his hundred day rule prior to defeat at Waterloo, excited a number of prints noticeable for their electricity. A prolific etcher of such images was George Cruikshank. As well as being transported to the French coast by the devil, elsewhere Napoleon rises from the flames as a phoenix, unceremoniously booting Louis XVIII from his throne, and on more than one occasion he bursts through a door or window to disturb the burlesqued rulers of Europe as they divide territory without him.[136] In the latter three examples, there is a real sense of excitement and elation in the re-emergence of the character of Bonaparte. Part of this excitement may be attributed to the caricaturist's self-interest, a relief at the return of the character whose image sold so consistently well on the print market. Nevertheless, Napoleon flickers between the role of hero and villain in these pieces. The disturbance of the European monarchs, whose

---

[135] *Ibid*., pp. 149-151.
[136] *Escape of Buonaparte from Elba* [Fig. 69] [BMC 12518] (March 1815), *The PHENIX of ELBA resuscitated by TREASON* [BMC 12537] (1 May, 1815), *JOHN BULL IN ALARM; OR, Boney's Escape, AND A SECOND DELIVERENCE OF EUROPE. A NEW SONG TO AN OLD TUNE* [BMC 12534] (April? 1815), *Boneys Return from Elba - or the Devil among the Tailors -* [BMC 12509] (21 March, 1815), *The Congress disolved before the Cake was cut up* [BMC 12525] (6 April, 1815).

self-satisfied laurel-resting has been interrupted to their shocked and horrified amazement by their enemy's return, has been etched with an infectiously mischievous glee. Even in the prints which use Cruikshank's caricatures as accompaniments to anti-Napoleon verses, the artist has made sure to include references to the fallibility of the restored Louis XVIII and of those involved in the Congress of Vienna, as well as to the continuing popularity of Bonaparte in the eyes of the French. In *JOHN BULL IN ALARM…* the verses describe Bonaparte as a satanic 'thief' who needs to be caught and skinned like an eel, yet Cruikshank's picture shows the fat Louis XVIII, grasping a pouch of 'Jewels, Precious Stones, &c &c', kicked by Napoleon from his throne towards representatives of 'England', 'Russia', and 'Prussia'. On the left, celebrating Frenchmen cheer on their hero, 'vive l'Empreur, vive l'Empreur', whereas on the right, John Bull consoles the Bourbon, 'Cheer up old Lewis for as fast as he kicks you down we'll pop you up again.' Given the unflattering caricature of Louis XVIII, this statement reads more ominous than triumphant. The verses of *Escape of Buonaparte from Elba* [Fig. 69], meanwhile, describe Bonaparte as a cowardly, hypocritical, war-mongering villain. Cruikshank's picture has the exile transported on the back of the devil. The land he flies towards contains celebrating French masses shouting 'Come along! my boy'. One of them, admittedly, has a skull for a face, yet the 'Congress' above is depicted as a group of complacent monarchs, asleep at their table, while the ever-duplicitous Talleyrand hands a note to a French courier, 'Take this to Buonaparte'. Back in Elba, in the distance on the right, an empty gibbet stands near three small figures who register their astonishment at the absence of their intended victim. This image brings to mind accounts of early nineteenth century criminals who, usually through the failure of the hangman or his equipment, managed to momentarily escape their execution, and in doing so won over the support of the assembled crowd, despite his or her crime. 'Shame! Let him go!' cried the crowd at Carmarthen in 1829 when David Evans had to be hanged a second time after appealing for his liberty when the first attempt faltered. When Robert Johnston's hanging at Edinburgh in 1818 malfunctioned, amendments were disturbed by the

crowd showering police and magistrates with stones, cutting Johnston down, some carrying him away whilst others destroyed his coffin and attacked the executioner, when soldiers took control and he was hanged again, 'Dreadful cries were now heard from every quarter.'[137] This was, even at basest level, an age of shifting sympathies, adjustable convictions, and undetermined loyalties, and this often comes across in satirical prints on France and the French, and the escape of Bonaparte from Elba added yet another barely believable legend-like element to his remarkable story.

It is possible there was an element of subversiveness in the way these depictions showed the French imploring and cheering their leader's return, rather than showing them as the submissive victims of the tyrant's will as they had been in the past. This was because Bonaparte's popularity was a significant factor for those wishing to make claims of his supposed legitimacy, and also because his reappearance again drew comparisons with English history and domestic issues of sovereignty:

> [The Glorious Revolution and the Hanoverian Succession] showed that the current British monarch owed his throne to parliamentary legislation - which by extrapolation, in radical accounts, amounted to the popular election of a monarch. Moreover, the Hanoverian dynasty owed its existence to an extra-legal landing of troops in Britain that was comparable to Napoleon's recent surprise landing. In the light of 1688 and 1714, these radicals argued, Britain's Prince Regent could hardly fight for the cause of hereditary 'legitimacy.' By joining a renewed crusade against Napoleon - by defending an unpopular hereditary monarch against a popular ruler - the Regent would chip away at the very principle that had installed his own family on Britain's throne.[138]

The keenness to etch so many images on the subject of Bonaparte's return, and doing it in a way which undermined the restored French monarch, the other European monarchs, and the Hanoverian reign at home, may have been the result

---

[137] Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree*, p. 50.
[138] Semmel, 'British Uses for Napoleon', p. 742.

of George Cruikshank's personal radical sympathies. He worked for, and was good friends with, the radical writer, satirist and publisher William Hone (1780-1842), who wholeheartedly supported Bonaparte's restoration as a popular dynast.[139] Cruikshank's income was reliant on public tastes, however, and other images from the time by different print artists seem to follow similar themes, methods of composition, and sentiments, indicating that Cruikshank's perception of events was perhaps not unusual.

Caricatures of Napoleon Bonaparte demonstrate further the continuous adaptation of the British image of France and the French. There were some continuities with earlier representations and themes, particularly with those of the *ancien régime*, such as dissatisfaction with a strong, oppressive, military ruler, the bad practice of power, a single figurehead to focus on and to demonise, and further uncomfortable parallels to British history and the contemporary Hanoverian dynasty which could be criticised both by its vague similarities to Napoleonic rule as well as by association with the traditional European monarchies who connived to defeat him. The return of a non-revolutionary authoritarian autocracy meant that the stereotype of the French in some ways regressed from that of active Jacobins back to oppressed, slavish creatures, and although echoes of the revolutionary image were still sometimes present, there could once more be portrayals which might evoke sympathy for the wretched foreigners. Yet some aspects of Napoleon's character were also very different. He was not French and he was 'illegitimate', though these points again could be used to implicate Hanover and to diminish blame from those over whom he ruled. He was also a hated figurehead who could at the same time evoke sympathy himself as well as begrudging admiration in the eyes of the British. This became clear after his downfall, and in light of the Bourbon restoration, but these sentiments were also present in earlier portrayals.

---

[139] Wilson, *The Laughter of Triumph*, pp. 132 and 145.

4) <u>Restoration</u>

If there were mixed feelings towards the restored Bourbon monarchy accompanied by a sense of sympathy and admiration for Napoleon in prints beforehand, those produced after the 'Hundred Days' of 1815 articulated these emotions in a clearer sense. The prints on Napoleon's first defeat and exile to Elba sometimes assigned a role to Louis XVIII, but it was usually a role relegated to the background of the print. This distance gave his character a passivity but also an ominous tone, the caricaturist's inherent pessimism subtly whispering in the ear of the viewer that the grass is not greener. We see this, for example, in Thomas Rowlandson's *THE ROGUES MARCH* [Fig. 70] [BMC 12222] (15 April, 1814) where the Bonapartes, both Napoleon and his brother Joseph, may have a grotesque appearance: Napoleon has been given humiliating long ass ears and a fool's cap, both are assailed by scaly serpentine monsters, one inscribed 'EXECRATION', the other 'DESECRATION'. In the background, however, we see Louis and the other victorious monarchs of Europe singing and dancing hand-in-hand round a pole from which fly two flags. One is decorated with fleurs-de-lis and inscribed 'REJOICE O YE KINGS', 'VIVE LE ROI', the other displays the double-headed eagle of either Austria or Russia. Louis is the fattest of the group and holds his friend the Pope warmly round the shoulders. Anti-Catholicism may not have been so prominent in more recent English satirical prints, but the presence here of the old bugbear certainly expresses fear of regression. Similarly, another Rowlandson print, *BLUCHER THE BRAVE EXTRACTING THE GROAN OF ABDICATION FROM THE CORSICAN BLOOD HOUND* [Fig. 71] [BMC 12216] (9 April, 1814) shows Gebhard Leberecht von Blücher (1742-1819), the Prussian general, holding out towards the shore, by the scruff of the neck, a dog with Napoleon's head. Again, the corpulent Louis XVIII celebrates in the background, this time with assorted royalists and soldiers, beneath a similar flag.

  If pessimistic suspicions were present beforehand, prints produced in the aftermath of the Hundred Days assign a much more active, aggressive and

vengeful persona to the restored King of France. In George Cruikshank's *Return of the Paris Diligence - or - Boney rode over* [Fig. 72] [BMC 12609] (6 September, 1815), Louis returns to Paris in a construction which is both coach and transportable fortress. In the driving seat sit Blücher and the Duke of Wellington, the victorious commanders of Waterloo. They are surrounded by allied soldiers, including numerous British troops, who also man the fortress and ride the horses that pull the coach. They drive mercilessly over prostrate French soldiers, joined by Napoleon who is being crushed beneath hooves. By the sides of the carriage lie decapitated and mutilated French soldiers, as well as their amputated limbs. One decollated head manages to breathe the words 'Vive l'Empereur', the phrase is repeated by a soldier who is being impaled on a British serviceman's bayonet. This is contrasted with Blücher's and Wellington's stern, cold exclamations of 'Vive le Roi Vive le Roi'. The tone of this print is far from celebratory; the misery and anguish of the French troops is matched only in those earlier prints which aimed to depict the disasters of the aborted Russian invasion. *BOXIANA - or - the Fancy* [Fig. 73] [BMC 12613] (1 October, 1815) is even more unforgiving and critical of the restoration. It features the conclusion of a boxing match between Napoleon, who lies defeated in the dirt, and Louis XVIII, standing over his opponent, immensely bulky, with his back to the viewer. In an ungentlemanly manner, he continues to kick his fallen adversary, whilst spectators standing behind Napoleon express their dismay at the excessive violence and implore him to desist. They include Frenchmen, an emancipated slave, as well as two generic Englishmen and the English boxing champion Tom Cribb (1781-1848).[140] Louis XVIII's supporters, on the left-hand side, are just three: Lord Yarmouth, Sir John McMahon, and John Scott (Baron Eldon). If the prints produced upon Bonaparte's first defeat had a foreboding, rather than patent, sense of unease, those produced in reaction to his second had a much more disparaging attitude towards the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, and Britain's crucial involvement in this. Whereas earlier prints depicted Bonaparte being pushed out of France, here we see Louis XVIII being pushed in. Earlier, too, Blücher might

---

[140] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [12613].

appear as the principal adversary of Bonaparte, if perhaps acting on behalf of Louis lurking in the background. In the later portrayals Louis himself acts violently. In *BLUCHER THE BRAVE EXTRACTING THE GROAN OF ABDICATION FROM THE CORSICAN BLOOD HOUND* Louis appeared to have won the support of at least the majority of the French, whereas in *Return of the Paris Diligence* and *BOXIANA* he tramples over and ignores his new subjects. These changes reflect the popularity of Bonaparte, both with those in France and with the more radically minded in Britain, the proportionate unpopularity of the restored regime, and the unease caused by Britain's major role in having contributed to this situation.

Debate raged in Britain over the ethics of replacing a popular leader with a potentially oppressive monarch, as well as over the way in which this was carried out and the arguable mistreatment of the fallen emperor. Radicals seized on the deportation of Napoleon to St. Helena, which was conducted without the consultation of Parliament and without trial, as an oppressive act in itself, contrary to the ideals of Great Britain with its traditions of habeas corpus and trial by jury (even if these had been repeatedly suspended in the course of the wars).[141] The nature, as well as the decision, of Napoleon's imprisonment also came under fire. A world away from the relative luxury of Elba, St. Helena was an isolated and hazardous hellhole. It was said that the climate of the island was detrimental to its inhabitants' health, that few lived past the age of forty-five, that this punishment was equivalent to a death sentence, and that it was a slow, agonizing regicide devoid of the merciful promptness that characterised Charles I and Louis XVI's executions.[142]

These may well have been the thoughts of the more radical-minded. Napoleon nevertheless left a lasting impression on the British public, and was uniquely revered for a figure who had been an enemy for so long. Napoleon's personal carriage was put on exhibition at London (and subsequently in Bristol, Dublin,

---

[141] Semmel, *Napoleon and the British*, p. 203.
[142] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

and Edinburgh), along with his personal wardrobe, his horses, and his Dutch coachman, Jean Hornn. In 1818 the carriage's owner, William Bullock, claimed it had received 110,000 visitors.[143] The London exhibition was portrayed in satirical prints by Rowlandson and Cruikshank, both of whose pictures show hoards of visitors swarming all over the coach, revelling in victory, but at the same time clambering crudely over one another in order to get closer to the carriage which had once transported the great man, and thus to get closer to the man himself.[144]

The replacement of a handsome, charismatic, popular, talented, and self-made leader with a man who was virtually the opposite, was a difficult scenario for Britons to swallow, not just the more radical types and, once again, political prints embraced attacks on the new French regime, whilst highlighting, or alluding to, the merits of that which had gone before. In *State of POLITICKS at the close of the year 1815* [Fig. 74] [BMC 12622] (George Cruikshank. 1 December, 1815) the fallen Napoleon can be seen in the background, sulking on the rock that is St. Helena, 'what is my crime? It must be ambition: but for that:! I might have been the Continental ruler by now!!' The accusatory term of 'ambition' is still present but it seems to have become less derogatory; there is an implication is that it is not such a crime, at least not in comparison to the diabolical exhibition of the foreground. Here, Louis XVIII, fat and gouty, seemingly unable to rise from his throne even if he wanted to, is joined by the Pope and a flying winged serpent with the face of Talleyrand, and is surrounded by nasty little monks, priests and nuns. They are supported on flimsy square platform held aloft by, in the middle, a slim pole marked 'Bourbon Party', and holding a corner on each of their heads, Francis of Austria, Frederick William III of Prussia, Alexander of Russia, and the Prince Regent. To the right, Ferdinand VII of Spain, who is unable to see due to the cloth marked 'Bigotry' tied over his eyes, is guided forwards by a priest using

---

[143] Stuart Semmel, 'Reading the Tangible Past: British Tourism, Collecting, and Memory after Waterloo', *Representations* 69 (2000), p. 12.

[144] *EXHIBITION AT BULLOCK'S MUSEUM OF BONAPARTES CARRIAGE TAKEN AT WATERLOO* [BMC 12702] (Thomas Rowlandson. 10 January, 1816), *A scene at the LONDON Museum Piccadilly,-or- A peep at the spoils of ambition, taken at the battle of Waterloo- being a new tax on John Bull for 1816 &c &c.* [BMC 12703] (George Cruikshank. January, 1816).

a string, 'Priest Craft', as a lead. The paper in Ferdinand's hands reads 'Hymns to accompany the Dying Groans of the Spanish Patriots', whereas the one protruding from his pocket is 'Death warrants'. Pushing him from behind is a grotesque black demon figure, 'Director of the HOLY inquisition'. This type of representation appears to mark a distinct regression to the earlier cruel, inquisitorial, autocratic portrayals of French rulers, not to the period directly preceding the revolution, which was characterised less in religious terms than by fashionable foppishness, but to older portrayals of the regimes of Louis XV or his predecessor.

   Due to the restored ancient dynasty, the perceived fickleness and servitude of the French was again the subject of some designs. The Frenchmen who prance in from the left in *State of POLITICKS* wear two faces, one celebrates 'Vive le Roi', 'Vive les Bourbons', the other scowls 'Vive l'Empereur'. Cruikshank literally spelt out fickleness in *The GENIUS of FRANCE EXPOUNDING HER LAWS to the SUBLIME PEOPLE* [BMC 12524] (4 April, 1815), which shows a monstrous ape holding forth a tricolour scroll, 'FRENCH CODE OF LAWS', for the benefit of smaller monkeys. It reads:

> Ye shall be Vain, Fickle & Foolish. - / Ye shall Kill your King one Day, and / Crown his Relative the next - / Ye shall get Tired of Him in a few / weeks - & recal a TYRANT / who has made suffering hum - / - anity bleed at every pore - / because it will be truly Nouvelle - / Lastly - Ye shall abolish & destroy / all virtuous Society, & Worship / the Devil - as for / Europe, or that little Dirty / Nation the English let them be / D__d - FRANCE the GREAT / NATION against the whole / WORLD!

In the background a weathervane, emblematic of French capriciousness, has a different allegiance inscribed on each of its four sails: 'Vive le Roi', 'Vive l'Empereur', 'Vive la Republique', and 'Vive le Diable'. Whilst French fickleness is emphasised in both these prints, it is clear that the French are no longer merely servile, and the dormant possibility for revolution remains; the two-faced Frenchmen in *State of POLITICKS* hold daggers behind their backs inscribed

'Bloody revenge the first Opportunity' and 'Bloody Murder as soon as Possible', displaying their genuine allegiances and the view that the restoration was unwelcome. The stereotype of the French, therefore, was unlikely to completely regress to that of earlier times despite the reinstatement of the Bourbons.

French fickleness was not the subject of most prints, however, and one was more likely at this time to discover caricatures critical of Britain's dubious role, one much more accountable than that of French whims, in restoring and supporting the French monarchy, and its latent hypocrisy in doing so. The Prince Regent is complicit in *State of POLITICKS*, as one of the columns supporting Louis. Nearby stand Wellington, accompanied by watchmen representing the army of occupation, and Blücher, holding a money-bag, 'well Mr Patrole I think we've Doctor'd them at last.' In *THE BRITISH ATLAS, or John Bull supporting the Peace Establishment* [BMC 12786] (c. June 1816), the ragged John Bull reluctantly bears the brunt, having to support on his shoulders a heavy military establishment containing the 'STANDING ARMY OF 130.000 MEN / a numerous & extravagant Military Staff'. The army supports a platform labelled 'The Cause of the Bourbons' upon which sits Louis, in his throne. From John's pockets protrude 'Bills Unpaid', round his feet lie various British bills and debts. Victory comes at a price.

Wellington may have secured his place in history as a British war hero with his victory at Waterloo, but in caricature he was rapidly transformed into the duplicitous agent of restoration and grovelling servant to the Bourbons. In *TRANSPARENCY* [BMC 12621] (Thomas Rowlandson. 27 November, 1815), Wellington elegantly and sycophantically leads the prancing, bulging Louis XVIII up the steps to the French throne. On the opposite side of the throne, Blücher blasts Napoleon down the stairs by firing a blunderbuss point-blank into his back. In *The Afterpiece of the Tragedy of Waterloo - or - Madame Françoise & her Managers!!!* [Fig. 75] [BMC 12620] (George Cruikshank. 9 November, 1815) he hammers Madame Françoise's chains into the ground as she is force-fed tiny

Bourbons by an armoured figure representing the Allied forces. The horrified expression worn by Madame Françoise as well as her pose make it clear that the Duke and his assorted compatriots are engaged in a type of vicious military gang-rape. Published by the radical William Hone, this was likely to be an emotional, anti-establishment composition, yet the rapid fall in favour of the Duke and his association with the French regime was part of a larger, more general trend, and one which would be sustained. In the minds of both British and Frenchmen, Wellington was associated, if unfairly, with the unpopular right-wing government of Jules de Polignac (1780-1847), which ruled under Charles X prior to the 1830 revolution.[145] This association was given visual articulation and perhaps further fuelled by, amongst other artists, John Doyle in a number of his 'Political Sketches'.[146] William Heath's *A VISION* [Fig. 76] [BMC 16030] (9 February, 1830) illustrates the reassessed perception of Wellington in a devastatingly effective way. On the left, 'PAST', Wellington, stands proud in military regalia. Below him is Napoleon's tomb, but surrounded by clouds, accompanied by an angelic figure with trumpet and holding a wreath, the mythical Wellington we see here is just as deceased as his old adversary. On the right, is the Wellington of the 'PRESENT'. He balances precariously, weakly, atop a globe, in civilian clothing, old, frail and grey-haired. The islands and continents of the globe are inscribed 'Free Trade', 'National Debt', 'Currency', and 'Taxes', and crushed beneath it are the writhing, desperate bodies of distressed artisans and farmers. In the centre, in the upper background, sits Charles X, on a throne, his head is one large fleur-de-lis surmounted by a crown, 'all for me', he says. Thus, the Wellington of caricature soon found himself the contemporary equivalent of Henry Fox or the Duke of Newcastle, fulfilling the role of weak British statesman in awe to, and in the pocket of, the French monarchy.

 Similarly, there was a continuation of distaste with the Hanoverian regime at

---

[145] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [15861].
[146] *EMBARKATION OF FRENCH CARGO IN AN ENGLISH BOTTOM* [BMC 15852] (1829), *A COURIER FROM FRANCE* [BMC 15854] (1829), *THE FROG and THE BULL* [BMC 15861] (1829).

home, George IV was associated with the joyous European autocrats in celebrating the defeat of Napoleon, and can be seen helping to prop up the nasty restored French monarchy in *State of POLITICKS*. Like Louis XVI and George III before the revolution, the French and British kings still seemed to merge into one. Take, for example, *A Pleasant Draught for Louis or the way to get rid of a Troublesome fellow* [Fig. 77] [BMC 12268] (William Heath? c.1814/15). Here, Louis XVIII sits back, swishing a glass of red wine which contains the tiny distressed Napoleon. The king may have the characteristic gouty left foot of Louis, and the French fleur-de-lis decorating his shirt, but this seemingly stylistically unsophisticated print contains some distinct representational similarities to past portrayals of the Hanoverians. The small, wet Napoleon being drowned recalls Gillray's (and his imitators') earlier King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver prints featuring George III. Louis' face has acquired similar features to George III's; the Hanoverian nose, the round, red cheeks, the similarly fashioned white hair. His body and his pose echo those of George IV in Gillray's famous satire *A VOLUPTUARY under the horrors of Digestion* [Fig. 78] [BMC 8112] (2 July, 1792). Louis sits in a similar red arm-chair next to a dining table, his equally bloated body clothed in trousers, shirt, and coat, their colours and shades correspond closely to those of Gillray's caricature. The parallels continued to be drawn, the criticisms of the Bourbons continued to reflect upon their Hanoverian equivalents, and the distinctions between the monarchs of different countries or houses continued to be blurred.

Some prints indicated a return to the traditional images of oppressively Catholic, or Popish, inquisitorial continental rule. This was truer of Charles X than Louis XVIII, Charles being the more openly reactionary of the two restored Bourbons, an attitude which would lead to his downfall in 1830. A caricature of the coronation of Charles depicts the king as a fat, ugly frog, holding a sceptre and a cross, the crown placed on his head by two monks, their appearances appropriately summed up by Dorothy George as 'malevolently sinister'.[147] Louis

---

[147] *CORONATION of the KING of FROGS, or MUMMERY FRANCOIS!* [BMC 14782] (June

XVIII, on the other hand, was not as closely associated with the Church and during Louis' reign Ferdinand in Spain was more frequently and more closely tied to oppressive Catholicism. In *The Curse of Spain* [Fig. 79] [BMC 13009] (George Cruikshank. c. December 1818), Ferdinand is an inquisitorial tyrant enthroned on a platform of 'TYRANNY', resting on skulls, and supported at the corners by cross-hilted daggers. He wears more skulls and bones as jewellery. He is advised by the devil, brandishing a headsman's axe as well as three nooses, and a monk, carrying tiny demons in his hood, a snake coiled round his neck. In the background stands a tower of Inquisition, where methods of torture and execution too numerous to list are taking place.

This representation is not especially surprising, given the relatively static nature of British representations of Spain in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Those of France, however, were not nearly as consistent, and if there was a certain degree of regression to more traditional iconography in the event of the restoration, it was also acknowledged that the recent turbulences in its history meant that things would never really be reversed. Rather than depicting French fickleness, or degeneration to the monarchical and religious authority of the *ancien régime*, *FAST COLOURS* - [Fig. 80] [BMC 12617] (George Cruikshank. 26 October, 1815) recognises the inevitable significance of the revolutionary legacy, and the impossibility of complete regression. It almost acts as a warning to the restored Bourbons, or to French rulers further in the future, that to ignore or to suppress the memories and ideals of the revolution and republicanism would be both foolish and impossible. Louis XVIII is cast as a fat, old washerwoman on the French coast, his petticoat decorated with fleurs-de-lis, at the back of which dangles an irradiated miniature of the British Regent. 'Bless me how fast these Colours are I'm afraid I shall not get them white altho' I have got such a Strong Lather', he says as he attempts in vain to scrub the colours from the Tricolour in his tub. The futility of his task is further emphasised. Firstly, by the print lying near the king's feet, *Old women washing a Blackemoore white*. Presumably a

---

1825); George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [14782].

popular print, there are other graphic satires which survive employing a similar theme and composition in reference to it.[148] The title of this print within a print comes from one of Aesop's fables, in which the owner of a black slave attempts to wash his negro white; a hopeless and foolhardy task.[149] Secondly, on the right-hand side we see Napoleon, seated on his St. Helena rock, 'Ha, ha! such an Old Woman as you may rub a long while before they'll be all white for they are Tricoloured in grain', the word 'engrained' having its etymological origins in the dyeing process.[150] Whilst Cruikshank's print has tiny soldiers, with the flags of the Allies, in amongst the lather, a copy published by J. Sidebotham makes clearer the accusation that the other powers of Europe were complicit in the attempted white-washing of republican ideals [Fig. 81].[151] Behind the figure of Louis, has been added a supplementary scene in which Wellington, Blücher, Alexander of Russia, and Francis of Austria attend a steaming copper inscribed 'Holy Water'. Wellington says 'In Waterloo I lather'd them till they turn'd white'. Blücher replies 'Louis must rub on as well as he can & we'll keep him in hot water'. Alexander and Francis sound less triumphant, the former stating 'They are fast colours & we shall only Burn our fingers by Dabbling in such Domestic Affairs!', the latter 'They look white at present but I am afraid the Colours will appear again after all!'

FAST COLOURS demonstrates perceptive attention to, and a respect for, changes in France, as well as continuities in the internal dynamics of the country, and anticipates the difficulties that future rulers would have to confront when trying to ensure domestic stability. Originally published by Hone, it was unlikely

---

[148] For example, *WASHING the BLACKAMOORE* [BMC 8667] (Isaac Cruikshank. 24 July, 1795), *LABOUR IN VAIN _ or OLD WOMEN TRYING to WASH a BLACKAMORE WHITE* [BMC 11272] (Isaac Cruikshank. 27 March, 1809), *THE ATTEMPT TO WASH THE BLACKAMOOR WHITE. IN THE WHITE-HALL. CITY OF LAPUTA:* [BMC 12833] (Thomas Rowlandson. 13 March, 1816).

[149] William Godwin had found recent success with his versions of Aesop's (and others') fables under the pseudonym Edward Baldwin, for 'Washing the Blackamoor White' see Edward Baldwin, *Fables Ancient and Modern. Adapted for the use of children. Tenth Edition* (London: M .J. Godwin & Co., 1824), pp. 145-148. The first edition was published in 1805.

[150] 'http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ingrain?rskey=bVDbzp&result=1#m_en_gb0411070' (18 February, 2011).

[151] *FAST COLOURS* - [Fig. 81] [BMC 12618] (c. October 1815).

to demonise the forces of French republicanism, and the print is no doubt also alluding to the reform movement at home and the unnecessary dangers of continued repression, a lesson which would not be properly learnt by the authorities until the aftermath of Peterloo. Far from being merely a peripheral print by a radical publisher however, *FAST COLOURS* is part of a larger trend in British society of popular uncertainty amongst the outbursts of celebration in the wake of Waterloo, as shown by the ability of Hone's prints to make profit, and the eagerness of Sidebotham to imitate or bootleg such designs for his own benefit.[152]

This print, in particular, seems less partisan than other Hone prints of the time, such as *The Afterpiece of the Tragedy of Waterloo* or *Louis XVIII climbing the Mât de Cocaine* [Fig. 75] [BMC 12614] (George Cruikshank. 6 October, 1815), its analysis of the situation is more sober, its eagerness to fully disgrace Louis XVIII and the Allies has been restrained. They are misled, and ignorant, rather than evil. Louis appears old and weary, foolish but not malevolent. The print viewer might even feel sorry for him, struggling to exist in his precarious position. Other prints may also have had this effect. *A FRENCH ELEPHANT* [Fig. 82] [BMC 13008] (George Cruikshank. November 1818)[153] despite being a very simplistic caricature of Louis who, in back-view, is so fat he resembles a pachyderm, evokes a distinct and undeniable melancholy. This is part of a larger development in the representation of French leaders over the course of the period. Because although many eighteenth and early nineteenth century prints concerned themselves with directly or implicitly criticizing abuses of strong, centralised power, both the French and their leaders came to be portrayed in more generous, more human terms. Louis XV had sat enthroned, surrounded by demons, inquisitorial priests conducting torture and murder, his subjects enchained. His restored grandson, on the other hand, despite at times having been associated with similar imagery (particularly in the immediate aftermath of his restoration, though still not as strongly associated as Ferdinand VII of Spain), was worthy, to a

---

[152] Wilson, *The Laughter of Triumph*, pp. 142-143.
[153] Probably a copy of a French original. George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [13008].

greater or lesser degree, of sympathy, like Napoleon had been before him, and Louis XVI before that. Even when Louis XVIII intervened in Spain in 1823, an occurrence which had the potential to arouse the alarmed resurrection of images of French imperial or monarchical ambitions, he was derided in caricature but more as a lumbering fool rather than as a dangerous and determined autocrat. He is caricatured failing to squeeze his swollen, gout-ridden feet into a pair of Napoleonic jack-boots, as Bonaparte's son offers to try them on instead, also reaching for his crown.[154] His overweight frame is shown pompously decorated in military regalia, as he is pushed on wheels or pulled on a sledge towards the Pyrenees by the other figureheads of the Holy Alliance.[155] Sympathy was expressed for the cause of the Spanish rebels and in at least one print frustration was shown towards Britain's failure to assist them[156], and while some prints appeared confident that the French venture would fail and that this could result in Louis' overthrow in France, the caricatures treat Louis with something approaching geniality. He is a rotund and slightly pathetic figure of fun rather than a warmongering monster, and it is suggested that he was persuaded into intervention by the other Holy Alliance leaders.

Both Linda Colley and Marilyn Morris have championed the theory that late eighteenth century satires of British royal family members strengthened the position of the monarchy, rather than undermining it.[157] Sustained mockery humanised them, and laughter took 'the sting out of criticisms', leading to what Colley described as an 'amused tolerance' of royalty, which ensured their survival.[158] For both scholars, the climate of war and rivalry with France is a significant contributory factor to the transition of perceptions of the monarchy,

---

[154] *Old Bumblehead the 18th trying on the Napoleon Boots - or, Preparing for the Spanish Campaign* [BMC 14502] (George Cruikshank. 17 February, 1823).

[155] *France, (The GREAT Nation) Driven by the NORTH into the SOUTH!!!* [BMC 14503] (George Cruikshank. 18 February, 1823), *The Three Gentlemen of Verona on a Legitimate Crusade* [BMC 14509] (J. Lewis Marks. 4 March, 1823).

[156] *IOHN BULL flourishing in a dignified attitude of strict NEUTRALITY!!!* [Robert Cruikshank. May 1823].

[157] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 209-210; Marilyn Morris, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 176-178, 191-192.

[158] Colley, *Britons*, p. 210.

and Colley particularly uses graphic satires as evidence of British Francophobia.[159] Neither gives further consideration to the effect that sustained mockery of French leaders, or of the French more generally, may have had on perceptions of the Other. Could this not also have had a humanising effect, and could the laughter produced here not have equally taken some of the sting out of criticisms? Given the parallels drawn between British and French leaders, the recurring similarities between representations of them, and the difficulties in criticizing one without implicating the other, it certainly seems plausible that the humanising effects of satire and of caricature were not confined simply to the British monarchy. Louis XVI, Napoleon, and Louis XVIII, were all at times caricatured in ways which emphasised the human over the majestic elements of their persons, and were lampooned in ways which could have evoked pity or sympathy just as much as scorn. Whereas Colley notes that the particular context and composition of Gillray's The *FRENCH INVASION; - or - John Bull, bombarding the Bum-Boats* [BMC 8346] (5 November, 1793) means that underlying the 'scatological disrespect' of the print is a 'deeply conservative' merging of king and country,[160] Morris writes more generally of scatological depictions of royalty, and how 'acknowledging that the king goes to the privy like everyone else, and being able to imagine him doing so, gave the monarchy a sympathetic, human quality…'[161] Well, we have seen Napoleon empty his bowels in *THE EVACUATION of HANOVER* [Fig. 56], in the next chapter we shall find Louis XVI, earlier, doing the same in *REVOLUTION* [BMC 7665] (Isaac Cruikshank, 3 August, 1790), and, for Louis XVIII, we could point to *Un Gourmand!!* [BMC 12997] (15 June, 1818), in which the gouty French monarch enjoys a rich feast, whilst sitting upon a commode. Scatological representations are, of course, more complicated than this, and their intentions and effects more numerous[162], but the fact remains that representations of French and British leaders contain abundant similarities in this period, constantly inform one another, and develop along similar lines at similar

---

[159] For example, *Ibid*., pp. 33-34.
[160] *Ibid*., p. 210.
[161] Morris, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution*, p. 178.
[162] For example, see Jeff Percels and Russell Ganim, (ed.), *Fecal Matters in Early Modern Literature and Art: Studies in Scatology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

164

times, and to highlight the humanising effects of satires on one of these houses, whilst not analysing satires of the other in the same way (these ones tending to be used as evidence of straight-forward, uncomplicated hostility), is contradictory. If there remained some discomfort with the House of Hanover, conceptions of the British monarchy had changed during the reigns of the Georges III and IV, but so too had conceptions of French kings and leaders, as well as their subjects, which should lead us to contemplate whether some of this supposedly rampant Francophobic imagery could similarly be interpreted as expressing or contributing to an 'amused tolerance' of the foreign creatures they featured.

5) <u>Summary</u>

British representations and conceptions of French kings and leaders were intrinsically tied to, and informed by, those of their domestic equivalents. Satires not only expressed disapproval of French rulers, but articulated more general anxieties about the nature of unchecked or excessive power and authority. At times, they were blatantly employed as a way of voicing disapproval of British authority figures, either explicitly, as in caricatures of the allegedly treacherous Henry Fox or the Duke of Newcastle, or implicitly, such as in the allusions to the House of Hanover. Anti-Catholicism may have had significance in the early years of the century, but religious definitions of the French faded after Hogarth's death. Images of corrupt Catholic leaders may also have been making broader statements about the nature of religious leadership and the problems with it; and independent caricatures of wealthy Protestant priests had characteristics comparable with their French counterparts. Protestantism, as such, seems not to have been properly formulated in caricature, and is not contrasted directly with French Catholic imagery, which questions the extent to which British identity at this time was centred around a common Protestantism, and there seems to have been little trouble in brushing over the differences between the two branches of Christianity at the emergence of revolutionary Terror. Subsequently, Napoleon was defined spiritually either through old associations, Satan or revolutionary Atheism, or by

connecting him to Islam, a more alien, but more straightforward, Other than that of the allusive and evolutionary French.

Napoleon's non-French birth was also emphasised. His Mediterranean background highlighted his illegitimacy and grounded him in an ancestry less respectable than a Gallic one, betraying the deference and affinity that the British held for the French in contrast to Others who were perceived to be less significant or 'civilised'. Napoleon's reign could also, like the rulers who preceded him, be used to express uncomfortable or resentful feelings towards Britain's domestic political leaders. At the same time, however, there were expressions of acceptance, of admiration, and of sympathy, for Bonaparte, particularly following his downfall, but also evident beforehand.

