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English Political Prints and Pictorial Political Argument c.1640-c.1832: a study in historiography and methodology

This thesis is a critical evaluation of scholarship in respect to political prints, including graphic political satire and political caricature, produced or circulated in England c.1640-c.1830, together with related political images in other media.

This study is historiographical, in that the greater part of Part I is written with reference to the secondary literature of this field and includes a bibliographical chapter.

It is also methodological, in that specific problems in the study of this material are considered: the greater part of Part II addresses problems identified in the course of Part I and suggests alternative approaches to this material, by means of which future studies might avoid perpetuating these problems.

Part I comprises twelve chapters; Part II, seven.

An Appendix offers an outline of a projected Index to the B.M. Catalogue (the main reference work for the material).

A volume of plates accompanies the text: these are not 'illustrations' as conventionally deployed, but primary evidence central to the argument of the chapters to which they belong.

This thesis is the first study to attempt a synthetic review and critical analysis of scholarship in the field.
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Introduction

The questions addressed in this thesis were originally to have been addressed - if at all - in passing, in the context of a straightforward, largely non-theoretical, examination of the iconography and 'visual rhetoric' of Church and State as expressed in graphic form between 1660 and c. 1790.

This thesis was to have paid particular attention to the iconography and rhetoric employed in defence of the Church of England and that employed, often in the same prints, to characterise the perceived threats to the Church from dissent; particular attention would have been paid to the prevalence, in 18th-century prints, of allusions to the upheavals of 1640-60 in both visual and verbal form.

To this end, graphic political satires and other polemical prints were to have been studied with reference to the wider pamphlet journalism of which they were a part, with particular emphasis on their shared rhetorical and satirical conventions; a study of the iconography and rhetoric of prints, pamphlets and broadsheets produced in connexion with the Sacheverell trial was to have offered a case study which would have established this common rhetoric.

The thesis as it now stands is quite different in scope and content to that originally projected. Instead of a detailed analysis of a set body of images and texts, I offer a critical review of scholarship in the field of English political prints, with reference to scholarship in French and Colonial American prints of the same period wherever this is relevant. This historiographical approach affords me the opportunity of addressing the several problems which, I will argue, have ensured that the potential of this material both as a subject for
study in its own right and more especially as a primary source for the historian, remain largely unrealised. This thesis is, then, a critical analysis of political prints scholarship; in it, I attempt to identify and account for the omissions, and in particular to account for and to question the emphases, of studies to date.

I was first alerted to the existence of problems in the academic study of this material by the paucity of studies addressing prints produced or available in England pre-1720 or, indeed, in some cases, pre-1760. The scant attention which has been accorded 17th- and early 18th-century material was not explicable in terms of an absence of material available from this period; my own researches had to a great extent focussed on this material and while initially taking 1660 as my starting-point, I had found it instructive to examine the material which survives for the two decades previous to 1660. Yet while offering considerable scope for research, the period c.1640-1720 proved to have attracted only one extensive study; elsewhere, it was addressed only as a preliminary to the period of choice, commonly 1720-1820 or 1760-1820. It was possible to read that the tradition of graphic comment and satire on current events was essentially an 18th-century phenomenon.

I also found that the limited appraisal of pre-1720 material offered by the literature was almost wholly negative. Gradually, this neglect and hostility, from being a minor irritation, came to assume a new significance as I came to recognise it as merely one manifestation of a larger failure of scholarship in the field to engage with the 18th-century print on its own terms.

In the course of my historiographical overview it became clear that the focus of studies of political prints has been at one and the same time excessively narrow - something reflected in the chronology of
political prints scholarship (for which see Part I, Chapter III) - not least in that it has focussed on one idiom, caricature (see especially Part I, Chapter V) to the neglect of other aspects of the material, - and unhelpfully broad, with general surveys, more popular than scholarly in conception and format, of 'graphic satire' or 'the cartoon', catholic in their chronology and geography, outnumbering scholarly studies of the English print c.1640-c.1840.

Scrutiny of these latter studies allowed the identification of further problems. As well as paying scant attention to the pre-1720 print, the scholarly literature was notable for its evasions of some of the more important questions raised by this material, such as the limits of contemporary exposure to political prints, and the extent of their distribution; without answers to which questions, assertions as to the print's contemporary significance cannot be other than speculative. Scrutiny of the secondary literature with such questions in mind established that more has been assumed on these and related subjects than has been convincingly established. Indeed, to paraphrase one historian, 'it is [...] impossible to examine' the secondary literature of the political print 'without a mounting sense of frustration at the shallowness, the superficiality and glibness' of so much of what has been written; frustration at the willingness of authors 'to skate over ignorance with a commonly received form of words, and to evade important problems with a well-turned generalisation'. In studying the literature of the political print for some evidence that 'difficult questions' had at least been asked of the evidence, I was instead alerted to their evasion by the 'repetition of phrases which were meant not to be scrutinised', or which at least do not survive such scrutiny (most notably assertions concerning the sphere of influence of
political prints (see Part I, Chapter VIII) and their effect (and, ultimately, their historical significance, for which see Part I, Chapters IX and XI). ¹

Surveying scholarly and non-scholarly publications side by side, it was impossible not to be struck by the degree to which 'scholarly' accounts often did little more than amplify the assertions which were to be encountered in the non-scholarly material. One found the same perception of the material and its significance (both aesthetic and historical); the same emphases and the same omissions, reflected in the illustrative choices and in the very phraseology. Significant, too, was the absence of any sense of progress in understanding and documentation over time as, their individual merits notwithstanding, 'new' works continued to reiterate and paraphrase a received account of the material, its nature and its 'development' in England over the 18th century. As far as some of the more commonly-held opinions concerning this material are concerned, the received wisdom of 1992 may be shown to be that of 1916.²

The derivative nature of political prints scholarship to an extent reflects an absence of debate in what is a relatively sparsely-populated field, in which publication is fitful and uneven.

The paucity of serious scholarship in the field has given pioneering studies such as M.D. George's English Political Caricature: to 1832 (1959) a monumental status which they do not always merit; as well as providing the foundation for innumerable compilations and lightweight surveys, George's work continues to inform academic prints scholarship.³

Two review essays by Roy Porter in the London Review of Books and Past and Present critical of political prints scholarship suggested that there was a place for a more extensive analysis of these problems than I had
originally intended, and offered a useful starting-point for the analyses and arguments of this thesis.

Part I of the thesis is concerned with the identification and analysis of the emphases and omissions of scholarship in the field to date.

It begins (Chapter I) with a consideration of the failure of prints scholars to eschew an approach to the material which, while it may not appear crudely illustrative, is nonetheless more contextual than analytical. It also considers the neglect of these prints by both historians and art historians, and considers the extent to which this material has languished in an academic 'no-man's-land'.

Chapter II is a brief bibliographical survey which is intended to establish the emphases - chronological, thematic - of the secondary literature. Chapter III provides a closer analysis of the chronology of political prints studies. The neglect of material from the 17th century which prompted this re-evaluation of political prints scholarship is, it is suggested, a significant omission. The idea that the idiom of caricature was necessary for effectual graphic political satire is considered in Chapter V; it is argued here, and also in Chapter IV that this perception has coloured the appraisal of non- and pre-caricatural idioms (Chapters VI and VII). Preoccupation with caricature itself proved to reflect the widespread perception of the 18th-century political print, political caricature or graphic political satire as both the ancestor of and counterpart of, the modern newspaper editorial cartoon. This perception informs the markedly linear approach to the material identified and examined in Chapter IV; it can be argued that the conventional account of the 'development of political caricature' is itself a caricature, a partial picture which has obscured significant continuities between the 17th- and 18th-century and
between the pre- and the post-caricature print.

Chapters VIII and IX focus on those aspects of this material which previous accounts have most conspicuously failed to address: the audience/market of these prints, and their contemporary impact. The still-prevalent perception of political caricature or graphic political satire as a medium which was potentially, if not always in actuality, 'popular' is challenged in Chapter VIII; Chapter IX scrutinises the (related) perception of the political caricature or graphic political satire as an inherently or potentially subversive medium.

Chapter X addresses the extent to which studies of this material have been preoccupied with the presence or absence of humour. Chapter XI considers the different ways in which this material has been deemed of value in understanding the society which produced it; it will be seen that many claims as to the print's historical value are in fact rooted in perceptions of the nature and audience of the material which were challenged in previous chapters. Chapter XII, finally, considers the failure of most those who have addressed political prints to extend their study to political images in related media, for example in coins and medals; this chapter argues that while a more restricted focus than the comprehensive (and anachronistic) 'English caricature 1620 to the Present' approach which has dominated prints study is required, future studies might in many instances benefit from a more inclusive approach to media.

Part II builds on Part I in considering ways in which certain of the problems identified in Part I might be redressed in future research.

Chapters I and II consider the suggestions made by those scholars whose analyses of the limitations of research in this field were set out in Part I, Chapter I. Chapter III looks at the analytical and descriptive terminology of political prints scholarship and argues
that the tendency of scholars to use the terms 'caricature', 'cartoon', 'graphic satire' and 'political print' interchangeably, especially in the case of the anachronistic use of the terms 'caricature' and 'cartoon', both reflects and perpetuates the anachronistic linear perspective identified in Part I Chapter IV.

Chapter IV considers the failure of scholars to build upon the basic documentation of the material as represented by the B.M. Catalogue. Chapters V, VI and VII consider three different approaches to the material by which scholars might advance beyond the simplistic contextual approach identified in Part I, Chapter I.

There follows an Appendix in which is outlined a project of my own devising, entailing extensive iconographical content-analysis of the prints which, if realised, would provide a reference work which would complement the basic documentation of the B.M. Catalogue but which might also function as a research tool in its own right.

The chronological framework adopted for the thesis - c.1640 - c.1840, with occasional forays into the present - is as broad as the focus of previous research, as reflected in the prints studied or reproduced, has been narrow.

Certain of the questions addressed suggested themselves immediately; the question of chronology was one, the focus on caricature another, the anachronism and teleology which inform the conventional account of 'the development of the English political cartoon' a third. Other questions suggested themselves as my analysis of the secondary literature came to assume a central as opposed to an auxiliary place in my research for this thesis.

In the course of framing the chapters, it rapidly became evident that apparently very different problems
were in fact the result of similar emphases and perceptions of the material, and that what at first sight appeared to be a variety of problems were in fact facets of the same problem. In this sense, although it has not been difficult to sort the thesis into chapters, and while certain chapters, such as Part I, Chapters I, III, VIII, XII, are more self-contained than others, it should be stressed that Part I in particular was conceived as a critical whole.

The approach has, necessarily, been selective, focussing only upon those aspects which I consider to have been central to the misreading and misrepresentation of the material. More importantly, in order to cover the extensive ground which addressing these problems entailed, it was not possible to proffer the degree of detailed documentation and analysis of the relevant prints that I could have wished. For every one print mentioned, I am acutely aware of the dozens of prints as relevant to the issue in hand, each with a claim to the print scholar's attention. It was with great reluctance that I decided to forego the comparative analysis of the Sacheverell prints and related pamphlet polemics which was to have been central to the thesis as originally projected. It was not, however, the exigencies of length and clarity alone which induced me to forego extended description and analysis of prints; there will, I hope, be places and occasions in the future better suited to such analyses. Similarly, I recognise that many of the themes and arguments in the thesis as it now stands could profitably be developed further.

The survey of the secondary literature is intended to be as comprehensive as possible; my time at the Lewis Walpole Library was of particular assistance in securing access to American material which I had otherwise been unable to locate, but even so, it has not been possible to locate all the secondary sources which I would have
wished to consult. I regret, for example, that, their potential relevance to Part II, Chapter III ('Winning the Semantic Battle'), I have not been able to read either James Sherry, 'Four Modes of Caricature: Reflections upon a Genre' Bulletin of Research in the Humanities 87 (1986-87) 29-62 or David Perkins, 'A Definition of Caricature and Caricature Recognition' Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication 2 (1975) 1-24. As I observe in Part I, Chapter II, the way in which useful work is more than usually scattered through the literature of a variety of disciplines is not the least problem entailed in the study of the historiography of the subject. In that one aim of this thesis is to offer the novice scholar an introduction to research in the field, I have included in the final bibliography works which it was not possible for me to consult but the relevance of which to the study of the prints is not in question.

If I have used some books more than others as sources for interpretations and statements with which I disagree, this reflects either, in the case of works such as George's English Political Caricature, their seminal status, or, in the case of other works, the fact that they offer the most representative or revealing statement of that questioned. Where possible, the notes to the main text have furnished instances from other authors not merely as additional evidence and amplification, but because it seemed to me necessary that I convey to those who have not reviewed the secondary literature in this fashion something of the derivative quality of much of this writing. In this sense, the profusion of superficially similar quotations from different sources is intended to be irritating and illuminating in equal measure, the better to emphasise this quality of the secondary literature.

Indeed, while occasionally critical of the way in which
Dorothy George interprets the material, George's are the failings of a praiseworthy pioneering effort; my real criticisms are reserved for those who have failed to build upon George's achievement.

As far as my deployment of visual evidence is concerned - that is, the plates which accompany the text - , a few words may be in order. While I single out as evidence of the perceived 'secondary' nature of the material the failure of those who deploy prints within the historical mainstream to integrate these fully with the text, I trust that it will be understood that such integration was not, on this occasion, practicable. In some chapters, for example, several prints, reproduced as plates, are cited within a single paragraph; how properly to integrate this visual evidence? My solution to the several problems entailed in integrating image and text has been to place the plates in a separate volume, the better to enable the reader to study them in conjunction with the text. All plates are referred to by number in the text; they are bound in the order in which they appear in the chapter to which they belong, and the chapter to which each set of plates belongs is indicated in the list of plates which prefaces each group.