The restored monarchy was again used to criticise British politicians and their monarch; Wellington and George IV being particular targets. Whilst there were elements of regression to absolutist, inquisitorial portrayals of France, the regression was not a complete one. Unlike the more static stereotype of Spain, there was sensitivity to changes and developments in France, its people, and its rulers. If not comprehensively, British satirical print culture had paid a great deal of attention to the turbulences that the French had experienced over the course of this period and, in some ways, had experienced it with them through this informative, if not always accurate, medium. One constant seems to have been that French rulers were condemned by representations of French suffering, either administered directly by their own hands, aided by their actions, or in their failure to prevent it. Whilst such imagery was often used to express the perceived superiority of the situation at home, its consistent employment points towards a sympathy for and kinship with the French and, ultimately, the sentiment that their suffering was something to be deplored rather than celebrated.

The parallels in British and French representations and developments, the projection of British-based anxieties onto foreign leaders, the diminishing

significance of religious differences, the relative sensitivity to changes in France, the condemnation of French suffering and, through representation, the shared experience of these, meant that over the course of this period the caricatured French Other, both in terms of leaders as well as their subjects, did become more human and more worthy of empathy. Though of course anti-French sentiment did not evaporate, there had developed something approaching an 'amused tolerance' of this particular foreigner.

Chapter 4:

War (and Peace)

1) Politics, Propaganda and Peace

Graphic satire may seem an inappropriate, insensitive medium for dealing with the horrors and brutality of war. Nevertheless, a large proportion of the thousands of prints produced in the second half of the eighteenth century dealt with this topic in a variety of ways. Despite the regular outbreak of war in this period, the British public's experience of war was 'remarkably indirect'.[1] Conflicts were rarely waged on national territory; Britons at home were not seriously threatened by the violence of war, other than during the Jacobite Rebellions.[2] As well as relying on press reports and correspondence from those family members or acquaintances who were enlisted, the public depended on artistic representations in order to experience and understand warfare. Although these portrayals, even those which aspired or purported to convey faithful, realistic accounts, tended to 'represent, rather than to reproduce', they can still be useful in their 'capacity to communicate the ideologies, as opposed to the actualities, of combat.'[3]

Graphic satires, however distorted or at times misinformed, provide us with an alternative depiction of war to that of the journalism, literature and history painting of the period, and one arguably less prone to the restrictions of form, or censorship, or the need for polite or idealised representation. No history painting, for example, looks quite like Isaac Cruikshank's depiction of the death of General Theobald Dillon in 1792, *Galic Perfidy, or the National Troops Attachment to their General after their Defeat at Tournay* [Fig. 83] [BMC 8085] (12 May,

---

[1] Matthew Craske, 'Making national heroes? A survey of the social and political functions and meanings of major British funeral monuments to naval and military figures, 1730-70', in John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 41.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 41.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 41-42.

1792). Less noble, heroic, and sentimental than the scenes of history painting; bloodier and caricatured yet arguably more realistic, this print would not have been held in the same high regard as a painting, but nor was it a flippant, crude sketch to be glanced at and disposed of in the same way that it is possible to treat modern cartoons. People purchased this image. It would have cost around 2 shillings. The owner might ponder and savour, even hang on his or her wall, this reproduction of the moment Dillon's throat is sliced, his head torn from his body, as numerous bayonets pierce his flesh. Having said that, print purchasers would not necessarily have been the only ones to gaze upon caricatures such as this. Printshop window displays, exhibitions, and the reproduction of images in alternative formats ensured a larger, broader audience and, although the extent of this is debatable[4], the large numbers of prints on the subject of warfare was one of the ways in which civilians could get a sense of war and their opponents.

  Galic Perfidy is one of the more explicit depictions of war from this period. Perhaps Cruikshank felt he had more license over what he etched in this instance because the action was of the French slaying their own; Dillon's angry, disgruntled and suspicious troops turning upon him in the aftermath of his defeat by, and retreat from, the Austrians. Cruikshank's image was a step towards the new cannibalistic representation of the French which emerged as a result of the Revolution, and which would really take off come the September Massacres later the same year.

  Prints of war produced earlier in the century, like the ones in the following century's *Punch* era, tended to be less explicit. They avoided gore, and principally concerned themselves with the higher aspects of international relations, command and diplomacy, rather than the lower-level reality of battle. In part, this was achieved by representing war through images of animals. During the War of Austrian Succession a number of artists chose to depict the various nations involved or affected in this way. *The Whole STATE of EUROPE* [Fig. 84] [BMC

---

[4] See Chapter One.

2502] of 17 November, 1741 is a rather intricately detailed print for its time. A bustling ruckus between all manner of beasts, careful attention has been put into etching the fur or feathers of the individual creatures; the background landscape, too, is quite impressive. Yet neither of these detracts from the energy of the picture. It is signed 'J. B. Vandrülle', most likely an invented name.[5] The accompanying 'KEY' identifies the countries that are represented.[6] France is embodied both in the fox cub held in the beak of the Austrian 'Imperial Eagle' and by the older fox, below, setting fire to the eagle's nest with a torch. Animal symbolism can be traced back to classical fables and had been used in heraldry[7], thus the characteristics and traits that men had projected onto beasts were familiar to audiences and useful to artists. The fox was a sly and wily character, treacherous and conniving, and was subsequently deemed a fitting symbol for France.

The Whole STATE of EUROPE employs the animal most commonly used to depict Britain: the lion. Lions had been employed frequently in heraldry and had long been associated with 'courage, fortitude, and force in the cause of virtue and justice.'[8] As well as being used in menagerie prints like this one, the British Lion makes regular appearances in other prints, including those which feature no other animals. The lion could be used to represent the nation (Britain or England) as well as, because of his proverbial kingly status, the monarch or monarchy. Like Britannia, he tends to appear in one of two ways. Firstly, as in this engraving, he is roused and roaring, ready to pounce upon Britain's enemies, as made explicit in the textual key: 'Is Britain idle 'midst this martial rage? / No, see her Lion eager

---

[5]'http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.aspx?objectid=3082176&partid=1&searchText=whole+state+of+europe+1741&fromADBC=ad&toADBC=ad&numpages=10&orig=%2fresearch%2fsearch_the_collection_database.aspx&currentPage=1' (5 June, 2008).

[6] The key was printed on a separate broadside, and may have been issued at a later date than the original image.
'http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.aspx?objectid=3082194&partid=1&searchText=2502+whole+state+of+europe&fromADBC=ad&toADBC=ad&numpages=10&orig=%2fresearch%2fsearch_the_collection_database.aspx&currentPage=1' (7 April, 2011).

[7] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, p. 101.

[8] *Ibid*., p. 102.

to engage!' In other prints he is asleep, wounded, chained, or dead.[9] It is this latter portrayal which occurs most regularly, perhaps due to the negative and pessimistic nature of graphic satire, perhaps because it was an effective way to appeal to audiences' patriotism, perhaps because Britain still felt rather precarious in its position as a major world power, as if it could topple from its pedestal at any given moment. Captured, injured, or slain by Britain's external or internal enemies, or in a state of slumber due to Britain's own political lethargy, the prints urge for the lion to be freed, awakened, healed or, indeed, resurrected. The present, or imminent, decline of the nation's virtues, values, authority and strength are suggested, as well as the urgent need to protect or reignite them.

In another menagerie print, *The CONGRESS of the BRUTES* [Fig. 85] [BMC 3009] from 1748, the lion is neither wounded nor asleep but does appear rather timid. Tamely raising his paw, he offers to the French cock, 'Pray accept of Cape Breton.' This piece relates to English disappointment with the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle and features various animals, representing their respective countries, gathered around a large table, all of whom are appealing to the French cock, who presides over matters. He stands tall above the others on the back of a chair at the head of the table. The cock was another established, easily-recognised, and oft-used symbol for the French nation. He is vain and haughty, armed with a sharp, mean peck. Below him, in this particular image, is a monkey, the third animal regularly adopted to personify France or the French. 'Lewis Baboon' had been the character used to personify France in John Arbuthnot's *A History of John Bull* (1712). Arbuthnot played on the name of Louis of Bourbon, though there are earlier examples of the French being referred to as apes.[10] As well as using images of monkeys, some graphic satirists would depict French people as having ape-like qualities and simian features. The monkey or ape is a conflicting character. They

---

[9] For example: *Tempora mutantur, et Nos Mutamur in illis* [Fig, 27] [BMC 3015] (8 December, 1748); *BRITANNIA'S Revival, or the rousing of the British LYON* [BMC 3377] (1756); *A View of the Assassination of the Lady of John Bull Esqr Who was barbarously Butcher'd Anno 1756 & 57 &c.* [Fig. 36] [BMC 3548] (1757); *THE ENGLISH LION DISMEMBER'D* [BMC 5649] (12 March, 1780).

[10] Alan W. Bower and Robert A. Erickson, 'Introduction', in John Arbuthnot, *A History of John Bull* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), p. lxvi.

can be said to embody foolishness and stupidity but can also be understood as cruel, cunning and devious. It is difficult to determine which definition of the contradictory simian character was most dominant but, as Robin Eagles has written, it was 'both a lack of seriousness and a more disturbing sense of deceit' that concerned the Francophobe press.[11]

Conflicting representations like these would appear throughout eighteenth century British depictions of the French. They highlight the complicated relationship between the two countries and emphasise the difficulties in effectively illustrating the 'Other.'

According to Herbert M. Atherton, 'ape' as a verb is also significant.

> To 'ape', of course, suggests mimicry, imitation of something superior to one's nature - as the anthropoid 'apes' human behaviour. So, too, the Frenchman apes in his pretentiousness and artificiality, denying human nature. Apelike qualities could also suggest something bestial and sub-human. The Devil was often visualized as a small imp or monkey. Physiognomy associated simian features with bestiality and viciousness.[12]

This aping possessed another level in the way that English 'macaronis' were also shown to be imitating French fashions and manners, as explored in Chapter Two. Although these bestial representations were always negative, it should be pointed out that they were also more intriguing than the bestial representations to be found of other nations. Three distinct creatures, the fox, the cock, the monkey, were all frequently employed to portray France; whereas for most other countries only one, or maybe two, would be used. Russia, for instance, as in *The Whole STATE of EUROPE*, seems confined to only ever be a bear. The variety and complexity of the animal analogies relating to France, in comparison to other countries such

---

[11] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 31.
[12] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, p.87. Atherton also points out that 'Evolutionary ideas in the nineteenth-century strengthened the association and made possible racist vilification. The apelike countenance became part of the Irish stereotype in Victorian graphic satire.' For more on stereotypes of the Irish see Chapter Six.

as Russia, might be explained by the prominence of the Gallic nation in the minds of the English at this time. England was most often at war with France in the eighteenth century, France was geographically closer than the rest of the world, it had become more powerful than its European neighbours, and due to all of these it posed the most threat. However, the variety and intricateness of France shown as beasts, points towards a relationship that is less straightforward than might initially be presumed. Other graphic stereotypes may also have this effect. The monkey is inferior to human beings, but it is more like them than any other animal, similarly the French were inferior but more like the English than other foreigners.

Contrary to the noble connotations of the heraldic lion, and despite their seemingly more formal style than later satires, there is still a disparaging, mocking, and cynical tone to these prints, one that is all-embracing. Although also present in *The CONGRESS of the BRUTES*, this is particularly noticeable in *The Whole STATE of EUROPE*. Some of the anthropomorphised nations might come off better than others, but it is essentially a scene of unrestricted, uncontrollable, debased bestial chaos. Far from invoking philosophical Enlightenment theories of natural law as the source of balance and civility, all nations are condemned of involvement in this primitive, destructive and disordered practice, in what could be interpreted as an indictment of high politics and the failings of international relations in general. 'Is Britain idle 'midst this martial rage? / No, see her Lion eager to engage!' may emphasise the nation's strength, resolve, and involvement, but the representation also lowers the country to the same level as the remaining beasts, and places the lion in the middle of this tumultuous, perhaps even futile, situation and system.

Along with depictions of creatures bickering over territories, the War of Austrian Succession also inspired prints in which the various kings or statesmen of Europe engaged in similar activities. *The C_rd_n_ls MASTER-PIECE, or EUROPE in a FLURRY* [Fig. 86] [BMC 2503] (1741), for example, has Maria Theresa of

Hungary, Louis XV, Robert Walpole and others gathered round a map of central Europe. It is a fairly sober print, reliant on its speech bubbles, through which the personnel announce their positions or intentions. One aspect of it to note is that Louis XV appears significantly taller and larger than anyone else in the room. He is the dominant presence. As with the animal prints, *The C_rd_n_ls MASTER-PIECE* both neatly summarises the international situation and satirises it, and all those involved, by boiling it down to a group of powerful personalities arguing across a table. In subsequent wars, this type of print would decline as well as those focusing solely on bestial representations. As the art of graphic satire changed and progressed, and as international relations and conceptions of warfare developed, they would be replaced by more imaginative and eclectic works. Echoes of these earlier pieces would remain, but maps and statesmen would appear in different ways, and in more original situations, with greater variety; animals such as the cock and the lion would appear independently, interacting with or complementing human characters, without the presence of the rest of the menagerie.

Caricatures on war often articulated a triumphant national loyalism, celebrating victories and scorning Britain's enemies. The short term causes of the Seven Years' War of 1756-1763 were depicted in *BRITISH RESENTMENT or the FRENCH fairly COOPT at Louisburg* [Fig. 87] [BMC 3332] (25 September, 1755). Designed by Louis Philippe Boitard, the son of the French François Boitard[13], it refers to the various skirmishes in the North American and Canadian colonies prior to the outbreak of the larger war, and mixes older emblematic symbolism with the increasingly popular character-based forms. In the bottom left corner stands the British Lion, in one of his more assertive personas. He has his paws rested firmly on 'OHIO', 'VIRGINIA', and 'NOVA SCOTIA', proudly guarding the territories. Behind the lion, Britannia sits on a throne, accompanied by the other classical figures of Mars and Neptune, the Roman gods of war and

---

[13] Timothy Clayton and Anita McConnell, 'Louis-Philippe Boitard', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 'http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2784' (5 June, 2008).

the sea. The obsession with classical figures and gods, usually defending Britain's interests, accompanied with a general lack of interest in the contemporary state of Greece and Italy, indicates that the British, with their expanding Empire, considered themselves to be the modern equivalent, or in some manner the descendants, of these highly-regarded ancient civilizations.

At Britannia's feet some natives appeal to her for assistance against the French. In the top-left corner, the British arms eclipse those of France. An Englishman in the centre of the image is gleefully pointing this out to a distressed, effeminate Frenchman. To the right is another Frenchman, mournfully observing an erect English rose, and drooping, emasculated French lily. A third Frenchman is alarmed by a cannon pointing towards him. Labelled as 'Cromwell's device', it is inscribed with the warning 'Open thou my Mouth and my Voice shall sound thy Praise'. On the right, an English sailor, encouraged by a soldier, throttles the French Cock, who is forced quite literally to cough up French 'usurpations' such as 'CROWN POINT', 'NIAGARA' and 'OHIO'. In the background, many Frenchmen are 'coopt' within a cage marked 'Louisbourg 1755'. At this time Admiral Boscawen, named on the obelisk behind Neptune, had been trying to blockade the fortress town of Louisbourg. He was not as successful in this task as this print would suggest.[14] Behind the coop, 'The falling of the boat down the Niagara cataract alludes to the expected result of the expedition which had been sent against the forts in that district. The allusions to conquests in this and other prints of the period were founded on reports which were not always correct.'[15] This richly composed print reflects patriotic sentiments of British superiority at the brink of war, as well as determination and confidence in the face of the weak, thieving French enemy.

Could this depiction of conflict in support of British interests, as well as others like it, therefore be categorised as propaganda? Definitions of propaganda are

---

[14] Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (London: Faber and Faber, 2001), pp. 110-111.
[15] Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [3332].

indeed tricky, numerous conflicting definitions have been proposed, and the varieties of different categories of propaganda are many.[16] In attempting to form a new model of propaganda better suited to accommodating the phenomenon of art propaganda, Sheryl Tuttle Ross proposed a definition of propaganda as 'an epistemically defective message used with the intention to persuade a socially significant group of people on behalf of a political institution, organization, or cause.'[17] Caricature may well be 'epistemically defective', though this itself seems a rather ambiguous, open term. Was there an intention to persuade? Scholars disagree. H. T. Dickinson contended that political caricature, which he associated with the rise of the press and of reform movements, was 'particularly well suited to be both a reflector and a shaper of public opinion'.[18] More recently, however, Mike Goode has used the ways in which caricature both portrayed and addressed its public in conjunction with logic-based conceptions of 'persuasion' as articulated in early nineteenth century comic novels to cast doubt on whether caricature ever intended to persuade.[19] Whether caricature acts on behalf of a 'political institution, organization or cause' is also doubtful. In the 1790s, John Reeves' *Association for the Preservation of Liberty and Property against Republicans and Levellers* subsidised loyalist prints to challenge supposed republican and reformist subversion, whilst the government experimented with paying Gillray a pension. Individuals sometimes paid for a particular print to be produced, or they might suggest a design, and caricaturists, either due to commission or their own whims, often ended up printing opposing viewpoints from one day to the next. The categories of 'political institution' and 'organization' are reasonably clear, but what counts as a 'cause'? Sheryl Tuttle Ross agrees that there is both propagandist art as well as political art that is not propaganda, and in illustrating how her definition helps to distinguish the two suggests that 'Often, political satire offers an epistemically defective message in

---

[16] See Stanley B. Cunningham, *The Idea of Propaganda: A Reconstruction* (Westport: Praeger, 2002), chapter 4; Sheryl Tuttle Ross, 'Understanding Propaganda: The Epistemic Merit Model and its Application to Art', *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 36 (2002), pp. 17-18.

[17] Ross, 'Understanding Propaganda', p. 24.

[18] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 11.

[19] Mike Goode, 'The Public and the Limits of Persuasion in the Age of Caricature', in Todd Porterfield (ed.), *The Efflorescence of Caricature, 1759-1838* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 117-136.

order to persuade a socially significant group of people, but it does not do so on behalf of a recognizably political institution or cause.'[20] Her wildly disparate examples, however, do not entirely convince. Impersonations of President George Bush on American television show *Saturday Night Live* during the 1990s are not classed as propaganda because the show is not a political institution or cause, whereas apparently Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal* (1729) is propaganda because Swift 'uses satire on behalf of the Irish in order to protest taxation laws that were oppressing poor people.'[21]

  BRITISH RESENTMENT might be a triumphant justification of conflict, but it is not necessarily propaganda. Michel Melot wrote that 'A caricature… cannot be ordered; it is either spontaneous or it does not exist'[22], which is an oversimplification and neglects examples such as Reeves' commissions. Charles A. Knight, on the other hand, has argued that satiric nationalism maintains a certain ambiguous, comic or paradoxical character, a 'recognition that they are falsehoods shared by the culture', which is not shared with propagandist imagery.[23] Satiric manipulation of national imagery and stereotypes implies 'a witty awareness of their unfairness or falsity' and 'in attacking other nations, satirists attack their own, even by contrasting it to the others', which can lead us to question the very concept of nationhood itself.[24] Not all scholars would subscribe to this notion of the prints' witty awareness of their own falsity, and it would be difficult to prove that contemporaries considered *BRITISH RESENTMENT* to possess this quality. Still, although eighteenth century graphic satire might fit the most open definition of 'propaganda'[25], and although there

---

[20] Ross, 'Understanding Propaganda', p. 26.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[22] Michel Melot, 'Caricature and the Revolution: The Situation in France in 1789', in James Cuno (ed.), *French Caricature and the French Revolution, 1789-1799* (Los Angeles: Gunwald Centre for Graphic Arts, 1988), p. 26.
[23] Charles A. Knight, 'The Images of Nations in Eighteenth-Century Satire', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22 (1989), p. 494.
[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 498-499.
[25] Such as William Hummel and Keith Huntress' 'any attempt to persuade anyone of any belief', a definition which Ross observes can extend as far as 'the meteorologist attempting to influence beliefs about the weather to parents urging their children to go to bed.' *Ibid.*, p. 17.

may be some exceptional examples, given its form, the nature of its production, its schizophrenic, opportunistic allegiances and often cynical attitudes, it is difficult to see it as more than 'political art'.

Due to the shaky early stages for Britain in what would become the Seven Years' War, *BRITISH RESENTMENT* was succeeded by a number of far less positive prints. Following the loss of Minorca to the French, a whole host of satires were published which featured French characters and references but whose attacks, in illustrating the defeat as an English loss rather than a French victory, were more directed towards the English persons they deemed responsible for the military and naval defeats. Thus, Henry Fox, Admiral Byng and the Duke of Newcastle were shown dancing to the tune of the Devil's French horn, trampling over the Magna Carta, British Constitution and inscribed values such as 'Honesty', 'Justice' and 'Law'[26], whilst in another print their hearts were feasted upon by demons in Hell.[27] In *Birdlime for Bunglers, or the French way of Catching Fools* (November 1756) [Fig. 35] [BMC 3434], Byng, Fox and Lord Hardwicke humiliate themselves by diving to the floor and floundering after the money and tickets inscribed 'Cooks', 'Valets' and 'Dancers' spilled by the devious French monarch.[28]

In the later years of the war, the number of prints concerned with France and the French decreased as Britain's military successes increased. There was also a shift towards scenes which were set in France, reflecting diminishing fear of French victory or invasion. In 1759, Britain's 'Year of Victories'[29], *The Grand Fair at Versaile, or France in a Consternation* [BMC 3679] depicted the disastrous, almost apocalyptic, condition of France; *THE FRENCH KING IN a SWEAT or the PARIS COINERS* [BMC 3727] showed Louis XV and Madame de Pompadour

---

[26] *THE DEVILS DANCE SET TO FRENCH MUSIC BY DOCTOR LUCIFER OF PARIS* [Fig. 26] [BMC 3373] (July 1756). George Stephens notes that the Byng figure here could perhaps be Lord Anson, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [3373].
[27] *A Scene in HELL, or the Infernall Jubilee* [Fig. 38] [BMC 3378] (August 1756).
[28] See Chapter Three.
[29] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p.138.

vainly attempting to fan the flames of the French war effort, and struggling to finance it.

When victory was secured and peace terms established, the situation was again portrayed in terms of political failure. This was similar to the way the conclusion of the War of Austrian Succession had been received. The aforementioned *The CONGRESS of the BRUTES* [Fig. 85] showed a timid British Lion failing to assert himself in front of the presiding, confident French cock. Another example is *Tempora mutantur, et Nos Mutamur in illis* [Fig. 27] [BMC 3015] (8 December, 1748), showing Lord Cathcart and the Earl of Sussex held hostage by the French as the Earl of Sandwich, the plenipotentiary who negotiated the treaty, stabs the British Lion, his bribery money protruding from his pocket.

As with the negotiations concluding the War of Austrian Succession, many printmakers chose to portray the terms of the Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Years' War, as far too lenient. It was, after all, 'the most generous peace treaty in European history'.[30] Like the Earl of Sandwich in *Tempora mutantur, et Nos Mutamur in illis* [Fig. 27], it was now the new Prime Minister Lord Bute who bore the brunt of their sardonic attacks. 'The corpus of anti-Bute literature is large - there are more prints than the number devoted to Walpole - even though the length of Bute's public career was short [May 1762 - April 1763]… The anti-Bute satire is more virulent and scandalous than the attacks on Walpole.'[31] Although the numbers of print satires being produced in general had increased since Walpole's death, there survive significant numbers which viciously lampoon Bute and his government. In *THE CONGRESS; OR, A DEVICE to lower the LAND-TAX. To the TUNE of, Doodle, Doodle, Do, &c.* [Fig. 88] [BMC 3887] (1762), one skinny Frenchman holds the sombre British Lion in chains, with his foot rested on the beast's back. On the ears of the Lion hang labels bearing the names of journals that supported Bute, 'Auditor' and 'Briton'.[32] Another Frenchman,

---

30 Anderson, *Crucible of War*, p. 507.
31 Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, p. 209.
32 Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [3887].

dealing with Bute, says, 'Dere is Canada & N.F. Land, Now Tank de grand Monarque for hes royale bountee.' Bute hands over a scroll inscribed 'Guadalupe Martinico &c &c &c &c &c &c', and in his Scottish accent, every bit as silly as the Frenchman's, exclaims, 'Tak aw again Mounseir, and gie us back what ye please'. Political satire defined Bute by his Scottish ancestry. Also fuelling resentment was his appointment as a favourite of George III; Bute had once been the king's tutor. The Prime Minister's position was seen as dependent on royal support and as an unconstitutional attempt by the monarchy to assert and expand its power.[33] The prints expressed the view that the Scot had no right to rule over England, and that England's interests would be ignored, hindered, or sabotaged under his premiership. Memories of the Stuarts, and of 'The Forty-Five', reemerged. Behind him, in this piece, stands Bute's Scottish standard-bearer; a large jack-boot (the common visual short-hand for Bute) can be seen on the flag which is crafted from the Princess of Wales' petticoat (Bute's opponents spread rumours of an affair). The *DEVICE to lower the LAND-TAX* in the title suggests that self-serving ministers were only negotiating peace in order to avoid having to pay further war taxes.

The lack of interest in France at times when the British were in the process of winning battles and the preference for illustrating victorious peace negotiations in terms of failure, signifies that satirists were more intent on deriding the reputations of powerful domestic figures than they were on deriding the French, and that prints on war could often be more about the political situation at home than of interaction with foreign forces.

In these earlier years, 'Treaties that ended major wars became special victims of popular virulence; they were, by nature, "give-aways" and "sell-outs"'[34], but the same reactions did not necessarily apply to the later Napoleonic Wars. The possibilities of a peace had been a subject for caricature in 1796, the year that

---

[33] Karl W. Schweizer, 'Introduction: Lord Bute: Interpreted in history', in Karl W. Schweizer (ed.), *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1988), p. 1.
[34] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, p. 185.

Edmund Burke published his *Letters on a Regicide Peace* and Lord Malmesbury (1746-1820) travelled to Paris for what would turn out to be a fruitless attempt to negotiate peace terms with the Directory. The downfall of Robespierre and the arrival of the Directory had not curbed graphic satire's enthusiasm for representing the French as bloodthirsty, guillotine-wielding sans-culottes. Nevertheless, reactions to the prospect of peace were mixed. Some prints appear to agree with Burke. Gillray's *The Genius of France Triumphant - or - BRITANNIA petitioning for PEACE* [BMC 8614] (2 February, 1795) of the previous year had shown Fox, Sheridan, Stanhope, with Britannia on her knees, appealing to a horrible guillotine-headed representation of the French Republic, surrounded by dark, ominous clouds. In 1796, Isaac Cruikshank's *THE MESSENGER of PEACE* [BMC 8829] (29 October, 1796) featured a more informed, moderate portrayal of the Directory. Instead of appearing as bare-legged, savage sans-culottes, they wear cloaks and feathered hats, an approximation of the official Directors' costumes designed by Jacques-Louis David.[35] Still, they sit arrogantly at their dais, unimpressed by the bowing, obsequious members of the English mission. More ambiguous are James Sayers' *Thoughts on a Regicide Peace* [BMC 8825] (14 October, 1796) and Gillray's *Promis'd Horrors of the French INVASION, - or - Forcible Reasons for negotiating a Regicide PEACE* [Fig. 89] [BMC 8826] (20 October, 1796). The former depicts Burke asleep in his chair, the upper part of the design depicting the troubles of his imagination, such as a sans-culotte, holding a head on a pike and standing on the map of Britain. Gillray's print, meanwhile, undermines Burke's warnings both by emphasising that the horrors are 'promis'd' rather than reality and implying, for example through its gleeful depiction of Pitt being flogged by Fox, that a republican invasion or uprising might actually be quite fun or, at least, funny.[36]

Both Gillray and Isaac Cruikshank also produced prints in which Malmesbury's

---

[35] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8829].
[36] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 170.

coach is shown being greeted by enthusiastic Parisian men and women [Figs. 90 & 91].[37] The crowds cheer, wave their arms and bonnets rouges in celebration, fishwomen grab Malmesbury and kiss him. The French here are scruffy, malnourished, some are grotesque, but they are not the same sadistic, cannibalistic types which had recently come to prominence in English representations. Though Malmesbury's actual arrival into Paris had been quiet, outside of Paris he had been met by a deputation of 'poissardes' who harangued and embraced him, after which the Directory took measures to avoid the event's repetition.[38] These prints in which the people of Paris celebrate Malmesbury's arrival suggest a distinction between the people of France and their government as represented in other prints (such as *The Genius of France Triumphant* or *THE MESSENGER of PEACE)* as violent, warmongering, or guilty of neglecting to take peace offerings seriously. This separation of people and rulers was less common during the revolutionary era than during the *ancien régime* or the later Napoleonic era, but here it is in evidence. Far from depicting the French as inhuman monsters, it is suggested that they desired peace and cooperation and there is a greater sense of optimism and affinity in these portrayals.

The Treaty of Amiens signed in March 1802, which temporarily ended the hostilities that had been raging between Britain and France since 1793, also inspired mixed reactions. Gillray's government pension ceased following Pitt the Younger's resignation and the accession of Addington in March 1801, yet some prints, such as *PRELIMINARIES of PEACE! - or - John Bull, and his Little Friends "Marching to Paris"* [Fig. 92] [BMC 9726] (6 October, 1801) appear to show the continued influence of George Canning, the minister behind Gillray's involvement with the government who was also a passionate, vocal opponent of the peace.[39] Here, Lord Hawkesbury (1770-1828; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and negotiator of the peace, later Prime Minister Lord Liverpool) appears

---

[37] *Glorious Reception of the Ambassador of PEACE, on his Entry into PARIS* [Fig. 90] [BMC 8828] (James Gillray. 28 October, 1796). *Lord Mum Overwhelmed with Parisian Embraces* [Fig. 91] [BMC 8830] (Isaac Cruikshank. 7 November, 1796).

[38] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8828, 8829].

[39] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 104-105.

as a drummer boy, leading a march across a rotten plank, 'HEART of OAK', over the Channel towards celebrating simian Jacobins. In the water float the country's losses: Britannia's Union Jack shield, a large money bag of '£400 Million', and documents inscribed 'Malta', 'West Indian Islands', 'Cape of Good Hope', 'Map of Egypt', 'Restoration of French Monarchy', 'List of Soldiers & Sailors Killed'. The crowd consists of an amiable but gullible John Bull, accompanied by numerous impish members of the opposition each wearing or waving their bonnet rouge. 'Allons, Enfans de la Patrie! - now's your time Johnny! - my dear Boys! - did not I promise long ago, to take my Friends by the hand, & lead them on to March to the Gates of Paris? - Allons! vive la Liberta!!', says Hawkesbury, in a mocking reference to a speech from 1794 in which he had said that 'marching to Paris was practicable and he for one should recommend it'.[40] Yet Hawkesbury here is not quite the self-serving contemporary reincarnation of Sandwich or Bute. The facial expression Gillray has given him signifies wariness, and his prancing, skinny limbs possess a reluctant fatigue. Although the treaty is still condemned, there is acknowledgement of Hawkesbury's difficult position; rather than being pulled towards negotiation by French bribery as was the case for earlier statesmen, here he seems to be driven by necessity rather than by greed, and the presence of John Bull shows that he is acting on behalf of public opinion, not counter to it.

A GAME at CHESS [Fig. 4] [BMC 9839] (9 January, 1802) is even more moderate. It shows Charles Cornwallis (1738-1805), the British plenipotentiary sent to negotiate the peace terms, playing chess with Napoleon. The plump Cornwallis scratches his head, stating 'Curse it I shall lose this Game; You are too much for me.' Cornwallis is incompetent rather than evil or subversive. Napoleon, on the other hand, is rather handsomely rendered and although the legs of his chair consist of fasces and axes, for the time being at least he appears to be playing the game fairly and winning simply because of his superior abilities. In contrast to the aforementioned public disbelief and indignation which greeted the

---

[40] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [9726].

early setbacks of the Seven Years' War and the subsequent explanatory representations of the French securing victories in the only conceivable way, bribing corrupt British politicians, there seems here to be an air of grudging acceptance of French superiority. Whilst British identity may have been forged during its late eighteenth and early nineteenth century wars, the image which emerged seems not to have been a consistently triumphant one, and images such as this attest to a growing awareness of Britain's deficiencies and of a coming to terms with such deficiencies. It also demonstrates the way in which Bonaparte was able to transform British perceptions of France from that of a nation which could only succeed through underhand means to one which could achieve victory in a manner which demanded an undeniable degree of respect.

William Wordsworth scoffed at the idea of peace with Bonaparte[41], men like Nelson remained wary of 'the overgrown detestable power of France'[42], and politicians such as Pitt showed little faith in the treaty, stressing the urgency of using the cessation of hostilities as an opportunity to build Britain's strength for the very plausible possibility of renewed conflict.[43] Yet publicly the peace was fervently celebrated on both sides of the Channel.[44] In England the mail coaches were decorated with laurels, with many displaying banners declaring 'Peace with France'. Soldiers at the Ipswich barracks kissed the wheels of the coach which brought the news, whilst that arriving at Hull was driven through the streets for three hours and eventually upturned in the marketplace by way of celebration. Church bells rang out and buildings were decorated and illuminated. When showing himself at the window of his hotel, General Lauriston (the man who delivered Bonaparte's signature ratifying the treaty) was greeted by a crowd

---

[41] 'Lords, Lawyers, Statesmen, Squires of low degree, / Men known, and men unknown, Sick, Lame, and Blind, / Post forward all like Creatures of one kind, / With first-fruit offerings crowd to bend the knee / In France, before the new-born Majesty.' William Wordsworth, 'Calais, August, 1802', in William Wordsworth, *The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 280.

[42] Quoted in Wheeler and Broadley, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England*, p. 215.

[43] *Ibid*., pp. 215-216.

[44] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, pp. 231-232.

shouting 'Long live Bonaparte!'[45] The cynical genre of political caricature by its very nature did not react with quite so much jubilation, though it did pass comment. In several prints John Bull is shown celebrating the return of 'peace and plenty', reunited after a long dearth with his old friends beef, mutton, bacon, flour, bread, ale and suchlike [Figs. 93 & 94].[46] In another, *Iohn Bull's First Intelligence of PEACE!!* [Fig. 95] [BMC 9727] (6 October, 1801), John dances and cheers upon hearing news of the peace, if in a somewhat irrational manner; '…Huzza - Huzza - lock up Mrs Bull or she'll do herself a Mischief - burn all my old wigs - set fire to the House- D-----n me any thing by way of rejoiceing - !!' Nonetheless, Amiens was not derided in the harsh, unforgiving terms that were used in previous decades even for treaties which had ended with British victory.

  James Gillray even mocked William Windham's (1750-1810) vocal opposition to the peace terms with France. 'Are these idle dreams the phantoms of my disordered imagination?', Windham had asked, rousing Gillray to produce *POLITICAL-DREAMINGS! - VISIONS OF PEACE! - PERSPECTIVE-HORRORS!* [Fig. 96] [BMC 9735] (9 November, 1801).[47] Recalling the way in which he had depicted events of the French Revolution by making literal the sensationalist language of Edmund Burke, and using Fuseli's *The Night Mare* as inspiration, Gillray depicted Windham asleep in his bed, surrounded by the elaborate horrors of his dreams. They include Death, a red skeleton on stilts who wears a bonnet rouge and grasps the cord of a guillotine as he tramples over British trophies, conquests, beef, pudding, and ale; Charles Fox as a plump demon playing a stringed instrument and singing 'Caira!' (referring to the French revolutionary anthem 'Ah ça ira'), other members of his Party appear as rats; Justice sits in anguish, her sword and scale in a state of disrepair; a crowd of small beheaded victims of the Revolution appeal to Windham. Hawkesbury, guided by

---

[45] Wheeler and Broadley, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England*, pp. 212-214.
[46] *OLD FRIENDS with NEW FACES, or WELCOME VISITORS to JOHN BULL* [Fig. 93] [BMC 9731] (Piercy Roberts. c. October 1801); *IOHN BULL visited with the BLESSINGS of PEACE* [BMC 9732] (21 October, 1801); *IOHN BULL and HIS FRIENDS COMMEMORATING the PEACE* [Fig. 94] [BMC 9850] (Piercy Roberts. c. March 1802); *JOHN BULL and his FRIENDS welcoming home the DEFINITIVE TREATY* [BMC 9851] (c. April 1802).
[47] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 280.

the hand of Pitt, signs 'Peace' on Britannia's 'Death-Warrant' whilst Napoleon holds a rope around Britannia's neck and gestures towards the guillotine. In the background, the flagpole of the Tower of London flies the tricolour as the dome of St. Paul's burns. It is certainly a frightening image, but it is one which clearly takes place within the principal protagonist's fevered imagination and the primary target of the satire here is not so much peace, or those striving to create it, or even the French with whom it was being negotiated, but rather Windham and his excited, exaggerated pronouncements that Ministers had 'signed the death-warrant of their country' and that 'we are a conquered people'.[48] As the German magazine *London und Paris* stated, Windham's 'bold turns of phrase… were repeated and discussed in every society and every pamphlet: either in mockery or in hearty agreement, according to whether one was peaceable or warlike in inclination', and Mrs. Humphrey's large stock of this print sold out in only a matter of days.[49] The many purchasers and viewers of this piece may not have all interpreted the composition as an attack on the critics of the peace rather than on the British instigators of it as well as their French counterparts. *London und Paris*, in fact, despite its acknowledgment of Windham's divisive language and mention of his debt to Burke's concept of the 'regicide peace' (a phrase which had inspired some degree of mockery in earlier Gillray prints), considered the artist an 'advocate' of Windham's attitude.[50] Nevertheless, the popularity of the print demonstrates how dramatic and pervasive the issue was at the time and suggests that the design was bought by both supporters and opponents of Windham.

The suggestion that the peace was endorsed, or at least tolerated, by both Gillray and his public might be further supported by the fact that, other than Bonaparte's appearance in *POLITICAL-DREAMINGS!*, Gillray paid no attention to Napoleon for the two and half years prior to November 1802 when Anglo-French relations became strained once more.[51] Gillray's contemporaries in the business of graphic

---

[48] Quoted by George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [9735].
[49] Banerji and Donald (ed.), *Gillray Observed*, pp. 116-118.
[50] *Ibid*., p. 118.
[51] Hill, *Mr. Gillray The Caricaturist*, p. 126.

satire also produced fewer caricatures of Napoleon at this time, and Pitt's continued unpopularity meant that a number of prints etched the First Consul in positive terms.[52] *IOHN BULL'S PRAYER to PEACE, or the FLIGHT of DISCORD* [Fig. 97] [BMC 9737] (Piercy Roberts. 1801) is perhaps the strongest example of this; it shows John Bull kneeling in front of Peace, represented by a young woman surrounded by clouds. Next to her is an irradiated, handsome profile portrait of Napoleon. The beams of light which shine from Bonaparte repulse the fleeing Pitt, a hideous snake-haired warmonger. Dorothy George notes that it was also at this time that the First Consul's image became glamorised by an influx of straight portrait pictures into the print shops.[53]

  The peace was only brief, but its representation in the print shops is significant. It is surprising that Amiens was not treated in the harsh, alarmist terms of previous treaties; there was certainly opportunity to portray it in such a manner. It is unlikely that Addington's government was placing pressure upon the artists to handle Napoleon in an amiable manner in order to avoid damaging cooperative relations, as it was upon Addington's ascension that Gillray's pension ceased.[54] These prints, then, could be said to be representative of public opinion and indicate a difference in attitudes towards the French, towards Britain's own leaders, and towards the establishment of peace from those of previous years. The reaction to Amiens seems to weaken both Newman and Colley's assertions (neither deals with the 1802-03 period of peace) that rising nationalism can be attributed to antagonism towards the French and to war. As illustrated by the many public celebrations and reactions presented in the prints, prolonged war in this instance may in fact have diluted anti-French, nationalistic feelings, and thus have had the opposite effect of that suggested by these scholars. In times of war clearly anti-French sentiment was rife, but at its cessation if it was not dropped then it was at least modified.

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 126.

[53] Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires. Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. Vol. VIII*, p. xix.

[54] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, p. 104.

War, of course, resumed and antagonism resurfaced, further fuelled by the renewed threat of invasion.[55] When peace was once again established, thanks this time to the victories first in 1814 and then at Waterloo in 1815, the reactions encapsulated in the prints were again very different to those produced in the aftermath of earlier conflicts. George Cruikshank referenced the 'peace and plenty' prints produced after Amiens in *PEACE & PLENTY or good news for JOHN BULL!!!* [Fig. 98] [BMC 12265] (25 May, 1815). Here, John Bull sits at a table, feasting in the company of Louis XVIII as foodstuff is lowered down a ladder, at the top of which the Prince Regent peers from a window, announcing 'They are all coming down Johnny.' In the background, other John Bull-like figures plough the fields and unload imported goods from ships. Although this print does partake in and reflect the celebrations of peace, the renewal of trade and the dropping of food prices, there is another side to it which hints at the mixed feelings towards the defeat of the French Emperor and the restoration of the Bourbons. Louis XVIII is swollen and gouty, the legs of his chair strain under his bulk. He raises a toast to 'The Prince Regent & his Allies!' A sign boasts an irradiated crown and the words 'The Old Constitution New Revived by John Bull', yet its position is noticeably flimsy; it hangs from the weak branch of an oak tree, which has been precariously supported by a strut from the wall of the Regent's building. The composition and the colouring of the print also compel the viewer's eyes away from the feasting, past the farming and importing of goods, to the lonely figure of Napoleon in the distance, shackled to his rock of exile. Even in captivity his presence overshadows everyone else's. The downfall of Napoleon was addressed in the previous chapter, but it is worth briefly reiterating that the victory was largely interpreted as the defeat of Napoleon, the usurper tyrant of the French, rather than as the defeat of the French people or nation, and that even then there was a bittersweet taste to the victory due to the restoration of the old enemy in the form of the Bourbons and the feelings of sympathy that may have been

---

[55]   Alexandra Franklin, 'John Bull in a Dream: Fear and Fantasy in the Visual Satires of 1803', in Philp (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon*, p. 126.

evoked by images of the defeated Emperor.

George Cruikshank presented a more pessimistic portrayal of renewed trade in order to satirise the government's unpopular Corn Law legislation. *The Blessings of Peace or the Curse of the Corn Bill* [Fig. 99] [BMC 12503] (3 March, 1815) shows French traders arriving at the British shore. The law dictated that no foreign corn could be imported when prices were below 80 shillings per quarter and opposition to the act maintained that its purpose was to make landowners even richer at the expense of the poor.[56] Thus, in Cruikshank's satire the French corn is rejected by four landlords. 'We wont have it at any price - we are determined to keep up our own to 80s - & if the Poor can't buy at that price, why they must starve, we love money too well to lower our rents again, tho the Income Tax is taken off', says one. Another agrees, 'Aye - aye let 'em Starve & be D__d to 'em.' The French reluctantly have to throw their stock overboard, 'By gar if they will not have it at all we must thro it over board.' John Bull, accompanied by his wife and family, witnesses the sorry scene, and is so appalled that he decides to emigrate: 'No, No Masters, I'll not starve but quit My Native Country where the poor are crushed by those they labour to support, & retire to one more Hospitable, & where the Arts of the Rich do not interpose to defeat the providence of God.' In this print peace is to be welcomed and the French are stereotyped but not demonised. Unfortunately, this time the expected 'plenty' part of the peace fails to emerge on account of the greed of the British ruling classes.

War did not necessarily put a temporary stop to tourism. People continued to visit France during the War of Austrian Succession. The Seven Years' War did have an effect on tourism, still there were some who succeeded in visiting France at this time, such as Sir Richard Lyttelton MP and the Duke of Grafton.[57] The American War of Independence also restricted travel, but again passports continued to be issued and the fact that hostilities did not take place on the

---

[56] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [12503].
[57] Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth-Century* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992), pp. 163-164.

continent meant that there were some who still felt comfortable visiting a country with whom Britain was at war.[58] Peace, however always stimulated travel. Bishop Douglas (1721-1807) complained of the huge numbers of Englishmen who turned up in Paris as a result of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Irritated that he had not travelled there with the intention of acquainting with his fellow countrymen, he complained that he heard everywhere the sound of the English language. He also criticised their large groups for being 'seldom or never in company with the natives of the country' and could not see the point of their journeys because they seemed happiest in the company of each other, speaking in their own tongue. He did add, however, that 'I speak with limitation, as there are doubtless many exceptions to the remark.'[59] Presumably he included himself among these exceptions. Tobias Smollett (1721-1771), on the other hand, wrote of the wholehearted 'total metamorphosis' that Englishmen underwent on entering Paris: 'At his first arrival he finds it necessary to send for the tailor, perruquier, hatter, shoemaker, and every other tradesman concerned in the equipment of the human body. He must even change his buckles, and the form of his ruffles…'[60] Philip Playstowe wrote of the fraternity and hospitality that was offered to English officers visiting France after the Seven Years' War by their French counterparts:

> Should he [the traveller] be an officer, I would have him by all means carry with
> him his uniform, regimentals; that being the most respectable dress he can possibly
> appear in, and which, in a great measure, excludes him from many impositions; and
> entitles him to mess with the *French* officers in any town he may chuse [sic] to
> reside at. This, of all schemes, is the most eligible for him, as they are most of them
> extremely friendly; men of strict honour, and will at all times, prevent his being
> impos'd on; as the privileges they enjoy (tho' their pay is so vastly inferior to ours)
> make them not only respected, but fear'd by people in business. They all speak good
> *French*; are very ready to set him right in their language; and as long as he behaves
> like a man of honour among them, is sure to receive every civility in their power to
> grant: for their attachment to the *English* officers, (and indeed the *English* in
> general, from their generous and unprecedented conduct to them, when prisoners in

---

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[59] In Maxwell, *The English Traveller in France*, p. 74.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

the late war) makes them solicitous to serve them: these, preferable to all other in
France, are the men he should endeavour to be most intimate with…[61]

The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars had more of an impact on travel than previous conflicts. The bloodier acts of the Revolution repelled those who might have wished to visit France and convinced them that it was not safe, contacts there were executed or emigrated, and British diplomatic representation was withdrawn.[62] When peace was established, firstly in 1802, then again in 1815, just as they had upon the cessation of conflicts in the previous century, British visitors immediately flocked across the Channel.[63] Charles James Fox was among the thousands who visited France following the Treaty of Amiens, and the prints focused on this tourist particularly. Fox was in France between 20 July and 17 November, 1802, during which he had three interviews with Napoleon. The meetings did not go well and descended into arguments about matters such as the freedom of the press. They confirmed Fox's views that, despite his religious toleration and his achievements in bringing order back to France, Napoleon was an enemy to representative government and, above all, a soldier.[64] Caricatures, however, in keeping with tradition, portrayed Fox grovelling for the affections of the First Consul. *Taking Leave* [BMC 9891] (12 November, 1802) shows him bowing down to Napoleon whose crown is decorated with weapons and a skull and crossbones. Gillray's *Introduction of Citizen Volpone & his Suite, at Paris* [BMC 9892] (15 November, 1802) again shows Fox bowing to Napoleon, this time accompanied by his Whig friends and extremely overweight wife. Fox had married Elizabeth Armistead (1750-1842) in 1795, with the marriage kept secret until 1802.[65] Napoleon sits on a throne, one hand resting on a globe, the other reaching out to Fox. He is surrounded by his mameluke bodyguards. Though Napoleon appears sinister and arrogant, he remains handsome and controlled, in

---

[61] [Playstowe], *The Gentleman's Guide in his Tour through France*, pp. 8-9.
[62] Black, *The British Abroad*, p. 167.
[63] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, pp. 232 and 310-311.
[64] L. G. Mitchell, 'Fox, Charles James (1749–1806)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, 'http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10024', 6 June, 2011.
[65] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [9892].

contrast to Fox, his followers and his grotesquely fat wife.

Napoleon's banishment to Elba in 1814 again provoked British tourists to flock to Paris. George Cruikshank's *Hell broke Loose, or the John Bulls made Jack Asses* - [Fig. 100] [BMC 12517] (c. March 1815) is one of the numerous prints which seems to revel in Napoleon's return.[66] This time Napoleon is almost heroic, appearing, unexpectedly, over a hill side in the distance, causing the British visitors to flee in panic. The tourists cry out in regret statements such as 'Oh! that I had never left Old England' and 'How they will laugh at us at home, for being so fond of spending our money in Foreign Countries.' Whilst prints such as this one express disapproval of those eager to visit France and spend their money there instead of back home, they also demonstrate that such activities were rife amongst those that could afford it and that the British fascination with France had not been eradicated or diluted on account of war.

2) The Battlefield

Although emblems, allegories, and symbolic representations remained, prints on warfare, and the art of caricature in general, increasingly focused on personalities and stereotypes (although of course these too are types of symbols). During the American War of Independence, which France formally joined in 1778, numerous prints used established allegorical symbols in order to illustrate the war, in a similar fashion to prints earlier in the century. The British Lion and Britannia continued to make regular appearances. *The BRITISH LION engaging FOUR POWERS* [BMC 6004] (14 June, 1782) again represents the different participating nations as animals; Spain is a spaniel, Holland a pug dog, France a cock, and America a snake. Britannia features in many prints. She battles America (represented as a Native American) as she is stabbed in the back by a Frenchman.[67] She is crushed by a wheelbarrow carrying Britain's enemies and

---

[66] See Chapter Three.
[67] *Bunkers hill, or the blessed effects of Family quarrels* [Fig. 151] [BMC 5289] (c. 1775).

driven by a Dutchman.[68] She is about to be torn apart, tied by her limbs to horses heading in the separate directions of France, Spain, America, and 'DESPOTISM'.[69] Her statue is dismembered and beheaded by domestic supporters of American independence, while Britain's foreign enemies run off with the spoils.[70]

  Other prints put more emphasis on stereotypes, and there was a trend for contrasting British and French soldiers. Both *The CONTRAST* [Fig. 101] [BMC 5674] (27 May, 1780) and *RECRUIT FRANCOIS/RECRUIT ANGLOIS* [Fig. 8] [BMC 5862] (c. 1781?) show a fat English and a skinny French soldier squaring up to one another. In the latter, the recruits' different diets are alluded to in the background of the print where on the English soldier's side graze sheep and cattle, and on the Frenchman's side sit frogs and rodents. In the former, the bony Frenchman claims that 'We Beat you every Battle', the Englishman answers 'you Lie'. Even these seemingly patriotic contrasts are not without their ambiguities. Although these prints adhere to the British and French stereotypes, their images do not entirely make it clear who, from the choice of 'Monsieur all ruffles no Shirt Wooden Pumps and Stockingless' and 'Jack English with Ruddy face and belly full of Beef'[71], might in fact make the more ideal soldier. The soldier, in general, was a 'culturally ambiguous' figure; they were at times portrayed as heroic but were also 'feared for a propensity for licentious, irreligious and riotous behaviour that kept them on the margins of mainstream culture and society.'[72] Caricatures of sailors were more popular than those of soldiers, and sailors were more likely to be glorified as national heroes, though they too remained strangely peripheral figures who did not necessarily conform to the 'normal' rules of society, being associated with prostitution, smuggling, the racial diversity (and by

---

[68] *THE EUROPEAN DILIGENCE* [BMC 5557] (5 October, 1779).
[69] *BY HIS MAJESTYS ROYAL LETTERS PATENT. THE NEW INVENTED METHOD OF PUNISHING STATE CRIMINALS.* [BMC 5580] (1779?).
[70] *BRITANIA'S ASSASSINATION. or - The Republicans Amusement* [BMC 5987] (10 May, 1782).
[71] *RECRUIT FRANCOIS/RECRUIT ANGLOIS* [Fig. 8] [BMC 5862] (Thomas Colley. c. 1781?).
[72] John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, 'Introduction', in Bonehill and Quilley (ed), *Conflicting Visions*, p. 3.

extension the perceived depravity) of the port, and homosexuality.[73]

  Some contrast prints were openly negative. *TIME PAST/TIME PRESENT* [Fig. 102] [BMC 5959] was published on 20 January, 1782, three months after Charles Cornwallis' defeat at Yorktown. The print consists of two panels. In the first, 'TIME PAST', a stout Englishman with clenched fists tramples on a French flag as he chases two skinny French soldiers. He says 'Lower your Topsails Monsieur'. 'We are bold Frenchmen', says one of his opponents, amusingly contradicting the fact that they are retreating in fear. The background features more Frenchmen in flight, with the words 'Run Frogs' inscribed above them. The second panel, 'TIME PRESENT', tells a different story. Here, a Frenchman chases the English soldier, kicking him up the rear. 'Begar we will make you lower your Topsails', declares the Frenchman. The English soldier, fleeing, looks over his shoulder to say, 'I'm an English man of War.' A British flag lies, 'Discolour'd', on the ground, in the background are more retreating British soldiers, with 'Run Beef Heads' inscribed over them. Although perhaps expressing dismay at the changed situation, the print also derives its humour from this turnaround, the unexpected misfortune of the Englishman, and the contrast with his earlier arrogant successes. Like earlier prints it is centred on the nation's decline, though here the comic tone rather revels in British military misfortune.

  Prints on the American War continued to employ the obvious figureheads of the French and British monarchs as participants in the fight. George III is depicted being thrown from his American horse.[74] Louis XVI makes appearances conniving with the Spanish and the Dutch.[75] There also appeared, however, a greater interest in certain specific military leaders and their engagements. *The Engagement between D'ORVILLIERS & KEPPEL* [Fig. 103] [BMC 5626] (12

---

[73] Cindy McCreery, 'True Blue and Black, Brown and Fair: prints of British sailors and their women during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 23 (2000), 135-152.

[74] *THE HORSE AMERICA, throwing his Master* [BMC 5549] (1 August, 1779).

[75] *THE FAMILY COMPACT* [Fig. 160] [BMC 5567] (1 November, 1779); *LEWIS BABOON about to teach NIC FROG the LOUVRE* [Fig. 164] [BMC 5664] (1780).

January, 1780) refers to the Battle of Ushant of 27 July, 1778, and takes the common contrast between the French and English diets to its disgusting (scato)logical conclusion. The English Admiral Keppel (1725-1786) and the French Admiral the Comte d'Orvilliers (1708-1792) are bent over at opposite sides of the engraving, pointing their rears at one another and discharging. D'Orvilliers' torrent of excrement proves too weak and watery because of his insubstantial French diet of soup and it misses its target, flying over Keppel's head. The British admiral's own faecal bombardment, sustained by good old British beef, is sturdier, being made of many weighty, solid, individual fragments. Despite Keppel's superior diet, however, the print succeeds in disparaging both parties. As well as showing Keppel in the same disrespectful a position as d'Orvilliers, Keppel also fails to achieve victory, even with his advantage of heavier artillery. As the accompanying verses elaborate:

> Don't you think my good Friends this a comical Farce is,
> To see two Great Admirals fight with their A___,
> Monsr. Squirts Soup-meagre across K_p__ls back,
> But he in return gives a far harder Smack.
> What a Smoak & a Stink! & yet neither prevails
> For how can it be? when they both turn their Tails.

It is an accurate metaphor; Keppel's naval forces in the battle managed to inflict heavy damage on the French, but failed to secure a convincing victory.[76]

More successful was Admiral George Brydges Rodney (1718-1792), who was portrayed in positive terms after winning the Battle of the Saints in April 1782. He is depicted as St. George, heroically slaying the French dragon.[77] The dragon's wings are decorated with fleur-de-lis and it coughs up smoke, fire and a number of little frogs. In another print, Rodney sails on the back of his defeated enemy, the Comte de Grasse (1722-1788), tugging the Frenchman's long pigtail and

---

[76] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [5626].
[77] *St. GEORGE & the Dragon* [BMC 6001] (James Gillray. 13 June, 1782).

chopping a French flagpole with his cutlass.[78] They sail towards Jamaica, where de Grasse was held before being transported to England.[79] In the background is a boat containing some miserable French sailors who exclaim 'o Begar', whilst their English captor shouts 'Down with the French; Georgey'.

Rodney's victory was followed by the controversy of the new Rockingham ministry, who had supported America when in opposition, deciding to hand Rodney's command of the West Indies over to Admiral Hugh Pigot (1722-1792). Pigot set sail on the very day that news of Rodney's victory reached London, causing loud public dissatisfaction to be expressed at the political appointment of this inexperienced officer.[80] *RODNEY introducing DE GRASSE* [Fig. 104] [BMC 5997] (James Gillray. 7 June, 1782) shows Admiral Rodney kneeling before George III. He gestures towards his prisoner, the Comte de Grasse, who is skeletal thin. 'Sire,' announces the Admiral, 'I have done my Duty & at your Royal Feet, I lay the Surge of these Destroyers.' On one side of the king stands Charles James Fox, at this time Foreign Secretary. Fox says 'This Fellow must be recalled, he fights too well for us - & I have obligations to Pigot, for he has lost 17000 at my Faro Bank', a reference to Pigot's and Fox's gambling habits. Keppel stands on the other side, inspecting a piece of paper, 'This is the very ship I ought to have taken on the 27th of July'. This highlights the injustice of Rodney's dismissal, especially given that Keppel had previously failed to defeat the French forces in the Battle of Ushant, and yet had since been made Viscount and First Lord of the Admiralty.

Gillray's print in which Rodney, as St. George, defeated the French dragon also referred to the controversy by having Fox run in from the left, holding a Baron's coronet, saying 'Hold my dear Rodney, you have done enough, I will now make a Lord of you, and you shall have the happiness of never being heard of again.'

---

[78] *The VILLE DE PARIS, Sailing for Jamaica, or Rodney Triumphant* [BMC 5993] (1 June, 1782).
[79] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [5993].
[80] *Ibid*., [5992].

Once again, victory is overshadowed by a sense of disappointment with the domestic regime. We can also see that prints were becoming more concerned with the figures of military leaders and becoming more informed on the specific details of certain events.

Although caricatured figures could also act as symbols, the increasing tendency to represent warfare through depictions of political and military leaders meant that graphic satire was moving away from articulating battle in terms of a clash of ideologies or of nations to articulating it in terms of a clash of powerful personalities. To represent war as a fight against a cruel French figurehead, be it a Bourbon monarch, *ancien régime* admiral, Jacobin general, or Napoleon Bonaparte, also meant that the French people could be shown as victims of these rulers and not necessarily complicit in their despicable actions or intentions. Like the prints of Malmesbury in his coach, this could emphasise the important differences between the French people and their leaders. Earlier prints such as *The Grand Fair at Versaile, or France in a Consternation* [BMC 3679] (July 1759) illustrate the oppression and suffering of the French people at the hands of their government in reaction to their recent internal and external problems. Prints on Napoleon's Russian campaign show numerous starving, freezing, dying Frenchmen, their miseries ignored by their ambitious and deluded Emperor.[81] Prints such as these depended on a degree of empathy with the suffering of the French, and implied that the principal enemy was France's leadership, rather than its people.

There is also another side to some of the images which at first appear to revel in French defeats and in the slaughter of Frenchmen. Gillray's *The High German method of destroying Vermin at Rat-stadt* [Fig. 105] [BMC 9389] (22 May, 1799) is an explicitly gory depiction of the decapitation of two Frenchmen. One Frenchman's head sits on the end of a sword as his hands reach for where his head used to be, finding only a torrent of blood spurting from the neck. The other

---

[81] See Chapter Three.

Frenchman has been turned upside down, his pose reminiscent of St. Peter's inverted crucifixion, while his head has been placed between his feet. Significantly, however, the perpetrators here are Austrian. The print refers to the murder of two of the three French plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Radstadt. The third Frenchman, seen here in the background wounded and fleeing a group of soldiers, was left for dead but escaped.[82]

  The following month, Isaac Cruikshank depicted the Russian General Alexander Suvorov (1729-1800) as *GENL. SWALLOW Destroying the FRENCH ARMY* [Fig. 106] [BMC 9392] (1 June, 1799), a huge, terrifying ogre wearing a skull and crossbones hat. Beneath the feet of his wide stance French soldiers are crushed and with his hands he uses two forks to impale other terrified Frenchmen and their horses, feeding them into his mouth. The slaying of Frenchmen at the hands of the British would never be portrayed in the same manner. Although not quite as extreme, depictions of Gebhard Leberecht von Blücher (1742-1819) defeating Napoleon also portrayed the victorious general as cold and brutal. The Prussian beats and thrashes the Corsican as Frenchmen, civilian rather than soldierly, are chased and slain by his troops [Fig. 107].[83] When Napoleon appears as a spinning top, whipped by a gang of Allied leaders, Blücher is the most violent; stripped to his shirt, his eyes stare furiously.[84] Even if the helpless, pathetic Frenchmen were intended to be laughed at, rather than sympathised with, these prints indicate the manner in which the British defined themselves not just against the French, but also against some of their supposed allies with whom they found it even harder to identify.

  Clashes in which the British were shown to have the upper hand were depicted very differently. Rather than demonstrating bloody violence, these prints could be more slapstick, such as *THE LAST HARVEST or BRITISH THRESHERS makeing*

---

[82] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [9389].
[83] *OLD BLUCHER Beating The Corsican BIG DRUM* [Fig. 107] [BMC 12214] (George Cruikshank. 8 April, 1814).
[84] *The Corsican Whipping Top in full Spin!!!* [BMC 12218] (George Cruikshank. 11 April, 1814).

French Crops [Fig. 108] [BMC 11024] (September 1808), the first satirical print in the British Museum Collection to feature Arthur Wellesley (later Duke of Wellington). Despite showing some French troops in the background having their heads blown off by artillery fire, more emphasis is put on the tugging of French ponytails by the British who are about to emasculate the French by cutting them off. Another example is *The Battle of Vittoria* [Fig. 109] [BMC 12068] (George Cruikshank. 7 July, 1813) in which French soldiers are not killed but humorously poked in the backside by the British soldiers' bayonets. The former print, in the foreground at least, uses another technique which is to paint the battle as a personal one-to-one fight between two generals or political leaders. Although they remain representatives of their respective countries, these prints articulate the victory in terms of a personal vendetta rather than a political or ideological war between two irreconcilable nations and their people.

  Other prints more obviously combine personal caricature with emblematical symbolism. *Extirpation of the Plagues of Egypt; - Destruction of Revolutionary Crocodiles; - or The British Hero cleansing ye Mouth of ye Nile* [Fig. 110] [BMC 9250] (James Gillray. 6 October, 1798) features Nelson wading through the Nile, bashing tricolour crocodiles[85] with his club of 'BRITISH OAK'. The crocodiles which Nelson has succeeded in leashing represent the ships that were captured. The creature in the background with the flames exploding from its mouth mirrors the fate of the French flag-ship *Orient*, whilst those in flight are *Guillaume Tell* and *Généreux*, the only two ships to have escaped.[86] This print thus demonstrates ample comprehension of the events of the battle itself. It, and others like it, in Ian Germani's view,

> ultimately served to trivialize the event, making it the subject of popular
> amusement… For late eighteenth-century Britons and Frenchmen did not linger
> long on considering the horror and the sorrow of war. Instead, they idealized battle
> as a clash of competing principles, allegorized it as a struggle of rival symbols and

---

85 Although in one of the British Museum's copies the crocodiles are purely green.
86 George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [9250]; Ian Germani, 'Combat and Culture: Imagining the Battle of the Nile', *Northern Mariner* 10 (2000), pp. 66-67.

trivialized it as a high-spirited frolic. Such values manifested and encouraged a deeply ingrained acceptance of the appropriateness and desirability of military conflict.[87]

Certain scenes, such as *Galic Perfidy* or *The High German method* despite their comic form and potential inaccuracies do go some way in depicting the horror, if not the sorrow, of war. Graphic accounts of events in which British forces were involved, however, do tend to be less gory and can make more use of allegorical methods. In this respect these prints do, in fact, share some of the conventions of high art; the avoidance of literal reproductions of bloodshed, the use of symbols, the practice of setting scenes either before or in the immediate aftermath of a significant event. This promoted a view of the British as a people who conducted war in the proper, respectable and gentlemanly manner, in contrast to other more uncivilised nations; the Germanic sadists of *The High German method* or the brutish Russian 'General Swallow'. There was an element of truth to this perception. There survived chivalrous elements to the British conception of war, championing the idea that battle should be fought in a decent manner, according to certain rules of warfare. This was something the British had in common with the French, and it could come as a shock to both when encountering certain peoples who did not follow their shared values and customs when it came to war.[88] This was particularly true of the Italians and the Spanish who employed guerrilla techniques, but these prints on the Germans and Russians illustrate a similar attitude to central and eastern Europeans. As well as, and as part of, promoting an idealised version of the gentlemanly conduct of the British in warfare, the reluctance to produce more realistically graphic scenes of British soldiers or generals engaged in the slaying of Frenchmen demonstrates that killing, and the killing of the French by the British, remained a taboo. According to Stella Cottrell, representations of savage sans-culottes and Jacobin soldiers had gone some way to eliminating this problem:

---

[87] Germani, 'Combat and Culture', p. 69.
[88] Forrest, *Napoleon's Men*, pp. 122-126; Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, pp. 280-281.

> English soldiers were helped across the hurdle of the Christian taboo on killing
> one's fellow man by the propaganda's implication that the French were less than
> human - a different order of creature, a sub-species, monsters, deviants, a danger to
> the rest of mankind. Alternatively, the French, having repudiated God at the
> Revolution, had, in turn, been abandoned by God. … The British soldier, defending
> Christianity, mankind, nature and civilisation needed to have no doubts about the
> righteousness of his cause nor feel any compunction about the destruction of his
> French counterpart.[89]

Firstly, Cottrell fails to consider the many previous conflicts in which Christian peoples had overcome their discomfort with killing their fellow men, and their fellow Christians, in ages when such an atheistic stereotype was unavailable. Secondly, and not necessarily in contradiction to this, prints on warfare suggest that, despite the dehumanising portrayals of the French enemy, the taboo remained. Similarly, the fact that the British still felt the need to conduct battle along 'gentlemanly' lines, to treat French soldiers, and prisoners of war, with continuing degrees of respect, weakens the idea that perceptions of the French had significantly altered and that they were now more readily considered a sub-species whose slaughter inspired little moral discomfort. There was an enduring sense that the French were fellow western Europeans who shared a certain kinship with the English that was less achievable to obtain with the unfamiliar natives of those countries which remained as a distance, both culturally and geographically.

A print which expressed a clearer uneasiness with warfare, victory and jingoism was Gillray's *JOHN BULL taking a Luncheon: - or - British Cooks, cramming Old Grumble-Gizzard, with Bonne-Chére* [Fig. 111] [BMC 9257] (24 October, 1798). In it, an ugly and obese John Bull sits at a table, gorging on tiny French ships representative of British naval successes. As Nelson and his fellow admirals, all very stern, serve up more and more dishes, John Bull is 'literally devouring the news of naval triumph with insatiable appetite.'[90] Through a window can be seen members of the opposition, most prominently Fox and

---

[89] Cottrell, 'The Devil on Two Sticks', pp. 268-269.
[90] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 162.

Sheridan, who are fleeing in terror. 'Oh, Curse his Guts! he'll take a Chop at Us, next', says Fox. Although the print uses the allegorical ship-dishes, John devours ships in the same brutal manner that Cruickshank's 'General Swallow' devoured Frenchmen and their horses, giving the print a very different tone to that of others of the time which seemed to revel in Nelson's Egyptian successes. It is less susceptible to Germani's accusation of trivializing battle and promoting the desirability of military conflict. In fact, John's insatiable hunger, the admirals' remorseless seriousness, and Fox's panic all seem to be asking the provocative question 'Where will it end?'

3) <u>Summary</u>

  Most prints were not as openly troubled by war and conquest as *JOHN BULL taking a Luncheon*, and those who found Gillray's image too discomforting may have preferred to purchase the significantly toned down copy published by Fores [Fig. 112].[91] In this more palatable rendition, John Bull's appearance is less unpleasant, the admirals are less stern, Fox and his friends peer through the window disapprovingly but do not appear to be under threat. Nevertheless, graphic satire in the period 1740-1815 did not necessarily reflect a nation defining itself through prolonged warfare against the French. Early satires depicted warfare as chaotic and bestial, later ones increasingly portrayed it as a clash between powerful figureheads rather than nations or peoples. War was also regularly used as a tool not to deride the French but to undermine the authority and policies of the ruling regime at home; prints are as much about British failings as they are about French failings, if not more so. In the earlier years, domestic leaders were blamed for French successes and peace terms that were deemed too lenient. Attitudes seem to have changed, however, as later treaties were more readily celebrated, with both French enemies, such as Bonaparte, as well as British politicians, such as Hawkesbury and Cornwallis, treated more sympathetically

---

[91] *IOHN BULL Taking a Lunch - or Johnny's Purveyors pampering his Appetite with Dainties from all parts of the World* [Fig. 112] [BMC 9259] (1 November, 1798).

than their predecessors had been. Although scenes depicting actual conflict, the battlefield, and the 'realities' of war increased, they were more likely to be represented in slapstick, symbolic terms when portraying British victories. As well as demonstrating a compulsion to distance British forces from the unpleasant realities of battle, this implied that, despite the many dehumanised representations of the French, there was still a taboo about killing them, even in wartime. At the same time, the reputation of Britain's allies was attacked through portrayals of their involvement in the cold and gruesome slaughter of the French.

Chapter Five:

Revolution

The violence of the French Revolution and the subsequent outbreak of war inspired a dramatic change in the stereotype of the French. Transformed from skinny fops into savage Jacobins, it was at this moment that the French appeared at their most abhorrent. It was also, however, the point at which domestic anxieties were at their highest, there remained certain continuities with previous representations, sympathy was not entirely transferred from the French people to the monarchy and aristocracy, and the transformation was certainly not permanent. Like the initial reception to 1789, the revolution of 1830 would also be viewed as cause for celebration.

British responses to the initial stages of the first French Revolution tended to be favourable, as evidenced by the textual as well as the visual accounts of the time.[1] The earliest phases of the Revolution (such as the meeting of the Assembly of Notables and the summoning and meeting of the Estates-General) were not acknowledged in prints, although Britain and France's commercial treaty signed in 1786 had provoked some response. Voices condemning the arrangement were loudest in France where people were already suffering from recession; 'Buy French' campaigns were established and riots erupted as manufacturers were ruined and unemployment increased.[2] Many on the other side of the Channel also objected. Although such complaints (particularly those of the opposition) were acknowledged, English satirical prints on the subject, while playing with stereotypes, were relatively positive, and this was not because they could envisage that the treaty would contribute to France's ruin. In one print the British king and queen meet their French counterparts to swap hearty beef and plum pudding for a tray of tiny frogs [Fig. 30], but in another the influx of 'Burgundy', 'Champaine',

---

[1] Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene"', pp. 13-14.
[2] Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, p. 184.

and 'Clarit' is welcomed by delighted, drunken Englishmen [Fig. 10].[3] Those who opposed the treaty, meanwhile, were mocked. A shadowy Charles James Fox is depicted attempting to persuade the Chamber of Manufacturers, whose members have asses' heads, to petition against the treaty; in the House of Commons, its members envisaged as dogs, Pitt and his cohorts hold the paper treaty in their teeth as the opposition attempt to tear it to shreds; and in one print Fox is dismissed as one of the 'Antigallicans', not a label that would stick to him for long.[4]

Isaac Cruikshank passed comment on the French financial crisis in *Le DEFECIT* [Fig. 3] [BMC 7376] (12 November, 1788), the text of which indicates it was perhaps intended for sale in France, but it was not until the fall of the Bastille in July 1789 that print artists' attentions were fully drawn to the turbulence that was occurring on the other side of the Channel. 'Above all,' explains John Brewer 'English graphic art strongly underscored the revolutionary representation of the Bastille as the embodiment of the *ancien régime*'. Thus, for a short while at least, 'French revolutionary politics and English stereotypes combined'; the prison's proportions were exaggerated to enhance its menace, its interiors were imagined to be full of torture instruments, the building's destruction was portrayed as a heroic act, and the realities (such as the rather small number of prisoners who were in fact mostly sexual offenders and madmen) were brushed over.[5] The destruction of the Bastille was one of the few events that caricaturists did not view cynically, and its portrayal as a triumph of liberty over despotism and autocracy supports the idea that the antagonism present in earlier representations was directed less towards the French populace than towards their leaders as well as at broader conceptions of arbitrary rule. The miserable souls who had been tortured

---

[3] *The Commercial Treaty; or, John Bull changing Beef and Pudding for Frogs and Soup Maigre!* [Fig. 31] [BMC 6995] (25 November, 1786), *The TREATY OF COMMERCE OR NEW COALITION* [Fig. 10] [BMC 7144] (26 February, 1787).