Some chapters of the thesis are not accompanied by plates, while others have at least sixty; this reflects the status of the plates as primary evidence rather than as 'illustration', although such is the wealth of material available that in many instances the plate chosen may stand - however unhappily to the perfectionist familiar with the full range of material available - for many others.

A fact that will be observed is that some images are reproduced as many as five times in the course of the thesis. This also reflects my determination to lift the material from an 'illustrative', auxiliary status, and is also intended to demonstrate the extent to which these
images are open to appraisal and analysis from numerous angles. Only in this way, I felt, could the polysemic nature of the material - too often presented as one-dimensional, simple and accessible - be conveyed.

In each case, the image was selected as the best instance of a particular characteristic of the material, but I have also been concerned to take as many examples as possible from pre-c.1720 prints. One of my criticisms of the secondary literature as well as of exhibitions is that the same images appear again and again, while others; above all the pre-c.1720 prints, remain almost unknown. I have also included several of these much-used 'high-profile' images, on the grounds that there are benefits to be gained from deploying familiar images in an unfamiliar critical context; my hope is that by looking at these afresh, the reader will be prompted to look afresh at the genre as a whole.

********

Historiographical and methodological theses are, probably with good reason, rare. I am conscious that historiographical criticism and methodological questioning are not the business of the historical Ph.D. thesis as traditionally conceived. As far as historical scholarship is concerned, it has been suggested that 'work in insufficiently explored regions, overwhelmingly equipped with material, should confine itself to the study of very restricted topics', that 'it would seem sensible to make clearings in the forest before laying out the garden'. The English political print is assuredly one such insufficiently-explored region, and one incontrovertably 'overwhelmingly equipped with material'. That said, that same historian has conceded that without occasional imprudent attempts at a synthesis of the whole

the problems which need answers and whose
solution could advance real understanding of the whole, do not become apparent. This [...] justifies the writing of 'premature' general studies, provided it is remembered that their chief purpose should be to define the work of further investigation which waits to be done.

This thesis is intended as one such study, with all the attendant merits and demerits of the kind. Arguably the fate to be desired for such works is that they will - and rapidly - be rendered largely obsolescent, retaining, perhaps, the status of an historiographical curiosity, by subsequent scholarship, and so it is with this thesis.

In further defence, I would say that once I had become convinced of the centrality of the questions here addressed to the study of this material regardless of what specific prints and specific aspects of the material are selected for study, the urgency of this task came to seem paramount. More than this, with reference to my own more specialised interest in a particular corpus of prints, and imagery within other prints, it became clear that any attempt on my part to advance beyond the conceptual framework within which scholarship in the field has previously operated must first address that conceptual framework. The emphases of this thesis as originally conceived - chronological, thematic, iconographic - were irreconcilable with those of previous scholars. In order to account for both my selection of material for study and my approach to it, in particular the divergence of my approach to this material from those accounts regarded as the benchmarks of study in this subject (in particular those of George, H.M. Atherton, and Ronald Paulson) it would be necessary to address the questions of historiography and methodology which follow.

Initially I hoped to do so within the context of the thesis as originally projected, but it rapidly became apparent that the questions raised demanded a more detailed consideration than that which they could have
received within a larger study of the prints.

That said, I cannot stress too much that in this thesis the theoretical and the critical are coupled with - indeed proceeded from - extensive and close scrutiny of the evidence of the prints themselves. It is fair to say that every print cited could be matched by at least half a dozen more as relevant - and in many instances the relevant evidence greatly exceeds this.

I would also point out that consideration - and in some cases, recognition of the existence - of these questions is long overdue and that failure to address them might more fairly be taken as a failing on the part any of thesis dealing with this material.

If English historical scholarship remains, as some contend, locked within an adversarial mode which informs both the appraisal of the past and of the scholarly interpretation of that past, and if this adversarial mode is encouraged by the volume of specialised scholarship, as far as the study of the English political print is concerned, the very reverse is true; it is the absence of debate and the paucity of scholarly publishing in the field which strike the observer. If, as has been claimed, 'bad history often has a wider and longer currency than good history', how much more is this a danger in a field in which publication is so sporadic and uneven? The very paucity of studies and specialist scholars has perhaps encouraged a less critical reception for such studies as do appear than would be the case in more populous and disputatious fields. This absence of debate, and the derivative nature of much that has been published, render me acutely conscious of the iconoclastic nature of what follows.

As much as with historiography, this thesis deals with method; the ways in which this material may most
profitably be studied; whether in its own right as a separate field of study, or as evidence open to use by the historian. It has been claimed that 'the generality of scholars are only driven to a discussion of method at times of crisis within their subject, when an orthodoxy is threatened or breaking up'. Once again, the reverse appears to be true of prints scholarship, which not only scarcely attains the status of a discipline in this sense, but in which the evidence of the most recently published works points to the continued currency of orthodoxies which are not only problematic but which are far from being established.

Whatever else, this thesis will, I hope, be seen as an attempt to assert the integrity of the evidence, of the prints themselves. If the discussion is sometimes theoretical, these prints are not theoretical. Trouble was taken over their design and content. In most cases commercial ventures, they were designed to sell and were, presumably, bought for a reason; precisely who bought them and for what reasons, are not the least of the questions which forty years of (fitful) academic attention to the material has failed to establish. They deserve, and will surely repay, reconsideration.

2. The account of the emergence and development of the political print in 18th-century England found in Milton Percival, Political Ballads Illustrating the Administration of Sir Robert Walpole (Oxford:1916) pp.xxvii-xxviii has yet to be drastically modified by prints scholars.
7. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion p.15.
Chapter I: 'Seeing the Past'? Problems associated with the study of the English political print

Making sense of political prints, their texts and contexts, is [...] no easy matter, and they have not been well served by scholars.


Reviewing the 1986 Chadwyck-Healey series of thematic monographs, The English Satirical Print 1600-1832,¹ in the London Review of Books and in Past and Present, Roy Porter accurately pinpointed several of the methodological problems, together with the barriers of prejudice and lack of sympathy for this medium on the part of historians and art historians alike, which have to this day bedevilled and inhibited the academic study of the genre of the political print, or graphic political satire², and, perhaps more importantly, of pictorial political propaganda in other, related, forms.³

I use the words 'to this day' advisedly as one who shares more the reservations expressed by Ivan Roots and more particularly by Celina Fox in their reviews of the Chadwyck-Healey series in, respectively, History Today, (March 1987) and Print Quarterly, (December 1990), than the enthusiasm (albeit not unqualified) with which Porter greeted this venture, admittedly the first serious work on the subject for some time.⁴ These reviews, together with two further reviews prompted by the appearance of several studies of French political prints of the revolutionary era, represent the most recent serious discussion of the status and potential value of political prints as historical evidence.⁵

Unfortunately, from the perspective of 1993, I would suggest that there has been little reason to amend Porter's indictment of scholarship in this field quoted at the head of this chapter, nor the still harsher criticisms of Fox. The post-Chadwyck-Healey years have seen the appearance of only two academic studies which
have addressed the English political print in any depth; Vincent Carretta's *George III and the Satirists: from Hogarth to Byron* (1989) and Lester C. Olson's *Emblems of American Community* (1991). It is, moreover, the argument of this thesis that neither work takes the study of the political print much beyond the point reached by the earlier studies of M.D. George and Herbert Atherton.

Thus, while the Chadwyck-Healey series has furnished the layman with a competent general introduction to this material, and perhaps reminded the historian of its existence and its potential, the state of play with regard to the study of political prints and related imagery by the political historian remains that of neglect and stagnation, not least when compared with the study of other subjects and source material which have been 'opened up' to, and now provide accepted and legitimate quarry for, the historian over the past three decades. Indeed, in 1974, Pat Rogers predicted that the study of graphic political satire would become the 'new fad' in 18th-century historical studies, following in the wake of pollbook analysis, studies of the family, et cetera; given what appeared to be the 'molten, deliquescent' state of historical studies, the hour of the political print seemed inevitable.

Yet in 1988 it was still possible for *Print Quarterly* to greet the Chadwyck-Healey volumes in a manner that can only be described as guarded:

> It is very clear that the study of English [print] satire is still in its infancy and the pioneering studies of Dorothy George still await development, but it is encouraging to note renewed signs of interest, of which this set of volumes is a [...] manifestation.

Porter, too, refers to 'the pioneering researches of a handful of historians - above all M.D. George and Herbert Atherton', as a result of which 'the basic documentation of the rise of the political print is fairly secure'.
Still lacking, however, is any 'extended analysis' of the methodological problems entailed in the study of this material. After thirty years, answers to the question 'how may historians deploy [political prints] as source materials, to enrich knowledge not just of Georgian politics but more generally of its material life and mentalité?' are still being sought.  

The paucity of rigorous scholarship in this field, whether from an historical or an art-historical perspective, has never gone unremarked. Similarly, the existence of serious problems in the approach to and the handling of political prints as data has been acknowledged by most of those scholars who have essayed to address the material. At various stages over the past fifty years, scholarly neglect of this material has been acknowledged and deprecated, and specific problems of methodology identified, but only rarely have tentative suggestions for their solution been proffered [see Part II, Chapter I].

With the exception of Fox's criticisms, to which this thesis will return whenever they are of relevance, Porter's is the most recent indictment of this state of affairs. It is perhaps indicative of the long-standing nature of academic difficulties with regard to this material, however, that much of what Porter says is not new, and that several of the specific problems which he identifies have been recognised by others over previous decades. A review of these earlier analyses of the poor state of prints scholarship, and of the methodological problems which have yet to be resolved, is revealing; the frequency and the consistency with which these problems have been identified, instructive. Indeed, it is possible to argue that these problems are not peculiar to the study of the political print but are part of a larger failure of prints scholarship.
That the political print has been 'unduly neglected', a phrase which Roots employs twice, is one of the many shibboleths of prints scholarship. 11 The series editor of the Chadwyck-Healey volumes, Michael Duffy opts for 'surprisingly neglected'; Diana Donald writes of a field that has been 'rather sparsely researched', E.H. Gombrich of a medium 'largely unexplored'. 12 The 'pioneer' of study in this field, M.D. George, writes of 'neglect' and 'disregard'; of 'wonderful material buried - the word is hardly an exaggeration - in the great mass of English satirical engravings'. 13 Another of those who this century attempted to rescue these prints from neglect, Wilmarth S. Lewis, wrote in 1973 of 'the vast and virtually unexplored continent of English eighteenth-century caricature'. 14 In 1969, W.A. Coupe, writing in response to a call for 'a theory of political caricature' claimed that 'even in the age of the mass-produced Ph.D., the academic study of caricature and political cartooning has suffered from considerable neglect'. 15 Not only, he wrote, is virtually nothing known about non-Western or non-European caricature, but it is 'only in the last decade', with M.D. George's English Political Caricature: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda (2 volumes, 1959), that England has 'been given the attention which the remarkable richness of her tradition of caricature deserves, and then only for the period up to 1832'. 16

To Pat Rogers, reviewing Herbert Atherton's Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth: A Study in the Ideographic Representation of Politics (1974), greeted - and still regarded by many - as the natural successor to George's monograph, graphic political satire appeared to 'be ripe for increasing exploitation'. 17 As has already been noted, notwithstanding astute criticisms which will be noted in subsequent chapters, Rogers considered Atherton's book as having the potential to reinvigorate scholarly interest in these prints; yet in Roots's review
of the Chadwyck-Healey series, published twelve years after the appearance of Atherton's book, the historical study of political prints is still seen as a 'new' area, and the material as 'underexplored'.

Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth itself opened with a quotation which dates from 1963 but which remains an astute, as well as the most eloquent, summary of the under-exploitation of these prints; that this should be the case is itself a damning indictment of the weakness of scholarship in this field over the past three decades:

the professional art historian has had little occasion to busy himself with the vast mass of ephemeral propaganda prints, broadsheets, and cartoons which were produced in ever-increasing volume from the sixteenth century onward. He is quite happy to leave these puzzling and often ugly images to the historian who may know how to unriddle their recondite allusions to long-forgotten events. But historians in their turn usually think they have more important and more relevant documents to study in the State papers and speeches of a period, and generally leave the old cartoons to the compilers of popular illustrated histories, where these crude and often enigmatic scrawls jostle uneasily with portraits, maps, and pictures of pageantries and assassinations.

(E. H. Gombrich, 'The Cartoonist's Armory' in Meditations on a Hobby Horse (1963))

This chapter does not propose to examine the root causes of the art historian's failure to accommodate the political print. The aesthetic considerations which have informed the art-historical approach to this material are the subject of Chapters VI and VII; changes in art historical methodology which may or may not herald a reappraisal of the material are discussed in Part II, Chapter II. It is fair to say, however, that, to date, the concerns of art historians have to a considerable extent marginalised the political print. Certainly it is rare to encounter an analysis of this material in the context of a larger 'fine art' study; the Reynolds exhibition catalogue (1986) and, to a lesser degree,
Marcia Pointon's Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England (1993) are uncharacteristic in this respect.  
The exhibition catalogue Darkness into Light - the Early Mezzotint (1976), a highly-regarded study of the English mezzotint of the second half of the 17th century, which fails to examine the use of this particular medium for polemical and satirical prints, notwithstanding the existence of many interesting examples, is more representative of the limited perspective which has prevailed, not least in the work of prints specialists.

The failure of 17th- and 18th-century historians to exploit the political print is less readily explained, and it is on the neglect of the political print by the historian which Porter focusses, rightly contrasting the historian's failure to exploit this source with the advances made in the study of other sources which formerly presented him with empirical difficulties or which were regarded as unorthodox.

The historian's underexploitation of the political print is at least in part explicable in terms of a prevailing ignorance of the wealth of material available; the average 18th-century historian 'can call to mind the score or so of the most famous endlessly reproduced in [or more often still, on the covers of,] history books', which, as Porter recognises, is 'the tiniest fraction of' the holdings of the British Museum.