[4] *The Chamber of Commerce, or L'Assemblée des Not-ables Anglois* [BMC 7140] (James Sayers. 14 February, 1787), *ANTICIPATION, or the approaching fate of the French Commercial Treaty* [BMC 7128] (James Gillray. 16 January, 1787), *THE OPENING OF ST. STEPHEN'S CHAPEL FOR THE PRESENT SEASON* [BMC 7130] (William Dent. 20 January, 1787).

[5] Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene"', p. 14.

and chained in prints such as *THE GLORY OF FRANCE* [Fig. 5] [BMC 2849] (1746) had finally been freed, and the celebratory depictions of liberated Frenchmen in 1789 emphasises the previous sympathies held for the French and the affinity that the British periodically shared with their neighbours.

   The early stages of the Revolution were also interpreted as an indication that the French intended to construct a system of government along the lines of the British model and that in doing so they were becoming more like the British. This view was illustrated in the most blatant terms by William Dent in *SUBSTANCE of a MODERN FRENCHMAN* [Fig. 113] [BMC 'undescribed', Registration no. 1948,0214.460] (24 August, 1789). This print features the rubble of the Bastille in the background, surmounted by the female 'Liberty' character, while the sun, inscribed with the words 'PUBLIC SPIRIT', shines on the central figure. This Frenchman is identifiable by his features and long coat, yet he also wears a large tankard of foaming beer on his head and in his arms he appears to be carrying a large plum pudding and a cut of beef. However, the fact that his coat is wide open and drawn back to reveal these items, the position of the beef where his chest might be and the pudding in the position of his stomach, his hands positioned too high to grasp the bulk effectively, but in the correct position to rub a satisfied stomach, suggest otherwise. The beef and the pudding are not merely items of consumption; they have become part of him, similar to their having been an intrinsic part of the stereotypical representation of the Englishman for so long. The Revolution has not merely brought the French into line with the British, it has transformed them physically.

   Other prints did not attempt to tie the storming of the Bastille so closely to conceptions of British progress. James Gillray used the event to emphasise the differences between the two nations' statuses in 1789, and the inferiority of the British system under the premiership of Pitt the Younger. The left-hand panel of *FRANCE. FREEDOM. BRITAIN. SLAVERY.* [Fig. 114] [BMC 7546] (28 July, 1789) shows Necker in an armchair, held aloft by a crowd in front of the Bastille,

who wave their hats in glee as the minister holds up a staff and cap of liberty in one hand, a royal crown in the other. A wreath inscribed with his name hovers over his head and he tramples instruments of torture under his feet. Pitt meanwhile, in the right-hand panel, strides arrogantly across a large, buckling royal crown, waving a flag decorated with torture devices. With his other hand he holds a headsman's axe and chains, the ends of which are attached to the necks of kneeling victims, including George III. In the background are gallows and an executioner's scaffold. Far from equating the storming of the Bastille with the free and prosperous situation in England, Gillray has used the event to suggest that the French may at last have discovered a more progressive system, but the British enjoy no such luxury, thanks to the political dominance of a certain individual. Nevertheless, while Pitt is lampooned, the print applauds the victory of the French people.

There were a small number of prints produced during the early years of the Revolution which expressed a more sceptical attitude to the events in France. Isaac Cruikshank produced a burlesqued scene of the 'Fête de la Fédération' on the one year anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, in which enthusiastic celebrations of fraternity have resulted in the king and several other Frenchmen overdramatically embracing, kissing one another and weeping with joy [Fig. 115].[6] The print is perhaps a parody of French images such as *Le Souhait accompli / V'là comme j'avions toujours désiré que ça fut* (4 August, 1789) in which representatives of the Three Estates passionately embrace each other while trampling on their respective restrictions; the nobleman crushes his pride, the clergyman his privileges and the commoner his hatred of the others.[7] In Cruikshank's version, however, the exaggerated fraternity of the French fails to hide the realities of self-interest, division, and continuing dissatisfaction, as one character engages in the hardly fraternal act of picking the pocket of the man he embraces. On the left an embracing couple make the sinister exchange, 'I'll

---

[6] *A New French Bussing Match or more Cursing & Swearing for the Assembly* [Fig. 115] [BMC 7661] (16 July, 1790).
[7] Cuno (ed.), *French Caricature and the French Revolution*, Pl. 33, pp. 159-160.

furnish tears to drown the King', 'And I the Dauphin and the Queen'. John
Barlow's *An Amphitheatrical Attack of the Bastille* [BMC 7561] (1 November,
1789), on the other hand, mocks an almost immediate sentimental British
obsession with the Bastille, and the inaccurate and inadequate dramatisations of
the event that were appearing on rival London stages.[8]

  One revolutionary figure who was afforded disdain at this time was the Duc
d'Orléans or 'Philippe Égalité' (1747-1793). He is shown force-feeding a
constitution to the reluctant king [Fig. 116], or dressed in women's clothing while
smuggling a dagger with which to assassinate his cousin, or attempting to recruit
support for his cause in Billingsgate among a gang of unimpressed, bawdy
fishwives [Fig. 117].[9] The unpopularity of Orléans does not contradict the prints'
more general support of the French people's triumph over the *ancien régime*,
however. Tamara L. Hunt uses Rowlandson's fishwives print to emphasise that
British opinion was still largely in favour of the revolution; it was not yet
considered particularly dangerous or threatening, even in light of the March to
Versailles (5-6 October, 1789):

> First, it seems that the duke is ridiculed for the folly of trying to promote a
> theoretical, political agenda among a poorly educated, coarse and traditionally
> unruly group that was excluded from politics by both class and gender. Second, the
> fact that he would approach such people in England also suggests that his followers
> in France were of a similar character; thus, the March to Versailles was the result of
> a mob action, which, while a serious matter, was not a political movement that
> challenged the status quo. Third, this print suggests that his ideas are so ludicrous
> that even fishwives, who were notorious for their eagerness to protest in the streets,
> were contemptuous of them. In any case, this was a reassuring view of French
> events and how Britain might be influenced by them. It suggests that even though
> the participants in the march to Versailles used revolutionary terminology, they
> were in reality the more familiar mob whose actions although violent, were not the

---

[8] Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, p. 90.
[9] *REVOLUTION* [Fig. 116] [BMC 7665] (Isaac Cruikshank, 3 August, 1790), *Assassination*
[BMC 7668] (Isaac Cruikshank, 19 August, 1790), *SERGENT RECRUTEUR* [Fig. 117] [BMC
7559] (Thomas Rowlandson, 24 October, 1789).

result of a concerted attempt by those traditionally excluded from the power to overthrow the existing political or social order. Paradoxically, the presence of Orléans could be seen as comforting, for it meant that the unreasoning mob at least was led by a member of the traditional ruling classes, thereby maintaining elements of the traditional social hierarchy.[10]

  It was the duc's Bourbon background, the fact that he was cousin to the king, which was the catalyst for his poor reputation in England. Having jumped on the bandwagon of revolution, he is portrayed as a duplicitous, insincere opportunist, attempting to exploit the people's achievements for his own interests, typical traits of traditional representations of the French monarchy. Force-feeding the king a constitution in itself is no bad thing; in *REVOLUTION* [Fig. 116] [BMC 7665] (Isaac Cruikshank. 3 August, 1790) there is little sympathy for Louis XVI who grumbles 'oh de pauvre Grand Monarch' as he reluctantly consumes the constitution, expelling a stream of 'Despotism' from his other end. But for Philippe to be encouraging such as act displayed such hypocrisy and opportunism, it could not pass without comment. General Lafayette (1757-1834), on the other hand, although involved in the same act, is portrayed in more noble, heroic terms, if obscuring the reality of Lafayette's desire for balance and order[11], in order to articulate satisfaction at the comeuppance of the monarchy which had contributed to the British being expelled from the United States ('by Gar you did send me to free de Americans & by gar I will Free mine own Countrymen'). The slithery manoeuvres of Orléans also evoked representations of the Prince of Wales and the controversy of the 1788 Regency Crisis. Orléans was an intimate of the Prince[12] and the pair had appeared alongside each other in previous print satires.[13] The two English and French prospective monarchs' hunger for the throne was illustrated by Thomas Rowlandson in *WHO KILLS FIRST FOR A CROWN* [Fig. 118] [BMC 7649] (29 May, 1790), the upper panel of which echoes the Regency Crisis, with

---

[10] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 95.
[11] Schama, *Citizens*, pp. 381-386.
[12] George Armstrong Kelly 'The Machine of the Duc D'Orléans and the New Politics', *Journal of Modern History* 51 (1979) p. 668.
[13] *The FROLICK or a NEW-MARKET, RACE* [BMC 7338] (10 July, 1788), *A new way to pay the NATIONAL-DEBT* [6945] (James Gillray, 21 April, 1786).

the Prince of Wales as a huntsman riding horseback chasing a crowned stag, his Whig supporters as his dogs. The lower panel mirrors this, though Orléans' hounds have already caught their stag.

  All the same, prints on the fall of the Bastille generally registered 'enthusiastic approval' with 'satire and caricature being reserved for the royal family'[14] and it would still be some time before British attitudes abandoned this positive viewpoint. Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, published in 1790, may have had immediate commercial success - seven thousand copies sold in the first week, nineteen thousand in the first year, with another thirteen thousand sold in France[15] - yet much of the critical reception it received was decidedly negative, both from Burke's enemies and his friends.[16] Caricatures on Burke and his *Reflections* were similarly critical, casting him as a pathetic Don Quixote or 'Don Dismallo'. Clad in armour, he bears a 'SHIELD OF ARISTOCRACY AND DESPOTISM' decorated with images of the Bastille and scenes of torture, riding an ass with a human head and papal crown.[17] He is paraded, shoved, and mocked by the French[18], or by his domestic critics.[19] The comparison to Quixote would also be employed in Thomas Paine's response to Burke, *Rights of Man*, in 1791.[20] At the end of the eighteenth century the character of Don Quixote was employed in two conflicting ways, 'On the one hand, he may be considered a positive character who tries to help others no matter how insurmountable the enemy is. On the other hand, he is also viewed as an individual to be pitied, since he conducts himself according to wrong and stale

---

[14] George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires... Vol. VI*, p. xxi.

[15] Gregory Claeys, 'The Reflections refracted: the critical reception of Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* during the early 1790s', in John Whale (ed.) *Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France: New Interdisciplinary Essays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 41.

[16] As discussed in *Ibid.*, pp. 40-60.

[17] *THE KNIGHT OF THE WOEFUL COUNTENANCE GOING TO EXTIRPATE THE ASSEMBLY* [BMC 7678] (Frederick George Bryon. 15 November, 1790).

[18] *DON DISMALLO AMONG THE GRASSHOPPERS IN FRANCE* [Fig. 119] [BMC 7688] (10 December, 1790).

[19] *DON DISMALLO RUNNING THE LITERARY GANTLET* [BMC 7685] (1 December, 1790).

[20] Paine, *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings*, p. 100.

principles.'[21] It is evidently the latter of these definitions which corresponds to the Burke/Quixote articulated by Paine and by the graphic satirists, although they seem to be expressing stronger emotions than merely pity.

   Of all the methods by which Burke attacked the Revolution and defended the old regime, it tended to be his famous description of Marie Antoinette at Versailles that was singled out for ridicule:

> It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the queen of France, then the dauphiness, at Versailles; and surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just began to move in, - glittering like the morning-star, full of life, and splendor, and joy. Oh! what a revolution! and what an heart must I have, to contemplate without emotion that elevation and that fall! Little did I dream that, when she added titles of veneration, to those of enthusiastic, distant, respectful love, that she should ever be obliged to carry the sharp antidote against disgrace concealed in that bosom; little did I dream that I should have lived to see such disasters fallen upon her in a nation of gallant men, in a nation of man of honour and of cavaliers. I thought ten thousand swords must have leaped from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened her with insult.- But the age of chivalry is gone.[22]

Dismissed by Burke's friend Philip Francis as 'pure foppery'[23], the passage was inscribed at the bottom of Frederick George Byron's print *FRONTISPIECE to REFLECTIONS on the FRENCH REVOLUTION* [BMC 7675] (2 November, 1790), accompanying a caricature of the sycophantic Burke on bended knee, hands clasped, obsequiously gazing at a vision of Antoinette. Clad in classical draperies, she lifts her veil to look down at her admirer, as a cherub holds a firebrand to Burke's head, releasing a gush of sparks. *DON DISMALLO, AFTER AN ABSENCE OF SIXTEEN YEARS, EMBRACING HIS BEAUTIFUL VISION*

---

[21] Maria Jesus Lorenzo-Modia, 'Cogitations on the French Revolution: "The History of Sir George Warrington; or The Political Quixote"', in Cristina Mourón Figueroa and Teresa Morale Gárate (ed.), *Studies in Contrastive Linguistics: Proceedings of the 4th International Contrastive Linguistics Conference* (Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2006), p. 544.

[22] Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London: Penguin, 2004), pp. 169-170.

[23] Quoted in Claeys, 'The Reflections refracted', p. 43.

[BMC 7679] depicts Burke reunited with the object of his affections. Antoinette welcomes him into her arms; he is her 'great Hero', a 'God of Chivalry'. Burke's wife stands in the background, weeping into a handkerchief. Burke confesses to Antoinette how foolish he has been in doting on this old woman for so many years; 'what's her bacon and eggs to the delicious Dairy of this celestial vision', he asks rhetorically.

As Dismallo, Burke is portrayed as a grovelling defender of everything that was considered objectionable about the French state before the Revolution: absolute monarchy, oppression, torture, and overbearing Catholicism.[24] He is also condemned as a hypocrite for his support of the American Revolution but not that of the French.[25]

Gillray's *Smelling out a Rat; - or - The Atheistical-Revolutionist disturbed in his Midnight "Calculations"* [Fig. 120] [BMC 7686] (3 December, 1790) depicts Richard Price (1723-1791; the dissenting minister whose sermon endorsing the Revolution and its ideals was attacked by Burke[26]) in alarmist terms. Price is writing a tract 'On the Benifits of Anarchy Regicide Atheism'. Beside him is a 'Treatise on the ill effects of Order & Government in Society, and on the absurdity of serving GOD, & honoring the KING' and a copy of his famous sermon. On the wall above hangs a picture of the execution of Charles I. Burke's personality and ideals are caricatured in stronger terms.[27] His giant, bespectacled nose protrudes from clouds, a copy of his *Reflections* resting on his glasses, two hands either side clasp a crown and a cross. Yet if Gillray's depictions of Price and Burke are satires of each adversaries' 'mental caricature'[28] of the other, perhaps Price is the more condemned of the two, as the cloud-engulfed Burkean

---

[24] *The Aristocratic CRUSADE, Chivalry revived by Don Quixote de St Omer and his Friend Sancho* [BMC 7824] (Isaac Cruikshank. 31 January, 1791).
[25] *DON DISMALLO RUNNING THE LITERARY GANTLET* [sic] [BMC 7685] (1 December, 1790); Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 99.
[26] Richard Price, *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country, Delivered on Nov. 4th, 1789, at the Meeting-House in the Old Jewry, to the Society for Commemorating the Revolution in Great Britain* (1789). Burke, *Reflections*, pp. 93-116.
[27] George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires... Vol. VI*, p. xxii.
[28] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 144.

creature his character is imagining is more frightening than the more realistically depicted Price that Burke's nose and glasses observe, despite the exaggerated terms of the tracts that he pens. Nevertheless, both parties' embellished attacks on the other are mocked, as well as the depths of hysteria to which political debate on France, and on Britain, has descended. Similarly, they are each the 'rat', Burke's association with the Fox-North coalition having in earlier years pitched him against the king, the Dissenters having for a time favoured William Pitt and the Court, so that 'If Gillray's print expresses any conviction, it is a sense of the hollowness of conviction as a guide to interpreting human behaviour.'[29]

  With the mounting violence of the Revolution and with the approach and outbreak of war between the two nations, graphic satire started to increasingly reflect the growth of British public hostility to France, as well as the intensification of input from governmental and loyalist association propagandists.[30] In many instances graphic satires remained focused not on actual events, but on the terms by which either loyalists or reformists exaggerated the events as well as each other's arguments. Thus, Gillray's infamous *Un Petit Soupèr, a la Parisiènne; - or - A Family of Sans Culotts refreshing after the fatigues of the day* [Fig. 121] [BMC 8122] (20 September, 1792) makes literal the cannibalism metaphors used by Burke in condemning revolutionary France[31] (as well as making literal the 'sans-culottes' by depicting the French as naked from the waist down). The grotesque scene is so depraved that it spills into outlandish burlesque, whilst the ironic mildness of the title suggests that the print was intended to be humorous rather than alarmist; the scene 'exists only in the fevered brain of the party zealot.'[32] At the same time, after decades of British graphic satirists having depicted the French as famished by their measly diet of 'soupe

---

[29] *Ibid*., pp. 144-145.
[30] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 43-44. Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 38. Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, p. 27. Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene"', pp. 17-18.
[31] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 145.
[32] *Ibid*., pp. 145-146. Donald does concede that 'an image of this deliberate crude power cannot be dismissed as mere spoof. It must be indeed have bloodied the imagination of the team of loyalist writers who were soon to depict the horrors of the Revolution as a cautionary lesson to the English labouring classes.' p. 146.

maigre', neglected and exploited by monarchy, aristocracy, and Church, there was a certain 'rock-bottom John Bullish logic'[33] to the situation depicted by Gillray. Having run out of soup and frogs, it made sense for the French to eat the aristocrats who had contributed to their starvation. The possibility that the sans-culotte 'is only a French John Bull in different circumstances, as Louis XVI is only a French George III'[34], may have struck fear into a pessimistic British aristocracy, but it also betrays an affinity with, perhaps a sympathy for, the French and their situation, and acknowledges the close parallels between the two nations and nationalities.

  Between 1797 and Pitt's resignation in 1801, Gillray was in receipt of an annual government pension.[35] Whether attributable to this or - as he insisted he was still free to 'chuse [sic] my own subjects and treat them according to my own fancy'[36] - whether down his own antipathy towards revolutionary politics[37], Gillray's prints persevered in condemning the actions of the revolutionaries. Both subversion (or rather an ambiguous all-pervasive satiric intent) and comedy are more difficult to detect in later Gillray prints on the revolution; such as the elaborate but largely humourless *The Apotheosis of HOCHE* [Fig. 122] [BMC 9156] (1798) or *Destruction of the French Colossus* [BMC 9260] (1 November, 1798). Nevertheless, there can still be found traces of anti-loyalist derision and spoof Burkean hyperbole in later prints. *Promis'd Horrors of the French INVASION, - or - Forcible Reasons for negotiating a Regicide PEACE* [Fig. 89] [BMC 8826] (20 October, 1796), brings to life Burke's *Letters on a Regicide Peace* which imagined the consequences of Jacobin victory in England. Butchery, chaos, and anarchy rage in St. James's Street. At the centre Charles James Fox flogs William Pitt, who is stripped to the waist and tied to a liberty tree. However, these horrors are merely Burke's 'promis'd horrors', rather than a credible

---

[33] Paulson, *Representations of Revolution*, p. 200.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 200.
[35] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 67 and 104.
[36] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 20.
[37] '[Gillray] hated Jacobins and was no friend of democracy…' Gatrell *City of Laughter*, p. 269; Nicholson, *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument*, p. 311.

possibility, and the scene is also suggested as a not unreasonable argument for negotiating peace: 'a wilful misunderstanding… and the spectacle of Fox scourging Pitt at the liberty tree, Grenville's bulky posteriors hanging truncated 'à la lanterne', and the EO gambling tables and playing cards tumbling out of the portal of the pro-government White's Club have an ebullience which is just as equivocal.'[38]

The influence of Burke on British literary and political culture was so profound that for many of the post-*Reflections* prints on the subject of the French Revolution it can be difficult to determine whether the intention was to attack the revolution itself (and its supporters) or to satirise the extremist, and often outlandish, terms on which those of the Burke camp condemned the republic and its champions. The question 'is this an attack on radicals or on the language of loyalists?' can be asked of an overwhelming number of prints on the French Revolution and is one that should always be kept in mind.

In spite of this, the majority of prints on the subject did, on the surface at least, reflect the increasing hostility to events in France, and in the months before the outbreak of war in February 1793 'London printshops acted as barometers of a deepening sense of national emergency.'[39] The imprisonment and execution of Louis XVI seems to have been one turning point, although the royal family's attempted flight and capture at Varennes had been welcomed as an opportunity for comedy in designs by Gillray, Rowlandson and John Nixon.[40] With the imprisonment of the Royal Family in the Temple in 1792, and the executions of the King and Queen the following year, representations became more sympathetic, depicting the French royals in domestic, familial, human terms,

---

[38] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 170.
[39] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, p. 43.
[40] *FRENCH DEMOCRATS surprizing the Royal Runaways* [Fig. 32] [BMC 7882] (James Gillray. 27 June, 1791), *THE GRAND MONARCK DISCOVERED IN A POT DE CHAMBRE. Or, the Royal Fugitives turning Tail* [BMC 7884] (Thomas Rowlandson. 28 June, 1791), *LE GOURMAND, HEAVY BIRDS FLY SLOW. DELAY BREEDS DANGER. A Scene at Varenne June 21 1791* [BMC 'undescribed', Registration no. 1948,0214.491] (Isaac Cruikshank after John Nixon. c. June 1791).

serving to highlight the inhumanity and unnaturalness of republicanism.[41] This was a significant shift in the way French royals were represented in print culture, and they were influenced not just by events in France but also the greater degree of affection that the British public held for George III in comparison to previous monarchs, affection which was in turn amplified by tragic portrayals of Louis.[42] This change in perceptions also permitted and informed the more sympathetic and human renderings of future leaders such as Napoleon and Louis XVIII discussed in Chapter Three.

   The rampant sentimentalism of such depictions of Louis XVI was still mocked by Gillray, however, two months after the execution. In *Louis XVI taking leave of his Wife & Family* (20 March, 1793) the drunken, gluttonous Louis XVI and hysterical Marie Antoinette bear an uncanny resemblance to the same artist's caricatures of George III and Queen Charlotte[43], and the Abbé Edgeworth is cast as a ghoulish monk.

   Print artists had difficulty in dealing with the subject of Louis' actual execution, apparently an event 'for which satire was self-evidently inappropriate.'[44] Isaac Cruikshank's *THE MARTYRDOM of LOUIS XVI, KING of FRANCE* [BMC 8297] (1 February, 1793) simply shows Louis posing in front of the guillotine with rays of light shining upon him. Below the title is written 'I Forgive my Enemies. I Die Innocent!!!' More imaginative was William Dent's *HELL BROKE LOOSE, OR, THE MURDER OF LOUIS* [Fig. 123] [BMC 'undescribed', Registration no. 1948,0214.450] (25? January, 1793), almost certainly the first response by a caricaturist to the execution.[45] Louis lies in position under the guillotine prior to execution, again lighted by the heavens. He is surrounded by

---

[41] John Barrell, 'Sad Stories: Louis XVI, George III, and the Language of Sentiment', in Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (ed.), *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (London: University of California Press, 1998), p. 79; Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene"', pp. 23-24.
[42] Colley, *Britons*, Chapter 5; Barrell, 'Sad Stories', pp. 78-79; Morris, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution*, p. 73.
[43] Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, pp. 132.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 135.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

revolutionary devils declaring 'CIARA' and 'VIVE LA NATION' which give the print more of a humorous than a sympathetic air.

A seemingly more serious etching by Gillray was *The Blood of the Murdered Crying for Vengeance* [Fig. 124] [BMC 8304] (16 February, 1793) featuring a decapitated Louis at the guillotine, a vast cloud of blood flowing from his neck towards the heavens, in which appear the words:

> Whither, - O whither shall my Blood ascend for Justice! my Throne is seized on by my Murderers; my Brothers are driven into exile; - my unhappy wife & innocent Infants are shut up in the horrors of a Dungeon; - while Robbers & Assassins are sheathing their Daggers in the bowels of my Country! Ah! ruined, desolated Country! dearest object of my heart! whose misery was to me the sharpest pang in death! what will become of thee? - O Britons! vice gerents of eternal justice! arbiters of the world! look down from that height of power to which you are raised, & behold me here! - deprived of Life & of Kingdom, see where I lie: full low festering in my own Blood! which flies to your august tribunal for Justice! - By your affection for your own Wives & Children, rescue mine: - by your love for your Country, by the blessings of that true Liberty which you possess! by the virtues which adorn the British Crown - by all that is Sacred, & all that is dear to you - revenge the blood of a Monarch most undeservedly butchered, - and rescue the Kingdom of France from being the prey of Violence, Usurpation & Cruelty.

The blood of the victim crying out for vengeance derives from the biblical account of Cain's murder of Abel, asserting the perception of Louis as martyr and appealing to the public for vengeance and justice.[46] It is possible that the print is so overdramatic as to also contain some essence of the derision that would be expressed in *Louis XVI taking leave of his Wife & Family*, but this is far from certain. *Louis XVI taking leave* was not circulated widely[47], so it at least seems that the more sentimental renderings of the execution had greater commercial appeal.

---

[46] 'the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou cursed from the earth… Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.' *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[47] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, p. 44.

Although scenes of the execution predominantly avoided comedy, promoting more saintly and tragic imagery of the king's death, the graphic goriness of prints such as *The Blood of the Murdered Crying for Vengeance*, or Isaac Cruikshank's *The MARTYR of EQUALITY* [Fig. 125] [BMC 8302] (12 February, 1793) suggests that such representations had a certain sadistic entertainment value. The event was used for entertainment purposes in other forms of art, there were at least three tragedies written about it in the years 1793 and 1794, and artistic renditions of the last interview were theatrical in nature, envisaging the incident in a stage-like space.[48] In 1757 Edmund Burke had written that nobody would stay to watch a tragedy if there was an execution taking place outside and, although sensibilities were starting to change, there was still pleasure to be taken in the suffering of others.[49] David Bindman lists several jugs and mugs which were decorated with pictures of the execution, including reproductions of *The MARTYR of EQUALITY* and other gory renditions, indicating that perhaps such images had more light-hearted purposes than to shock or to evoke mournful meditation.[50] Such pictures did, however, move Hannah More (1745-1833), who on receiving one of William Lane's prints of the execution wrote that 'I can generalise misery… but there is something in detail and actual representation which I cannot stand.'[51]

A number of prints also envisaged the execution as having been actually carried out by Orléans, who had voted for his cousin's death in the Assembly, continuing the theme of disparaging the duc's enthusiasm for revolution, and therefore more satirical in intention than sentimental. *The near in Blood, the nearer Bloody* [Fig. 49] [BMC 8292] (Isaac Cruikshank. 26 January, 1793), a satire on the duc's vote, shows Louis with his head on the block, Orléans is dressed as a sans-culotte bearing the axe. Marie Antoinette and the dauphin kneel behind Louis, weeping,

---

[48] Barrell, 'Sad Stories' p. 94.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 94.
[50]   Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, pp. 135-137, 140-141.
[51] Quoted in Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 151.

asking how the duc could do such a thing. Robespierre kneels in front of the king, waiting to catch his head in a basket. In *The MARTYR of EQUALITY*, Orléans holds out his cousin's decapitated head as torrents of blood gush from the neck, even one of the members of the National Guard in the background appears mildly repulsed. *The VICTIM of EQUALITY* [BMC 8298] (1 February, 1793) also shows Orléans holding aloft the king's head, the style of the engraving suggests that it is a French design, although the title has been etched in English. These prints seem more intent on belittling the actions of the duc than evoking sincere reflection on the unfortunate fate of the king. Like earlier caricatures such representations might also have been alluding to the unpopularity of the Prince of Wales, his relationship with George III, and his behaviour during the Regency Crisis.

Despite betraying some uncertainty of how to deal with such a subject, portrayals of Louis' execution did mark a shift away from straightforward humorous lampooning to a different variety of more alarmist imagery. This was clearly compounded by the declaration of war on Britain by France on 1 February, 1793. The French became warmongers, intent on fulfilling the promise made by the National Convention's decree of 19 November, 1792, to assist 'all those wishing to recover their liberty'.[52] In prints this extended to those who were not particularly interested in recovering their liberty, as the sans-culottes were shown to ransack their way across the continent, force-feeding the various hesitant and bewildered peoples of Europe with the 'bread of liberty' [Fig. 126][53] and firing off cannons in the ironic name of 'UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE'.[54] In Britain, without the threat of invasion which was not a serious concern (if ever it really was) until 1803, the attacks were directed 'as much against "French Principles" in England as against the French, and the motto of the caricaturists might be a phrase of the *Anti-Jacobin* (14 May, 1798): "the Principles by which, much more than by

---

[52] Quoted in Schama, *Citizen*, p. 543.
[53] *Sans-Culottes, feeding Europe with the Bread of Liberty* [Fig. 126] [BMC 8290] (James Gillray. 12 January, 1793).
[54] *PHILOSOPHY RUN MAD OR A STUPENDOUS MONUMENT OF HUMAN WISDOM* [BMC 8150] (Thomas Rowlandson. c. December 1792).

the Arms of our enemy, the safety of the British Empire is endangered.'"[55] Thus in Gillray's *Sans-Culottes, feeding Europe with the Bread of Liberty* [BMC 8290] (12 January, 1793) the stereotypical representatives of Holland, Savoy, Germany, Prussia, and Italy are harassed by bona fide French sans-culottes, but those who force-feed John Bull with the bread of liberty are Sheridan and Fox, bare-legged and capped with bonnets rouges.

   As with representations earlier in the century, antipathy was largely directed towards natives who were allegedly under the influence of France, rather than at the foreigners themselves. There was some shift in the people targeted as being under or susceptible to the influence of France. It is arguable that the accusation that the British upper classes were under the influence of France, an influence which may have been at risk of trickling further down the social strata, was replaced by the accusation that the lower classes were being directly influenced by France. The nature of the influence had changed also; whereas the upper classes had been seduced into becoming weak, effeminate fops, the lower classes were at risk of becoming stronger and more self-assured. Events in France provided a catalyst for the explosion of expressions of anxiety over the British reform movement which had been growing in recent years; 'Between 1788 and 1792 Britain saw the most sustained radical and reformist activity since the civil wars of the seventeenth century: a radical newspaper press flourished as never before; radical clubs and associations were set up in nearly thirty English towns, as well as in Scotland and Ireland; and the astonishing success of Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man*… ensured the unprecedented exposure of radical political ideas.'[56] Onto the French, then, were projected 'all the forces, fantasies, contradictions and fears with which the English ruling classes, at least, were ill at ease and needed to repress. The French threatened to unleash all that was contained, incarcerated, suppressed or made subordinate in English society, and to challenge or subvert all that seemed secure and natural.'[57] The revolution, with all

---

[55] George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires... Vol. VII*, p. xi.
[56] Brewer, '"This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene"', p. 14.
[57] Cottrell, 'The Devil on Two Sticks', p. 267.

its vivid, memorable, and distinctive symbolism, also provided a suitable means with which to condemn reformists; their caricatures could be dressed up in bonnets rouges, shed of their trousers so as to be literally 'sans-culottes', and shown wielding tricolours and guillotines.

In Newman's view at least, such representations succeeded in significantly damaging the reform movement. The movement 'lay paralyzed for more than a decade (circa 1790-1805) under exactly the same slur it had formerly cast against its upper-class opponents, namely that its motivations and actions were insidiously "French" in origins.'[58] Though he does make the concession that this was in conjunction with significant repressive government measures such as the suspension of habeas corpus, Newman overemphasises the importance of Francophobia and underplays the way in which the French and their supposed influence, both before and after the revolution, were often merely a tool on which to project domestic unease, rather than the principle objects of hostility themselves. While establishing a precedent of using images of (either British or French) ragged, violent sans-culottes in order to undermine the domestic left, as well as there being a lack of interest in the individual leaders of the revolution, specific events and developments of the revolution in France which were not directly relevant to British life passed largely without comment, and there was little acknowledgement of the revolution outside of Paris.[59] Antitheism may have become a new element of the French stereotype, but while the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and nationalism of church property were taking place in 1790-1792, inspiring a great number of prints in France and riling Burke on the other side of the channel, caricaturists barely noticed.[60] Similarly, although the guillotine was regularly employed to symbolise the cold-blooded mass execution that resulted from the outbreak of unrestrained liberalism, the counterrevolution and subsequent suppression of the Vendée was ignored by all except Gillray in *The Apotheosis of HOCHE* [Fig. 122], published at least three months after the death

---

58 Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism*, p. 230.
59 Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, p. 27.
60 *Ibid*., p. 27.

of Hoche, and three years after his pacification of the rebellion. Again, Hoche may not have attracted the attention of Gillray had he not also tried, and failed, to invade Ireland in December 1796. Produced in a nation supposedly identifying itself in its opposition to France, and although they remained more attentive to France than to any other nation, caricatures on the revolution betray some lack of interest in the inner workings of France, not just towards the minutiae but also in respect to some relatively major events, confirming that the response to the revolution was repeatedly about British rather than French politics.

It is possible to overemphasise the shift from fear of a Francophilic elite to that of a Francophilic (in the new, revolutionary sense) popular classes, Burke's 'swinish multitude'. Much of the antipathy was directed against the Foxite Whigs, no strangers in satire. It was mentioned in the previous chapter how the revolution's principal figures were virtually ignored in caricature. Well, the genre did provide revolutionary 'leaders' but they were not Frenchmen; they were the influential figures of the domestic left. Fox and his friends were depicted serving up Pitt's head, a broken crown, and a mitre (all with a garnish of frogs), to be devoured by the French general Dumouriez[61], or sycophantically laying monarchical, religious, and constitutional emblems at the feet of a grotesque 'Marianne' or the guillotine-headed 'Genius of France'.[62] In *A DEMOCRAT, - or - REASON & PHILOSOPHY* [BMC 8310] (James Gillray. 1 March, 1793), Fox is simply shown dressed à la sans-culotte, a dagger thrust through his belt, waving with his blood-stained hand. 'Ca ira!' he exclaims, his expression and attitude suggesting 'quasi-intoxication', it is said to be one of the small number of caricatures which managed to genuine offended Fox.[63] Although at times the allegation was made clear that the lower classes were at risk of being led astray by political leaders, as well as dissenting religious leaders such as Richard Price or

---

[61] *DUMOURIER dining in State at St. James's, on the 15th of May, 1793* [BMC 8318] (James Gillray. 30 March, 1793).

[62] *A PEACE OFFERING To the Genius of LIBERTY and EQUALITY. Dedicated to those Lovers of French Freedom who would thus Debase their Country* [BMC 8426] (Isaac Cruikshank. 10 February, 1794), *The Genius of France Triumphant, - or - BRITANNIA petitioning for PEACE. - Vide, The Proposals of Opposition* [BMC 8614] (James Gillray. 2 February, 1795).

[63] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8310].

Joseph Priestley[64], it was generally these members of the elite, supposedly under French influence, who were the principal objects of criticism. In this respect there is a continuity from the pre-revolutionary age when macaroni aristocrats (Charles James Fox and his father Henry had been among them) were at risk of influencing those below them of becoming similarly Francophilic. Fears of the lower orders, if genuine, were articulated largely through lampooning the actions of Fox and although a shift had occurred, in that the French revolution and renewed war with France had provided the opportunity for government and loyalists to be able to accuse the opposition of Francophilic tendencies (whereas previously it had often been vice-versa), concentration seems to have been focused less on the French enemy, less on differences of class, than on old fashioned disagreements of party politics.

The idea that the real focus was domestic, metropolitan party politics might also be suggested by the fact that, according to some observers, people outside of London were less concerned about the issues evoked by the revolution and the war than those in the capital. Louis Simond, recording his journey around England, Wales, and Scotland in years 1810 and 1811, became convinced that 'As we get farther from London, I think I perceive more moderation in political opinions; fewer people speak of revolution, either to wish or fear it, or believe the people ripe for it.'[65] More work needs to be done on regional attitudes towards the French Revolution, and although Colley tried to argue that the reason for the emergence of the volunteer corps, and for the great numbers of participants, was principally the desire to protect the homeland from French invasion[66], it 'seems undeniable that many individual Volunteers were not always highly motivated by ideological hostility to the French Revolution'[67]; more recent scholarship, such as that of Nicholas Rogers or Katrina Navickas, has undermined the constitutional

---

[64] '…caricaturists tended to emphasize the idea that… working-class threat in England were the result of plebeians being led astray by demagogic political or religious leaders.' Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 116.

[65] [Simond] *Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain… Volume first*, p. 202.

[66] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 305-308.

[67] Emma Vincent Macleod, 'Historiographical Review: British Attitudes to the French Revolution', *Historical Journal* 50 (2007), p. 699.

impetuses of the Volunteers.[68] In some ways, then, satirical prints on the French Revolution continued the traditional mode of London-centric caricatures of the outstanding politicians of the day, their central concerns being focused on events and on power within the capital over national or international affairs. War, revolution in France, patronage, censorship, and bribery may have tipped the balance in favour of the administration, but in many ways French imagery remained a tool with which to tarnish the reputation of members of the political elite.

Elsewhere, however, we are reminded of the continuous infatuation with French fashions and entertainments on the part of the political class, regardless of party persuasion. Isaac Cruikshank's *A PEEP at the PARISOT! with Q in the corner!* [Fig. 18] [BMC 8894] (7 May, 1796), for example, in which members of the government and the opposition sit side by side to leer at the French dancer. British enthusiasm for French culture remained, and it was not seen to be an exclusively Whig trait.

In some prints, the Whigs were treated more sympathetically, and Pitt was demonised for his megalomania and militarism. In 1795, the point at which 'general discontent was at its peak, radical societies at their most active and Pitt's popularity at its nadir'[69], Gillray produced *Presages of the MILLENIUM…* [Fig. 29] [BMC 8655] (4 June, 1795), in which Pitt is cast as Benjamin West's *Death on the Pale Horse*, here the horse of Hanover. He gallops over prostrate pigs (the 'swinish multitude'), the hind legs kicking Fox and his associates (Norfolk, Stanhope, Grafton, Wilberforce, Sheridan, and Lansdowne) into the flames of Hell; they seem more pathetic than dangerous.[70] In *DRESSING THE MINISTER ALIAS ROASTING THE GUINEA PIG* [Fig. 127] [BMC 8650] (23 May, 1795)[71],

---

[68] Rogers, 'The sea Fencibles, loyalism and the reach of the state', 41-59; Navickas, 'The defence of Manchester and Liverpool in 1803', 61-73.

[69] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, p. 55.

[70] *Ibid*. p. 55.

[71] Previously attributed to Henry Kingsbury, now thought to be by W. O'Keeffe, 'http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database/search_object_details.as

a response to the tax on hair powder, English and French immigrant barbers unite in hanging Pitt upside down on a spit.[72] They appear more emaciated than the John Bull-ish English barbers, but there is little animosity here towards the French and no damning revolutionary symbolism is employed. Though there is the prospect of cannibalism, the phrase 'Ah grant to me von little bite!' refers to pre-revolutionary representations of elegantly dressed but starving Frenchman.[73] The Englishmen are also complicit in the act, 'I shall have a double appetite when the Guinea pig is well roasted', if not more so, as it is the Frenchman who has to ask the English for a share of their roast. Rather than the English having been infected with contagious cannibalistic Jacobinism of the French, the print makes clear that Pitt has brought this sticky end upon himself and that the barbers' actions are in the interests of the nation; one of the Frenchmen singes Pitt with a burning paper, the unpopular 'Prince's Debts'. Similarly, the French barbers' appearance remains 'dandified', with their 'elaborately figured jackets' and 'gaudy stockings' (though their wigs remain unpowdered thanks to the tax)[74], indicating that the older stereotype of the French had not been completely superseded.

As with prints earlier in the century, by emphasising the suffering of the French at the hands of a cruel government, though it was now a different style of tyranny, some images implied a sense of sympathy for the French people and their unfortunate political circumstances. In Isaac Cruikshank's *Rights of Man alias French Liberty alias Entering Volunteers for the Republic* [Fig. 128] [BMC 7853] (c.1793), republican officers drag and drive terrified and famished Frenchmen; 'oh mon Dieu, my Wife & my pauvre Famille' says one, as his spouse and small children attempt to pull him in the opposite direction. Though it is not one that is often made, there is a distinction here between the agents of the French government and the sufferings of the (provincial?) ordinary people of the country.

px?objectid=1463079&partid=1&searchText=Pitt+barbers&fromADBC=ad&toADBC=ad&numpages=10&orig=%2fresearch%2fsearch_the_collection_database.aspx&currentPage=1' (14 February, 2011).

[72] For the controversy of the tax on hair powder, see Chapter 4 of John Barrell, *The Spirit of Despotism: Invasions of Privacy in the 1790s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[73] *"Ah, grant a me von letel Bite."* [BMC 5790] (James Gillray? 1 December, 1780).

[74] Barrell, *The Spirit of Despotism*, p. 162.

Similarly, in Gillray's *Apotheosis of HOCHE* [Fig. 122], below the general and his accompanying ridiculous Jacobin angels and cherubs, is the sombre scene of the Vendée in which French folk are hanged, lie decapitated, are shot, or drown as they attempt to flee their Jacobin persecutors. Outside of the theatre of Anglo-French war, the spilling of French blood in visual prints tends to be articulated in terms of unnecessary horror. Whether by gibbet or Inquisition-style torture or, later, by guillotine, it is to be condemned not celebrated. The moral implication of a scene, be it one produced earlier in the century or post-1789, in which the French conduct violence on one another, is that such actions are repugnant and undesirable.

 Some of the suspicions we have about the sentiments contained within, and the meanings behind, British prints produced in reaction to the events of the French Revolution can be confirmed by those which responded to a later uprising, that of 1830. After the decades of instability and war which had emerged in light of 1789, one might expect more satires on 1830 to be in line with the appalled condemnation that appeared in publications such as the *Morning Post*. Here, Charles X, 'the unfortunate King' and 'much-abused Monarch', was described in the terms of a martyr (albeit one more fortunate than his elder brother Louis XVI):

> …Charles X, in his honourable anxiety to close the horrific scenes of bloodshed
> which have again disgraced the capital of this Kingdom, instead of availing himself
> of the fidelity of the immense military force that still remained at his command,
> consented to resign his power, and retire into a foreign land.

The consequences of Charles' apparently benevolent and selfless actions, however, were likely to follow the pattern of the previous revolution, an argument reinforced by the presence of Charles' likely successor, the Duke of Orleans, son of the notorious 'Philippe Égalité':

> …The Republican Faction in the State could not however be conciliated even by so
> generous a sacrifice on the part of the King, and in pursuance of their insidious

designs, they have put up in opposition to the legitimate Royal Race, the early child and adherent of inveterate Jacobinism, the junior *Egalité…* whose prime boast is that he pursued the infamous course of his father, whose conduct was so atrocious as to call upon his guilty head the just vengeance even of his own fellow-Regicides. This unworthy being is however much mistaken if he suppose that he will be enabled to establish himself in the permanent favour of the Republicans of France. He may for a short time be contained at the head of affairs; but he must be the weakest-minded mortal that ever existed, if he do not foresee that in the inevitable re-establishment of a Republic, if not the renewal of the Reign of Terror, a dread punishment awaits his conduct, which no good man of any country will deplore.[75]

William Heath's *BLOWING UP THE FIRE* [Fig. 129] [BMC 16284] articulates a similar anticipation of revived Jacobinism and potential international catastrophe, depicting the Devil, or a demon, wearing a cap decorated with a blood-dripping dagger and tricolour cockade. He sits on a dark cloud opposite a globe engulfed by flames, which he encourages with his bellows. At the centre of the flames is 'France', but they are starting to extend over 'Holland', 'Portugal', and 'Spain'. Above is written 'A small spark will kindle a Flame -That Oceans cannot quench'. Not only is this print among a small number of prints which express hostility towards the revolution, it was also the first print to do so, yet it was not published until 8 October, 1830, some time after the events of July.[76]

Mirroring the reaction to France's first revolution, visual prints for the most part expressed empathy and support for the rebellion, whilst again attributing blame to the oppressions of Bourbon rule. Scenes produced after, but set before, the 'Glorious Days' of July focus on the French government's infamous 'July Ordinances' which had suspended the liberty of the press, dissolved the newly elected Chamber of Deputies before it had even met, almost halved the size of the chamber, restricted the franchise, and called for new elections, all in a misguided

---

[75] *The Morning Post* (7 August, 1830).
[76] There followed *AN HIERGLYPHIC FOR 1830* [BMC 16300] (Henry Heath. c. November 1830), 'a naïve survey of the situation at home and abroad', George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [16300], and *A BAIT for JOHN BULL* [BMC 16317] (Charles Jameson Grant? 11 November, 1830).

attempt to restore order.[77] French Prime Minister Prince Polignac (1780-1847) is depicted trampling on the 'Charter Liberty' as he fires a cannon at horrified and distressed representatives of the French press, also disturbing a Bonapartist bee hive [Fig. 130].[78] Elsewhere, he appears heading a group of soldiers, commanded by Charles X to destroy a printing press defended by two lowly journalists. Charles says 'Heed them not, Polignac - we'll shew an example to all monarchies - and soon shall every Liberal tremble', while his minister, lifting his axe above his head, exclaims, 'Factious villains! traitors and libellers! thus for the honor and security of the French Throne, and the check of opinion and anarchy do we destroy thy infernal machines'. Here, French newspapers are trampled underfoot as well as, beneath the foot of Charles, a paper inscribed 'Constitutional' [Fig. 131].[79]

  In *THE ZANYS* [Fig. 132] [BMC 16214] (Robert Seymour. 6 August, 1830), French 'PUBLIC OPINION' is given the allegorical form of a sleeping lion, an interesting image to use given this beast's association to Britain and its regular use in identifying enemies of the British state, domestic or foreign. Charles and Polignac stand over the lion; both have a fool's cap and asses' ears. As Polignac hammers staples to attach the lion's tail to the ground, the king approaches its face with a plaster inscribed 'Ordinance for abolishing the free press'. The same artist's *FRANCE RECEIVING THE ORDINANCES* [Fig. 133] [BMC 16215] (7 August, 1830) uses another allegorical representation of the French people. A classical, heroic figure, perhaps Marianne, surrounded by clouds, dramatically tears in half the paper ordinances as Charles, Polignac, and other Bourbon supporters scatter in terror. Though she wears a Bonapartist eagle on her helmet, this embodiment is a world away from the gross female representations of France which had dominated the 1790s in prints such as Rowlandson's *THE CONTRAST 1792* [BMC 8149] (December 1792) or Isaac Cruikshank's *A PEACE OFFERING*

---

[77] Pamela M. Pilbeam, *The 1830 Revolution in France* (London: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 60-61.
[78] *ORDNANCE againt the liberty of the press* [Fig. 130] [BMC 16208] (William Heath. 2 August, 1830).
[79] *FRENCH MODE of PROCEEDING EX-OFFICIO* [Fig. 131] [BMC 16213] (Charles Jameson Grant. 6 August, 1830).

To the Genius of LIBERTY and EQUALITY [BMC 8426] (10 February, 1794).
The bloodthirsty, snake-haired, grotesque hag is no more; instead she has
transformed (or reverted) into a rather sober and noble figure. She embodies the
French people's glorious triumph over the evils of monarchical and governmental
oppression. The allegorical and classical terms in which France is represented
here expresses respect and empathy for the French nation. With this, there is
obvious identification with the French, emphasised by the use of the lion
character, with its echoes of the British Lion, in *THE ZANYS*.

   In less allegorical prints, such as Heath's *PATRIOTS WHO FOR SACRED
FREEDOM STOOD* [Fig. 134] [BMC 16217] (8 August, 1830), the French are
also etched with sympathy and admiration. While depicting Frenchmen in the
process of storming the Tuileries, attacking royalist soldiers, triumphantly waving
the tricolour, in 1830 'the figures were now determined and heroic and not the
grotesque archaic simian morons of Gillray.'[80] They are less caricatured, less
stereotypical, their appearance more serious and more human. Although engaged
in an act of violence, it is not a ferocious, cannibalistic violence. It is legitimate
violence, expressed here through the bodies over which the rebels wade; not their
victims but the innocent civilian casualties of the government's authority. When
expressed in a more comic form, the sentiment that the people are justified in their
actions against the state and its defenders is the same. Another Heath print, *Street
Fighting/IT'S A NICE THING TO BE A SOLDIER NOW A DAYS* [Fig. 135]
[BMC 16225] (20 August, 1830), shows royalist soldiers in a Paris street
bombarded by a shower of furniture, household utensils, and bricks. Most of the
soldiers lie crushed, some try to escape, as a Parisian woman leans out of her
window to empty the scalding contents of a saucepan. Though employing a more
comic style and slapstick brand of humour than Heath's former print, it is not an
entirely inaccurate portrayal of the violence which did occur in the streets of
Paris. In fighting to defend their districts, the insurgents used their intimate
knowledge of the narrow streets and interconnecting alleys and courtyards to their

---

[80] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 39.

advantage.[81] Though no women died in the fighting, they were involved in the building and defending of barricades and in feeding and tending the combatants.[82] Certainly this was a politer revolution which established a constitutional monarchy and did not descend into a reign of terror, but in the summer of 1830 the outcome was far from clear. The *Morning Post* predicted that Louis Philippe would share the same fate as his father: decapitation at the hands of the revolutionaries he had initially supported, followed by further violence, military dictatorship, and probable European war.[83] Given that graphic satire had spent much of the last few decades regularly depicting the French as brutal, simian sans-culottes, it is surprising that this was dropped so easily and that the uprising in 1830 was not portrayed in equivalent terms.

A couple of satires even went as far as calling for the execution of Polignac and other ex-ministers. The first panel of *Great mercy for the great – Little mercy for the little* [Fig. 136] [BMC 16532] (William Heath. 1 January, 1831) imagines Polignac and his colleagues cheerily stepping over the bodies of the dead, the verdict of their judge having been 'Ye have committed Treason and Murder - yet out of respect to your High Order we save your Lives'. This is contrasted with the fate of the poor Englishmen in the second panel who are sentenced to death for breaking a threshing machine. In *PUNISHMENT IN FRANCE FOR THE MURDER OF THOUSANDS* [BMC 16565] (Robert Seymour. 1 February, 1831) Polignac plays backgammon with a fellow prisoner as a cook serves dinner onto a table below a chandelier. In December 1830 rioting had occurred in Paris in reaction to the ministers Polignac, de Peyronnet, de Guernon Ranville, and de Chantelauze having been sentenced to life imprisonment rather than death[84], a grievance with which these prints appear to empathise.

Support for the revolutionaries had also been expressed in some areas of the

---

[81] Pilbeam, *The 1830 Revolution in France*, p. 61.
[82] *Ibid*., pp. 62 and 64.
[83] *Morning Post (*6 August, 1830).
[84] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [16532].

230

British press. The *Liverpool Mercury*, for example, condemned Charles X and praised the actions (and moderation) of the rebels.

> It has often been observed that the Bourbons were an infatuated and incorrigible race, upon whom experience, which is said to make even fools wise, was utterly lost. If the history of the last quarter of a century has fully established this truth, the history of the last fortnight has, on the other hand, proved that the French people do not participate in the infirmities and vices inherent in their rulers. They have most assuredly profited by the lessons of experience, and we are at a loss whether more to admire the courage and firmness they have displayed in their recent struggle for liberty, or the exemplary moderation they have exhibited since the achievement of the unparalleled triumph they have gained over a traitor king and his execrable ministers.[85]

The *Hampshire Advertiser*, meanwhile, made more explicit the connection between governmental rule abroad and at home, and perhaps the self-interest inherent in press condemnation of Charles' ordinances: 'The measures taken are so openly in defiance of all law, that not even the shadow of an apology can be offered for them. What would be the sensation in England if we had a Government mad enough to attempt to suppress the publication of all papers to-morrow morning!'[86]

Graphic satires, too, drew parallels between events in France and the situation at home. William Heath's depiction of Polignac firing a cannon at French journalists was mirrored in Henry Heath's (relationship unknown) *AN ENGLISH ESSAY on the POLIGNAC SYSTEM!!* [Fig. 137] [BMC 16233] (1830) in which Judge Scarlett inhabits the role of Polignac and fires at representatives of the British press, encouraged by Wellington who was Prime Minister at this time. As chief law officer, Scarlett 'exhibited much hostility to the press, and at his instance several informations were filed against the *Morning Journal*, *Atlas*, and other

---

[85] *Liverpool Mercury* (6 August, 1830).
[86] *Hampshire Advertiser: Royal Yacht Club Gazette, Southampton Town & Country Herald, Isle of Wight Journal, Winchester Chronicle, & General Reporter* (7 August, 1830).

papers, for libels on the duke of Wellington and the lord chancellor.'[87] Wellington was also condemned in prints for his supposed support of the Polignac administration, partly the unfortunate downside to his reputation as the war hero who had defeated Napoleon and thus restored the French monarchy.[88]

Although, as Michael Duffy says, 'revulsion from the Bourbons and the growing radicalism of the English press led the printmakers to take a far different view of the 1830 Revolution than they had of that after 1789'[89], it would be wrong to believe that graphic satire completely fell in line with the radical press and that it no longer had time for tarnishing the characters and reputations of reformists. While the French had largely escaped their image as crazed, bloodthirsty Jacobins in 1830, representations of reformists in England did continue to employ the symbols of 1790s French republicanism. Thus, Henry Brougham, Charles Grey, and John Lambton, architects of the Reform Act, appear as *THE TRICOLORED WITCHES* [BMC 16709] (John Doyle. 6 June, 1831), stirring their cauldron, wearing conical hats which resemble liberty caps or bonnets rouges. This may at first appear to fit Newman's thesis of the left being undermined by association with France and French symbolism, as clearly this technique continued to be used. Yet the fact that the French themselves were not even being portrayed in this way anymore undermines the strong tie between supposedly dangerous reformist politics and France. The Jacobin stereotype had been separated so easily and so clearly from the French, even in light of a subsequent revolution, whilst continuing to be used to satirise the domestic left, that it brings into question the extent to which it mattered that the republican symbolism was of French origin, and the extent to which earlier satires were concerned with France rather than British internal disputes.

---

[87] G. F. R. Barker, rev, Elisabeth A. Cawthon, 'Scarlett, James, first Baron Abinger (1769–1844)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, 'http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24783', (28 February, 2011).

[88] For example, *A RELATIVE POSITION in 1830 versus 1792; or, Policy to a Letter* [BMC 16218] (9 August, 1830) and THE *BOURBONS FALL or Priestcraft and Despotism rewarded* [BMC 16263] (September, 1830).

[89] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 39.

It is also worth noting that revolutions (or attempted revolutions) in other European nations did not merit the same degree of empathy or attention as those which took place in France. The Dutch Patriot Revolt of 1787 and subsequent Prussian invasion were dealt with in derisively humorous slapstick terms, though this was partly informed by the satisfaction evoked by France's failure to assist the Dutch rebels.[90] Prints on the Spanish revolt of 1820-1823 meanwhile, though generally supportive, were still small in number with prints on the intervention by France in 1823 appearing more insistent on flippantly undermining the character of Louis XVIII than on celebrating or championing the cause of the revolutionaries. Additionally, rather than concentrating on the overthrow of Ferdinand VII that was at that moment being attempted in Spain, they were keener to imagine that French intervention might have the repercussion of another revolution in France and the overthrow of Louis.[91] Revolutions in France attracted the most British attention because France remained a continuous source of fascination, France was the most serious threat to British power, but it was also the French with whom the British felt the most affinity.

Summary

The early events of the French Revolution were depicted in a positive light. This is unsurprising because, although the bigoted and inquisitorial elements of the French stereotype had diminished in the period between the Seven Years' War and the American Revolution, there was an English satirical tradition of depicting France (and previously Spain) as having struggled under the cruelty of its overly powerful Church and monarchy. Nevertheless, despite the misfortune of the royal family being occasionally mocked, caricatures on events such as the storming of the Bastille were characterised by an unusual lack of cynicism. As well as

---

[90] See Chapter Six.

[91] *Old Bumblehead the 18th trying on the Napoleon Boots - or, Preparing for the Spanish Campaign* [BMC 14502] (George Cruikshank. 17 February, 1823), *A Hint to the Blind & Foolish - or the Bourbon Dynasty in Danger!!* [BMC 14510] (George Cruikshank. 10 March, 1823), *King GOURMAND XVIII and PRINCE POSTERIOR in Fright!* [BMC 14512] (Robert Cruikshank. 14 March, 1823).

informed by past portrayals of French authority, such renditions could be used to promote the idea that France was progressing towards the British system, or to criticise the domestic situation under the rule of William Pitt the Younger. When a more cynical attitude was shown, it was usually towards the Duc d'Orléans; a figure whose opportunistic actions in themselves were perhaps worthy of contempt but who also reminded the satirists of their own narcissistic Prince of Wales.

The outrage shown towards France by Edmund Burke was initially ridiculed, and his attitude and writings continued to influence satires throughout the revolutionary period. A number of prints (some more clearly than others) made fun of Burkean hyperbole by making literal his vivid and inflammatory texts, exaggerating them to the point of absurdity, or peppering their images with ironic inscription. This can make analysis of prints on the Revolution extremely difficult; it can be hard to determine whether certain satires intended to deride the revolutionaries themselves, or their supporters in Britain, or Burke's attitude, or all at the same time. There is no doubt, however, that prints did become more genuinely derisive towards French republicanism as events on the continent developed.

The escalation of violence, including the execution of Louis XVI, had a noticeable effect, although the king's imprisonment and death were still treated as a subject worthy of humour in some designs, while some of the more serious renditions had a certain gory, voyeuristic, and insensitive entertainment value. A greater influence was the outbreak of war, creating a climate in which positive portrayals of Frenchmen were less of an option and negative stereotypes were sure to dominate. Having said that, portrayals of Frenchmen became more repugnant than they had been in previous wars. Such imagery was fed by events of the Revolution, but also by the divisions that it had created or exposed at home, and the anxieties that it sparked. If the English (as well as the French) had spent the earlier part of the century staring intently across the Channel trying to assess

its rival's power and potential (as well as its failings) and discovering therein its own reflection[92], as the Whig lawyer Lord Henry Cockburn observed of the post-1789 period, 'Everything rung and was connected with the Revolution in France… Everything, not this thing or that thing, but literally everything was soaked in this one event.'[93] The revolutionary period was the era when the French stereotype was at its most abhorrent, it is no coincidence that it was also the point at which domestic anxieties were at their highest. Such as it was in earlier decades, it was often the natives who were considered to be influenced by or enamoured with France, rather than the French themselves, that were the principal concern. Although the lack of caricatures of actual French revolutionary leaders and the prevalence of cannibalistic sans-culotte characters imply a fear of the 'swinish multitude', the real danger still seemed to lie with the political elite of Westminster, particularly with Fox and his Whig Party, while at the same time those on both sides of the political spectrum continued to be interested in and infatuated with French fashion and culture.

Although stereotypes would again be modified in line with the progress of Napoleon, in some caricatures the revolutionary image prevailed, in which Bonaparte remained a child of the revolution; a guillotine-wielding Jacobin general.[94] The abhorrence of the French revolutionary stereotype was not so great, however, as to diminish the chances of empathy for the revolution of 1830, which again was portrayed supportively, the French once more heroically throwing off the shackles of despotism in the name of liberty, even while reformists at home were still at times being associated with symbols such as the bonnet rouge. Prints produced during the era of the French Revolution may have promoted an image of the Frenchman as a grotesque Jacobin, fostering and enforcing an abhorrent, perverted and violent variety of republicanism. They may have briefly fallen in

---

[92] Derek Jarrett, *The Begetters of Revolution: England's Involvement with France, 1759-1789* (London: Longman, 1973), p. 24.
[93] Quoted in David McCracken, 'Introduction' in William Godwin, *Caleb Williams* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. ix.
[94] *The ARMS of FRANCE* [BMC 10090] (James Gillray. 6 September, 1803), *BUONAPARTE! AMBITION AND DEATH!!* [BMC 12171] (George Cruikshank. 1 January, 1814).

line with the popular conservative response to the French Revolution, the outbreak of war having been a crucial factor in this, and enthusiastically portrayed members of the opposition as fanatical sans-culottes. Despite these occurrences, and despite the claims of certain scholars that political prints essentially endorsed conservative values[95], there survived and prevailed in this material certain liberal sentiments and elements of Anglo-French fraternity, even if they did stop short of radicalism. This can be seen in the early responses to 1789, the initial and the arguably sustained disdain shown towards Burke, his ideas, and his language, the continual fascination with French fashions and culture, the disappointment which greeted the restoration of the Bourbon regime[96], and the enthusiasm with which revolution was again greeted in the year 1830.

---

[95] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21; Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 143-156; Goode, 'The Public and the Limits of Persuasion', 117-136.
[96] Investigated in Chapter Three.

Chapter Six:

Women and 'other Others'

1) Women

In his 1988 historiographical article 'Seeing the Past' Roy Porter stressed the regrettable lack of interest that scholars dealing with satirical prints had shown towards representations of Georgian women.[1] Porter's challenge was taken up by Cindy McCreery in her 2004 publication *The Satirical Gaze*[2] which, though enlightening in some respects, was not without its drawbacks.[3] Amongst McCreery's omissions were discussions of images of foreign women, and the use of female figures as emblems. It was in this latter employment that Porter felt female characters were 'most strikingly present' in print culture, being employed to personify concepts such as Britannia, Virtue, Justice, and Liberty.[4] Tamara L. Hunt gave attention to some of Britannia's many uses in *Defining John Bull*, noting Britannia's versatility, her prominence in prints on the conflict with America, the decline of her utilization after 1785, and her being displaced by John Bull as national symbol.[5]

In terms of stereotypes of 'real' Frenchwomen, prior to the revolution numerous eighteenth century British writers were keen to stress that the fairer sex in France possessed a worrying degree of power. The Parisian salons, in which individuals of both genders met and exchanged ideas, meant that 'a minority of Frenchwomen had acquired pretensions to intellectual autonomy' and women 'had been able to use their prominence at the royal court to engage in political intrigues with kings

---

[1] Roy Porter, 'Review Article: Seeing the Past', *Past and Present* 118 (1988), pp. 204-205.

[2] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*.

[3] Frank O'Gorman, 'Review of *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in late Eighteenth Century England* by Cindy McCreery', *English Historical Review* 484 (2004), 1430-1431.

[4] Porter, 'Seeing the Past', pp. 204-205.

[5] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, pp. 121-125.

and ministers alike.'[6] John Andrews was particularly eager to repeat such notions. In France, he wrote, women 'dictate all that is to be said, and prescribe all that is to be done in the genteel world.'[7] They were the '*primum mobile*' of everything that occurred in the kingdom, in its government, its politics, as well as in lesser concerns, and the French were more 'subject and subservient to the government and controul [sic] of their women' than any other people.[8] Frenchmen complained of the situation but were powerless to change it: 'While on the one hand they patiently submit to the whim and capriciousness of woman-kind, on the other, they are everlastingly declaiming against their tyranny.'[9] This could be used as a parallel to the alleged slavish, servile tendencies of the French in other respects: 'Subjection… of some kind or other seems necessary for a Frenchman. Whether in love or in politics, he is always ready to bend the knee before some favourite idol.'[10]

   This attitude is more implicit than explicit in satirical prints. Foppish Frenchmen appeared regularly, their laughable effeminacy indicating their slavishness politically, and perhaps also to their wives, but they tended to be shown as dominated by Englishmen, particularly butchers, as well as Englishwomen, namely the fishwives of Billingsgate.[11] Nor was the suspicion that women dominated and dictated the workings of the French court a subject that caricature particularly stressed. Louis XV's unpopular mistress Madame Pompadour appears alongside her lover in *THE FRENCH KING IN A SWEAT or the PARIS COINERS* [BMC 3691] (1759); she operates the bellows for the furnace on which Louis melts down his valuables following the French disasters of 1759. She also appears in *The Grand Fair at Versaile, or France in a Consternation!* [BMC 3679] (1759), in which she is attributed greater blame: 'Thy misfortunes come by a Wh__e'. Satires on Pompadour and her manoeuvres are, however, rare. Although

---

[6] Colley, *Britons*, p. 251.
[7] John Andrews, *A Comparative view of the French and English nations*, pp. 84-85.
[8] John Andrews, *Remarks on the French and English ladies*, pp. 162 and 345.
[9] *Ibid*., p. 160.
[10] *Ibid*., pp. 184-185.
[11] See Chapter Two.

some of the scandalous French images of Louis XVI's queen may have found
their way across the Channel, English caricaturists paid negligible attention to
Marie Antoinette prior to the outbreak of revolution, and when she did feature it
was not as the dominating true possessor of power. She joins her husband in
swapping frogs and soup for beef and pudding on the event of the Commercial
Treaty of 1786, but does not seem to be in charge.[12]

  One of Andrews' concerns, and of others such as the evangelical Thomas
Gisborne (1758-1846), was that English women might be tempted to follow, and
increasingly did follow, the precedent set by Frenchwomen of involving
themselves in spheres that were deemed inappropriate. Gisborne believed women
in London were following the pattern set by those in Paris, and that even those
with 'no connection with the political hemisphere' were inspired by successful
women's dangerous ambitions.[13] Andrews tried to convince his readers, as well as
himself, that

> In England, the glory of the sex is modesty in their behaviour, and discretion in their
> words. Though possessed of an exquisite share of wit and sense, they have too much
> prudence to make a parade of either: thinking it more eligible to reserve them for
> use on proper opportunities, than to throw them away in ostentation. However
> severely we reflect upon our women, for being too curious and inquisitive, it may be
> affirmed that, when compared to the French, the English women seem rather to
> shun occasions of meddling with the concerns of others, and are not fond of laying
> out their abilities unless necessity compel, or interest authorise their exertion. Such,
> in general, is the temper and disposition of the fair sex in our island.[14]

Elsewhere, he was less optimistic, noting that 'It is the complaint of the thinking
part of our nation, that our women already betray too much proneness to imitate
their neighbours'. It was a predicament he attributed to the 'frequent tours to
France', which had not been so problematic when it had mainly been men

---

[12] *The Commercial Treaty; or, John Bull changing Beef and Pudding for Frogs and Soup Maigre!*
[Fig. 31] [BMC 6995] (25 November, 1786).
[13] In Colley, *Britons*, p. 251.
[14] Andrews, *A Comparative view of the French and English nations*, p. 85.

travelling, as he considered men to be less susceptible to seduction by French fashions and habits.[15]

The fact that such fears were not articulated as strongly in satirical prints of French women might be used to question the prevalence of such attitudes. More likely, however, is that these particular anxieties did not need to be expressed in prints of French women, as they were voiced so blatantly in caricatures of English women, such as those of the notorious Duchess of Devonshire (1757-1806). Huge numbers of prints attacked Devonshire for her campaigning on behalf of the Whig Party. *POLITICAL AFFECTION* [Fig. 138] [BMC 6546] (Thomas Rowlandson. 22 April, 1784), for instance, has Devonshire suckling a fox, signifying Charles James Fox with whom she was rumoured to be having an affair. Engaged in this act, she neglects her maternal duties by ignoring her wailing infant.[16] Other prints alleged that the Duchess prostituted herself to procure votes for the Whigs.[17] Tamara L. Hunt suggests that this concern over women's influence on politics contributed to the adaptation of Britannia's image and her being displaced by the masculine character of John Bull.[18] To show Frenchwomen as outrageously, ridiculously fashionable, to show Frenchmen as effeminate, and to show English folk copying such examples, of course has political implications. Yet Frenchwomen were not etched in such an extreme manner as domestic female political troublemakers like Devonshire.

Jane Kromm argues that prints on the early events of the French Revolution tended to be positive when men featured most prominently, whereas those on revolutionary women were different. She writes that

> Whereas the Bastille scenes received a clearly positive treatment in their emphasis

---

[15] Andrews, *Remarks on the French and English ladies*, pp. 260-261.

[16] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, p. 190.

[17] For example *THE DEVONSHIRE, OR MOST Approved Method of SECURING VOTES* [BMC 6520] (Thomas Rowlandson. 12 April, 1784), *The POLL* [BMC 6526] (Thomas Rowlandson. 12 April, 1784), *THE DUTCHESS CANVASSING FOR HER FAVOURITE MEMBER* [BMC 6527] (William Dent. 13 April, 1784).

[18] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, pp. 125-141.

on the vagaries of French carceral practices and on liberation as a suitable response to them, the march of Versailles was treated as a more potentially negative processional scene of marginal women.[19]

This interpretation is questionable. Kromm fails to investigate the more celebratory prints of revolutionary women. *DON DISMALLO AMONG THE GRASSHOPPERS IN FRANCE* [Fig. 119] [BMC 7688] (10 December, 1790) for example, which shows Edmund Burke surrounded by a French crowd and led towards a gibbet, greatly evokes the October Days due to the active part it assigns to the French women. On the whole these ladies are portrayed respectfully, and it is Burke who is the object of ridicule. Perhaps this crowd is taking revenge on Burke for his description of the October Days marchers as 'the vilest of women.'[20] Other prints, granted, depicted violence. William Dent's *FEMALE FURIES or Extraordinary Revolution* [Fig. 139] [BMC 'undescribed', Reg no. 1948,0214.464] (18 October, 1789) features hordes of women besieging Versailles, attacking the guards and displaying heads on pikes. Yet the tone of the print remains comic, perhaps even congratulatory. The women are not portrayed in a particularly unflatteringly manner, they appear cheerful and bawdy rather than evil, and it is not necessarily implied that the violence is unjustified or that the royal guards or the royal family are particularly worthy of sympathy. It may also be the print's intention to parody Charles Benazech's polite and sentimental rendering of the event, *The Paris Militia setting out for Versailles, on the 5th of October 1789.*[21]

  Nor does the fact that the female revolutionary characters in Isaac Cruikshank's *Le ROI ESCLAVE ou les SUJETS ROIS/FEMALE PATRIOTISM* [Fig. 140] [BMC 7560] (31 October, 1789) appear '*less* caricatured' than other figures such as the royals and Lafayette necessarily mean that they achieve 'by virtue of this

---

[19] Jane Kromm, 'Representations of Revolutionary Women in Political Caricature', in Lisa Plummer Crafton (ed.), *The French Revolution Debate in English Literature and Culture* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1997), p. 124.
[20] Burke, *Reflections*, p. 165.
[21] Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine*, p. 93.

contrast, a less ambiguous position of documentary validity' which serves to 'indicate that French women actually looked and behaved in this way.'[22] The lack of caricaturing here could just as easily denote respect. Moreover, a good reason for their lack of physiognomic distortion is that they are not specific, famous individuals like some of the other characters, but rather a gang of generic women. The print also suggests justification for the women's violence, or at least an acknowledgement that the violence emerged as a result of great hardship; the women at the back of the parade draw a wagon of grain, praising God that their hunger has ended, and celebrating the return of their 'baker' (Louis XVI).[23]

As with prints of Liberty and of French revolutionary men, revolutionary women were inevitably portrayed in an increasingly grotesque manner as war and violence diminished British empathy for their cause. The fierce women in *A Representation of the horrid Barbarities practised upon the NUNS by the FISH-WOMEN, breaking into the Nunneries in France* [Fig. 141] [BMC 8109] (James Gillray. 21 June, 1792) furiously beat distressed nuns. Here, anxieties about the role of domestic women and those of either gender who might be sympathetic to the revolutionary cause are clearer; the print is dedicated 'to the Fair-Sex of Great Britain, & intended to point out the very dangerous effects which may arise to Themselves, if they do not exert that influence to hinder the "Majesty of the People" from getting possession of the Executive Power.' Far from adhering to Andrews' view that women should stay out of the political sphere and curb their ambitions, however, the dedication suggests that it is imperative that women exercise their potential influence and persuasive powers (so long as it is in the interests of conservatism rather than radicalism).