Yet this ignorance may be as much symptom as cause. Significantly, Porter interprets both the neglect, or, conversely, the inadequate or inept handling of, political prints by the historian, as a fundamental problem of 'iconoclasm', that is, a residual hostility towards, or at the very least a considerable lack of ease when confronted with, things visual on the part of the average historian; an iconoclasm which is the result of a
professional training which 'encourages [him] to assume the primacy of written records in terms both of reliability and of representativeness'. Too many historians remain 'blind to all but words'.

The same argument may be found in a recent article by Barbara Stafford, 'Presuming Images and Consuming Words: the visualisation of knowledge from the Enlightenment to post-modernism'. Stafford refers to a 'consumption of [...] images by an official hermeneutic of higher interpretive [sic] words [...] evinced in the academic demotion of images to an ornamental, or merely craft, status when bereft of a superior non-visual "method"'. As Stafford sees it, the irony is that this perception of the image, and consequent 'attempt[s] at textual control', occurred in a century [the 18th] unprecedented until then [sic] for its sophisticated visual practices, technical inventions and sheer pictorial production. The prejudicial implications of continuing to see images linguistically, that is, as a lesser, transitory and illusory form of written communication, are still playing themselves out.

Thus, while it has become conventional that late 20th-century Western society has become increasingly 'visual', it is a society which 'remains, ironically mired in a deep logocentrism.'

Certainly, the consistent failure, over more than two decades' increasingly diverse and sophisticated study, of scholars of 17th- and 18th-century English political journalism and the development of a political press to address the political print as a legitimate manifestation of this phenomenon, and the failure of these scholars to address the pictorial components of otherwise verbal data would seem to point to a prevailing 'logocentrism'. Almost without exception, the 17th-, and, more often still, the 18th-century 'political press' has proved to mean the newspaper, pamphlet, and/or periodical, press.
It is notable that the political print as a part of a larger political press was not a theme of choice in the Chadwyck-Healey series. The implications of this neglect will be set out in Chapter VIII.

Nor is the study of the 17th- and 18th-century political press the only area of scholarship where the historian might reasonably be expected to have engaged with the political print but has mostly failed so to do. With one or two exceptions, the study of 'public opinion and propaganda' has, like the study of the press, been oriented to the pamphlet and to the newspaper.

Similarly, although Chapter VIII will take issue with the still-prevalent perception of the political print of the type most commonly illustrated and studied as a 'popular' genre, it is noticeable that the study of 'popular culture' in this period has to date paid only lip-service to the notion that this was a culture that was as much visual as it was oral. Those seeking information on the nature and extent of popular exposure to or consumption of pictorial propaganda - indeed, pictorial material tout court - will consult studies such as the 1985 collection of essays on the theme of Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England in vain, while for a later period, Susan Pedersen's 'Hannah More Meets Simple Simon: Tracts, Chapbooks and Popular Culture in Late Eighteenth-Century England' is silent about the pictorial components of both the Cheap Repository Tracts and the more traditional chapbooks and ballads with which these competed. Only very recently have the visual literacy of, and the consumption of visual images by, ordinary people been addressed, in Patricia Anderson's The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture 1790-1860.

The 'primacy of print' may be underlined and perpetuated by the consistent exclusion of visual material from historical studies with aspirations to
heavyweight status, but it is those studies which reproduce political prints and similar images which exemplify the extent to which the historian has marginalised the pictorial. The political print has figured largely, but only rarely in a central role, in popular historical studies. It is also to be found on the dustjackets of more serious works - in which it is unlikely even to merit a footnote. Plates are not unknown in works of this kind, but here, too, the way in which they are deployed in the text says much about the low value placed on the pictorial. 'Such "illustrations" as there are', notes Porter, 'are seldom well-integrated in the text', but are, rather, kept 'at a safe, non-contaminating distance from the chaste body of the text'. The historian's deployment of images too commonly presents a 'new variation on the Cartesian mind-body dualism, in which word and image have no connexion, except through the pineal gland of the caption, itself often written by one 'anon' in the picture research department and all too often inaccurate'. The very term 'illustration' emphasises the diminution of the image to an auxiliary status.

Even in the context in which one might expect to find the image restored to the centre of the frame, so to speak, the exhibition, the same diminution is often discernible. It is the deployment of prints as 'evidence' which Anthony Griffiths correctly takes as his 'litmus test' in reviewing the several exhibitions and related publications commemorating the French Revolution:

Judged by this [...] yardstick, many of the most prestigious exhibitions of 1989 fail lamentably. Again and again, prints were pressed into service simply as illustrations, whether of the events of the time, or as evidence of 'what every one thought', without any attempt to enquire into what purpose they were meant to serve when they were made.
In one notable instance, 'so little attention' was paid to the prints as artefacts that the fact that several exhibits 'were not originals at all, but reduced copies made as illustrations for Jaime's Musée de la caricature (1838)' passed unacknowledged. The large Grand Palais exhibition, *La Révolution française et la Europe*, accompanied by a three-volume catalogue was little better. Prints were popped into the appropriate places in a narrative sequence as if they were mere illustrations. Except in one chapter [of the catalogue] no serious attempt was made to analyse the prints that were included, and no attention was paid to the crucial need to date them accurately.

Notwithstanding the claim made by the series' General Editor, that the aim of the series was to show, through the study of selected themes over the period 1600–1832, 'how the historian can illuminate the prints, and the prints [...] illuminate the historian', Porter rightly cites the Chadwyck-Healey project as evidence of the historian's failure to cope with the political print on a visual level, by which is meant not aesthetic evaluation, but the analysis of the prints as image-systems.

As Porter notes, the fact that most of the contributing historians 'interpreted their brief as being essentially to provide a survey of their subject as "background" to the prints' meant that historical contextualising, in the form of 'capsule accounts' of, for instance, 'Georgian religion' or 'the Law', took precedence over analysis of what might be called the formal or generic qualities of the prints themselves and, more importantly, over discussion of the problems inherent in their study, a discussion which is largely absent from these volumes.

Porter describes the prints as having been to some extent 'short-circuited' by the format of the studies, which, as Roots also noted, failed the iconographic-analytical challenge of individual images by
reproducing them with no more than their title, date, British Museum Catalogue number and a brief, and largely contextual, explanation.  

Indeed, in the format of these volumes - the long introductory essay (not infrequently divided into 'chapters') preceding the unamplified plates - the Chadwyck-Healey series comes close to the 'illustrative' approach to this material which has for so long prevailed, which Porter and Griffiths rightly single out for criticism and which the series ostensibly sought to counter; the format of the Chadwyck-Healey volumes reflects 'the unspoken assumption [...] that the text, grounded upon written evidence, is "primary" and the prints "secondary"'.  

That historians have used, and continue to use, the political print 'principally for illustrative material', as a source to be plundered for dustjacket or frontispiece, and that problems of handling such images as documentary evidence within an historical text persist, is, however, less surprising when one considers that the approach of M.D. George, 'their principal historian' was itself, fundamentally, illustrative and, as a consequence, as Porter himself is astute enough to note, limited:  

their principal historian [...] clearly thought of them essentially as visual documentation for a political narrative, rather like a Georgian version of the Bayeux Tapestry.  

As a consequence of such practices and more as a consequence of the perception of the image which informs them, 'we still have a long way to go in "seeing" what people saw, and [in] interpreting the significance of visual signs'. The historian remains 'ill-equipped' to a remarkable degree to tackle the question of how not only political prints but other visual evidence, such as that of coins or commemorative artefacts, is to be 'read':
how far the historian should see [such material] as primarily ornamental, merely duplicating, at best reinforcing, the information and sentiments which [contemporaries] derived from other sources, above all from the spoken and printed word,

or whether it should be regarded as 'integral and special to the processes of creating and conveying the wider sign-systems of former times'. Continued ignorance or uncertainty on this front will ensure continuing difficulties with the important question of the argumentative power, the propagandist potential, of the visual image.

Those who would confine the political print to a auxiliary role would do well to consider the distinctions recognised and articulated by the aesthetic theorists of the 18th century, as discussed by Stafford: 'DuBos, Caylus, Diderot, Falconet, Addison, Shaftesbury, Hogarth, Reynolds, Winckelmann, Lichtenberg', articulated an important distinction that is largely forgotten by twentieth-century verbally-shaped disciplines. With great sophistication, these thinkers differentiated between imagery used as equivalents to discourse, or as illustration, and as an untranslatable constructive form of cognition.

Whereas the one

is the result of an active and constitutive expression that makes visible and intellectually graspable impalpable, ambiguous, mixed, intricate experiences intractable to numerical or linguistic reduction [,] illustration is the didactic pictorial imitation of a preformed, prepackaged, simple quantum of verbal information.

Whereas, with regard to the latter, perception or visual cognition may be a passive process, with regard to the former, it is demanding and above all interactive:

Understanding emerges progressively [and] is the result of an investigative process as each viewer struggles to relate the medium-suffused message to his [...] own experience. Such interactive graphic
encounters do not illustrate. Rather, they set before the eyes, or disclose
-a distinction which is of particular relevance to the political print. 41

Indeed, it may be argued that the continued marginal status of the political print in 18th-century studies is in no small part bound up with a failure on the part of those who have addressed this material adequately to establish and demonstrate precisely how prints articulated political arguments and expressed ideas.

In order to use political prints or related pictorial evidence, the historian must

confront the issue: what (if anything) do printed pictures say which was not already being said verbally elsewhere (indeed, often enough, in the accompanying captions and legends)? 42

The illustrative approach to the political print which has for so long prevailed can only have encouraged the historian to view the contemporary role of imagery as auxiliary to the written word, 'duplicating, at best reinforcing, the information and sentiments which [contemporaries] derived from other sources, above all from the spoken and printed word'. 43

Significantly, the literature of the political print has to date been concerned to emphasise the perceived rhetorical and polemical limitations of the print. In this respect, too, the Chadwyck-Healey series, in that the various essays direct attention to the perceived limitations of the medium, 'and its alleged lack of subtlety', may be said to have failed the material which it sought to rehabilitate. Porter notes how several of the contributing historians appear anxious to apologise for the material, to 'explain how, precisely because of their visual nature, prints had to simplify complex issues'. 44 John Miller, for example, is quoted as claiming that 'one cannot adequately discuss such abstruse concepts as predestination in pictorial forms';
to which Porter's retort is that, aside from the fact that the prints selected by Miller (in which, as another prints scholar, Robert Philippe, has put it, 'verbal dialectic [is] extended and amplified by visual dialectic') 'give him the lie',

prints are not in the business of 'discussing'. The idea that profundity can be verbalised but not visualised is surely a typical fallacy of the word-bound academic for whom the Word is God, and who can be as patronising to pictorial as to 'preliterate' cultures.

Indirectly and inadvertently, the Chadwyck-Healey series reasserts the 'primacy of print' over that of its ostensible subject-matter, entrenching a perception of the print's rhetorical capacity which can only ensure that the analysis of these and other images will remain of low priority to the historian, and that the political print remains an optional extra within the 'canon' of printed contemporary sources.

Against the 'iconoclasm' - or perhaps more accurately, the 'logocentricism' - of the historian must be set the failure of more specialist, image-oriented, studies to tackle appropriate aspects of these prints. Prints scholarship in general has fallen into two camps, the technical-aesthetic and the historical-contextual. In a significant review, Conal Shields identifies the methodological and sympathetic limitations of English prints scholarship, whereby 'those who are familiar with the story of materials and processes tend to be ignorant of the [historical] circumstances in which printmakers operated' and, worse, indifferent to the uses to which the 'multiplicity of the technical processes' were put [...] inept when it comes to appreciation and description of prints' most important aspect, their emotional and technical significance. The most persistent attention to technical processes [...] gets nowhere if the purposes they serve are left out of the account or merely gestured at.
Conversely, 'the social historians of the medium are in the main unable or reluctant to descend to the particulars of hands-on practice'. While this last consideration is perhaps less significant with regard to the study of the political print, its absence is, for all that, telling.

Porter concludes that political prints 'talk to us in many different languages'. In the absence of 'a hermeneutics' sympathetic and adequate to the task, 'their range of meanings has hardly begun to be explored'.

Porter is not the first to call for a more sophisticated and more rigorous approach to this material. In the late 1960s, the journal Comparative Studies in Society and History published two essays on this theme: L.H. Streicher 'On a Theory of Political Caricature' (1967) and W.A. Coupe 'Observations "On a Theory of Political Caricature"' (1969). In that Streicher did not reply to Coupe's analysis of his suggestions, the two papers scarcely amount to a debate on methodology, but, between them, the authors identified several of the problems inherent in the study of this material.

Streicher's 'On a Theory of Political Caricature' refers the reader to two earlier essays published in the journal, which addressed the 'political caricature' of two very different periods and societies. What Streicher perceived to be the limitations of these studies led him to exhort 'students of caricature to again persuade themselves of the necessity for a theory of caricature.' As Streicher saw it, while 'much effort has been expended on specific studies of caricature' - by which he would seem to intend studies
either of caricature as an idiom or of the political caricature of specific periods - 'less devotion [...] has been expended to rational as over against [sic] empirical considerations in research on caricature'. Yet 'it is impossible to divorce empirical from rational needs in this or in any other research. For it is, ultimately, theoretical and rational directives which tell us which hypotheses to entertain, what data to collect and, finally, how to interpret the evidence'.

Two years later, Coupe, to an earlier essay of whose Streicher had referred, responded with the opinion that 'we still do not possess sufficient empirical studies on which such a theory might be based: even in the age of the mass-produced Ph.D.:

in calling for a general theory of political caricature Streicher points to an obvious need; whether his call is likely to be answered in the near future is another matter.[...] In his 'Directions for Research' Streicher reminds us that a theoretical understanding of political caricature involves an understanding of caricature itself, the caricaturist, his publishers and his audience, and the historical epoch and social structure within which the caricaturist operates. One may, I think, be forgiven for doubting whether it will ever be possible to fit such a vast collection of topics, each embracing a number of variables and presenting us with a mass of contradictions, into a meaningful theoretical framework.