In other etchings, French women join their sans-culottes husbands in being depicted as scrawny, cannibalistic ruffians; for example in Gillray's *Un Petit Soupèr, a la Parisiènne; - or - A Family of Sans Culotts refreshing after the*

---

22 Kromm, 'Representations of Revolutionary Women', pp. 124-125.
23 Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 94.

fatigues of the day [Fig. 121] [BMC 8122] (20 September, 1792) in which one woman bastes a baby on a spit as other men, women and children feast on human flesh. A similar print, *CITIZEN COUPE TÊTE in his MISERY* [Fig. 142] [BMC 8293] (T. Ovenden. 1793) does not tar the French wife with the same brush as her ragged sans-culotte husband. He sits with a dagger and a rope, studying them with his fierce face, trying to decide which to use to 'end his Wretched Days'. His bestial children sit on the floor, gnawing at bones. The picture and accompanying text suggests that the French male is responsible for his and his family's fate, that it is punishment for his 'bloody Services', his 'Treasons and his Murders'. He is not deserving of sympathy despite his abject situation. The depiction of his wife is significantly more tragic. She kneels, crying over the body of a girl. She still clings to her faith, hands clasped, 'In vain to Heav'n she prays.' Her pose is reminiscent of the Madonna, particularly those paintings in which Mary witnesses the descent of her child from the cross, such as Fra Angelico's *Deposition from the Cross* (1434) or Rogier van der Weyden's *The Descent from the Cross* (c. 1435).

Non-allegorical women do not feature so heavily in prints on France after 1793, partly because many focus on the male theatre of war, perhaps also because the political classes of the revolution had been determined to restrict, or at best postpone, female participation at least as early as the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*.

Following the coup of Brumaire (9 November, 1799), prints on France tended to focus on the figurehead of Napoleon Bonaparte, and prints which featured women tended to do so in order to mock the French leader. In 1805 Gillray shows a younger Napoleon peering through a curtain, behind which are two naked dancing ladies, Josephine and Madame Tallien (1773-1835) [Fig. 143]. To the left sits the opulent Barras who, it is explained below, had grown tired of his mistress, Josephine, and thus

promissed Bonaparte a promotion, on condition that he would take her off his

hands… Madame Talian is a beautiful woman, tall & elegant; - Josephine is smaller

& thin, with bad Teeth, something like Cloves, - it is needless to add that

Buonaparte accepted the Promotion & the Lady, - now, - Empress of France![24]

Just like those on Napoleon, some prints also allude to a fascination with
Josephine, her life and her background. *THE PROGRESS of the EMPRESS
JOSEPHINE* [Fig. 144] [BMC 10981] (Charles Williams. 20 April, 1808) is
similar to the multi-panelled etchings on Napoleon and the different stages of his
life and career, such as Gillray's *DEMOCRACY; - or - a Sketch of the Life of
BONAPARTE* [Fig. 57] [BMC 9534] (12 May, 1800). Eight depictions of
Josephine are shown, charting her evolution. She progresses from 'A Planters
Daughter', through 'A French Countess', 'A Widow', 'A Prisoner', 'A Loose
Fish', 'Barras's Mistress', to 'A Generals Lady', and finally 'An Empress'.
Dorothy George described the caricature as 'libellous' and the final image of the
Empress as 'fat and vulgar'[25], but the print does not seem as excessively cruel or
inaccurate as George's interpretation suggests. The print may tap into the
aforementioned fears of women using their sexual charms to achieve power,
wealth and influence but, as with similar portrayals of Napoleon, the print also
suggests that there is something undeniably impressive and alluring, perhaps
inspirational, about a person who has risen to such a position from relatively
humble beginnings.

In *THE IMPERIAL DIVORCE* [BMC 11529] (Henry Brocas. January 1810)
Napoleon's decision to divorce Josephine is used to emphasise the Emperor's
cruelty, his unemotional pragmatism, as well as his power over the Pope. Sitting
on their respective thrones, Napoleon takes the ring from Josephine's finger. The
distressed Josephine concedes 'For the benefit of the Empire I resign my
Husband'. Napoleon's left foot rests on the head of the Pope, whose mitre lies on

---

[24] *ci-devant Occupations - or - Madame Talian and the Empress Josephine dancing Naked before
Barrass in the Winter of 1797. - A Fact! -* [Fig. 143] [BMC 10369] (James Gillray. 20 February,
1805).
[25] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [10981].

the floor along with St. Peter's keys and a broken triple cross. The image was taken from the *Hibernia Magazine,* accompanying an article on 'The Repudiation of the Empress Josephine'. Beginning 'Everyone, whether enemy or friend of France, must be more or less affected by the singular fate of this lady', the article suggests that Napoleon owed his success to this woman who, 'quits the splendid scene with a mildness and modesty belonging an angel, though the lying historians of our own and other countries have wantonly and wickedly painted her as a devil.' It explains that Napoleon was violating the Roman Catholic faith of France by divorcing, and compares him unfavourably to Henry VIII who, in seeking a divorce in order to remarry and secure an heir, initially at least had asked the Pope's permission.[26] In the picture a young lady stands behind Josephine weeping, 'I would prefer even Jerome'. A man tells her 'Take him with good grace or I'm undone.' At this stage Napoleon had the choice between Anne of Russia, Marie Auguste of Saxony and Marie Louise of Austria, one or all of whom this woman is intended to represent. It was announced on 6 February that Marie Louise was to be the Emperor's new bride.[27]

Bonaparte's new relationship was also used to mock the French emperor. Caricaturists continued to represent the marriage as one of convenience for Napoleon, one imposed on Marie Louise against her wishes, and the pair's differences and disagreements were highlighted. Amongst George Cruikshank's retrospective prints on *The Life of NAPOLEON* was *FIRST INTERVIEW WITH MARIA LOUISA* [Fig. 145] [BMC 12475] (14 December, 1814) in which Napoleon rushes down the steps of his palace to greet his new bride, her head solemnly bowed. Thomas Rowlandson's *THREE WEEKS AFTER MARRIAGE, OR THE GREAT LITTLE EMPEROR PLAYING AT BO-PEEP* [Fig. 146] [BMC 11557] (15 May, 1810), on the other hand, shows a raging Marie Louise kicking her feet and wildly brandishing the imperial crown and sceptre, pronouncing her hatred of her new husband and her wish for their two Houses never to be

---

[26] *The Hibernia Magazine, and Dublin monthly panorama* (January 1810), pp. 52-53.
[27] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [11529].

reconciled. Napoleon cowers behind a chair appealing for Talleyrand's help. 'Tally', however, has been knocked to the ground and shouts 'By Gar she will give us all de finishing Stroke'. Another character, suggested by Dorothy George as the ghost of Louis XVI, hides behind a curtain saying, 'Marblue – Vat a Crown Cracker she be'.

In other prints, Marie Louise is employed to emphasise the Emperor's military failings. *The Empress's wish – or Boney Puzzled!* [Fig. 147] [BMC 'undescribed', Reg no. 1988,1001.47] (Isaac Cruikshank. 9 August, 1810), for example, lampoons Napoleon's inability to overcome the might of the British navy. The Emperor and Empress stand on a barricade on the French coast. Josephine gestures with a telescope towards a British ship which is blockading the harbour. She asks

> My Dear Little Great Emperor of Kings, Nations & Princes your Majesty has often promised to me - that if I ever longed, or wished, or had a Desire for any thing in all the World - it would be got immeadiatly - I do not wish to put your Highness to such a proof of your love - I only wish you to send out and bring me dat Little Ship with the Blue Flag, that lays at Anchor?

The furious Napoleon curses the ship and starts inventing excuses, 'O de wind is not favorable to me. Ah! I have de Cholic… let us begone', behind him one of the four French soldiers subtly glances at the soldier next to him, knowingly amused. Napoleon's supposed short stature is also mocked; the telescope which Josephine holds out to her side is eye-level for the small emperor. In Josephine's speech the word 'Highness' has been underlined, ridiculing his height and perhaps also alluding to his fraudulent attempts to establish himself as a genuine European monarch.

Other, later examples showed Marie Louise in distress at the sight of her injured, ragged husband returning from the Russian front where the French forces were suffering irreversible losses. In one print, a frail Napoleon is escorted into the

Empress' dressing room by his mameluke bodyguards; he has patches over his missing ear and nose, and bandages on the ends of his limbs.[28] Marie Louise faints into the arms of Bonaparte's sisters, as their son wails in distress. In another version Napoleon, again ragged with a damaged nose, enters Marie Louise's bedroom.[29] The sight is so disturbing that the terrified Marie Louise and her maids conclude that this cannot be the real Napoleon who promised to return triumphant; it must be his ghost.

The brief sympathy that Marie Louise was shown to possess for her husband's defeats disappeared on the event of his exile to Elba. Marie Louise made the decision never to join her husband in Elba, preferring instead to return to Vienna. In *BLOODY BONEY THE CARCASS BUTCHER LEFT OF TRADE AND RETIRING TO SCARECROW ISLAND* [Fig. 148] [BMC 12219] (Thomas Rowlandson. 12 April, 1814) it is Napoleon's wife and son who cruelly drive him towards the coast to set sail for Elba. In another print, Rowlandson shows Napoleon having arrived at his new home, being humiliatingly pestered by the gross locals, one of whom, an ugly woman, announces 'Come cheer up my little Nicky I'll be your Empress', a prospect which does not amuse the grumpy new Emperor of Elba [Fig 68].[30] The empresses are employed principally in order to attack the character of Napoleon. In doing this, however, the prints ask for their audiences to empathise with the thoughts and feelings of the female figures.

The glamour and allure of Napoleon himself, and also of France, is demonstrated in a couple of misogynistic prints in which British women are shown to be in anticipation of a French invasion. *THOUGHTS on the INVASION!* [BMC 9725] (Isaac Cruikshank. 27 August, 1801) depicts a pretty, young woman talking to an older crone who owns a number of cats. The young girl says 'Indeed Ma'am I can't sleep of a Night with thinking of it shocking work - if they come they will

---

[28] *The HERO'S RETURN* [Fig. 48] [BMC 12012] (George Cruikshank. 22 February, 1813).
[29] *NAP'S GLORIOUS RETURN or the Conclusion of the Russian Campaign* [BMC 12059] (June 1813).
[30] *NAP DREADING HIS DOLEFUL DOOM OR HIS GRAND ENTRY IN THE ISLE OF ELBA* [Fig. 68] [BMC 12232] (Thomas Rowlandson. 25 April, 1814).

certainly ruin us all - I do assure you I did not close a leg (an Eye I mean) all last Night.' The other answers 'Why, really Miss you surprise me - sure you dont say so - do you think they will ravish us all!! …what not one single one escape - I hope however they will spare my Poor Cats.' The prospect of a French invasion for some, it seems, was actually rather exciting.

In *FEMALE POLITICIANS* [Fig. 149] [BMC 11465] (Thomas Rowlandson. c. 1809) a group of women sit around a table discussing the prospects of a French invasion. An ugly, older woman peers at a newspaper and exclaims 'Mercy on us here is news!! They write from Hanover that when Boney part took possession of that country, he ravish'd all the Women!!' Another older woman says 'O! the Wretch'. The younger ladies' reactions are rather different. One turns to the other and says 'It is very true Ma'am it is only a word and a blow with him - Your Honour or your property'. Her friends says 'Well Ma'am if he should come here, at all events I will take care of my property', while an even younger girl at the end of the table shouts out enthusiastically 'So will I Mamma!' A butler, possibly of French origin, enters the room with a tray of wine glasses, grinning. The title of this print suggests the absurdity of the idea of female politicians and evokes the engagements and representations of figures such as the Duchess of Devonshire. It also relates to the fears of increasing female adultery, sexual freedom or licentiousness and increasing rates of divorce which characterised many eighteenth and early nineteenth century social and political satires.[31] By using the French as the ladies' temptation, however, the print also suggests that it is not female impiety that is responsible for these matters, as much as a failure of English masculinity. It also derides the conservative obsession with the protection of property that was championed by thinkers such as Edmund Burke.

English ladies' interest in French men is paralleled by Englishmen's attraction to French women. Written accounts on the character and appearance of French women tend to emphasise their ugliness and reliance on cosmetics while at the

---

[31] McCreery, *The Satirical Gaze*, pp. 153-167.

same time describing the ubiquitous risk of the English becoming seduced by such apparently unattractive women. 'Nature', wrote John Andrews, '…has generally taken too little pains with their outside, and beauty is on account of its rarity, no trifling advantage in France', and he complains of French women's 'preposterous custom of rather plastering than painting their faces'. Their ugliness, however, is compensated by their conversation, their 'innumerable graces', and their sheer determination in aiming to gain possession of a man 'with all the circumspection of those who are laying siege to a town', omitting nothing 'either in dress, deportment, or discourse, that is conducive to the purpose of subduing the man she proposes to conquer'.[32] Philip Playstowe warned that English travellers could be lured into 'bawdy-houses' by the promise of a '*jolie fille*', before being attacked and mugged.[33] The women in Avignon, he believed, were prettier than those elsewhere in France, thanks to the exiled English Jacobites who had fled there after the '45.[34]

The allure of French women in English satirical prints is most prominently displayed in those which feature French actresses or dancers, and the enamoured Englishmen in the audience, much more interested in the women than the art. Those on Rose Parisot, for instance, which feature prominent London figures such as the Duke of Queensberry, the Duke of Bedford, Pitt, Fox, and Burke in the theatre, gawping at the dancer.[35] As well as revealing the 'real' intentions of those who showed enthusiasm for French dance and theatre, such prints may be intended to reveal the supposed disloyalty in patronising the French arts at a time when Britain and France were at war. Nevertheless, in doing so they illustrate that English enthusiasm for French culture remained prevalent even in wartime and after the turbulence and animosity fuelled by the French Revolution. As well as having a satirical intention, the prints themselves, and others on French women, Gillray's naked, dancing Josephine for example, no doubt had a titillating, quasi-

---

[32] Andrews, *Remarks on the French and English ladies*, pp. 2-7, 219, 240.
[33] [Playstowe], *The Gentleman's Guide in his Tour through France,* p. 40.
[34] *Ibid*., pp. 50-51.
[35] *MADAMOISELLE PARISOT* [Fig. 17] [BMC 8893] (Richard Newton. 1796), *A PEEP at the PARISOT! with Q in the corner!* [Fig. 18] [BMC 8894] (Isaac Cruikshank. 7 May, 1796).

pornographic appeal.

  Allegorical female figures also shed some light on attitudes towards gender and Britain's conceptions of other nations. First seen on Roman coins, Britannia's image re-emerged during the seventeenth century on account of the classicism of the Renaissance and enthusiasm for antiquarian studies, and became a stock image during the eighteenth century.[36] She was employed during the reign of James I to emphasise the union of Scotland and England under one crown,[37] though in the eighteenth century she could be used to represent either Great Britain as a whole or England as distinctly separate from Scotland. Often Britannia plays victim in political prints to the nation's enemies, external or internal. Disappointment with early setbacks in the Seven Years' War was articulated by showing Britannia weeping above a chained British Lion.[38] In *The New Ordinary Or Resort for French Men* [BMC 3651] (1757) Britannia lies in exhausted distress, witnessing a Frenchman who has transformed the British Lion into a wheelbarrow for his turnips. In the background two Frenchmen pass a tavern, laughing at its sign, while a Frenchman inside the tavern says 'Very good for us'. The sign is a portrait of the Duke of Cumberland (1721-1765); a reference to the Duke's defeat at the Battle of Hastenbecke on 26 July, 1757. Prints produced at the end of the war, such as *The CALEDONIAN PACIFICATION, or ALL'S WELL that ENDS WELL* [BMC 3902] (September 1762), are similar. Here, disappointment with the generous terms of the Treaty of Paris is expressed through the image of Britannia weeping at the sight of Lord Bute who sits in front of the muzzled lion.[39] In another print, Bute threatens to stab Britannia through the heart unless she agrees to the peace terms; 'What a Situation am I in,' she weeps, 'sold by a Scot & purchased by France and Spain O wheres my Pitt'.[40]

  At times Britannia was also susceptive to being misled by subversive forces. In

---

[36] Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, pp. 90-91.
[37] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 121.
[38] *BRITANNIA'S Revival, or the rousing of the British LYON* [BMC 3377] (1756).
[39] Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 122.
[40] *The Triple Compact or Brittannia's ruin* [BMC 3889] (August 1762).

THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly [Fig. 25] [BMC 2659]
(1745) she dances to France's fiddle playing, led towards Charles James Stuart,
the Pope, and the Devil. In another print she is flattered by immigrant Protestants,
to the expense of the English who are forced to emigrate.[41] In *England Made
Odious Or the French Dressers* [BMC 3543] (1756) she is dressed in French
cloth by Henry Fox and the Duke of Newcastle. Later, she joins Charles James
Fox in foolishly surrendering to the monstrous French republic.[42]

  In other instances, although these are rarer, Britannia becomes more assertive,
actively defending Britain's interests. This method of representation was most
prominent shortly before and during the American War of Independence. In the
bottom plate of *The Colonies Reduced. Its Companion.* [Fig. 150] [BMC 4183]
(1768), Britannia aggressively thrusts a spear towards America, a Red Indian in a
headdress. The same situation occurs in *Bunkers hill, or the blessed effects of
Family quarrels* [Fig. 151] [BMC 5289] (c. 1775). Such prints do not necessarily
intend to glory in Britannia's aggression. There is a degree of sympathy for
America, in both prints she is shown as the shocked and perhaps undeserving
target of Britannia's aggression. The personification of America as a Native
American is inaccurate given that it was the American colonists who were in
dispute with the English, not the indigenous peoples who became caught in the
middle of the conflict. It appears that the print artists were looking for an
American equivalent of Britannia and were drawn to the romantic idea of the
noble savage. This virtuous, innocent native could be used to emphasise the
tyranny of the English government. At times Britannia and the American native
were cast in the roles of mother and daughter, a fitting analogy given the nature of
the conflict and one which was utilised both in prints supportive and critical of the
American cause.[43] This savage would sometimes be depicted as male, increasingly
so as the war continued, indicating a gradual lack of compassion for the

---

[41] *The Consequences of Naturalizing Foreigners, The Dreadful Consequences of a GENERAL
NATURALIZATION, to the NATIVES of Great Britain and Ireland* [BMC 3124] (April 1751).
[42] *The Genius of France Triumphant, - or - BRITANNIA petitioning for PEACE* [BMC 8614]
(James Gillray. 2 February, 1795).
[43] Madge Dresser, 'Britannia', in Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism, Volume 2*, p. 36.

Americans as they came to be viewed more as enemies than as the victims of government repression.[44] In *The Colonies Reduced* the American Indian is unarmed and cowers away from her aggressor, albeit into the protective arms of France. In *Bunkers hill*, though she bears arms, she is on the back foot; her appearance is noble, her expression surprised, in the face of the frenzied Britannia. In both prints her hostility towards America allows Britain's 'traditional' enemies to use the distraction to their advantage, aided by the disloyal Lord Bute who was still thought to be influencing British policy for the worse. In the first, France points a pistol and sword towards Britannia and announces 'Now me vill be de grande Monarque indeed me vill be King of de whole World begar.' Bute stabs Britannia with a dagger from behind and at the same time lifts up the back of her dress, enabling Spain to thrust a sword into her backside. In the latter, the engagement with America allows France to stab Britannia from behind as Spain pierces her shield. Bute watches the incident, smiling, from the clouds, accompanied by the Prime Minister Lord North (1732-1792) and Lord Mansfield (1705-1793).

At the other extreme are those prints which depict Britannia being crushed or dismantled. She is run over with a wheelbarrow, torn apart by horses, and her statue dismembered.[45] These visual metaphors may have been appropriate in order to represent the breaking away of the colonies, although there is also a certain incongruousness in expressing patriotism in such a voyeuristic, sadistic manner. For Madge Dresser, they have a 'salacious prurience', as well as wider implications on eighteenth century social and gender attitudes (particularly those of the aristocracy); they suggest that 'the lady nation, like one's lady or one's private property, should be enjoyed only by those who legally own her.'[46]

---

[44] Amelia Rauser, 'Death or Liberty: British political prints and the struggle for symbols in the American Revolution,' *Oxford Art Journal* 21 (1998), p. 165.
[45] *THE EUROPEAN DILIGENCE* [BMC 5557] (5 October, 1779), *BY HIS MAJESTYS ROYAL LETTERS PATENT. THE NEW INVENTED METHOD OF PUNISHING STATE CRIMINALS.* [BMC 5580] (1779?), *BRITANIA'S ASSASSINATION. or - The Republicans Amusement* [BMC 5987] (10 May, 1782).
[46] Dresser, 'Britannia', pp. 30-31.

The female character Liberty, as well as other liberty symbols such as the liberty cap and staff, were used in portrayals of America before the war, as 'prints repeatedly represented the colonists as aggrieved Britons: their rights were the rights of Englishmen; their concerns merited a call for British liberty against ministerial tyranny.'[47] With the outbreak of war, these liberty symbols remained in the hands of the Americans, even in prints unsympathetic to the colonists' cause, where negative connotations could be applied; liberty as licentiousness, hypocritical liberty, the extreme and irrational slogan of 'Death or Liberty'.[48] The loss of this symbol, which had previously been employed to comment upon internal political disputes, contributed to John Bull superseding the classical Britannia as the most prominent national symbol.[49]

The Liberty character was reemployed at the time of the French Revolution, at first to illustrate support for the rebellion against monarchical and religious tyranny. *The OFFERING to LIBERTY* [BMC 7548] (James Gillray. 3 August, 1789) shows characters queuing to praise and bestow gifts to Liberty, 'The Goddess of the Noble Mind'. She is enthroned upon the ruins of the Bastille, holding a liberty staff and cap. At the front of the parade is the repentant Louis XVI. He kneels at Liberty's feet, near a broken axe, offering his crown to her. *LIBERTY IN UTOPIA/LIBERTY IN FRANCE* [Fig. 152] [BMC 'undescribed', Registration no. 1987,0516.4] (Frederick George Byron? 12 May, 1792) is probably inspired by Gillray's *FRANCE. FREEDOM. BRITAIN. SLAVERY.* [Fig. 114] [BMC 7546] (28 July, 1789) as it also uses the achievements of the French revolutionaries as a contrast to the continuing domestic political problems. The right-hand panel displays the situation in France. Liberty, standing on clouds with the staff and cap, is worshipped by celebrating Frenchmen, including Lafayette, who quote mottos such as 'Men are equal, it is not by birth. It is virtue alone that confers distinction.' Events in England, the left panel, are rather different. Britannia hobbles with a crutch, weighed down by numerous taxes, towards a

---

[47] Rauser, 'Death or Liberty', p. 156.
[48] *Ibid*., pp. 163-168.
[49] *Ibid*., p. 170.

grave which is being dug by Time. 'Do as you will with me,' she says, 'I have been hateful in the eyes of my POOR children for many years.' Her liberty staff has been snapped, her cap is falling to the ground. There is hope, however, in the sight of Liberty appearing with cherubs from the clouds in the top left corner, while from another cloud a hand emerges, seizing a mitre from a bishop's head.

As public opinion turned against the French Revolution, Liberty was transformed in a more extreme way than had occurred during the American War of Independence. Liberty, who at times also represents France, was portrayed as a hideous, violent, snake-haired harpy. In Rowlandson's *THE CONTRAST 1792* [BMC 8149] the fierce harridan stands on a decapitated body, holding a trident on the spikes of which are a head and two hearts. This is juxtaposed with a noble image of Britannia who is holding the Magna Carta and the scales of justice, watching a ship set sail, accompanied by the British Lion. In William Dent's parody of the Festival of Reason (10 November, 1793), the figure of Liberty sits on 'PANDORA'S BOX', the cap upon her staff is decorated with a guillotine, as fawning Frenchmen surround her, kissing her cloven foot and destroying religious artefacts [Fig. 43].[50] The positive, classical-derived character had been inversed, and now evoked the female monsters of Greek mythology; Medusa, Medea, and the furies.[51] The continuation of attributing some form of classical allegory to the French, albeit one that had been inversed, does indicate that France was still held in some degree of esteem. France was still Britain's contender as the contemporary equivalent of the ancient empires. The newly aggressive female French harpy was also indebted and related to the warlike images of Britannia and the liberty-thieving American native that had emerged during the war with America.

Not all prints insisted on turning Liberty into an abomination. Instead of showing the French as captivated by a monstrous Medusa-like figure, a design by

---

[50] *The French Feast of Reason, Or The Cloven-foot Triumphant* [Fig. 43] [BMC 8350] (5 December, 1793).
[51] Kromm, 'Representations of Revolutionary Women in Political Caricature', p. 126.

John Nixon and etched by Rowlandson, maintained the representation of Liberty as a young, elegant woman, held hostage by the revolutionaries [Fig. 153].[52] She is shown being dragged from a temple, 'LIBERTAS', the accompanying text explains that she is 'to be Sacrificed to the rage of these Ignorant People'. Despite being published by John Reeves' alarmist association, the portrayal is not informed by a knee-jerk hostility to the concept of liberty itself. Yes, the background features a grotesque female statue, 'raised on the Foundation of Murder, Cruelty, Cowardice, Treachery & Sedition, agreable [sic] to the French Idea of Freedom', but the implication here, absent in some of the other prints, is that Liberty herself is not necessarily evil, it is the perversion or hijacking of her for nefarious means that is the problem. Given the course that the revolution took, the sentiment of this print, at least in the way it represents Liberty, seems quite apt.

Nor had the image of France as a positive, classical heroine been eradicated for good, and prints produced in reaction to the revolution of 1830 echoed those which had initially celebrated 1789. The female persona in Robert Seymour's *FRANCE RECEIVING THE ORDINANCES* [Fig. 133] [BMC 16215] (7 August, 1830) is informed by Liberty, Marianne, and Britannia. She emerges from clouds to tear up the ordinances, as Charles X, Polignac, and their supporters tremble and flee.

Graphic satires of French women were not as numerous as those of men, their types were fewer and the situations in which they were depicted less varied. This is something they share with prints of English women, and although the similarities between representations of French and English women might be used to emphasise the patent misogyny present in prints of this era, they also indicate that the women which resided in each of these countries, and in fact these countries themselves, had much in common. Allegorical figures based on classical imagery were used for both countries. Britannia was used to denote patriotism in a

---

[52] *French Liberty* [Fig. 153] [BMC 8334] (1793).

variety of ways. She can be seen passively weeping over British losses, being seduced or fooled by the nation's enemies, or more violently torn apart. At times she was also given a less flattering, more masculine, aggressive persona, particularly during Britain's dispute with the American colonies. The female character of Liberty had once featured heavily in prints on domestic political disputes, but was transferred to or appropriated by the Americans and then the French on account of their revolutionary uprisings. She could be used contrastingly in order to expose the lack of liberty, or the restrictions on it, that was promoted by the British government. She could also be used to emphasise the revolutionaries' dangerous perversion of the concept of liberty, and as attitudes increasingly turned against the French Revolution, she became a monstrous Medusa-like figure, although this was still classically derived. Her more positive guise was resurrected in support of the revolution of 1830.

Eighteenth century texts on the nature of French women often referred to the power that they held over their men and the ways in which they influenced important political decisions and the workings of society. This was, of course, fuelled by these writers' fears that such a situation was already occurring at home. Although the attitude that the women in France were too dominant was alluded to in certain prints, this was not on the whole a major theme because such anxieties of female supremacy were articulated in prints of Englishwomen such as Devonshire. Nevertheless, early prints on the outbreak of the French Revolution, and of female participation in this, could in fact be interpreted as relatively supportive. In line with prints on the French Revolution in general, representations of French women became worse with the onset of war and of Terror, although women were not always shown to be as monstrous as the male Jacobins or sans-culottes, and could remain sentimental figures who were, unlike their husbands, deserving of some degree of sympathy.

Often women were used as a tool with which to attack, undermine and comment on men. Though evident elsewhere, this was particularly true of Napoleon

Bonaparte. Josephine's background was used in this way, although, as with certain prints on her husband, they also betray a fascination and perhaps admiration for her and her story. This attitude, as well as the continuing desire to disparage Napoleon and his actions, meant that sympathy was shown towards her when Napoleon decided to divorce her. His next marriage, to Marie Louise, was also ridiculed. It was portrayed as a miserable union on account of it having been arranged. This relationship was also used to draw attention to Napoleon's defeats and failings; he was unable to eliminate the British ships that Marie Louise objected to and returned from Russia so broken that he was barely recognisable to his wife.

The undeniable attraction that the British and French could hold for one another also features heavily. Although at times the message is that such activities are regrettably unpatriotic, depictions of English women secretly longing for French invasion, or of London men using the excuse of the theatre to get a good glimpse of desirable French ladies, and the sublime appearance of such ladies in the prints themselves, demonstrate the allure and obsession that each country had for one another, and the atmosphere of such prints suggests an amusement, or even delight, at such occurrences, as opposed to the more alarmist attitudes expressed by writers such as Andrews.

2) <u>Other 'Others'</u>

There may have been some constants in representations of French women, such as their employment to comment on the actions of men, and representations of women were fewer in variety and in their uses than those of French males. Nevertheless, their stereotypes were not static. They were adapted, developed and remoulded according to occurrences in France, which were followed by those in England with an attention greater than that given to any other nation. They also depended on developments at home and, not least, interactions between the two nations. Stereotypes of other nations' women remained more rigidly static, while

a similar assessment could be made of representations of their men. Dutch women, for example, like their men, remained stout, rotund, gin drinkers and pipe smokers.[53]

The French may have drawn the greatest degree of attention from eighteenth century and early nineteenth century English graphic satirists, but they were by no means the only foreigner to have been consistently caricatured, and the scorn shown towards them was in some ways no greater than that shown towards other nationalities.[54] This section will focus on the most prominent of these other 'Others', particularly western Europeans. On account of the nature of the research undertaken for this project, the vast numbers of social and political prints produced in this period, and prominence of the French in this material, the examples cited will often be those in which these foreigners appear alongside French characters, although other prints have been consulted. Each of the Others observed here merit much closer and comprehensive study than is achievable here. Nevertheless, the comparisons that can be drawn with images of the French are useful in illustrating the unique role that France and the French played in English graphic satire.

Evidently it was not just continental Others that made regular appearances in print satire, attention was also focused on those 'foreigners' who lived within the British Isles as well as domestic minorities.

Despite the failure of Henry Pelham's 1753 Jewish Naturalisation Act, Jews continued to immigrate to Britain, particularly from Eastern Europe. Whereas there were only around 8,000 in 1750[55], by 1800 there were thought to be up to 26,000 Jews in England, with almost three-quarters of these living in London.[56]

---

[53] *OPENING the SLUCES or HOLLANDS last SHIFT* [BMC 8493] (Isaac Cruikshank. 24 October, 1794), *Dutch Steamers on the frozen Zuyder Zee* [BMC 'undescribed', Reg no. 1931,1114.329] (William Heath. c. 1822-1840).
[54] Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society*, p. 22.
[55] Miller, *Religion in the Popular Prints*, p. 40.
[56] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 17.

Often stereotyped according to representations and perceptions of the poor Ashkenazi Jews from Germany and Eastern Europe, Jews tended to be depicted as ragged, bearded, hooked-nosed street traders and criminals. At other times they appeared as greedy financiers, although a more positive image was provided by boxing champion Daniel Mendoza (1764-1836).[57] Nonetheless, Jews never featured as heavily in prints as other inhabitants.

The Welsh also received minimal attention. They appear surrounded by hills and dark clouds, accompanied by goats, enthusing over their leeks and toasted cheese, while their parsons remain in a perpetual, dour state of poverty.[58] Due to their relatively early and intimate associations with England, they had fallen victim to resentment and satire in earlier centuries[59], but by the eighteenth the Welsh did not feature heavily in print culture and when they did were 'merely a poor and rather quaintly backwards relation.'[60] While Richard Wilson's (1714-1782) paintings of the Welsh landscape had helped to romanticise the area, inspiring other artists and tourists to journey there, Thomas Rowlandson parodied such artists by producing *AN ARTIST Travelling in Wales* [Fig. 154] [BMC 9445] (10 February, 1799), which turned the focus onto such a painter and exposed the grim 'reality' of such trips. A miserable, gaunt old man rides a small, weary pony, loaded with painting materials, his fragile umbrella failing to protect from the deluge of rain. A peasant woman and her children watch in the background. Rowlandson himself had visited Wales with his friend Henry Wigstead (c. 1745-1800) in 1797, Wigstead's journal having recorded an incessant rain from which even the ceiling of their accommodation had failed to protect them.[61]

The Irish featured more heavily and were largely characterised as poor, rural,

---

[57] *Ibid*., pp. 17-18.
[58] *SAINT DAVID FOR WALES* [BMC 5943] (2 January, 1781), *A WELSH FEAST ON ST. DAVID'S DAY* [BMC 7798] (1 March, 1790), *The Welch Parson* [BMC 7781] (1 December, 1790), *THE PARSONS HOBBY, or Comfort for a Welsh Curate* [BMC 13413] (Charles Williams. 1819).
[59] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 18.
[60] Clayton, *Caricatures of the People of the British Isles*, p. 9.
[61] Payne, *Regarding Thomas Rowlandson*, pp. 190-192.

and stupid. They would occasionally be attributed more alarming characteristics according to certain political events and debates. At times their Catholicism was emphasised, though it was often the high-profile political figureheads or emancipation sympathisers (such as Lord Fitzwilliam, Daniel O'Connell, George Canning) who were portrayed as the really dangerous, evil, and subversive figures rather than the sillier, superstitious peasants they had managed to rally.[62] Some prints did register sympathy for the Irish cause.[63]

If the Irish could be associated with France through their Catholicism, after the French Revolution they could also be associated through radicalism and unrest, particularly in light of the rebellion of 1798.[64] Robert Cruikshank's *THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION OR PADDY coming it STRONG* [Fig. 155] [BMC 14766] (February 1825) even has the audacity to do both at the same time, featuring a mean-looking monk holding a crucifix inscribed with the word 'RELIGION' on top of which sits an incongruous bonnet rouge. Less contradictory was the second plate of Gillray's series *Consequences of a Successful French Invasion* [Fig. 156] [BMC 9183] (6 March, 1798) which represented the treatment that the Irish Catholic Church would receive should the French succeed; bestial Jacobin soldiers violently drag a distressed priest from a church and trample on various religious artefacts. The series was commissioned by Sir John Dalrymple, who was pleased with the design, writing to Gillray, 'The Irish Roman Catholic is excellently executed & will do good in Ireland in opening the eyes of these poor people - I shall send it there.' The caricaturist soon fell out with Dalrymple and the proposed set of twenty designs was abandoned after the completion of just four.[65] The failure of the rebellion, and the failure of General

---

[62] *The Irish Howl or the Catholics in Fitz!* [BMC 8632] (20 March, 1795), *MARCH of the LIBERATOR* [BMC 15551] (William Heath. c. 1829), *THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION OR PADDY coming it STRONG* [BMC 14766] (Robert Cruikshank. February 1825).

[63] *JOHN BULLS BELLY and its MEMBERS* [BMC 15657] (1829), *THE TRUE HOLY ALLIANCE STORMING THE FORTRESS OF SUPERSTITION* [BMC 15713] (Robert Seymour. 1829), *THE ABSENTEE* [BMC 16206] (Robert Seymour. 1 August, 1830), *IRELAND* [BMC 16726] (Robert Seymour. 1 July, 1831).

[64] *United Irishmen upon Duty* [BMC 9228] (James Gillray. 12 June, 1798), *United Irishmen in Training* [BMC 9229] (James Gillray. 13 June, 1798).

[65] Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 73-80.

Humbert to rally any significant degree of support from the locals after landing at Killable (22 August, 1798) before being defeated and captured at Ballinamuck on 8 September[66] helped to diminish fears that the Irish were a potential threat to the British state or that they were likely to conspire with France. Irish women, like English fishwomen, could also act as defenders of earthy British values against the influx of frivolous French fashions, for example in *IRISH PEG in a RAGE. Make good the Damage you Dog, or I'll cut away your PARSNIP* [BMC 4531] (29 May, 1773) in which an Irishwoman punishes a macaroni character for knocking over her drink by grabbing his long ponytail. Cartoon depictions of the Irish became significantly more hostile in the second half of the nineteenth century, fuelled by the rise of physiognomic, phrenological, ethnological, and evolutionary theories as well in reaction and resistance to the rise of both Irish immigration and rebellious Irish independence movements.[67] Between 1840 and 1890, with the 1860s being the pivotal decade, says L.P. Curtis, the slovenly Irish peasants transformed into 'a monstrous Celtic Caliban capable of any crime known to man or beast.'[68] It was a stereotype, Curtis suggests, that far exceeded Gillray's simian Jacobins in its monstrousness.[69]

Despite the sporadic connections drawn between the Irish and the French in the years 1740 to 1832, the Irish were treated with lesser hostility than another 'internal foreigner': the Scots.[70] England and Scotland had a long history of conflict, but from 1603 were ruled by the same monarch and the Acts of Union of 1707 united the countries under one parliament. This did not end tension. The union provided Scotland with economic opportunities and benefits, with some Englishmen resenting the migration of Scotsmen into England which they

---

[66] Wheeler. And Broadley, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England*, pp. 126-130.