Against 'the sheer magnitude of the theoretician's task' must be set 'the contrariness', i.e., the heterogeneous nature, 'the peculiarly self-willed protean nature of what material is available', which would prove inimical to a theoretical approach.

Certainly, it would seem that straightforward empirical study in this field has been to some extent frustrated by the extent to which the material itself 'resists classification'. The biographer of Gillray, Draper Hill, for example, asserts that 'political caricature
tenaciously resists classification'; it is 'neither fish nor fowl, [...] an unstable compound of art and literature [...] of permanence and transience, [...] of the creative and the parasitic'.

Others, including Coupe, have pointed to the absence of an accurate descriptive vocabulary for its study, a 'lack of words' which has ensured 'a continuing difficulty about description or discussion of the subject'. The extent to which an inept and arbitrary use of definitive and descriptive terms not only reflects, but may lie at the root of, the deficiencies of political prints scholarship is considered in Part II, Chapter III.

Coupe's scepticism that a 'theory of political caricature' as envisaged by Streicher 'can ever be arrived at' derives from the 'hybrid' nature of the material and the concomitant need for interdisciplinary synthesis in addressing it; the political print 'lies in a peculiar no-man's-land where several disciplines meet'. As noted by Gombrich, this has led to its being neglected by all. Streicher concedes that the fact that the political print is a document upon which a whole spectrum of specialist knowledge and perspectives may, and in his opinion should, be brought to bear, does create 'certain problems of analysis'. The aspiring theoretician faces 'a difficult task', 'for the analyses require at least materials from the history of fine arts, political history of the areas concerned and the sociology of public opinion and mass communications'.

In addition to questioning the demands which so comprehensively interdisciplinary an approach would place on the aspiring prints scholar, much emphasis has been placed on the potential difficulties of access to the material caused by the topicality of its allusions and subject-matter, and by the historical remoteness of the events and personalities depicted. The political print is inextricably 'tied to transient historical
circumstances, without detailed knowledge of which it is scarcely intelligible'. The very topicality which should commend the political print to the historian has militated against its study by the non-historian; 'enjoyed as [they] may be for their drawing, their energetic composition, and fine colouring, without an overwhelming knowledge of British history of the period, the point is a mystery'. The art historian in particular may be said to have fled in horror from what have been perceived as the necessary tasks of identification and contextual elucidation.

The point which has to be made in this context is that adequate if not exhaustive documentation in this vein for the period under review in this thesis has been available for over a century with regard to the period pre-1770, and for more than forty years for the period 1770-1832, in the form of the British Museum Catalogue. Not for nothing has this been described as the 'key' by which the historical context of an individual image may be 'unlocked'.

The real problem would seem to be methodological, namely the fact that the preferred mode of prints literature has been descriptive rather than analytical. It is this tendency which Streicher identifies; 'the subject is, after all, great fun; and many [scholars] have been more willing to inform their readers than to order the data' [my emphasis].

Gombrich anticipates Streicher in concluding that the complex details and obscure allusions by which these prints are characterised trepan the scholar into the conveying of empirical information, in preference to the more demanding task of analysis of the nature and internal dynamics of the image. As an example of the way in which the need to contextualise and narrate, rather than elucidate, the image can come between the scholar and his evidence, Gombrich cites a Punch cartoon from the
First World War, in which Admiral Tirpitz as the Old Man of the Sea is shouldered by Wilhelm II:

I do not know how well-known is the story from the Arabian Nights, of the fiendish beggar who asked his victims to carry him across a brook and then clung to them until they dropped dead. I do not know either how well known it was that Tirpitz was the special bête noire of the English because his provocative naval policy resulted in increasing tensions between England and Germany. I do not pretend to know how far the cartoon applied to a real situation, how far, that is, Tirpitz could really be said to have restricted the freedom of action of the Kaiser in the first years of the war. Can it be surprising, after all, that both historians and art historians have shied away from cartoons, and that such books or articles as are devoted to graphic journalism usually become so engrossed in the task of explanation [and historical contextualising] that the medium and its history [and its peculiar qualities] are largely unexplored? (my emphasis) 62

Rogers, similarly, criticises Atherton for having fallen into the trap, or taken the undemanding course, of paraphrasing or reiterating the descriptive entries of the B.M. Catalogue:

Certainly, Mr Atherton has saved us labour; but that is something different from 'breaking new ground and devising new methods of analysis' - his own account of the undertaking. 63

It is true that those attempting a discussion of even a handful of prints will be faced with this problem. Imperceptibly, what begins as analysis slides into literal description and historical contextualising. Indeed, it could be said that, so far from liberating scholars from the exigencies of description and basic contextualisation, the all-too usable précis of the Catalogue has come between the scholar and the image, that reiteration of information which exists in readily consultable form has taken precedence over more detailed and subtle analysis. Hence Rogers's conclusion that 'it will be left to others to establish a finer-grained
technique for describing the graphic content of these prints'.

********

In 1969, Coupe concluded that the geography of the political print was not sufficiently secure to facilitate the construction of a larger theory of political caricature as advocated by Streicher. In that more than one important aspect of the political print remains, to all intents and purposes, terra incognita after more than fifty years of publishing in the field, bears this out.

Yet, as argued above, the problem is not solely one of documentation. What a survey of the literature of the subject reveals is a failure of scholarly nerve, exemplified by a dependence upon the Catalogue and on George's monograph EPC, to the extent that the years 1883 and 1959 might fairly be described as invisible lines marked 'the frontiers of knowledge'. With a few exceptions, the literature of the political print may be characterised as a corpus which is over-general in scope, superficial, timid, and above all, derivative; distinguished by a refusal to ask more searching questions of the material and by a refusal to step beyond a few well-trodden paths.

These are harsh assertions to make in a field hitherto untroubled by untoward criticism, indeed, largely untroubled by debate of any kind; in the absence of which, the limited and, I will argue, deeply flawed, approach to these prints which this thesis attempts to delineate, is perpetuated.

The following chapter will consider the study of the political print from a bibliographic perspective. Subsequent chapters will be concerned with the emphases and omissions, the biases and evasions, discernible in this literature. In 1971, a review of Ronald Paulson's
then-innovative Hogarth: His Life, Art, and Times

observed:

We still have far to go (and not in historiography alone) [...] and there will be need of many expeditions of rediscovery of the kind that Paulson has mounted on behalf of Hogarth before some subjects are liberated from the lazy idées reçues that have served.66

It is these idées reçues which are the subject of the remainder of Part I.

1. The Chadwyck-Healey series comprises:

2. Not necessarily the same thing. For a critical discussion of the descriptive terminology which has been employed in prints studies to date, see Part II, Chapter III.

3. 'Prinney, Boney, Boot' London Review of Books 20 March 1986, pp.19-20 (hereafter LRB) and 'Seeing the Past' Review Article, Past and Present (hereafter, Porter, P&P) 118 (1986) 186-205. For pictorial propaganda other than the political print or graphic political satire, see Chapter XII, 'Political Graphics'.


11. Roots, op. cit, pp.51-52; Thomas, p.11.
16. ibid, p.79. For the periodisation of studies of the English political print, see Chapter III.
   It is the argument of this thesis that little of value is to be gained from the comparative, 'international' approach to the study of political prints and satires; prints which are disparate in origins, conventions, and often in period, many countries not having produced political prints until comparatively recently. Even comparative studies restricted to European prints and to a limited period, can be more misleading than instructive, most of all in encouraging too generalised an interpretation of the genre. Such comprehensive overviews remain popular, however.
17. (Oxford:1974); Rogers, TLS p.898.
the concern of print scholars with artistic quality and technical proficiency has tended to marginalize material of the sort with which this thesis is concerned, and Richard Godfrey, Printmaking in Britain: a general history from its beginnings to the present day (Oxford: 1978) pp.28-30. Cf. Antony Griffiths 'Early Mezzotint Publishing in England. II: Peter Lely, Tompson and Browne' PtQlly VII (1990) 130-45, p.145 'The development of mezzotint was retarded, not so much by lack of technical knowledge, but because initially there seemed nothing particularly to use it for [sic].'

Significant early satirical mezzotints include: BM 1137 Oates His Degrees and 1141 A Popish Whigg (1685), satires on the discrediting of Titus Oates; 1231 and 1232 A Trimmer (c.1689); BM 1210 Le Roy Iacque Deloge and 1409 Le Pere Iaques, satirical portraits of James II; 1236 Hy Holt Hy Holt (1689) a satire on the failure of James's rising in Ireland. BM 1166, a satirical adaptation of Bernard Lens's Mary of Modena with the Prince of Wales (1688) is discussed in Craig Hartley and Catherine MacLeod, 'Supposititious Prints', PtQlly VI (1989) 49-54.

Mezzotint continued to be employed for satirical prints throughout the 18th century, with hand-coloured mezzotints a feature of the 1770s and 1780s (see Elizabeth Miller, Hand-Coloured British Prints (London, V&A: 1987) p.25; Godfrey, English Caricature nos 60,64,65.

23. ibid, p.19.

25. Notable instances in recent years of 'the press' proving to mean only newspapers, pamphlets, periodicals include: J.A. Downie 'Politics and the English Press' in McCubbin and Hamilton-Phillips, The Age of William III pp.340-51; idem, 'The Development of the Political Press' in ed. Clyve Jones, Britain in the First Age of Party, 1680-1750: Essays Presented to Geoffrey Holmes (London:1987) pp.111-27; Jeremy Black, The English Press in the Eighteenth Century (London and Sydney:1987; while one accepts the author's claim that it was not 'possible to cover all aspects of the subject' (Preface, p.xiii) it is significant that at no point are prints mentioned, nor do they merit a single footnote); Michael Harris 'Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole' in ed. Jeremy Black, Britain in the Age of Walpole (Basingstoke and London:1984) 189-210, in which prints presumably fall in the minor category of 'a variety of other forms of ephemeral output' (p.189);
J.A. Downie’s essay on anti-Walpole satire in the same volume (pp.177-88) is another chapter in which a reference to graphic satire might reasonably have been expected. The introduction to eds Harris and Alan Lee, The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries (London and Toronto:1984) rapidly (p.13) establishes 'the press' to mean 'newspapers and periodicals', although prints are mentioned in passing in the essay by W.A. Speck on politics and the press, pp.47-64 and the editors or publishers are rather less scrupulous when it comes to the inclusion of several 18th-century prints in an illustrative capacity.

There is no reference to graphic printing in either P.B.J. Hyland, 'Liberty and Libel: Government and the Press During the Succession Crisis in Britain, 1712-16' English Historical Review [hereafter EHR] 101 (1986) 863-88 or J.C. Hood, 'The Press and the Protestant Succession 1710-14', unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Manchester (1972), an omission which is particularly conspicuous in Hood’s chapter on 'The Politics of the Printing and Publishing Trade' (Chapter 9). The index of Lucyle Werkmeister, The London Daily Press 1772-1792 (Lincoln, Nebraska:1963) contains a single reference to Gillray which a scrutiny of the text failed to discover; in Robert R. Rea The English Press in Politics, 1760-1774 (Lincoln, Neb.:1963), we read that the 'broadest use of the term ['the political press'] has been used' and Rea does mention 'satirical prints'; the genre is, however, disposed of in five sentences (pp.9-11).

For an exception to this tendency, albeit concerned with the verbal as opposed to the pictorial component of prints, see Martin Kallich, British Poetry and the American Revolution: A Bibliographical Survey of Books and Pamphlets, Journals and Magazines, Newspapers and Prints 1755-1800 2 vols (New York: 1988); for Kallich's 'unstated assumption' that 'the claim of superiority for one type of publication over another cannot be substantiated', see Stephen Copley's review of this work, BJECS 15 (1991) p.111

26. Roots, p.53; in fact, as Chapter VIII will argue, the Chadwyck-Healey series provides only limited and derivative information on the production, consumption and distribution of prints.

27. For example, P. Chapman, 'Jacobite Political Argument in England 1714-66' unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1983 addresses pamphlets, broadsheets, ballads and newspapers; despite a chapter (Chapter 10) entitled 'Imagery and Language: Jacobites and the Political Role of the People', visual material is dismissed in a few words on pp.21, n.49, 292; J.A. Downie, Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe (Cambridge:1979) ignores relevant prints; for
example, when dealing with the activities of the press during the Sacheverell crisis of 1710, (p.10). This cannot have been through ignorance of their existence; Downie utilises the Madan bibliography of Sacheverelliana edited by W.A. Speck, to whom must go the credit of retaining a section devoted to prints (A Critical Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell (Lawrence, Kansas:1978) 261-74); Marie Peters, '"Names and Cant": Party labels in English political propaganda c.1755-65' Parliamentary History 3 (1984) 103-27 makes no mention of prints; idem, Pitt and Popularity: the Patriot Minister and Public Opinion during the Seven Years' War (Oxford:1980) actually includes 'prints, political' in the index, but the main account of this material (p.20) is a paraphrase of that offered by John Brewer, Party Ideology and Popular Politics at the Accession of George III (Cambridge:1976, paperback edition 1981), pp.152-53. Brewer's handling of visual argument and propaganda is discussed in Chapters VIII and IX below.

The lack of rigour on the part of scholars of the political print with respect to the extent of the print's influence, together with the imprecise usage of 'public opinion', are discussed in Chapter IX.