[67] L. Perry Curtis, *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1997). Other scholars put Irish religious or class status above racial identity as an explanation for English attitudes. For example, Sheridan Gilley, 'English Attitudes to the Irish Minority in England, 1789-1900', in Colin Holmes (ed.) *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1978), 81-110.

[68] Curtis, *Apes and Angels*, p. 29.

[69] *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154.

[70] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 22; Clayton, *Caricatures of the People of the British Isles*, p. 10.

considered would be detrimental to the wellbeing of their own country and countrymen.[71] Richard Newton portrayed such hostility in *PROGRESS of a SCOTSMAN* [Fig. 157] [BMC 8550] (22 April, 1794), charting the journey of a conniving Scotsman from his shabby Highland beginnings to his eventual haughty position in the House of Lords. Nor did the union immediately end the fighting. The exiled Scottish Stuart dynasty continued to pose a threat to the Protestant, Hanoverian succession, and in 1715 and 1745 Jacobite armies marched from Scotland into England in favour of the Stuarts. They were a minority overall, but the participation of many Scots in the rebellions 'tainted the whole nation.'[72] The rebellions were a crucial factor in the prevalence of anti-Catholicism in political prints of this time, and for some years after. France showed support for the Jacobite cause, in 1743 even offering an invasion fleet to transport 10,000 troops to Britain.[73] In *THE PLAGUES of ENGLAND or the JACOBITES Folly* [Fig. 25] [BMC 2659] (1745) it is the 'King of France' who leads the intoxicated Britannia towards the Pope, the Devil, and Charles Edward Stuart, surrounded by grovelling worshippers. France also gave asylum to the exiled Stuarts and their supporters, who were mocked in William Hogarth's *THE GATE OF CALAIS* [Fig. 6] through the figure of the tartan-clad Scotsman who lies slumped and starving in the right-hand corner. The Jacobite threat diminished after 1745 and although Hogarth persevered with further anti-Catholic, Francophobic imagery[74], as the threat of a Jacobite uprising or invasion became an increasingly unlikely prospect, prints became less concerned with the fear of the forces of Catholicism. Despite continued rivalry and, later, further conflict with France, the Catholic elements of the French stereotype were used less frequently, implying that, rather than the Jacobite uprising inciting such fear and hatred towards the Scots because of the invitation it gave to French involvement (as Colley suggests[75]), the stereotype of the French as a subversive Catholic Other depended on the anxieties caused by domestic differences and disturbances.

---

[71] Clayton, *Caricatures of the People of the British Isles*, p. 9.
[72] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 20.
[73] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 77-78.
[74] Such as *The Invasion* (1756).
[75] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 77-78.

As the Jacobite threat faded, anti-Scottish prejudice was articulated more often in terms of the social and political problems of large numbers of migrants, although there could still be found echoes of the '45. In 1779 Gillray produced a new version of a 1745 Charles Mosley design, in which a Scotsman has misunderstood how to use a latrine, by putting his legs down two of the holes in the board.[76] In Gillray's version, 'Sawney' grasps a document inscribed 'Act for [esta]blishing Popery', a reference to the Catholic Relief Act, but also explicitly evoking the '45.

Scottish politicians also came under fire, particularly Lord Bute, the ex-Tutor of George III who was appointed Prime Minister as the king's favourite at the expense of more popular and qualified politicians such as William Pitt and the Duke of Newcastle. He was in office no longer than a year, and yet appears to have been attacked in more eighteenth century prints than any other politician.[77] Even long after he had stepped down, prints were still alleging Bute to be subversively influencing British policy.[78] Henry Dundas (1742-1811) drew similar attention for his close relationship with William Pitt. In *THEIR NEW MAJESTIES!* [Fig. 158] [BMC 9032] (Richard Newton. 12 September, 1797) Pitt and Dundas sit together on the throne as the new king and queen. Dundas is dressed in tartan, with a Scots cap, and holds Pitt round the shoulders. At times, these devious Scotsmen continued to be associated with France. Bute is shown happily handing British possessions over to the French at the climax of the Seven Years' War.[79] In *THE SCOTCH ARMS* [BMC 7125] (9 January, 1787), arguably an attack on Dundas' influence, one of the quarters of the Scottish escutcheon is decorated with the French fleur-de-lis.

---

[76] *Sawney in the Bog-house* [BMC 2678] (Charles Mosley. 17 June, 1745), *SAWNEY in the BOG-HOUSE* [BMC 5539] (4 June, 1779).
[77] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 20.
[78] *Bunkers hill, or the blessed effects of Family quarrels* [Fig. 151] [BMC 5289] (c. 1775).
[79] *THE CONGRESS; OR, A DEVICE to lower the LAND-TAX. To the TUNE of, Doodle, Doodle, Do, &c.* [Fig. 88] [BMC 3887] (1762).

Colley has suggested that British identity was forged in the eighteenth century, and that this can largely be attributed to common Protestantism and fear of the French Other. Richard Finlay has highlighted a number of problems with conceptions of British identity in Scotland. He argues that there has been too much focus on the intellectuals and elites of society, who cannot necessarily be said to be representative of the nation, that the British nation did not have significant impact on the lives of most Scots at this time, and that different competing versions of Scottish identity were more important than that of the abstract notion of Britishness promoted by a narrow elite. Far from possessing a common Protestantism with the English, Finlay argues that Episcopalian Jacobitism, Moderate Presbyterianism, and radical Covenanting Presbyterianism all laid claim to Scottish national identity, each with their own distinct religious vision of the nation. With its roots in the seventeenth century, Covenanting Presbyterianism dominated, and was a belief system incompatible with that of Anglicanism.[80] To this, Stephen Conway added that, unlike Wales, Scotland possessed other separate institutions such as its own legal system and well-established universities.[81]

In English satirical prints, it seems that the Scots retained their outsider status and at times were treated with a level of disdain equal to, if not greater than, that shown towards the French. The memory of the '45 seems to have tainted Scotland's reputation to such an extent that, even though Jacobitism never received mass support and dwindled after 1746[82], later prints of figures such as Bute and Dundas, and portrayals of a more general Scottish migration[83], still evoked memories of that attempted invasion. This differs from images of the French who, as we have seen, were being increasingly conceived in terms of

---

[80] Richard J. Finlay, 'Keeping the Covenant: Scottish National Identity', in T. M. Devine, and J. R. Young, *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 121-133.
[81] Stephen Conway, 'War and National Identity in the Mid-Eighteenth-Century British Isles', *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), p. 868.
[82] Finlay, 'Keeping the Covenant', pp. 123-124.
[83] *A FLIGHT of SCOTCHMEN!* [BMC 'undescribed', Reg no. 2001,0520.22] (Richard Newton. 3 September, 1796).

fashionable foppishness rather than as cruel inquisitorial or superstitiously worshipping types. French support of the Stuarts, therefore, seems to have been more easily forgotten that than of the Scots.

Not all prints were quite so harsh. Colley cites the increase in numbers of Scottish recruits in the British army from the Seven Years' War onwards as evidence of the acceptance of Scotland's role as 'the arsenal of the empire', as opposed to 'an expensive nuisance', and indicative that Scotland had invested in British patriotism.[84] Produced during the American War of Independence, *THE PRESENT STATE OF GREAT BRITAIN* [Fig. 159] [BMC 5579] (James Philips. c. 1779) features a central John Bull figure standing, asleep, holding a staff with a liberty cap on the end. France creeps in from the left, America and Holland from the right. America attempts to steal John's liberty cap, while the Dutchman goes after his purse. France, however, is thwarted by the figure of a stern, protective Scotsman in highland dress. With one arm he grabs the Frenchman by the scruff of the neck, holding him at bay. His other arm is placed around John Bull's shoulders, so that with his left hand he can hold firmly onto the staff. This print may represent a change in perceptions of Scotland owing to the number of Scottish regiments raised for the war, although as Dorothy George made clear its 'apparently favourable representation of Scotland is exceptional.'[85] It may also be suggested that the title of the plate, and its sleeping John Bull character which is evocative of the many images of the sleeping British Lion, indicate that the current circumstance of Britain as being primarily defended by Scotland is not a particularly desirable one. There is some implication that Britain, or England, should be able to protect itself effectively, as it had done in the past, and that having to be bailed out by the Scots is in fact something of a humiliation.

'Anti-Scottish hysteria', as Conway puts it, was of course a product of the progress that was being made by the Scots as they increasingly occupied posts in

---

[84] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 103 and 120.
[85] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [5579].

the military, in politics, in the law, and in other spheres.[86] An investigation of such hysteria, however, helps illustrate some of the problems with the idea of a British identity forged by a common Protestant hatred of the French. The Scottish were not generally a Catholic Other, but because of their association with the Stuarts they were represented in harsher terms than the Irish who were a 'domestic' Catholic Other. Memories of the '45 stuck to the Scottish stereotype more than it stuck to stereotypes of the French, as shown in the decades after Hogarth when images of France shed many of their Catholic symbols in favour of an emasculated foppishness. Rather than seeing Scotland's dire reputation as a consequence of an association with France, it is possible to view the French as a tool with which to attack the Scottish, just as it was used to attack other domestic figures and their supposed failings, and to articulate prejudices towards the increasing influence and integration of this geographically closer 'traditional enemy'. The Scottish may well have become integrated into a wider conception of Britain during this period, though it is doubtful whether this had anything to do with common Protestantism. In other respects the Scots retained their own national and local identities, and in many ways they continued to be viewed as outsiders in the eyes of the English.

As has already been mentioned, some of the characteristics of the stereotypes of Frenchmen in the eighteenth century had been lifted from representations of Spain, the foreigner which drew most attention in the first half of the seventeenth century[87], but whose power and influence had since been eclipsed. Transferred to the now greater threat of the French were allegations of religious bigotry and inquisitorial persecution, arrogance and vanity, the desire for universal Catholic monarchy, and aiming to achieve such goals through treacherous, underhand means. Spain's decline, and France's successes, meant that the Spanish stereotype from 1740 to 1832 remained noticeably static. The stereotype in question was that of the cloak and ruff wearing, feathered hat sporting Spanish 'Don'. On the

---

[86] Stephen Conway, 'War and National Identity in the Mid-Eighteenth-Century British Isles', *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), p. 875.
[87] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 24.

surface it seems a relatively complementary stereotype, unparalleled in its noble, handsome appearance. However, continuing to dress Spanish characters in their late sixteenth and early seventeenth century fashions, rather than updating the stereotype in order to depict Spain in its present state, acted as a reminder of Spain's decline and implied that the Spanish were 'stuck mentally in their past grandeur' naively unaware that the world had moved on.[88] Spain's frozen state in satirical representations also shows how England had moved on, its attention now focused elsewhere, particularly on France. Whereas no attempts were made to update the stereotype of the Spanish, caricatures of the French tended to feature up-to-date, contemporary fashions.[89] English anxiety, but also fascination, was now firmly focused on the present and evolving state of France.

Spain then, when it does appear, tends to be little more than a sidekick to France. Some prints produced in reaction to France and Spain's involvement in the American War of Independence seemed to place both countries on something approaching an equal footing, as partners in an attempt to secure universal monarchy. *THE FAMILY COMPACT* [Fig. 160] [BMC 5567] (1 November, 1779) shows France and Spain standing on a map of America, holding hands, looking into each other's eyes. Between them stands the Devil, wearing a papal crown. More often, however, France is the more prominent. Another example features the Spanish don cowering behind France as both are threatened by a British soldier's bayonet. He cowardly offers a bag of dollars over the Frenchman's shoulder, claiming 'I Renounce de France for ever' [Fig. 161].[90] In another illustration, he and America cower behind France as they are attacked by English fishwives.[91]

Spain's resistance to Napoleonic rule and Britain's role in the Peninsular War did lead to a change in representations of the Spanish, although it was only

---

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[89] Conway, 'War and National Identity', pp. 884-885.
[90] *England France and Spain* [Fig. 161] [BMC 5556] (c. September 1779).
[91] *BRITANNIA PROTECTED from the TERRORS of an INVASION* [BMC 5629] (26 January, 1780).

temporary and minimal. Gillray's *SPANISH-PATRIOTS attacking the FRENCH-BANDITTI* [Fig. 44] [BMC 11010] (15 August, 1808) does not exactly transform Spanish stereotypes, but at least transforms their role. Monks, nuns, and dons heroically battle against the Napoleonic armies, accompanied by a British soldier. In other prints the Spanish are more passive, such as the priests who cheer Wellington as he chases Joseph Bonaparte out of Madrid.[92] The brutal Spanish guerrillas that both French and British troops commented upon and criticised during the Peninsular War[93] do not appear in caricature, perhaps so as to avoid undermining British support in Spain. *THE POLITICAL BUTCHER, OR SPAIN CUTTING UP BUONAPARTE, For The Benefit of her Neighbours* [BMC 11025] (Thomas Rowlandson. 12 September, 1808) suggests that Spain has defeated Napoleon by her own efforts[94] and does have an element of brutality about it, though it is not typical. A Spaniard is in the process of butchering Napoleon's flayed and decapitated body as the other countries of Europe, represented as animals, feast on the spoils; he assures them that it is 'True Corsican Veal'.

  The restoration of the House of Bourbon in the aftermath of Napoleon's defeat was not exactly celebrated in English caricature. Although Louis XVIII was treated derisively in caricatures, depictions of Ferdinand VII were more hateful and Louis' reputation was sullied through his association with the Spanish monarch. In *State of POLITICKS at the close of the year 1815* [Fig. 74] [BMC 12622] (George Cruikshank. 1 December, 1815) Louis sits on his fragile perch supported by the kings of Austria, Prussia, Russia, and the British Prince Regent. He is joined by the Pope and a number of tiny monks, priests and nuns. He appears foolish and easily manipulated, but the image of Ferdinand creeping in from the right-hand side of the print is much worse. He has a cloth marked 'Bigotry' over his eyes, is guided by the lead of 'Priest Craft', holds death warrants in his hand, and is joined by a horrific, black inquisitorial demon. Those

---

[92] *KING JOEY taking leave of his Capital ie Madrid relieved from Robbers* [BMC 11901] (September 1812).
[93] Forrest, *Napoleon's Men*, pp. 122-126; Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy*, pp. 280-281.
[94] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [11025].

which focus on Ferdinand exclusively depict him despicably surmounted by skulls, treading upon laws and constitutions, supported by sycophantic, evil priests, monks, or demons, heralding a new era of Inquisition.[95] Caricaturists may not have treated Louis XVIII gently, but he was never this evil. Having said that, the restoration did not return Spain to its old position of the nation which drew most attention from English eyes. Prints on Louis and on France continued to be more common than those on Spain, as the English fascination with the French persisted.

England's relationship with, and representations of, the Dutch in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century appear to have been more turbulent and more complicated. Elizabeth I had supported the Dutch revolt of 1585, as at the time the United Provinces of the Netherlands could be viewed as an important buffer against the possibility of a Spanish invasion. Thereafter Holland (as the United Provinces was often known, after the largest of its seven provinces) was used as a training ground for English soldiers and was also an appropriate place of asylum for Protestant dissenters fleeing domestic persecution.[96] English volunteers travelled to Holland in 1621 when it again found itself at war with Spain, though the amplification of the Dutch's commercial and maritime power in the early seventeenth century meant that, after union proposals with this economic and religious cousin failed, three Anglo-Dutch wars took place between 1652 and 1674. The relative similarities and formerly close friendship between the two nations meant that, although at certain times admiration for and identification with the Dutch was evident, they could also be attacked with a vulgarity and scorn unsurpassed by representations of other rival nations.[97] Holland's neutrality meant that it was accused of demonstrating ingratitude for England's previous cooperation and also of exploiting the conflicts of other nations for its own material gain, in prints such as *THE BENEFIT of NEUTRALITY* [Fig. 162] [BMC

---

[95] *THE PRIVY COUNCIL OF A KING* [BMC 12510] (Thomas Rowlandson. 28 March, 1815), *The CURSE of SPAIN* [Fig. 79] [BMC 13009] (George Cruikshank. November, 1818).
[96] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, p. 27.
[97] *Ibid*., p. 28.

2665] (26 December, 1745) produced during the War of Austrian Succession. This shows a Frenchman and a Spaniard pulling at the horns of a cow, an Englishman pulling in the opposite direction by the tail, and a sneaky Dutchman below, quietly milking. The metaphor was repeated after the outbreak of the American War of Independence in a print which showed America sawing the horns of a cow, with Holland milking her, as France and Spain hold bowls, much to the distress of an English observer [Fig. 163].[98]

If neutrality was interpreted as a betrayal, then the outbreak of hostilities was portrayed in inevitably bitter terms. It is arguable that Holland was the nation which was treated with the most disdain over the course of the American War because the aggression of Britain's more 'traditional' or 'natural' enemies, France and Spain, was regarded as predictable, typical, and expected. In *LEWIS BABOON about to teach NIC FROG the LOUVRE* [Fig. 164] [BMC 5664] (1780), France and Spain appear in their familiar customary dress. Holland, or 'Nic Frog' (the name John Arbuthnot had used for Holland in *A History of John Bull*), is represented as a bulky man with numerous heads. Each head, notes Dorothy George, represents one of Holland's seven United Provinces.[99] It also alludes to the untrustworthy two-faced, or rather many-faced, nature of the Dutch, as well as echoing the Hydra of Greek mythology. In the verses below the print, Nic Frog is referred to as 'The Monster seven headed whose name is Mynheer.' Holland also dominates *TRIA JUNCTA IN UNO. OR the Three Enemies of Britain* [Fig. 165] [BMC 5826] (17 January, 1781), the three enemies being France, Spain and Holland; America is noticeably absent. France and Spain stand either side of the print, France with long pigtail and large shirt-sleeves, Spain with ruff, black moustache, cloak, spurred boots and feathered hat. Their heads are oversized, but largest is Holland, who stands in the centre. He stares out from the print, as France and Spain gaze inwards towards him. He has his hands in his breeches and wears a hat in which sits his pipe. France says 'Ah! Myneer vat is de mater?';

---

[98] *A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778* [Fig. 163] [BMC 5472] (1 March, 1778).
[99] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [5664].

Spain, 'Vat News Myneer?'; Holland replies, 'Oh Yontlemans, Yontlemans! da Unglish be playing de very diable mid us.' Beneath the picture is engraved the following verses:

> Three Bullys in three distant Countries born
> France, Spain & Holland, would adorn;
> The first in Craft & Cowardice, surpassed
>
> The next in Haughtiness, in both the last.
> Old Satans power could no further go
> To make a Third he joined the former Two.

The Dutch were a former ally of Britain, and a Protestant mercantile nation as opposed to Britain's other Catholic enemies. These prints which show all three of the European enemies, but which express most repulsion for Holland, show the way in which feelings of betrayal can be stronger than the hatred felt towards more traditional, predictable, enemies and the animosity that can result from familiarity.

The 1787 Prussian invasion of Holland was deemed a fitting event for contemptuous, slapstick renditions. A pair of prints by Johann Heinrich Ramberg, the German artist who at the time was a studying at the Royal Academy supported by George III[100], show amateurish Dutch soldiers practising their firing techniques at a crude sketch of a Prussian soldier drawn on a wall, before being easily overrun by a single Prussian officer on horseback. In both, the actions, stances, and pretensions of the Dutchmen are mimicked by the preposterous fat little frogs at their feet [Figs. 166 & 167].[101] Other prints do, however, focus on the failure of the French, discouraged by English naval preparations, to support the Dutch

---

[100] R. E. Graves, 'Ramberg, Johann Heinrich (1763-1840)', rev. Annette Peach, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, 'http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23068', (28 July, 2011).

[101] *REHEARSAL in HOLLAND 1787* [Fig. 166] [BMC 7176] (Johann Heinrich Ramberg. 18 October, 1787), *PERFORMANCE in HOLLAND in Septr. & Octr. 1787* [Fig. 167] [BMC 7177] (Johann Heinrich Ramberg. 18 October, 1787).

Patriots.[102] In another couple of satires by Ramberg, an effeminate Frenchman is shown impotently dangling his empty purse at a begging Dutchman, threatened by a Prussian's bayonet [Fig. 168], and a Dutchman is depicted being tossed into the air by Prussian soldiers [Fig. 169]. Coins fall out of the Dutchman's pocket as an English sailor smugly alerts a horrified Frenchman to the scene.[103]

Even amidst the Francophobic climate of the revolutionary wars, print artists considered the French invasion of Holland to be the subject of farcical slapstick. When France declared war on England and Holland on 1 February, 1793, Pitt argued in Parliament that treaties compelled England to protect the Dutch, whereas Fox claimed that England was forcing the Dutch into a war they would rather evade.[104] In response to such debates, Isaac Cruikshank depicted a furious John Bull thrusting a sword into Nic Frog's hand and berating him for his passivity.[105] Nic Frog, through a cloud of pipe smoke replies, perhaps insincerely, that he dare not contradict John. Incidentally, the print also features one of the funniest caricatured depictions of William Pitt ever produced; taking the caricature of Pitt to its logical conclusion, the Prime Minister's pointy features have been condensed within a single small triangle, poking its way in from the right-hand margin. He adds 'tell him they shall open the Scheldt, and he shall fight Dam him'.

John's rage seems to have been superseded by something approaching satisfaction on the event of the French invasion in 1795. Some prints played with the characterisation of the Dutch as the wearers of baggy breeches, and the French as 'sans-culottes', suggesting that the French attacked the Dutch in order to procure their trousers. This time Cruikshank showed a bare legged, perplexed Dutchman, exclaiming 'Oh my Dollars & Ducats D__n their Citizenship; A

---

[102] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum,* [7178].
[103] *POLITICS inside-out – a FARCE* [Fig. 168] [BMC 7178] (Johann Heinrich Ramberg. 21 October, 1787), *MILITARY RECREATION in HOLLAND* [Fig. 169] [BMC 7179] (Johann Heinrich Ramberg. 24 October, 1787).
[104] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8299].
[105] *John Bull in a rage forcing Nic frog to fight against his will* [BMC 8299] (Isaac Cruikshank. 9 February, 1793).

fellow here calls me Frere Citoyen and takes away all my Property' [Fig. 170].[106]
Skinny Jacobins parade in the stolen breeches, with coins spilling from the
pockets. One guzzles gin, while another tries smoking a pipe, and another
embraces a Dutch woman. One in the group of fleeing Dutchmen in the
background says 'I dont like this Equality business I wish we had not Invited
these Plundering Fellows here, I suppose they'll make use of my Frow next', the
invitation refers to the Dutch Patriots who initially welcomed the French.[107]
Another print shows the French employing the guillotine as a way to deprive the
Dutch of their breeches, while another Dutchman hangs from a lamp-bracket as
two Frenchmen tug at his trousers [Fig. 171].[108] Louis Bonaparte and his son
Charles-Louis (later Napoleon III) would also be shown dressed as Dutchmen,
smoking pipes, after Louis was appointed King of Holland by his brother in
1806.[109]

  Other stereotyped foreigners drew less attention and were represented with less
variety. Despite being the other principal destination for those on the Grand Tour,
Italy received scant notice other than in occasional references to the Pope[110] or
caricatures of fashionable Italian opera singers.[111] It was infatuation with Italian
arts and fashions as well as with those of France which inspired fears of cultural
invasions, the dilution of domestic stock, and the decline of English livelihoods.
The term 'macaroni' obviously had its etymological origins in Italian, but it came
to be applied exclusively to those English fops who embraced French fashions.
Whilst this is evocative of the way in which the French dominated the minds of
print artists and their customers at this time, it also demonstrates that images of

---

[106] *The first ARTICLES in REQUISITION at AMSTERDAM or the SANS Culotts become touts
Culotts* [Fig. 170] [BMC 8613] (Isaac Cruikshank. 29 January, 1795).
[107] George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum*, [8299].
[108] *SANS CULOTTES Fundamentally Supplied in DUTCH-BOTTOMS* [Fig. 171] [BMC 8630]
(10 March, 1795).
[109] *THE KING of HOLLAND and the Dauphin* [BMC 10582] (c. July 1806).
[110] *Sans-Culottes, feeding Europe with the Bread of Liberty* [Fig. 126] [BMC 8290] (James
Gillray. 12 January, 1793), *BUONAPARTE at ROME giving AUDIENCE in STATE* [Fig. 45]
[BMC 8997] (Isaac Cruikshank. 12 March, 1797).
[111] *The CAMBRIDGE MUSICAL SQUEEZE!! or DOUBLE-BASS ENTRÉ to the ORCHESTRA*
[BMC 14707] (Robert Cruikshank. July 1824), *An Italian Singer, cut out for English amusement,
or, Signor Veluti Displaying his Great parts* [BMC 14880] (J. Lewis Marks. 1825).

Francophilic fops or effeminate Frenchmen sometimes acted as a vehicle for expressing frustrations which had a wider basis than a particular resentment towards the French.

  Germanic peoples tended to appear only in prints on the subject of warfare, or other major international events or disputes, and they were usually characterised as rather stern, strong, and brutish Prussian soldiers or generals.[112] Graphic satire was also used to criticise Britain's Hanoverian royal family. As discussed in Chapter Three, this was done both directly but also, again, implicitly through certain depictions of French rulers and their subjects. As with Prussia and Austria, depictions of Russia, of whose people and politics the English were still largely ignorant despite a growing awareness and interest as it expanded its territory and influence, were generally confined to sovereigns, generals, soldiers[113], and the bestial representation of the large Russian bear.

  The Turks appear in a similarly static, two-dimensional way, their barbarism accentuated further by their non-Christian turbans and their exotic, savagely curved swords. In some prints, Napoleon Bonaparte would be undermined through his association with Islam; he was shown as having converted (or having pretended to), and often appeared in the company of his mameluke bodyguard Roustam and sometimes several more mamelukes.[114] Having said that, Others such as the Turks who could be seen as religiously, culturally, and geographically distant were not so primitive or different to be viewed as inhuman or undeserving of empathy. Napoleon was also attacked for his apparent cold and blood-thirsty slaying of Turks at Cairo and Jaffa in 1798 and 1799.[115]

  To reiterate, although they may have been the foreigner which drew the most

---

[112] For example the caricatures of General Blücher mentioned in Chapter Four.
[113] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, pp. 40-42.
[114] See Chapter Three.
[115] *BUONAPARTE Massacring Three Thousand Eight Hundred Men at JAFFA* [BMC 10062] (Robert Ker Porter. 12 August, 1803), *MASSACRE IN EGYPT* [BMC 12463] (George Cruikshank. 2 December, 1814).

attention, the French were by no means the only ones to be lampooned in satirical art. Ireland could be associated with France through its Catholicism, sporadic radicalism, and as the potential location for French invasion, but on the whole the Irish were seen as unintelligent, poverty-stricken, and amusing rather than threatening. This would start to change in the middle of the nineteenth century, when large numbers of poor, Catholic immigrants travelled to England, exciting prejudices which were reinforced by developments in ethnology and evolutionary theory. Spain, following the opposite trajectory, had drawn much attention in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but had since been defined by its decline, appearing in a state of stereotyped stasis, trapped forever as the foolish cloak-sporting Don, ignorantly clinging to memories of his former glories. Sometimes memories of the Inquisition and the 'Black Legend' were evoked, particularly when Ferdinand VII returned to the throne, his restoration being viewed a greater abhorrence than that of Louis XVIII, but Spain was predominantly cast as the weaker brother of France.

  Scotland was on the receiving end of much hostility. Memories of the Stuarts and of the 1745 Jacobite rebellion were regularly evoked, Scottish politicians were depicted as untrustworthy and villainous, and at certain times appeared to be more dangerous, more conniving and underhand than the foppish and laughable Frenchmen that regularly appeared in the period of peace between 1763 and 1778. Of course, part of the inspiration for such animosity was the recent union between England and Scotland and the progress made by certain successful Scots, their integration into English (or British) society, and perhaps a growing sense of 'Britishness'. Whether this was triggered or nourished by a common Protestantism and in resistance to the French Catholic Other is, however, questionable.

  Like Spain, the actual stereotype of the Dutchman remained fairly static, the pipe-smoking fat 'Mynheer' or 'Nic Frog' in breeches. Attitudes towards this stereotype and the situations in which he was cast fluctuated, however. At times

depicted with a friendly affinity, more often the Dutch were berated either for their treacherous neutrality or for more directly antagonistic activities. On account of this, invasions of Holland were treated as opportunities for taunting slapstick, although the Prussian invasion of 1787 was also used to jeer the impotency of France. The French invasion of 1795, however, was also deemed a topic of amusement, despite the preceding few years of casting the French as cannibalistic Jacobin monsters, intent on spreading their demonic republicanism across the world. The accusations of Dutch treachery were at least partly stimulated by England's identification with this other Protestant, mercantile nation, and the intimate relations that the two nations had at times enjoyed. The disappointed feelings of betrayal articulated in certain prints materialised from a closeness rather than distance.

England's obsession with France and representations of the French Other were also inspired by an affinity with that nation. As Derek Jarrett emphasised, Britain and France's relationship was so intimate, their histories so inextricably involved with one another, that they resembled 'a pair of separated Siamese twins, each determined to live its own life and yet resentfully conscious of the other self that had been taken from it', and the more each country repudiated each other, 'the more binding their strange relationship became.'[116] It is necessary for the Other to be somebody one can identify with, one through which the (usually undesirable) traits of one's own nation or society can be shown, and which is exacerbated by the further projection of domestic anxieties onto this Other. For the English in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the principal Other, though not the only one, was the French:

> Like many other hawk-eyed and self-deluding observers before and since,
> Englishmen and Frenchmen of the eighteenth century stared intently across the
> Channel, determined to search out their neighbour's secrets and reach a detached
> assessment of his powers and potentialities. And deep in the pupils of his eyes they

---

[116] Jarrett, *The Begetters of Revolution*, pp. 3-4.

saw what they were really looking for all the time: their own reflections.[117]

The English at this time would never have chosen, say, Russia as a suitable Other. Little was known of its people or its politics and its power and influence, despite expanding, were not sufficiently significant to deserve sustained attention.[118] To attract a wealth of perpetual interest from English graphic satirists, then, was something of a complement to the nation in question that was being portrayed. Even if the portrayal was derisively critical, to be acknowledged in such a manner was to be considered important, substantial, noteworthy, just as it was for significant public figures who were caricatured. It was Samuel Johnson who said that, after having been caricatured by Gillray, 'I hope the day will never arrive when I shall neither be the object of calumny or ridicule, for then I shall be neglected and forgotten'[119], whereas George Canning actively sought to be caricatured.[120] For nations, as for politicians, to be ridiculed by the political print artist was to be significant, to be ignored by him was to be irrelevant.

3) <u>Summary</u>

Perhaps the most appropriate design with which to close a discussion of prints of women and of other nationalities is James Gillray's crude *NATIONAL CONVENIENCES* [Fig. 172] [BMC 8906] (25 January, 1796), in which the figures of four different nationalities, English, Dutch, French, and Scottish, are depicted at their respective latrines. The 'Scotch Convenience' is simply a ramshackle shelter with a bucket, on top of which sits a grumpy tartan-clad figure. The Dutch equivalent is the lake, into which a pipe-smoking Hollander, in back view, perched on a fence, carries out his or her business. The French convenience, or 'le Commodites', is not quite as derisively imagined. The figure chosen to represent France is a fairly elegant and pretty young woman. In front of papers referring to her diet of 'Soupe Maigre', she is forced to perch awkwardly, lifting

---

[117] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[118] Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, pp. 40-42.
[119] Quoted in Hunt, *Defining John Bull*, p. 18.
[120] Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 16.

herself with one foot above the piles of excrement which overflow from the toilet. Her system of sanitation has not yet been perfected, but it is more sophisticated than that available in Scotland or in Holland; she is indoors and not surrounded by ducks or livestock, and the woman herself has been handsomely rendered. Gatrell asserts that this print offers 'taunting social commentary… on the primitive lavatorial habits of the Scots, French and Dutch as compared with the sophistication of the English'.[121] The representative of England, however, is not exactly flattered. His 'English Convenience - The Water Closet' is cleaner than the French equivalent, and considerably more preferable to the Scottish bucket or the Dutch lake. This robed alderman has enjoyed, as indicated by the placards on the wall behind, a diet of 'Roast Beef', 'Turtle Soup', 'Fish', 'Poultry', 'Ham', but it has left him fat and gross; his left foot is wrapped in bandages as a consequence of gout and the spotlessness of his toilet may be the result less of an inherent cleanliness than of constipation.

   Prints which feature women and those on 'other Others' help to illustrate the English obsession with France, characterised not just by rivalry, war, and hatred, but also by fascination, mutual respect, and identification. Writers in England projected their anxieties about female independence and participation in the political sphere onto their commentaries of French gender relations, a habit which was not as blatant in graphic art. Here, the Duchess of Devonshire was treated with greater cruelty than French ladies. Female participation in the early stages of the French Revolution, like that of male participation, was celebrated, and even when British public opinion turned against the revolutionary cause some sympathy was shown towards the suffering and plight of French women. Sympathy was also shown towards the intriguing figure of Josephine, although, like the suffering sans-culottes' wives being used to emphasise their husbands' errors and crimes, this was principally in order to accentuate Napoleon's cruelty. His next wife was used in a similar way to undermine his authority and to draw attention to his failings and weaknesses. Nevertheless, in doing this print

---

[121] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, p. 184.

audiences were being encouraged to identify with and show sympathy for French females. Prints of Englishmen or Englishwomen becoming enamoured with attractive French figures, though implying that such habits were foolishly unpatriotic, suggested that such habits continued to be rife and that the Other possessed an exotic sexual appeal.

Stereotypes of the French, and the situations in which they were envisaged, evolved and transformed according to the threat that French power posed to Britain, but also according to an attentive fascination with that nation and the projection of domestic anxieties onto this familiar, recognisable Other, with whom it was possible to identify and draw comparisons. France, therefore, drew the most attention, but was not the only nation to incur the wrath of the satirists. Those with whom the English were less acquainted, the Russians or the Austrians for example, tended to be dismissed as two-dimensional savage brutes. Attracting greater attention, and thus simultaneously bestowed of greater relevancy, were foreigners such as the Scottish and the Dutch. Both had at one time posed a threat to Britain's power and dominance, but by the early eighteenth century Scotland had united with England, albeit while maintaining much independence and its own national identity or identities, and Dutch commercial and maritime power had deteriorated. In these cases, the 'Othering', the resentment, the prejudice that was articulated in satirical prints seems to have emerged from a closeness and intimacy with these Others with whom it was easy for English audiences to recognise, understand and even relate to. Prints may have attempted to deny such sentiments, but they could not conceal them. Though France continued to pose a threat to Britain through its commercial power and more directly in the numerous wars which took place between the two rival nations, it was a Western European closeness and kinship that also helped to create, nourish and develop representations of the French. Consequently, in prints such as *NATIONAL CONVENIENCES*, it was the French characters with whom the English had the most in common.

Conclusion

Although British fascination with their Gallic neighbours was abundant beforehand and would remain subsequently, and although it fluctuated according to contemporary political events both at home and abroad, the obsession with France was particularly potent during the eighteenth century and early years of the nineteenth. As France's wealth and power had eclipsed that of other influential European nations such as Spain, this attention was fuelled by rivalry in trade and empire and by war, as well as by travel and the attraction of French fashions and culture. This period also coincided with London's 'golden age of caricature', and it was only natural that much of this material focussed on France, the French and on Anglo-French relations. While there might be a temptation to employ these prints as straightforward evidence of the Francophobia which supposedly defined this age and contributed to the formation of British identity, a more attentive study reveals greater satirical complexities at work which do not merely conceptualise and employ the French 'Other' as a simple target of hatred.