30. A prime example must be History Today. A recent advertisement claims for the journal 'a richly illustrated format enhanced with rare paintings, photographs, cartoons and prints - uniting serious history with a measure of high entertainment'(Sunday Times, Books section, 3 October 1993). Lynn Hunt's 'Engraving the Republic: Prints and Propaganda in the French Revolution', History Today 30 (1980) 11-17 is one of the few articles to have taken this material as primary evidence.

31. For example: Linda Colley, In Defiance of Oligarchy (Cambridge:1982; paperback edition, 1985) uses a detail from BM 2488 The Protest, identified only as 'a print published in 1741', although this note does elucidate on the image); the sleeve of H.T. Dickinson, Liberty and Property (London:1977; paperback edition, 1979) is graced with BM 8145 French Liberty-English Slavery; identified only as 'a cartoon by James Gillray, published 21 December 1792'; Jeremy Black, British Foreign Policy in the Age of Walpole (Edinburgh:1985) is rather better, identifying the print which makes up the sleeve by its title, 'The European Race, 1738'. More recently, H.M. Scott, British Foreign Policy in the Age of the American Revolution (Oxford:1990, paperback edition)
has BM 5549 The Horse America throwing his Master (1779). Carole Shammas, The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America (Oxford:1990, paperback edition) uses Hogarth's The Distrest Poet; the prints of Hogarth are particularly prone to such plundering: Michael MacDonald and Terence R. Murphy, Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England (Oxford:1990, paperback edition) elected for a detail from the last plate of Marriage à la Mode. These examples could be multiplied several times.

Post-Chadwyck-Healey, P.D.G. Thomas's Tea Party to Independence: the Third Phase of the American Revolution 1773-1776 (Oxford:1991) is a high-political narrative which does not address the press response to events; this has not prevented Oxford University Press from decorating the cover with BM 5232 A New Method of Macaroni-making as Practised at Boston (1774).


In the light of Porter's comments, it must be observed that Consumption and the World of Goods is one of the worst offenders, with the plates which are referred to by several of the contributors being placed not even at the end of the relevant essays but rather lumped together halfway through the whole - with scant regard for the essay which is thereby divided.

Similarly, in the light of her observations on 'logocentrism', it was interesting to read the remarks of one reviewer in respect of an earlier work by Barbara Stafford, (Voyage into Substance: Art, Science, Nature and the Illustrated Travel Account, 1760-1840 (London:1984)) 'the 270 plates are left unexplained as if their "selflessness", their veracity, and their scientism were unquestionable and for all to see, as if, in other words, they were photographs and we naively thought photographs to be artless' (Sylvana Tomaselli, BJECS 10 (1987) p.106)

Few historians prior to the Chadwyck-Healey project can have shown such contempt for the political print as that displayed by Paul Langford in his
post-Chadwyck-Healey A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783 (Oxford: 1989) and in his Public Life and the Propertied Englishman (Oxford: 1991). In both volumes, prints are deployed in a resolutely auxiliary capacity; in neither are the images integrated into the text, being in both volumes confined to glossy plates intruded into the text between (in A Polite and Commercial People) pp. 268-69 and (in Public Life) pp. 306-307; nor are the images selected referred to in the text. In the bibliography of A Polite and Commercial People, p. 746, EPC1, George's Hogarth to Cruikshank, Atherton's Political Prints and Paulson's Hogarth's Graphic Works are cited as 'liberally illustrated'.

On the same page, Langford writes that 'satirical art has obvious appeal for the historian'; so obvious that the terms 'caricature', 'political print', graphic political satire' or, anachronistically, 'cartoon' figure in neither index, although the latter anachronism is used frequently in A Polite and Commercial People. The reader is, in the case of A Polite and Commercial People, left to take the prints as verisimiludinous representations, most notably in the case of plates 4a and 4b.

The most obvious indifference to the prints qua historical evidence must be Langford's failure to give their dates, although, unlike those in Public Life, at least the prints reproduced in A Polite and Commercial People are given their BM Catalogue numbers.

The auxiliary, illustrative status of the pictorial is affirmed by the pastiche vignettes with which the introduction to each chapter of A Polite and Commercial People is decorated - there can be no other word, for in no instance are they provided with any explanatory caption (pp. 10, 60, 124, 184, 236). One of these (p. 184) is nothing other than an (unacknowledged) pastiche of an existing print, BM The Anti-Craftsman Unmask'd.

For other abuses of pictorial material when reproduced, see Griffiths, 'The Bicentenaire and the Print', p. 454 and n.

33. ibid, p. 453.
34. ibid, p. 453; for the importance of accuracy in dating political prints, pp. 453, 454-55.
35. Duffy, Preface to each volume; Porter, LRB p. 19
37. Roots, p. 53.
39. ibid, p. 19. George's idea that prints 'reflect' contemporary opinion and 'illustrate' events is discussed in Chapters IX and XI.
44. Porter, LRB p.19. Dickinson, Caricatures and the Constitution pp.11-12; Langford, Walpole and the Robinocracy p.13 The idea that prints 'condensed' or 'simplified' issues is widespread: for example, Peters, Pitt and Popularity pp.26,66.
51. ibid, p.427.
52. Coupe, p.79.
53. ibid, p.79.
54. Mr Gillray, the Caricaturist (London:1965), p.155
56. Coupe, p.79.
57. Streicher, p.427. The perception of 17th and 18th-century political prints as as a form of 'mass communication' is challenged in Chapter VII below.
60. ibid, p.5. In 1830, Thomas McLean's Genuine Works of Mr James Gillray was provided with an extensive explanatory 'key'; previously, the editors of The Caricatures of James Gillray, a serial edition instigated in 1818, could complain 'that so many of his works should have become ambiguous for want of a commentator. The political squibs have already lost half their point for want of a Glossary'; quoted Draper Hill, The Satirical Etchings of James Gillray (London:1976) pp.xxvi-xxvii.
Griffiths, 'Bicentenaire', p.455 notes that as yet no comparable catalogue exists for French political prints of the period.
61. Streicher, p.427. Streicher's term, 'great fun', illumines a further stumbling-block to the study of this material; the idea that the material itself is not unduly serious, its original purpose having been 'to amuse' (for which see Chapter X below) has to an extent militated against the academic study of
political prints. In the preface to the exhibition catalogue *English Caricature 1620 to the present: Caricaturists and Satirists, their Art, their Purpose and Influence* (London: 1984) we are warned that, 'before the subject is harnessed, footnoted and led off to the stables of art history', it should be remembered 'that its intention is often merely to amuse [...] [to] expose a plump backside for a coarse laugh'; while the principal commercial dealer in political caricature, Andrew Edmunds, has cited the study of the captions of such prints as an instance of American 'pedantry' (Sarah Jane Checkland, 'Laughing their heads off', *The Times* ('Artfile') 29 June 1989). For the study of print captions, see Part II, Chapter VI.

63. Rogers, *TLS* p. 898
64. ibid, p. 899

Chapter II: 17th- and 18th-Century English Political
Prints, Political Caricatures and Graphic Political
Satire: a bibliographical survey

Basic Documentation and Seminal Texts

The indispensable source for the study of 17th- and
18th-century English political prints is the
eleven-volume Catalogue of prints held in the British
Museum. The first four volumes cover the period up to
1770; the title of these - Catalogue of Prints and
Drawings in the British Museum. Division I: Political
and Personal Satires reflects G.W. Reid's intention to
catalogue the entire collection of prints and drawings in
different divisions. The entries, by F.G. Stephens, are
to a large extent based on the notes of Edward Hawkins,
Keeper of Antiquities at the Museum, whose large,
annotated collection of print satires was purchased by
the Museum after his death in 1866. While Stephens
initially expected his task to be restricted to the
editing of Hawkins's notes, the work was expanded to
include the many other satirical prints and the few
drawings in the Department's collection, and, more
importantly, pictorial representations in works held in
the British Library.

The entries in the Stephens volumes are characterised
by a Victorian detail and comprehensiveness. This
comprehensiveness is not, however, without its drawbacks,
not least for the inexperienced or casual user. In many
cases, Stephens reproduces the greater part of the text
of a pamphlet or other piece of literature which by date
or subject-matter is related - but not always directly -
to that of the image under discussion; it is not always
easy for the novice user to extrapolate the description
of the print in question from this welter of
information. Also potentially misleading is the fact
that the different images within a compartmental design
may, occasionally, be catalogued individually.
Most problematic, perhaps, for the novice user is Stephens's decision to place a print in the Catalogue according to the date of the event represented, even though the print may in fact derive from a later period. Thus a print depicting Prince Charles Edward Stuart and dating from c. 1745 is catalogued under James II (1688) because of the allusion to his father's birth in the form of a portrait of James III within a warming-pan [BM 1156]. The absence of an index of titles, a subject-index or an index of engravers and publishers also detracts from its usefulness. A manuscript index of titles, which the User's Guide to the Department describes as 'often defective' is kept in the Department.

The last of these volumes was completed in 1883, after which there was a hiatus in the work of documentation until 1930, when the social historian Mary Dorothy George was engaged to continue the Catalogue. The final seven volumes cover the period 1771-1832, under the revised title Catalogue of Personal and Political Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. This thesis will refer to both the Stephens and George volumes inclusively as 'the Catalogue'.

The George volumes include a series of indices which cover persons represented, print titles, selected subjects (for example, 'horse-racing'), artists, printsellers and publishers. Unlike the Stephens volumes, prints are catalogued according to date of publication; George also eschews Stephens's habit of giving separate Catalogue numbers to different scenes on a single compartmentalised print. The most obvious change is one of format: George divides the material as much as possible between the categories 'Political', and 'Personal', or 'social', satires; this is particularly useful with respect to those years in which the number of prints produced was extremely high, for example 1784, but
the distinction is never absolute and most users whose concerns are 'political' will find it prudent to scan the 'Personal' entries for each year. Each volume is provided with an extensive introduction which addresses the political context of the prints, together with changes in the printmaking and publishing trades; these introductions are in many respects superior to the rather more condensed narrative of George's English Political Caricature.

The main flaw of the later Catalogue is that it does not attempt to present a comprehensive picture of the range of material available. Whereas Stephens 'made a deliberate attempt' to catalogue those works which were to be found in works within the Department's Library and the British Library - according to the Department's User's Guide c.10% of the works catalogued -, George only included those which had come to her notice; thus one finds the occasional reference to or description of a print in the Guildhall Library or similar collection. 9

More importantly, the Catalogue has yet to be expanded to incorporate prints acquired or discovered subsequent to the compilation of either the Stephens or the George volumes. The need to update the 'basic documentation' of extant material is the subject of Part II, Chapter IV.

In 1978, the publishers Chadwyck-Healey transferred the Catalogue onto microfilm at the same time that it was reprinted; all versions of the Catalogue are now (1993) once more out of print. More significantly, the greater part of the collection itself was microfilmed, allowing access to images which it had hitherto been possible to study only in the Print Room and Library. 10 The pictorial microfilm is far from perfect; much early material was omitted, notably pictorial material from the Thomason Tracts, available on a separate microfilm. This omission is one of several manifestations of the lower
esteem in which the pre- c.1720 political print appears to be held by scholars. The quality of photography is also variable; images appear to have been filmed actual size, which is prejudicial to the very small and the very large. The accompanying letterpress of many prints, has in many instances been omitted; something which can only reinforce the perception, fostered by the secondary literature, of the text as irrelevant.¹¹

Ultimately, its many flaws notwithstanding, the B.M. Catalogue merits the over-used epithet 'indispensable' as far as research in this field is concerned. Many of the works referred to in this thesis have, however, depended for information not on the Catalogue but on George's two-volume English Political Caricature: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda (Oxford: 1959), hereafter referred to as EPC. This may fairly be described as the first serious study of this material. Chronologically, it extends from the 1640s to 1832, with Part I concluding at 1792. Each volume is reasonably well-served with plates, with ninety-six in each volume, excluding two frontispieces. These plates are not, however, integrated with the text but are placed at the end of each volume.

This thesis will have many occasions of questioning both the tenor of George's narrative, and specific conclusions reached in EPC. The demerits of EPC are, however, very much those of a pioneering study. It is, indeed, less the errors of EPC which are the concern of this thesis - these are, in any case, remarkably few - , but rather the extent to which subsequent studies have paraphrased George's account, as a result of which the inaccuracies and imbalances of that account have been perpetuated; the extent to which a work which was designed to be an introduction to the material has been accorded monumental status.¹² The failure of those who have since 1959 addressed this material to engage with this seminal text has stultified political prints

33
One work which did attempt to build on George's achievement may be mentioned in this category of the main texts of political prints scholarship, although it has never enjoyed a status comparable to that of EPC, was Herbert Atherton's *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth: A Study in the Ideographic Representation of Politics* (Oxford: 1974). Chronologically, this overlaps with four of the twelve chapters of the first volume of EPC, in covering the years 1727-63. The previous chapter saw the work's claims to originality of approach called into question; the thematic rather than chronological approach adopted gives the impression of a closer attention to iconography and argument than is conveyed by George's narrative and, most usefully, Atherton devotes some pages to the nexus of printsellers and publishers in London, about whom EPC is largely silent. Like EPC, however, Atherton's study is notably evasive with respect to the not unimportant questions of the consumption and circulation of political prints. It is also the case that Atherton's account of the development of the political print is harnessed to a theory - and a narrative - of the development of an organised and increasingly legitimate Parliamentary opposition (Opposition, in fact) over this period which has not altogether stood the test of time.

Whatever the merits and demerits of *Political Prints...*, Atherton's subsequent work in this field has been disappointingly slight; an exception might perhaps be made of his examination of British constitutional tropes in the period of the French Revolution, 'The British Defend Their Constitution in Political Cartoon and Literature'.
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The Secondary Literature

The secondary literature of the political print forms a corpus which is reasonably large but markedly inconsistent, both in terms of subjects covered and in the quality of scholarship.