Many of the prints were informed by war and rivalry and represented these in an ostensibly antagonistic manner. They also, however, demonstrate a continuous dialogue between the English and the French people, even if it was one that was fictional, manipulated, and biased, as well as degrees of familiarity and empathy, even kinship, which the English held for the French that they did not appear to share with any other 'Others'. Other foreigners, of course, featured regularly in print culture, but they tended to be represented in extremely static, monotonic ways. The French stereotypes, although maintaining some consistent features, and having some which faded only to reappear at a later stage, were significantly more varied, uniquely fluid, and permitted to evolve. Greater attention was given to internal developments and turbulences within France than to those occurring in other parts of the world and although representations were often derisive, like the caricatures of famous public figures or leading politicians, they paradoxically flattered the French nation by conceding its undeniable significance.

Amongst the other nations which drew particular attention from English graphic satirists were the Scots and the Dutch. Although their stereotypes were not permitted to evolve in the same way as the French, the resentments and the prejudices that were expressed towards them in graphic satire were dependent on an intimacy with these foreigners with whom the English competed, but with whom they also interacted and had much in common. English audiences could readily recognise, understand and relate to Others such as the Scottish, the Dutch and the French. In some cases graphic satirists had to work hard to search for and manufacture differences in areas such as religion or diet between the French and British nations; nations which were actually more similar than the printshop artists and audiences were willing to admit explicitly.

At the same time, Britain's rivalry and fascination with France could not avoid the projection of some positive elements onto the French character. The art, fashion and culture of France were at times accepted, perhaps begrudgingly, to be superior, more sophisticated, or more popular than Britain's. Even if applying it for devilish means, the French were often furnished with intelligence, usually a greater intelligence than that possessed by caricature depictions of British politicians, British kings, and the symbolic embodiment of the nation, John Bull. Pity was also shown towards the French people. French leaders were attacked for the suffering endured by their subjects, suffering which such leaders were shown to be directly enacting, sanctioning, or failing to prevent. Although such representations could be employed to convey the professed superiorities of the British political system and the objectionable nature of French governments, in promoting the idea that the suffering of Frenchmen was deplorable the prints had to contend that the French were human beings deserving of better treatment, suggesting empathy and affinity.

In conjunction with the increasingly human terms in which British monarchs came to be portrayed, French leaders were also attributed degrees of sympathy. Certain caricatures of Napoleon Bonaparte betrayed acceptance, admiration, and compassion; this was particularly true following the defeat of

his empire, when such feelings could be more easily aroused and freely declared, yet they were also present beforehand. Even Louis XVIII, whose restoration was greeted with cynicism on the part of graphic satirists, was attributed a more human caricature than his predecessors. If laughter targeted towards the British monarchy at this time could be said to have contributed to an 'amused tolerance' of royalty[1], then it is not unreasonable to suggest that laughter at the expense of France could lead to a similarly amused tolerance of that nation, its people, and its rulers. In producing, viewing, and laughing at these satires, an outlet was provided for frustration with the 'traditional enemy', and this satiric trend might have alleviated Anglo-French tension rather than exacerbated it, whether this was the print artists' intention or not.

When war broke out between the two nations, a regular occurrence in this period, the French stereotype inevitably became more grotesque and the brand of humour that was employed would develop a harsher, more antagonistic air. However, prints did not necessarily reflect or promote a nation which was defining itself through its extensive wars with a French enemy. Prints on English men and women's appetite for French fashion and culture were not just in abundance during peacetime, and although such Francophilia attracted greater disapproval in periods of war, the prints attest that such habits remained prevalent and seem not to have diminished on account of international conflict. War was increasingly depicted as a battle between powerful rulers more than it was as a clash of different peoples. Peace treaties in the earlier half of the period were used to attack domestic political figures with a greater degree of hostility than that was used against the French, whereas later truces were more enthusiastically celebrated with both British diplomats and politicians and French leaders being treated with greater sympathy than their predecessors. Even after the French stereotype had transformed into the grotesque Jacobin, scenes depicting warfare continued to avoid gore when portraying British victories against the French. There was a preference for politer, slapstick or symbolic imagery, such as battles being represented as a fistfight between two generals. While this distanced Britain

---

[1] Colley, *Britons*, p. 210.

from complicity in the unpleasant realities of battle and promoted the image of a nation which conducted respectful, chivalrous warfare, it also indicates that the image of the French had not become so debased as to eradicate the feeling that chivalrous practices (or chivalrous representations) should be maintained. Other nations, meanwhile, even those allied to Britain, were derisively characterised by their uncivilised and brutal treatment of the French enemy. The continued insistence that Napoleon Bonaparte was not French through consistent references to his Mediterranean background, and by associating him with Islam, undermined his authority and castigated him as a usurper, but also illustrates that the French could be held in a higher regard to that of less respected and less familiar nationalities.

   The French Revolution itself was initially celebrated as a victory of the French people over the forces of despotism and the reactionary attitude of Edmund Burke was ruthlessly mocked. Even as public opinion, and consequently the attitude of print satires, turned against the revolution, prints persevered in satirising the alarmist language that was employed by loyalists. Still, direct expressions of sympathy for the revolutionary cause became less frequent and the French stereotype was transformed into the bloodthirsty and often cannibalistic sans-culotte character (although as Paulson pointed out, even here there was an element of fathomable rationality to the starving Frenchman's consumption of his oppressors[2]). If this was the era in which the image of the Frenchman was at its most abhorrent, however, it was also the moment when domestic anxieties were at their highest. Whilst Britain's domestic problems and divisions had been caused, or exacerbated, by events in France and the outbreak of war, prints tended to dismiss the direct threat that France posed, victories such as Nelson's in Egypt and British maritime power in general had installed enough confidence to ensure that the threat of French invasion was not usually taken as a particularly foreseeable prospect. Instead of suggesting that the real danger came from France, those who were reproached for posing the most threat were the subversive forces at home accused of supporting France's revolution but who were in reality more likely

---

[2] Paulson, *Representations of Revolution*, p. 200.

to be religious dissenters and champions of political reform. Whereas in previous and subsequent decades the French enemy was conceived to be less the French people than their autocratic leaders, revolutionary leaders were largely absent from caricature. In part this illustrated the deplorable nature of a regime built on equality and the sovereignty of the people. This was contradicted, however, by the images of the potential revolution at home which, it was suggested, would have its leaders, in men such as Charles James Fox. In this respect prints on the subject of revolution continued the print tradition of being concerned with lampooning the reputations of members of Westminster's political elite. Ultimately, the revolutionary stereotype of the French and the memories of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars were not so potent or enduring that they diminished support for France's next revolution in 1830, an event again celebrated in print culture.

The prints produced throughout the broader period also reveal many of the tensions that existed not between the two nations that lay either side of the Channel, but those within Britain itself. At this time when Britain appears to have become prouder, more self-assured, and developing greater unity, satirical prints exposed a number of the insecurities that existed in the country concerning its identity, its values, and its position on the world's stage. It was not always important that the Other happened to be French, so long as an Other existed onto which the English could project their already existent fears and anxieties. These included class anxieties as well as anxieties over more intricate social divisions; anxieties over warfare and empire; religious anxieties; anxieties about gender and masculinity. Political anxieties were expressed through direct criticism of British kings and politicians in Georgian print culture, and often the French were used merely as a tool with which to express disappointment with British political figures by accusing them of corruption or treachery. In other instances, criticism of the British political system and its social inequalities, and more general attacks on issues such as arbitrary power and religious hypocrisy or corruption, were implicit in portrayals of the various French leaders. Although graphic satire enjoyed greater freedom of expression than the printed word, publishers occasionally

did suffer from official harassment or prosecution[3], so it is not inconceivable that satirists endeavoured to cloak certain critiques behind images of the French.

These visual depictions, therefore, reveal the insecurities and divisions within Britain that on the surface the satirists would at times attempt to deny with their often patriotic imagery. As in France, life in Britain was also prone to the possibilities of tyranny, religious oppression, torture, capital punishment, social division, rebellion, and starvation; Britons were either experiencing these at the same time as the French, or had done in the recent past, and in all possibility could do again. Many of these themes were constant, though the way they were depicted varied according to the time and the news. Yet we also discover a country which found little difficulty in mocking itself while in the process of attempting to lampoon its foreign neighbours, a country aware of its insecurities and able to express them, if not always directly, and able find humour in its difficulties.

Neither the vain, foppish, oppressed Frenchman nor the contrasted overweight, red-faced, stocky, stupid, drunk and aggressive John Bull was an ideal figure worthy of emulation. Both characters appeared to be grotesque, both contained faults easily recognisable from English life, and both were, crucially for an essentially comic medium, funny. The ideal citizen would be, we can gauge, somewhere between the two. Graphic satires express not merely hatred for a traditional enemy but a fascination and affinity with this enemy, and a continuous unease with its own identity, constant self-criticism, and a sensitivity to the fact that Britain was not an unwavering utopia built upon the solid foundations of Parliament, constitutional monarchy, and the ideals of 1688 which nurtured a well-fed, loyal population. A rather less confident, still flawed, and more fragile nation emerges, uncertain of where it was, where it might be going, and who was included. These quandaries could not be solved by print culture, but they could be expressed, and perhaps eased, and at the very least articulated in such a way as to provoke laughter rather

---

[3] Donald, *The Age of Caricature*, p. 2; Banerji and Donald (ed.), *Gillray Observed*, p. 203 n. 1.

than fright or panic.

Vic Gatrell argues that the prints produced in the decades following Hogarth's death dealt less in explicit didacticism and that those concerning British vices such as gambling, drunkenness, and licentiousness may have been celebratory rather than satirical. They were consumed by those who engaged in such activities themselves, whereas disapprovers would have kept their distance from such publications.[4] Though Gatrell focuses on how satirists represented their own countrymen, a comparable assessment could be made of prints on the French. The sections of society who could afford and were interested in caricatures of the French, the aristocracy and upper middle classes, were also those who were most enamoured with French fashion, art, language, culture and society. This material should not be simply employed as shorthand confirmation of English antagonism towards France devoid of the requirement for greater consideration. In these prints which at first appear to signal the Francophobia that is said to have pervaded British society, can also be found celebrations of Frenchness and of national differences, the desire to use such imagery for self-criticism, liberal attitudes towards the French people, and an admiration and respect for those people in whom the English saw their own reflections[5] and with whom they shared a uniquely intimate relationship.

[4] Gatrell, *City of Laughter*, pp. 136-156.
[5] Jarrett, *The Begetters of Revolution*, p. 24.

Bibliography

Visual Print Resources:

British Museum Collection of Satirical Prints

Lewis Walpole Library Collection of English Caricatures and Political Satirical Prints
(http://images.library.yale.edu/walpoleweb/)

Grosvenor Prints, London
(www.grosvenorprints.com)

Primary Sources:

*Cannibals' Progress or the dreadful horrors of French invasion. A warning to Great Britain and
Ireland against French perfidy and cruelty: or, a short account of the treacherous and inhuman
conduct of the French officers and soldiers towards the peasants of Suabia, during the invasion of
Germany in 1796. Selected and translated from a well authenticated German publication, by
Anthony Aufrıre, Esq: with an address to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, by the
translator* (1798).

*An estimate of the manners and principles of the modern French. By Monsieur Helvetius, with
notes by the translator* (1762).

France Run Mad (1795).

French people, their case and their cure (1792).

John Bull roused from his lethargy. A new song (1795?).

A KING or a CONSUL? A NEW SONG to the tune of Derry Down (1799?).

A letter of condolence and congratulation from Antichrist to John Bull; and the answer (1795).

*The Life of Mahomet; or, the History of that Imposture, which was begun, carried on, and finally
established by him in Arabia; and which has subjugated a larger proportion of the globe, than the*

Religion of Jesus has yet set at Liberty. To which is added, an account of Egypt (1799).

The Life of Mahomet, the Imposter; with the pretended miracles said to be wrought by him and his disciples; his wonderful ascent to heaven, description of paradise, and a relation of his death (1784).

The Prospect: or, the great advantages which the common people of England are likely to gain, by a successful invasion from the French (1798).

The Revolution, or the blessings of French liberty. A true story, in verse. Addressed to the people of Great Britain (1799).

Andrews, John, *A Comparative view of the French and English nations, in their manners, politics and literature* (1785).

Andrews, John, *Remarks on the French and English ladies: in a series of letters: interspersed with various anecdotes, and additional matter arising from the subject* (1783).

Arbuthnot, John, *A History of John Bull* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

Banerji, Christiane and Donald, Diana (ed.), *Gillray Observed: The Earliest Account of his Caricatures in* London und Paris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Barrell, John and Mee, Jon (ed.), *Trials for Treason and Sedition, 1792-1794, Volume 1* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006).

Baudelaire, Charles, *Selected Writings on Art and Literature* (London: Penguin, 2006).

Bending, Stephen and Bygrave, Stephen (ed.), *Women's travel writings in revolutionary France* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007).

Burke, Edmund, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London: Penguin, 2004).

[Eaton, Daniel Isaac], *Extermination, or an appeal to the people of England, on the present war* (1793).

'English Lady', *A Residence in France, during the years 1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795; described in*

a series of letters from an English lady: with general and incidental remarks on the French character and manners (1797)

Foote, Samuel, *The Englishman in Paris* (1753).

Foote, Samuel, *The Englishman Return'd from Paris* (1756).

'Friend to the People', *French fraternity and French protection, as promised to Ireland, and as experienced by other nations. Addressed to all ranks and descriptions in this kingdom* (1798).

Godwin, William, *Caleb Williams* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Godwin, William (under the pseudonym William Baldwin), *Fables Ancient and Modern. Adapted for the use of children. Tenth Edition* (London: M.J. Godwin & Co., 1824).

Grose, Francis, *Rules for Drawing Caricaturas: with an essay on comic painting* (1788).

Hume, David, *Essays, moral, political, and literary*, (Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1987).

'John Bull Antigallicus', *Ambo; or the danger of French invasion repelled by British union. A letter addressed to all true antigallicans. With a comparative view of the population of Great Britain and France* (1796).

'Junius, Junior', *National character of the English and French people* (1795).

Knox, Vicesimus, 'On the effect of caricaturas exhibited at the windows of printsellers', in *Winter Evenings: or, lubrications on life and letters, Volume 1* (Third Edition, 1795), 139-144.

Mezague, Vivant de, *A general view of England, respecting its policy, trade, commerce, taxes, debts, produce of lands, colonies, manners &c. &c. Argumentatively stated, from the year 1600 to 1762; in a letter to AMLCD By MVDM. Now translated from the French, first printed in 1762* (1766).

Moore, John, *A View of Society and Manners in France, Switzerland and Germany, by a Gentleman, who resided several years in those countries* (1779).

Moore, Thomas, *An Address to the Inhabitants of Great Britain, on the dangerous and destructive*

tendency of the French system of Liberty and Equality, with an historical account of the French Revolution, the imprisonment and sufferings of the Royal Family, and the deliberate murder of the King of France (1793).

Nares, Robert, *A short account of the character and reign of Louis XVI showing how little he deserved, from his ungrateful people, the name of Tyrant. To which is subjoined, a corrected translation of his last will* (1793).

Paine, Thomas, *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Picard, George, *The English guide to the French tongue: shewing the grammatical construction of English words into French: with a set of rules and exercises. For the use of young people* (1778).

[Playstowe, Philip], *The Gentleman's Guide in his Tour through France. Wrote by an officer in the Royal-Navy, Who lately traveled on a principle, which he most sincerely recommends to his Countrymen, viz. Not to spend more money in the Country of our natural enemy, than is requisite to support with decency the character of an English Man* (1766).

Price, Richard, *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country, Delivered on Nov. 4ᵗʰ, 1789, at the Meeting-House in the Old Jewry, to the Society for Commemorating the Revolution in Great Britain* (1789).

[Simond, Louis] *Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain during the years 1810 and 1811 by a French Traveller: with remarks on the country, its arts, literature, and politics, and on the manners and customs of its inhabitants. Volume first* (1815).

Simond, Louis, *Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain during the years 1810 and 1811 by Louis Simond. Volume second. Second edition, Corrected and Enlarged: To which is added an appendix on France, written in December 1815, and October 1816* (1817).

Sterne, Laurence, *A Sentimental Journey* (London: Penguin, 2005).

Swift, Jonathan, *Gulliver's Travels* (London: Penguin, 2003).

Taylor, William, *French irreligion and impiety alarming to Christians. An address to the people of Scotland* (1794).

Thicknesse, Philip, *Observations on the customs and manners of the French nation, in a series of letters, in which that nation is vindicated from the misrepresentations of some late writers* (1766).

Wendeborn, Frederick, *A View of England towards the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (1791).

Wordsworth, William, *The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Secondary Sources:

Alexander, David, *Richard Newton and English Caricature in the 1790s* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006).

Anderson, Fred, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (London: Faber and Faber, 2001).

Atherton, Herbert M., *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth: A study of the ideographic representation of politics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974).

Baer, Marc, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *American Historical Review* 98 (1993), 119-121.

Baker, Kenneth, *George III: A Life in Caricature* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007).

Baker, Kenneth, *George IV: A Life in Caricature* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005).

Barrell, John, *Imagining the King's Death: Figurative Treason, Fantasies of Regicide 1793-1796* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Barrell, John, 'Radicalism, Visual Culture, and Spectacle in the 1790s', *Romanticism on the Net* 46 (2007), 'http://www.erudit.org/revue/ron/2007/v/n46/016131ar.html' (accessed 14 September, 2008).

Barrell, John, 'Sad Stories: Louis XVI, George III, and the Language of Sentiment', in Sharpe,

Kevin and Zwicker, Steven N. (ed.), *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (London: University of California Press, 1998), 75-98.

Barrell, John, *The Spirit of Despotism: Invasions of Privacy in the 1790s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Bindman, David, 'How the French became frogs: English caricature and national stereotype', *Apollo* (2003), 15-20.

Bindman, David, *The Shadow of the Guillotine: Britain and the French Revolution* (London: British Museum Publications, 1989).

Binhammer, Katherine, 'Marie Antoinette was "One of Us": British Accounts of the Martyred Wicked Queen', *The Eighteenth Century* 44 (2003), 233-255.

Black, Jeremy, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth-Century* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992).

Black, Jeremy, 'Ideology, history, xenophobia and the world of print in eighteenth-century England', in Black, Jeremy and Gregory, Jeremy (ed.), *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660-1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 184-216.

Black, Jeremy, *Natural and Necessary Enemies: Anglo-French Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1986).

Blanning, T. C. W., '"That Horrid Electorate" or "Ma Patrie Germanique"? George III, Hanover, and the Fürstenbund of 1785', *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977), 311-344.

Boime, Albert, 'The Sketch and Caricature as Metaphors for the French Revolution', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 55 (1992), 256-267.

Bonehill, John and Quilley, Geoff, *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Bowen, H.V., *War and British Society, 1688-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Brewer, John, *The Common People and Politics 1750-1790s* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Brockliss, Laurence and Eastwood, David (ed.), *A Union of Multiple Identities: The British Isles c. 1750-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

Bryant, Mark, *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons* (London: Grub Street, 2009).

Bury, Adrian, *Maurice Quentin de la Tour* (London: Charles Skilton, 1971).

Cardwell, M. John, *Arts and Arms: Literature, Politics and Patriotism during the Seven Years War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

Carretta, Vincent, *George III and the Satirists from Hogarth to Byron* (Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1990).

Clark, J. C. D., 'Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity, 1660-1832', *Historical Journal* 43 (2000), 249-276.

Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian (ed.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Clayton, Tim, *Caricatures of the People of the British Isles* (London: British Museum Press, 2007).

Cohen, Michele, *Fashioning Masculinity: National identity and language in the eighteenth century* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Cohen, Michele, 'Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England', in Hitchcock, Tim and Cohen, Michele (ed.) *English Masculinities 1660-1800* (Essex: Longman, 1999), 44-61.

Cole, Juan, *Napoleon's Egypt: Invading the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave, 2008).

Colley, Linda, 'The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation', *Past and Present* 102 (1984), 94-129.

Colley, Linda, 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), 309-329.

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Colley, Linda, 'Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain 1750-1830', *Past and Present* 113 (1986), 97-117.

Conway, Stephen, 'Continental Connections: Britain and Europe in the Eighteenth Century', *History* 90 (2005), 353-374.

Conway, Stephen, 'War and National Identity in the Mid-Eighteenth-Century British Isles', *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), 863-893.

Cookson, J. E., *The British Armed Nation, 1793-1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Cookson, J. E., *The Friends of Peace: Anti-war liberalism in England, 1793-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

Cottrell, Stella, 'The Devil on Two Sticks: Franco-phobia in 1803', in Samuel, Raphael (ed.) *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity, Volume 1* (London: Routledge, 1989), 259-274.

Coupe, W. A., 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1969), 79-95.

Crouzet, François, 'The Second Hundred Years War: Some Reflections', *French History* 10 (1996), 432-450.

Crown, Patricia, 'Sporting with Clothes: John Collet's Prints in the 1770s', *Eighteenth Century Life* 26 (2002), 119-135.

Cubitt, Geoffrey (ed.), *Imagining Nations* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

Cunningham, Stanley B., *The Idea of Propaganda: A Reconstruction* (Westport: Praeger, 2002).

Cuno, James (ed.), *French Caricature and the French Revolution, 1789-1799* (Los Angeles:

Gunwald Centre for Graphic Arts, 1988).

Curtis, L. Perry, *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1997).

Davis, Dorothy, *A History of Shopping* (London: Routledge, 1966).

Dickie, Simon, 'Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humor', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (2003), 1-22.

Dickinson, H. T. (ed.), *Britain and the French Revolution, 1789-1815* (London: Macmillan, 1994).

Dickinson, H. T., *Caricatures and the Constitution, 1760-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Donald, Diana, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III* (London: Yale University Press, 1996).

Donald, Diana, *Followers of Fashion: Graphic Satires from the Georgian Period* (London: Haywood Gallery Publishing, 2002).

Dresser, Madge, 'Britannia', in Raphael Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity, Volume 2* (London: Routledge, 1989), 26-49.

Duffy, Michael, *The Englishman and the Foreigner* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Duffy, Michael, 'The Noisie, Empty, Fluttering French: English Images of the French, 1689-1815', *History Today* 32 (1982), 21-26.

Eagles, Robin, *Francophilia in English Society, 1748-1815* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

Ellis, Geoffrey, *Napoleon* (London: Longman, 2000).

Emsley, Clive, *British Society and the French Wars, 1793-1815* (London: Macmillan, 1979).

Erwin, Timothy, 'William Hogarth and the Aesthetics of Nationalism', *Huntington Library*

Quarterly 64 (2001), 383-410.

Festa, Lynn, 'Cosmetic Differences: The Changing Faces of England and France', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 34 (2005), 25-54.

Festa, Lynn, 'Personal Effects: Wigs and Possessive Individualism in the Long Eighteenth Century', *Eighteenth Century Life* 29 (2005), 47-90.

Fife, Graeme, *The Terror: The Shadow of the Guillotine, France 1792-1794* (London: Portrait, 2004).

Finlay, Richard J., 'Keeping the Covenant: Scottish National Identity', in Devine, T. M. and Young, J. R., *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 121-133.

Foner, Eric, 'Introduction', in Paine, Thomas, *The Rights of Man* (London: Penguin, 1986), 7-22.

Foreman, Amanda, *Georgiana: Duchess of Devonshire* (London: Harpercollins, 2008).

Forrest, Alan, *Napoleon's Men: The Soldiers of the Revolution and Empire* (London: Hambledon and London, 2002).

Fox, Christopher, 'Introduction: Biographical and Historical Contexts', in Fox, Christopher (ed.), *Gulliver's Travels by Jonathan Swift* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1995).

Franklin, Alexandra and Philp, Mark, *Napoleon and the Invasion of Britain* (Oxford: The Bodleian Library, 2003).

Gatrell, Vic, *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Atlantic, 2006).

Gatrell, Vic, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People 1770-1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

George, Dorothy and Stephens, George, *Catalogue of Prints in the British Museum, Division 1, Political and Personal Satires* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey).

George, Dorothy, 'America in English Satirical Prints', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 10 (1953), 512-537.

George, Dorothy, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).

George, Dorothy, *English Political Caricature 1793-1832: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959).

Germani, Ian, 'Combat and Culture: Imagining the Battle of the Nile', *Northern Mariner* 10 (2000), 53-72.

Gilley, Sheridan, 'English Attitudes to the Irish Minority in England, 1789-1900', in Holmes, Colin (ed.), *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1978), 81-110.

Godfrey, Richard, *English Caricature 1620 to the Present* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1984).

Godfrey, Richard, *James Gillray: The Art of Caricature* (London: Tate, 2001).

Gombrich, E. H., *Meditations on a Hobby Horse* (London: Phaidon, 1978).

Grenby, M. O., 'The Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Fiction, British Conservatism and the Revolution in France', *History* 83 (1998), 445-471.

Griffin, Dustin, *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1994).

Hallett, Mark, 'James Gillray and the Language of Graphic Satire', in Godfrey, Richard, *James Gillray: The Art of Caricature* (London: Tate, 2001), 23-38.

Hallett, Mark, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

Hardwick, Joseph, 'Book Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', University of York's *Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past*, 'http://www.york.ac.uk/ipup/projects/britishness/discussion/colley.html' (accessed 14 March,

2011).

Haynes, Clare, *Pictures and Popery: Art and Religion in England, 1660-1760* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

Haynes, Clare, '"A Trial for the Patience of Reason"? Grand Tourists and Anti-Catholicism after 1745', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33 (2010), 195-208.

Heffernan, James A. W. (ed.), *Representing the French Revolution: Literature, Historiography, and Art* (New England: University of New England Press, 1992).

Hegel, G. W. F., *The Phenomenology of Mind* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1910).

Hill, Draper, *Mr. Gillray The Caricaturist* (London: Phaidon, 1965).

Hole, Robert, 'British Counter-revolutionary Popular Propaganda in the 1790s', in Jones, Colin (ed.), *Britain and Revolutionary France: Conflict, Subversion and Propaganda* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1983), 53-69.

Hunt, Tamara L., *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in late Georgian England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Jarrett, Derek, *The Begetters of Revolution: England's Involvement with France, 1759-1789* (London: Longman, 1973).

Jones, Colin and Wahrman, Dror (ed.), *The Age of Cultural Revolutions: Britain and France, 1750-1820* (London: University of California Press, 2002).

Jones, Colin (ed.), *Britain and Revolutionary France: Conflict, Subversion and Propaganda* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1983).

Jones, Michael Wynn, *The Cartoon History of the American Revolution* (London: London Editions, 1975).

Kates, Gary, 'Review of *Fashioning Masculinity: National identity and language in the eighteenth century* by Michele Cohen', *Journal of Modern History* 71 (1999), 954-955.

Kelly, George Armstrong, 'The Machine of the Duc D'Orléans and the New Politics', *Journal of Modern History* 51 (1979), 667-684.

Kemnitz, Thomas Milton, 'The Cartoon as a Historical Source', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 4 (1973), 81-93.

Knight, Charles A., 'The Images of Nations in Eighteenth-Century Satire', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22 (1989), 489-511.

Koditschek, Theodore, 'The Making of British Nationality', *Victorian Studies* 44 (2002), 389-398.

Kooy, Michael John, 'Coleridge's Francophobia', *Modern Language Review* 95 (2000), 924-941.

Kromm, Jane, 'Representations of Revolutionary Women in Political Caricature', in Crafton, Lisa Plummer (ed.), *The French Revolution Debate in English Literature and Culture* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1997), 123-135.

Lamb, Jonathan, *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2009).

Langford, Paul, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Langford, Paul, *Walpole and the Robinocracy* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Lehmann, Gilly, 'Politics in the Kitchen', *Eighteenth Century Life* 23 (1999), 71-83.

Lorenzo-Modia, Maria Jesus, 'Cogitations on the French Revolution: "The History of Sir George Warrington; or The Political Quixote"', in Figueroa, Cristina Mourón and Gárate, Teresa Morale (ed.), *Studies in Contrastive Linguistics: Proceedings of the 4th International Contrastive Linguistics Conference* (Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2006), 539-546.

Loughlin, James, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *Fortnight* 319 (1993), 50.

Low, David, *British Cartoonists Caricaturists and Comic Artists* (London: William Collins, 1932).

Macleod, Emma Vincent, 'Historiographical Review: British Attitudes to the French Revolution', *Historical Journal* 50 (2007), 689-709.

Macleod, Emma Vincent, *A War of Ideas: British Attitudes to the Wars Against Revolutionary France, 1792-1802* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Maidment, B. E., *Reading Popular Prints, 1790-1870* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Maltby, William S., *The Black Legend in England: The development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1971).

Matar, Nabil, 'Islam in Britain, 1689-1750', *Journal of British Studies* 47 (2008), 284-300.

Maxwell, Constantia, *The English Traveller in France, 1698-1815* (London: Routledge, 1932).

McCreery, Cindy, *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in late Eighteenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004).

McCreery, Cindy, 'True Blue and Black, Brown and Fair: prints of British sailors and their women during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 23 (2000), 135-152.

Mee, Jon, 'The Political Showman at Home: Reflections on Popular Radicalism and Print Culture in the 1790s', in Davis, Michael T. (ed.), *Radicalism and Revolution in Britain, 1775-1848, Essays in Honour of Malcolm I. Thomis* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 41-55.

Middleton, Richard, *The Bells of Victory: The Pitt-Newcastle Ministry and the conduct of the Seven Years' War, 1757-1762* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Miller, John, *Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Mohrmann, Ruth-E. and Meyer, Silke, 'Of Krauts and Frogs: Stereotypes and their uses', *German Research* 25 (2003), 7-9.

Morris, Marilyn, *The British Monarchy and the French Revolution* (London: Yale University Press, 1998).

Murdoch, Alexander, 'Scotland and the Idea of Britain in the Eighteenth Century', in Devine, T. M. and Young, J. R. *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 106-119.

Newman, Gerald, 'Anti-French Propaganda and British Liberal Nationalism in the Early Nineteenth Century: Suggestions Toward a General Interpretation', *Victorian Studies* 18 (1975), 385-418.

Newman, Gerald, 'Nationalism Revisited', *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996), 118-127.

Newman, Gerald, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1987).

Nicholson, Eirwen E. C., 'Consumers and Spectators: The public of the political print in Eighteenth-Century England', *History* 81 (1996), 5-21.

Nicholson, Eirwen E. C., *The English Political Print and Pictorial Political Argument c. 1640 - c. 1832: a study in historiography and methodology*, University of Edinburgh unpublished Ph.D. thesis (1994).

Nicholson, Eirwen E. C., 'English Political Prints ca.1640-ca.1830: The Potential for Emblematic Research and the Failures of Print Scholarship', in Bath, Michael and Russell, Daniel (ed.) *Deviceful Settings: The English Renaissance Emblem and its Contexts* (New York: AMS Press, 1999), 139-165.

de Nie, Michael, *The Eternal Paddy: Irish Identity and the British Press, 1798-1882* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).

O'Gorman, Frank, 'The Paine Burnings of 1792-1793', *Past and Present* 193 (2006), 111-155.

O'Gorman, Frank, 'Review of *The Satirical Gaze: Prints of Women in late Eighteenth Century England* by Cindy McCrery', *English Historical Review* 484 (2004), 1430-1431.

Olszewski, Edward J., 'Exorcising Goya's The Family of Charles IV', *Artibus et Historiae* 20 (1999), 169-185.

Patton, Robert L., 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature', *Art Journal* 43 (1983), 331-338.

Paulson, Ronald, *Representations of Revolution (1789-1820)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

Payne, Matthew and James, *Regarding Thomas Rowlandson, 1757-1827: His Life, Art and Acquaintance* (Cornwall: Hogarth Arts, 2010).

Pentland, Gordon, 'Patriotism, Universalism and the Scottish Conventions, 1792-1794', *History* 89 (2004), 340-360.

Percels, Jeff and Ganim, Russell (ed.), *Fecal Matters in Early Modern Literature and Art: Studies in Scatology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

Petrey, Sandy, 'Pears in History', *Representations* 35 (1991), 52-71.

Philp, Mark, 'Vulgar Conservatism, 1792-3', *English Historical Review* 110 (1995), 42-69.

Philp, Mark (ed.), *Resisting Napoleon: The British Response to the Threat of Invasion, 1797-1815* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

Phillips, A. A., *On the Cultural Cringe* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006).

Pickering, Michael, *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)

Pilbeam, Pamela M., *The 1830 Revolution in France* (London: Macmillan, 1991).

Pincus, Steven, 'Review of *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* by Linda Colley', *Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995), 132-136.

Porter, Roy, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001).

Porter, Roy, 'Review Article: Seeing the Past', *Past and Present* 118 (1988), 186-205.

Porterfield, Todd (ed.), *The Efflorescence of Caricature, 1759-1838* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Press, Charles, 'The Georgian Political Print and Democratic Institutions', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 19 (1977), 216-238.

Rauser, Amelia, 'Death or Liberty: British political prints and the struggle for symbols in the American Revolution', *Oxford Art Journal* 21 (1998), 153-171.

Rogers, Ben, *Beef and Liberty: Roast Beef, John Bull and the English Nation* (London: Vintage, 2004).

Romani, Roberto, *National Character and Public Spirit in Britain and France, 1750-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Rosenthal, Norman (ed.), *Citizens and Kings: Portraits in the Age of Revolution, 1760-1830* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007).

Ross, Sheryl Tuttle, 'Understanding Propaganda: The Epistemic Merit Model and its Application to Art', *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 36 (2002), 16-30.

Rudé, George, 'The Gordon Riots: A study of the rioters and their victims', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, Vol. 6 (1956) 93-114.

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003).

Samuel, Raphael (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity* (London: Routledge, 1989).

Schama, Simon, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London: Penguin, 2004).

Schweizer, Karl W. (ed.), *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1988).

Scott, H. M., *British Foreign Policy in the age of the American Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

Scurr, Ruth, *Fatal Purity: Robespierre and the French Revolution* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2006).

Semmel, Stuart, 'British Uses for Napoleon', *MLN* 120 (2005), 733-746.

Semmel, Stuart, *Napoleon and the British* (London: Yale University Press, 2004).

Semmel, Stuart, 'Reading the Tangible Past: British Tourism, Collecting, and Memory after Waterloo', *Representations* 69 (2000), 9-37.

Shapiro, Susan C., '"Yon Plumed Dandebrat": Male Effeminacy in English Satire and Criticism', *Review of English Studies, New Series* 39 (1988), 400-412.

Sharpe. J. A., *Crime and the Law in English Satirical Prints, 1600-1832* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Simon, Robin, *Hogarth, France and British Art: The Rise of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Hogarth Arts, 2007).

Steig, Michael, 'George Cruikshank and the Grotesque: A Psychodynamic Appraoch', in Patten, Robert L. (ed.) *George Cruikshank: A Revaluation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 189-211.

Streicher, Lawrence H., 'On a Theory of Political Caricature', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (1967), 427-455.

Stott, Andrew, *Comedy* (London: Routledge, 2005)

Sutherland, D. M. G., *France 1789-1815: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (London: Fontana, 1985).

Taylor, Miles, 'John Bull and the Iconography of Public Opinion in England, 1712-1929', *Past and Present* 134 (1992), 93-128.

Thomas, Peter D. G., *The American Revolution* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1986).

Tombs, Robert and Isabelle, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present* (London: Pimlico, 2007).

Weber, Eugen, 'Of Stereotypes of the French', *Journal of Contemporary History* 25 (1990), 169-203.

West, Shearer, 'The Darly Macaroni Prints and the Politics of "Private Man"', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25 (2001), 170-182.

Wettlaufer, Alexandra K., 'Absent Fathers, Martyred Mothers: Domestic Drama and (Royal) Family Values in *A Graphic History of Louis the Sixteenth*', *Eighteenth Century Life* 23 (1999), 1-37.

Whale, John (ed.), *Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France: New Interdisciplinary Essays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Wheeler, H. F. B. and Broadley, A. M., *Napoleon and the Invasion of England* (Stroud: Nonsuch, 2007).

Williams, Caroline D., *Pope and Manliness: Some Aspects of Eighteenth Century Classical Learning* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Williams, David (ed.), *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Williams, Robert R., *Hegel's Ethics of Recognition* (California: University of California Press, 1997).

Wilson, Ben, *The Laughter of Triumph: William Hone and the Fight for the Free Press* (London: Faber and Faber, 2005).

Wood, Marcus, *Radical Satire and Print Culture, 1790-1822* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Young, B. W., 'Religious History and the Eighteenth Century Historian', *Historical Journal* 43 (2000), 849-868.