The secondary literature may be divided into three main categories: monographs on individual artists; the very generalised 'introduction' to or general survey of the subject; and the exhibition catalogue, although it must be said that none of these categories is watertight, the latter categories in particular tending to overlap. It is also possible to divide the literature by its approach to the prints.

i) Monographs on individual artists or on specific prints by individual artists. While numerous, in focus these are limited to a handful of the more celebrated caricaturists.

The largest bibliography would appear to be that devoted to the life and work of William Hogarth (1697-1764). Not all of the innumerable studies produced by workers in what is a veritable Hogarth industry have been directly concerned with either his political prints or his graphic output, however. Relevant studies, and those to which this thesis will return, include: F.D. Klingender, Hogarth and English Caricature (1944); Ronald Paulson, Hogarth's Graphic Works (1965: 3rd edn The Print Room, London, 1989); David Kunzle, 'Plagiaries-by-memory of the Rake's Progress and the Genesis of Hogarth's Second Picture Story' Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 29 (1966) 311-48; M.M. Cohen, 'Hogarth's The Rake's Progress and the techniques of verse satire' Studies in Iconology V (1979) 159-72; Sean Shesgreen, Hogarth and the Times of Day Tradition (1983); idem, 'Hogarth's

As with that for Hogarth, much of the vast bibliography which exists for Thomas Rowlandson (1756-1827) is more concerned with his drawings, watercolours, book illustration, erotica and 'humorous subjects' than with his political prints. Indeed, a specific study of the political prints has yet to be written, although this material forms the best part of that described in Paul Goldman's catalogue accompanying the B.M. touring exhibition, The Rumbustious World of Thomas Rowlandson, The Prints: 1774-1822 (1989). Relevant works include: Joseph Grego, Rowlandson the Caricaturist: A selection from his works with anecdotal descriptions of his famous caricatures, and a sketch of his life, times and contemporaries (two volumes, 1880, reprinted in 1970), the first serious study and the only attempt to catalogue Rowlandson's prints.

If the Rowlandson bibliography contains little that
specifically relates to his political prints, his contemporary James Gillray (1757-1815), regarded with considerable justification as the towering genius of the political print of the later 18th century, has fared slightly better. The Gillray bibliography is dominated by three works by Draper Hill: Mr Gillray the caricaturist (1965); Fashionable Contrasts, Caricatures by James Gillray (1966) and The Satirical Etchings... (1976). In addition; M.D. George 'Pictorial Propaganda, 1793-1815: Gillray and Cruikshank' History XXXI (1946).

Where they have not been plundered of their plates, the 19th-century reissues of Gillray's work, Thomas McLean, The Genuine Works of James Gillray, engraved by himself, two volumes engraved from the original plates, with a key, Illustrative Description. (1830) and reissued in 1851 as Historical and Descriptive Account of the Caricatures of James Gillray (Thomas Wright and R.H. Evans); Wright and J. Grego, The Works of James Gillray the Caricaturist (1873, reissued 1970) are useful. An informed account of these earlier works is given in the Introduction to Hill, The Satirical Etchings. In addition, Paul Goldman, James Gillray (B.M. touring exhibition catalogue 1986); Karen Domenici, 'James Gillray: an English source for David's Les Sabines' Art Bulletin LXV (1983) 493-95; David V. Erdman, 'William Blake's debt to James Gillray' Art Quarterly 12 (1949) 168-70; Richard Godfrey, 'Four Wood Engravings by James Gillray' PtQtly I (1984) 4-22. It may, however, be argued that Gillray's prints have been under-exploited in comparison with those of Hogarth, and that the Gillray bibliography compares unfavourably in terms of size with that for Hogarth, Rowlandson, and George Cruikshank; a comparative paucity of studies which is the more significant because Gillray's oeuvre was, unlike theirs, almost exclusively political.

Gillray's great rival James Sayers (1748-1825) has
yet to be considered worthy of a biography or any other study, while E.B. Krumbhaar's Isaac Cruikshank: A Catalogue Raisonne with a Sketch of his Life and Works (1966) remains the sole monograph on another of Gillray's contemporaries (1762-1811). 19 The brief career of Richard Newton (1777-98) also awaits its scholar; as recently as 1992, Newton was referred to as a 'neglected genius of British caricature'. 20 William Austin (1721-1820); William Dent (active 1783-93); Charles Williams (active 1797-1830); William Elmes (active 1811-20) William Heath ('Paul Pry'; c.1795-1840) and William O'Keefe (active 1794-1807) have been similarly neglected.

In contrast, George Cruikshank (1792-1878) has been the subject of innumerable studies. 21 As with Rowlandson, however, graphic political satire and caricature represent only a fraction of Cruikshank's oeuvre and most studies have favoured an overview of his work. Volume I of R.L. Patten's recent biography, George Cruikshank's Life, Art and Times (1992) offers a comprehensive account of Cruikshank's political prints, all of which were produced in the early part of his long career. This does, however, repeat information which is to be found in idem. ed., 'Cruikshank: A revaluation', Princeton University Library Chronicle 35 (1973-74) and 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature' Art Journal 43 (1983) 331-38. John Wardroper, The Caricatures of George Cruikshank (1977); idem, Cruikshank 200 (1992) are predictable in both scope and emphasis.

For the later period, John Doyle ('HB'; 1797-1868) and the very different J. Lewis Marks (active 1814-30s) and Charles Jameson Grant (active 1831-46) have yet to be the subject of serious study.

The artist with the best claim to the much-disputed title 'the first political caricaturist', George
Townshend (1724-1807), has fared better. In 1976, Draper Hill could write that

we are still waiting for a thorough appraisal of [Townshend's] contribution to the political cartoon [...] There is still much to be done on the caricatures of the climactic third quarter of the 18th century and particularly on Townshend and the crucial summer of 1756.22


The preoccupation with the idiom of caricature which this thesis will deprecate (see Chapter V, below) has to a considerable degree dictated both the chronology and the emphasis of research in the field to date. Thus, while much work remains to be done on designers of the pre-caricature political print, that is pre-c.1750-80, the non-political caricaturist Thomas Patch has been the subject of two pieces by F.J.B. Watson, 'Thomas Patch' Walpole Society, 28 (1939-40) 15-50 and 'Thomas Patch, some new light on his work' Apollo, ns 85 (1967) 348-53. Similarly, Henry William Bunbury (1750-1811), contemporary of Rowlandson, is the subject of John Reily, Henry William Bunbury (1983) and idem, 'Horace Walpole and "the second Hogarth"' Eighteenth-Century Studies 9 (1975) 28-44.
In contrast, there is little on artists of the early 18th century, both preceding and contemporaneous with Hogarth. Paul Sandby, responsible for a number of savage anti-Hogarth satires in 1753 and 1762, has yet to be studied as a satirist and caricaturist. J.L. Wood, 'The Bickhams', Factotum: Newsletter of the XVIIIth-Century Short-Title Catalogue xxvi (1988) 7-9; M. Snodin, 'George Bickham junior, Master of the Rococo', The V&A Album, II (1983) 354-60; David Hunter 'Pope v. Bickham: An Infringement of an Essay on Man Alleged', The Library, IX, (1987) 268-73; Nancy Valpy, Anthony Griffiths, Michael Snodin 'Plagiarism in Prints: The Musical Entertainer Affair', Print Quarterly VI (1989) 54-59 address a particularly interesting figure, recent evidence of whose political sympathies suggests that his work would repay closer study. While it is the case that many of the political prints of this period remain unattributed, it can be argued that this is a symptom and not the cause of their neglect, one of several reasons for which is a continuing preoccupation with the figure of Hogarth which has, arguably, exaggerated his importance in relation to printmaking in general in this otherwise comparatively neglected period. Closer attention to this period as a whole promises to supply further attributions, such as that claimed for BM 2439 The Devil Upon Two Sticks (1741), attributed in English Caricature (1984) to Hubert Gravelot.

The graphic satirists of the 17th century have fared still worse than those of the first half of the 18th century. Several studies of Wenceslaus Hollar (1607-77) exist; to date no study devoted to his political prints. William Faithorne (1616?-91), like Richard Gaywood (active 1653-64), William Marshall (active 1630-50), and David Loggan (1635-93), has yet to find his biographer. Edward Hodnett's 1978 biography of Francis Barlow (active from c.1670 in this field) devotes ten
pages to his political satires, but is conventionally
dissmissive of the genre at this period.28

Stephen Colledge (c.1635-81), 'the Protestant joiner' and author of several striking disloyal prints during the Exclusion Crisis is another figure about whom notably little has been written.29 An article by Sheila O'Connell, 'Simon Gribelin (1661-1733) Printmaker and Metal-Engraver' Print Quarterly II (1985) 27-37, reproduces and refers to Gribelin's prints commemorating the Seven Bishops, but is not primarily concerned with these works.


The paucity of studies of the identifiable artists working in this genre at this period reflects the general perception of the period as one in which the only 'significant' prints circulated in the country were of Dutch manufacture. Conversely, George, concerned only with prints of English manufacture, excludes de Hooghe from her (limited) account of this period in EPC; for an account of de Hooghe's contribution to the Williamite propaganda campaign in England, the reader must turn to Wilson's thesis.31

The extent to which graphic political satire was an activity the practice of which extended beyond London and Westminster has yet to be established: the Lancashire amateur, John Collier ('Tim Bobbin':1708-86) is one artist who occasionally merits a footnote.32 Another
artist whose subject-matter was only rarely political is covered by Hilary and Mary Evans, *John Kay of Edinburgh, Barber, Miniaturist and Social Commentator* (1973). 33

Outnumbering studies of individual artists are the general surveys and 'Introductions' to the subject.

It is these which dominate the bibliography of the political print and which exemplify the preference of previous scholars for ease over effort which has retarded progress in this field. It was the superficial, repetitious and derivative nature of this corpus, viewed collectively, which first alerted me to the more general poverty of scholarship in the English political print, which the prevalence of such compilations is merely one of the more conspicuous symptoms. As a genre, the survey/introduction may also be found in the format of the exhibition catalogue; for example, Draper Hill's *Introduction to Cartoon and Caricature from Hogarth to Hoffnung* (Arts Council: 1962); Richard Godfrey *English Caricature from 1620 to the Present* (Victoria and Albert Museum: 1984); Katie Hughes and Duncan Scott, *Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social and Political Caricature* (Canterbury College of Art: 1985); and Marcus Wood, *Folly and Vice: the Art of Satire and Social Criticism* (South Bank Centre, touring exhibition: 1989-90).

As a genre, the survey/introduction inclines to the catholic both in its chronology and in the number of countries represented by prints, as exemplified by the title of James Parton's 1878 survey *Caricature and Other Comic Art in All Times and Many Lands*. The tendency to present 'the history of cartoon' or caricature as a linear sequence of artists is reflected in the 'from x to y' titles of other surveys. Often, although not invariably, reflected in the ratio of text to
illustration, the quality of scholarship is variable; the ground covered, on the other hand, is remarkably consistent.


As far as the study of 17th- and 18th-century English political prints and graphic political satire is concerned, such works are of only limited value. This is primarily because 17th- and 18th-century political prints and graphic political satires as such are almost invariably subsumed in the larger categories 'caricatures' or 'cartoons'. The introduction/survey is characterised by a preoccupation with the comic, a preoccupation which is discussed in Chapter X below, and with caricature (for which see Chapter V below): the non-humorous 17th-century political print, in which facial caricature in the accepted sense plays no part is thus marginalised.

The irrelevance of the 17th-century English political print is reflected in the chronology conventionally
adopted in such accounts; as far as the English print is concerned, the conventional starting-point has been c.1720 or later (prefaced in some cases with an observation as to the numerical poverty and general insignificance of prints produced prior to this date). The chronology of English political prints study is the subject of Chapter III below, but in the context of the general survey, it may be remarked that, of those which adopt a 15th-to-20th-century chronology, it has been conventional to present the 'history' in terms of a succession of countries, with the Germanic countries the focus for the 16th century, the Dutch for the 17th, England for the 18th and early 19th, and France for the remainder of the 19th century. The limited focus of the general survey is reflected in the illustrative choices; the same prints are enlisted time after time: only exceptionally will a pre-1720 English print appear.

As far as the 18th-century English print is concerned, the political nature of political prints is too frequently treated as incidental; as such, even though prints by, for example, Gillray, are reproduced, only rarely will the commentary provide any fresh insight into either the print in question or the genre as a whole, being in most cases derived from either the Catalogue or from EPC.

The emphases and omissions common to these surveys, and the specific points on which the received account of the history and 'development' of the political print and graphic political satire errs, will be identified over the course of subsequent chapters. In view of the fact that for over fifty years, such surveys and introductions have covered the same ground, the vitality of this particular genre of prints 'scholarship' is worthy of remark.
iii) Exhibition catalogues. Next to the general survey, the exhibition catalogue is possibly the most popular format for political prints scholarship.

The exhibition catalogue may be a solid work with extensive scholarly commentaries, often in the form of collected essays, and with detailed catalogue entries, or it may consist of reproductions of the prints with a minimum of text. Exhibition catalogues vary also from those with a specific focus, be it an individual artist, a period, or a theme, to those which are highly generalised 'introductions to' the subject, or else a pot-pourri of images drawn from one collection.

The scholarly catalogue is exemplified by James Cuno et al, French Caricature and the French Revolution 1788-99 (Los Angeles, Grunewald Center/University of Chicago 1988); exemplary in its reproduction of images and in the breadth and depth of the collected essays. Similarly, although it is only one part of a far larger catalogue, the remainder of which is concerned with painting, the essay by Diana Donald, 'Characters and Caricatures: The Satirical View' in Nicholas Penny et al, Reynolds (London: Royal Academy, 1986) is also exemplary in its intelligent approach to the material; arguably, Donald's essay remains the best account to date of the political and social caricature of the later 18th century within its contemporary context. Reva Wolf, Goya and the Satirical Print (Boston College Museum of Art: 1991) might also be singled out as an instance of a scholarly approach to a single theme, in this case an excellent appraisal of the influence of English political caricature and graphic satire on the work of Goya.

At the other end of the scale, Jo Anne Birnie Danzker, Hogarth, nationalism, mass media and the artist (Vancouver Art Gallery, 1980-81) and Marcus Wood, Folly and Vice, op.cit., offer inflated and superficial approaches to their material.
Exhibitions which focus on individual collections include: John Riely, *The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature: An Exhibition of satirical Prints and Drawings from the Collection of W.S. Lewis* (Sterling Memorial Library, Yale, 1973) - which, given the resources of the Lewis collection, is disappointing, not least in the paucity of reproductions -, and the Art Institute of Chicago, *British Caricatures of the 18th and early 19th centuries from the William McCallin McKee Collection* (1977). The Godfrey/V&A English Caricature, *1620 to the Present* (1984) exhibition was at least in part designed to display the resources of the major American collections; this catalogue constitutes a useful reference work for the study of the idiom of caricature, but is to a considerable extent invalidated by its anachronistic categorisation of prints pre-c.1750 as 'caricatures' and by the correspondingly orthodox account of the 'development' of the genre to the present. 35

Other exhibitions have adopted a thematic approach to the material; a favoured theme would seem to be graphic political satire as 'the art of social criticism', the treatment of which theme is almost invariably relativist and superficial, as it is in Wood, *Folly and Vice*, op. cit.. 36

As noted above, the exhibition catalogue frequently favours the chronological and geographical breadth of the general survey, as exemplified by Hill's *An Introduction to Cartoon and Caricature from Hogarth to Hoffnung* (1962). A survey of titles also reinforces an impression of an imbalance in favour of a handful of artists: John Reily, *Henry William Bunbury* (Sudbury, 1983); Brenda Rix, *Our Old Friend Rolly [Rowlandson]* (Art Gallery of Ontario 1987); Paul Goldman, *The Rumbustious World of Thomas Rowlandson, The Prints: 1774 - 1822* (B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings, touring exhibition,
1989-91) op.cit.; W.B. Coley, William Hogarth, Pictorial Dramatist (Davison Art Center, Middletown Ct., 1962);
Lucia Iannone, Comedy and Revolution: Satire from Hogarth to Daumier (Davison Art Center, Middletown, Ct.,: 1981);
William Feaver, George Cruikshank (London: Arts Council, 1974) op.cit.; John Wardroper, Cruikshank 200: an Exhibition to celebrate the bicentenary of George Cruikshank (touring exhibition:1992) op.cit., et cetera.

As a source of information respecting 17th- and 18th-century English political prints, the exhibition catalogue in general suffers from the same failings as those of the general survey/introduction, from which it is often indistinguishable, being at one and the same time over-general, and predictable, in scope and emphasis.

In theory, exhibitions 'provide the occasions for publishing recent scholarship, making new connections between works normally scattered round the world, and providing fresh perspectives from which' to view them.37 In practice, few exhibitions of political prints and graphic political satires have harnessed original scholarship to the material in the fashion of the Cuno, French Caricature exhibition.

The concentration of political prints within a handful of major print collections makes the exhibition of this material less dependent on international resources than many other prints or paintings, but the fact that it is comparatively easy to mount an exhibition of a museum or library's own holdings makes it still more imperative that such an exhibition should be informed by fresh scholarly perspectives and constitute something more rigorous and challenging than the conventional two-dozen jolly Rowlandsons depicting 'Rowlandson's England' or the two-dozen images illustrative of 'The Art of the Political Cartoon Past and Present'.
Exhibition catalogues tend to 'reflect the merits and defects of the exhibitions for which they were designed'. At least as far as the political print is concerned, the situation is more likely to resemble that described by one reviewer, who referred to his 'disappointment and frustration' at the conjunction, too often experienced, of a splendid exhibition of prints and a lack-lustre critical and historical accompaniment.

There is a case to be made that the poor exhibition catalogue reflects a larger dichotomy, one which is also to be seen in the generously-illustrated general survey; a segregation of word and image which is one aspect of the 'logocentricism' which has seen political prints relegated to the status of auxiliary evidence. In the case of the exhibition catalogue and general survey, this 'logocentrism' is manifested in, paradoxically, a willingness to hide behind the images. Because political prints are indeed vivid and, at least on one level, and with a minimum of historical contextualising, accessible, the thinking would seem to go that they may be left to speak for themselves - 'res ipsa loquitur', as one such survey has it - in a way which would not nowadays be countenanced with regard to a Gainsborough 'fancy picture' or a Richard Wilson landscape.

In this way both the lightweight exhibition catalogue and the copiously-illustrated 'introduction' may be said to exemplify precisely that perception of this material which has allowed the historian to marginalise it; the perception of the print as an uncomplicated 'visual soundbite' deprecated by Porter; a perception which has coloured ostensibly scholarly approaches to the material - for example, the largely unamplified plates of the Chadwyck-Healey series. The ratio of image to text in the exhibition catalogue or general survey may be said to
mirror the uneasy relationship between, or the failure to reconcile, verbal and visual which is at the heart of both the omissions and the abuses of political prints study; the scholarly catalogue, as exemplified by the work of Cuno, Wolf, Donald (and indeed the Reynolds catalogue within which Donald's essay appears) is as much verbal as it is visual: 'logocentrism' finds its true expression in the catalogue which adopts an almost exclusively pictorial format.

********

It is also possible to categorise the secondary literature by the approach to the material taken.

The essays of Streicher and Coupe, together with the reviews of the Chadwyck-Healey series by Porter, Fox and Roots comprise the handful of accounts which might be termed 'methodological'.

'Theoretical' studies, that is to say, studies which address the satirical print, but more commonly caricature, as an idiom, include E.H. Gombrich's essay 'The Experiment of Caricature' in Art and Illusion (New York:1960) and Werner Hofmann, Caricature; Leonardo to Picasso op.cit.; Gombrich and Ernst Kris, Caricature (1940).


Several of the more general works cited above also attempt to define and explain the nature of graphic satire and caricature, notably Charles Press, The

James Sherry 'Four Modes of Caricature: Reflections upon a Genre' Bulletin of Research in the Humanities 87 (1986-87) 29-62 attempts to distinguish between portrait caricature, and satiric, comic, and grotesque caricature. The need for greater precision in categorising political prints - and for this to be reflected in the descriptive terminology of the subject - is argued in Part II, Chapter III.

The failure fully to distinguish between the different genres of political print, graphic political satire, political caricature, caricature, graphic satire, 'popular imagery', 'the grotesque' or 'comic art' has bequeathed an unhelpful breadth and complexity to bibliographical searches, with political prints being addressed, if only indirectly, in works such as C. Veth, Comic Art in England (1930); Robert R. Wark, Isaac Cruikshank's 'Drawings for Drolls' (San Marino: 1968); Patricia Crown, British Comic Art 1730-1830 from the Yale Center for British Art (1985). The place of the comic in the political print is considered in Part I, Chapter X.

In contrast to the innumerable works concerned with 'caricature and comic art', certain specific forms taken by political prints remain obscure, notably the rebus or pictogram, although Jean Céard and Jean-Claude Margolin, Rebus de la Renaissance: Des Images qui Parlent 2
volumes (Paris:1986). The compartmental format of many prints is addressed by David Kunzle The Early Comic Strip: Narrative Strips and Picture Stories in the European Broadsheet from c.1450 to 1825 (The History of the Comic Strip volume I: Berkeley:1973); R.L. Patten, reviewing volume II, praises Kunzle's efforts in having mapped out 'a terra incognita' stretching over several countries and centuries. 41 Patten's own 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature' Art Journal 43 (1983) 331-38 fails to address the pictorial conventions of the prints in the sense that this term is used in this thesis.

Studies which might be termed 'art historical', that is to say, approaching prints from the standpoint of aesthetic significance or their contemporary aesthetic context include Donald's 'Characters and Caricatures' op.cit.; F. Antal, Hogarth and his place in European Art (1962); Sean Shesgreen, Hogarth and the 'Times of Day' Tradition op. cit.; Ronald Paulson, Rowlandson, a New Interpretation (London:1972); idem, Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, Mass.:1975); Wolf, Goya and the Satiric Print op. cit.; Karen Domenici, 'James Gillray: an English Source for David's Les Sabines' Art Bulletin LXV (1983) 493-95.

Histories of printmaking in Great Britain have conventionally paid little attention to the political and satirical prints, referring to these, if at all, in passing; representative are A.M. Hind, A History of Engraving and Etching from the Fifteenth Century (London:1923) and Richard Godfrey, Printmaking in Britain: a general history from its beginnings to the present day (Oxford:1978). Non-satirical political prints of the kind with which this thesis is in part concerned figure in Margery Corbett and Michael Naughton's conclusion of Hind's Engraving in England in the 16th and 17th Centuries. Part III, the Reign of
Charles I (London: 1964), of which the plates are extremely useful.

Studies of relevant printmaking techniques are numerous, but few are useful for more than background information. The most lucid and useful short account is that to be found in David Coombs's essay, 'The English Sporting Print' in British Sporting Painting 1650-1850 (London, Arts Council: 1974) pp. 125-31. Also useful; Elizabeth Millar, Hand-Coloured British Prints (London, V&A: 1987) and Antony Griffiths, Prints and Printmaking: An Introduction to the History and Techniques (New York: 1980).

Turning from the history, technique and format of the prints to their content and subject-matter, iconographical studies, that is to say studies focussing on specific images and motifs, are notably thin on the ground. The greater number of those which have been published have been concerned with national personifications and stereotypes: Amon Carter Museum, The Image of America in Caricature and Cartoon (Fort Worth, Texas: 1976); Michel Jouve, 'La formation de l'image de John Bull dans le caricature anglaise au xviii siecle' Linguistique, civilisation, litterature - actes du Congres de la Societe des anglicistes de l'Enseignement superieur de Tours, 1977 (Paris: 1980); idem, 'L'Image du sans-culotte dans la caricature politique anglaise: creation d'un stereotype pictural' Gazette des Beaux-Arts 91 (1978) 187-96; Miles Taylor, 'John Bull and the Iconography of Public Opinion' P&P 134 (1992) 55-123 (of which only a small part is devoted to 18th-century prints); E. McClung Fleming 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783' Winterthur Portfolio II, (1965) 65-81; idem, 'From Indian Princess to Greek Goddess: The American Image 1783-1815', Winterthur Portfolio III, (1967) 37-66; Rolf Reichardt, 'Prints: Images of the Bastille' in eds Robert Darnton and Daniel


Increasingly, the political print has been approached from a literary perspective, and many of the more detailed and analytical contributions to the literature have been made by literary scholars. The greater number of such studies have focussed on the relations between verbal and visual satire: M.M. Cohen, 'Hogarth's *A Rake's Progress* and the Techniques of verse satire' *op. cit.*; Kahrl, 'Smollett as a Caricaturist' *op. cit.*; Gassman, 'Smollett's *Briton* and the art of Political Cartooning', *op. cit.*; Wagner, 'Hogarth's graphic palimpsests', *op. cit.*; idem, 'Hogarth, eighteenth-century literature and the modern canon', *op. cit.*; Robert Adams Day, *Ut Pictura Poesis: Smollett,

The literary bias of Carretta's studies suggest that while the analysis of the prints by literary scholars is far from unproductive of insights, the danger is that the prints will be approached and deployed not in their own right but as auxiliary to the literary evidence. Lois Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature 1641-1660 (Cambridge: 1989) is an exception, not least in that Potter addresses non-satirical images and their rhetorical capacity. In contrast, the otherwise rich and important study by Paul J. Korshin, Typologies in England 1650-1820 (Princeton: 1982), while recognising the typological basis of much 18th-century graphic political satire, fails to address this particular genre in any detail.

The extent to which a more verbally-oriented appraisal of a genre which was always as much verbal as visual is desirable is considered in Part II, Chapter VI; the extent to which the satirical print deploys a corpus of basic satirical conceits and tactics, some of which it may share with written satire, is considered in Part II, Chapter VII.

The idea that the graphic satirists both 'reflected' and 'recorded' their 'age' (for which see Part I, Chapter XI) has informed their career as textbook illustrations.
Yet the material has largely failed to attract the attention of the social historian. M. D. George's interest in the prints was in many respects primarily as documents for the study of social history, as expressed in her *Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social Change in Graphic Satire* (London: 1967), but to date, this approach to the material has produced comparatively few accounts; Rosemary Baker's 'Satirical Prints as a Source of English Social History' *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress* (1982) is one exception.


Together with such historical surveys, the most conventional approach has been to study a body of prints as auxiliary evidence illuminating a particular episode of history, or a particular personality, for example, A. M. Broadley *Napoleon in Caricature* two volumes (1911); C. Clerc, *La caricature contre Napoleon* (1985). Again, this was an approach sanctioned by George, not only in *EPC* and the contextual essays of volumes V - XI of the *Catalogue*, but in her 'Pictorial Propaganda, 1793-1815: Gillray and Cruikshank' op. cit. and 'America in English Satiric Prints' *William and Mary Quarterly* X (1953). Studies which take this contextual approach include: R. T. H. Halsey, "'Impolitical Prints": The American Revolution as Pictured by Contemporary English
In compiling this introductory bibliography, several problems associated with the study of the political print became apparent. The first was that, outwith a core of the primary documentation as represented by the Catalogue, supported by the pioneering studies of EPC (and to a lesser extent Atherton's Political Prints), there was nothing resembling a coherent and self-conscious 'prints literature'. This itself poses problems for both the bibliographer and the student. Reflecting the paucity of scholars for whom this is their specialist field of study, scholarly publishing on the
subject of political prints is not only piecemeal in the sense that it is sporadic, but piecemeal in that efforts are divided between several disciplines. This was most obvious with regard to articles, with relevant articles appearing in the journals of a variety of disciplines, from 'straight' history to semiotics. While it is true that in any field of research, works of relevance will occasionally be published outside the field as conventionally delimited, to all intents and purposes a delimited field does not exist for the study of the political print. Keeping abreast of what little research is advanced in the subject is, therefore, extremely difficult. This problem is compounded by the failure of many of those who have addressed the material to provide more than a perfunctory bibliography of secondary literature - that of Wardroper's *Kings, Lords and Wicked Libellers* is representative - , and it is not unusual for works to lack even a limited bibliography; this is the case with *The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature*. More recently, the bibliography provided in *English Caricature 1620 to the Present* (1984) is uneven, and the references to articles in journals unhelpfully without pagination; that offered by Wood, in *Folly and Vice* (1990) is not, in fact, a bibliography as such but rather a list of the sources of the various excerpts from literature addressing prints and satire in general quoted in the text. Of the six volumes cited in the leaflet accompanying the British Museum's exhibition *Europeans in Caricature* (1992), only two are specifically concerned with these prints. The endnotes of the more scholarly studies in the field (Donald, Patten, Wagner) are productive of much useful bibliographical information, Patten's notes to *George Cruikshank* in particular, but this serves only to underscore the need for a comprehensive critical bibliography of the political print, for which neither this chapter nor the more extensive bibliography provided at the end of this thesis
can take the place.

Bearing in mind the necessarily incomplete nature of this survey, certain general conclusions may be still drawn concerning the nature of post-George prints scholarship.

The first is the over-general nature of much of what has been published, as exemplified by the chronological and geographical breadth of Folly and Vice and the chronological breadth of English Caricature 1620 to the Present. Detailed analyses of both individual prints and aspects of the genres of caricature and graphic political satire have not been wanting in recent years, but the convenience of compilation continues to win out over the rigours of scholarship. On this point, it may also be observed that the more general literature has mostly failed to keep pace with such scholarly advances as have been made.

As far as the print's status as historical evidence is concerned, McCreery's 'Satiric Images', is the most recent evidence to suggest that study of this material has failed to break out of the contextual methodology of George which, while it may produce detailed and informative accounts - as is McCreery's - fails to engage with the genre in any significant fashion.

McCreery's piece also shows that political prints scholarship continues to be weighted first, towards the 1760-1820 period and second, towards the satirical print, more especially the political caricature.

Similarly, the study of 'the political print' has in most instances meant the study of the separately-issued broadsheet print; the printed image as a component of contemporary polemical literature has attracted little attention. The printing/publishing background of both the separately-issued and the text-bound print remains one of the least well-documented aspects of the material.
The implications of the continuing emphases and omissions of political prints scholarship will, I hope, become clear over the following chapters.

1. **Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. Division I: Political and Personal Satires:** I (1870); II (1873); III (1877); IV (1883); Catalogue of Personal and Political Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: V (1935); VI (1938); VII (1942); VIII (1947); IX (1949); X (1952) XI (1954); hereafter Catalogue.


4. A good example is the entry for BM 1494 Roundheads and Whigs Compara'd.

5. Still more disconcerting for the novice is the use of later 18th-century and 19th-century reproductions of older plates, catalogued by the date of the original or its context rather than by the date of the print itself: for example, BM 1541 Daniel Burgess Preaching, dated 1710, but as the entry establishes, in fact a plate from James Caulfield, *Portraits, Memoirs, and Characters of Remarkable Persons, from the Revolution in 1688 to the end of the Reign of George II* (1819) 'copied from an old engraving'.


8. George was aided in this by the 1734/35 Engraver's Act; it is from this date that the publication line 'published as the Act directs' begins to appear on prints. That said, pirated prints or other satires for which prudence dictated that this information be omitted; see Nicholas Robinson, 'Caricature and the Regency Crisis: an Irish Perspective'. *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 1 (1986) 157-76, p.173 for Dublin piracies of London satires.


11. For the significance of this, see Part II, Chapter VI.


14. Rogers, TLS p.898; 'it is possible to feel that Mr Atherton pushes too hard the emergence of a constitutional Opposition, as outlined by his mentor A.S. Foord (this is a Yale key to eighteenth-century politics)'. For Foord, see J.C.D. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Cambridge:1986) p.135, n. Atherton also discerns, pp.106-90, a 'Country vs Court' theme in the prints of this period; for the historiography of both theses, see Clark, op.cit, Chapter 7.


16. For which see Paulson, HLAT; idem, Hogarth's Graphic Works.


20. B.M. Europeans in Caricature; leaflet accompanying exhibition.

21. For a full Cruikshank bibliography, see Patten, GCLTA volume 2. See also Albert M. Cohn, George Cruikshank. A Catalogue Raisonnee (London:1924)


23. I regret that I have not been able to see Johnson Ball, Paul and Thomas Sandby: Royal Academicians. An Anglo-Danish Saga of Art, Love and War in Georgian England (London:1985), nor Yale Center for British Art, The Art of Paul Sandby (New Haven:1955)


26. Kathleen S. van Eerde, Wenceslaus Hollar; Delineator of his Time (Charlottesville, Va.:1970) does not address Hollar's political work; I have not been able to see Manchester City Art Gallery, Wenceslaus Hollar 1607-1677: Drawings, Paintings and Etchings (Manchester:1963).


29. T. Harris, London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II


31. Wilson, pp.2,7,26-35 and n34,168ff and 244ff, and 252-83,301ff.

32. English Caricature, pp.36-37; Alexander, 'Eighteenth-Century English Graphic Satire' outline history and bibliography provided for one-day conference on the subject, York 3 March 1990, hereafter Alexander, York, p.3,

33. Hilary and Mary Evans, John Kay of Edinburgh, Barber, Miniaturist and Social Commentator (Aberdeen: 1973) hereafter Evans, John Kay; for neglect or underestimation of Kay, see pp.2,4,22,25-28; see also English Caricature p.92.


The catalogue entries are by James Cuno and Cynthia Burlingham.

35. English Caricature, Preface pp.7-9. Fox, 'Satire and Censorship', p.331 describes, English Caricature as 'a workmanlike compendium'; 'but given the scope of the subject, it might have been so much more than a useful guide. It would have been appropriate to have discussed the role of caricature in English society in much greater depth: its importance as an essentially urban phenomenon dependent on speed of news, gossip and rumour. Or its significance as a purely literary genre: is this one of the few ways in which the English can accept art [...]? And taking into account that the exhibition relied upon two major individual collections amassed by formidable men, namely Horace Walpole and George IV, would not some analysis of their range of purchases have been in order?'.

61
37. Fox, 'Satire and Censorship' p. 329.
38. ibid.
42. As Porter observes, *P&P* p. 188.
44. Korshin mentions, pp. 271-72, the use of typology in the prints produced urging the repeal of the Jewish Naturalisation Act of 1753 and Hogarth's *Harlot's Progress*; his sources are Atherton, *Political Prints* and Paulson, *HLAT*. Korshin also reproduces, plate 22, Gillray's millenarian satire, *Presages of the Millennium*; with *The Destruction of the Faithful, as Revealed to R. Brothers the Prophet &c.*, 1795 (misdated by Korshin to c. 1791; clearly he has not looked closely at the print, whence he might have established this from the publication line, legible even in his small reproduction); Korshin discusses the immediate context of this satire on p. 332, without reference to the print reproduced.
Chapter III: Periodisation: The Problem of the Missing Century

It will not have escaped notice that, with only a few exceptions, the period covered by the existing literature on English political prints is relatively short. With the exception of the very general surveys of 'caricature', the focus is on the eighteenth century. On closer inspection, the ground covered shrinks still further; curiously truncated at one end and extended at its other, 'the eighteenth century' in most cases proves to mean the decades 1760-1830. With the decades 1780-1820 being perceived and presented, by almost universal consent, as the 'Golden Age of English political caricature', even the period 1760-1830 is not immune from abbreviation.

Excepting that body of work which focusses on Hogarth, and the handful of studies devoted to George Townshend, the decades preceding 1760 have not figured largely in studies. But while the period 1720-1760 has never been entirely neglected, it remains the case that for both 1700-1720 and, it is worth noting, post-1830, there is comparative silence.¹

By 'neglect' or 'silence' is meant not just the ostensible chronology as professed in the - often misleading - titles of works, but the proportion of text and illustration devoted to prints of a given period. Above all, with most of the works in question resorting, at some point or another, and to a greater or lesser degree, to a narrative account of the 'growth' or 'development' of the genre, it refers to the tenor of this narrative.

Certainly when it comes to delineating the precise historical boundaries of 'English political caricature' or 'graphic satire', there is near-unanimity. Although at first sight incompatible with the post-1760 emphasis of most accounts, '1720', and 'the South Sea Bubble' -
or else, in more biographically-structured accounts, 'Hogarth', (in some instances both together) - are commonly presented as marking the 'beginnings' of something called 'the English tradition of graphic satire', and '1832' or 'the 1830s' its 'end'. 1841, the date of the first appearance of *Punch*, is a date which also appears in this context. The exhibition title, 'Masters of English Caricature, 1750-1850', represents a rather daring forward transposition of what is essentially the same model, but the fact that this exhibition catalogue belies its title and begins with the South Sea Bubble, is indicative of the degree to which there is consensus on this point.2 (Where there are dissenting voices, they are - for reasons which have more to do with the primacy accorded the idiom of caricature in the literature than with the evidence - for moving this 'take-off point' forward, to 1760 or 1770, or even 1780.3)

While it is possible to encounter statements to the effect that 'the propaganda value of printed satires, and their power of influencing the public mind, was not apparent until George II's reign', the extent to which the South Sea Bubble has become the official starting-point for any account of 18th-century English graphic political satire is demonstrated by Pat Rogers's comment on Atherton's alternative choice of 1727;

the author knows he is flying in the face of a well-grounded opinion that the South Sea Bubble produced 'a landmark in English cartoon history' as Dorothy George paraphrased it.

Thus we are informed that the 'development' of 'political cartoons' may be traced 'from their anonymous beginnings in 1720'; that the South Sea Bubble prints represent 'the first popular outbreak of cartoons in England, the seeds from which one of the greatest traditions of satire and caricature in the world was to grow'; that 'the many satirical prints it inspired,
effectively mark the beginning of an unrivalled English tradition'. 5 Alternatively, 'the "modern" political cartoon begins with Hogarth'. 6

Klingender speaks of a tradition of graphic political satire which 'began with the end of Queen Anne's reign and broke off c.1840'; significantly, post-1815 'developments' are relegated to an 'Epilogue', just as the post-1832 period is the 'Postscript' to EPC2. 7 That, post-c.1820, the political print declines is a received wisdom, with most accounts of the following decade inclining to the valedictory mode:

The period of the social and political print in England [...] closed, in terms of mood, about 1830, with the last of William Heath's (Paul Pry) prints, and in actual fact, about twenty years later with the last of John Doyle's (HB) more refined and Victorian-like prints. Others would mark the demise of the 'eighteenth-century tradition of graphic satire' with the first rather than the last 'HB' print; Charles Press sees a 'decline' in the 1820s; 'the day of the Georgian caricature symbolically drew to a close a few years before the last George did. This was in 1827', with the appearance of the first 'HB' print; 'the new style marked the beginning of the Victorian cartoon'. 9 David Alexander opts for a decline in 1830s, allowing for a 'brief revival of powerful work with the campaign leading up to the Reform Bill in 1832'. 10 'By 1835 the independent comic print was becoming a minor amusement'. 11 'By the time Victoria came to the throne, the tradition of brightly-coloured caricature was played out'. 12 Coupe professes to see not only a 'striking reduction' in the number of prints produced after 1830, but 'an equally remarkable change in their nature', as the impudence of Gillray's 'pictorial libels' is replaced by the dignity of Tenniel and Leech. 13 Michael Wynn-Jones, an honourable exception to the 'end at 1830' rule, nonetheless inclines to orthodoxy to the extent that he posits '1720' and '1830' as
'milestones' and can also write, of the 'classic' political caricature; 'By 1830, this rich vein had exhausted itself, its greatest exponents either dead or turned to other work'.

Reasons given for this decline, or in some accounts the outright demise of the idiom, vary from the aesthetic-technical - 'a great transition was taking place in terms of style and publication - a shift from broadsheet to periodical, from etching to lithography and wood-engraving', 'the regular production of separate caricature prints did not begin until after the middle of the eighteenth century and came to an end in the 1840s, when the advent of Punch and other illustrated periodical journals killed the demand for them' - to the socio-cultural: Victorian decorum enervated the idiom, Chartism and trades unionism furnished an alternative focus for the attention of 'the working classes', and as a result, 'graphic social criticism was never again to reach the height in England begun by Hogarth's first tentative efforts' [my emphasis].

1720 may be the orthodox starting-date, but few choose to linger in the following decades. Outwith the work of Hogarth, there seems little that is worthy of comment; 'even the age of Hogarth saw only stop-and-start developments [...] It was the reign of George III that put political caricature on the map'.

Superficially, this comparative neglect of the decades 1700-1760 corresponds to J.C.D. Clark's observation that, for the [political] historian 'the years c.1714 - 1760 were terra incognita.' Similarly, the apparent elasticity of 'the 18th century', its vulnerability to chronological manipulation:

If "the eighteenth-century" meant, in practice, 1714-89 or even 1760-84, it is [not] surprising that students concluded that little of importance can have transpired in a period which allowed itself so pusillanimously to be truncated.
The elasticity of one boundary at least is noted by Rogers in his criticism of the chronology for which Atherton opted in his Political Prints; 1727 is condemned as an arbitrary starting point which determines the exclusion of much that is of importance, yet

at the other end, Atherton is prepared to stretch his boundaries to catch Bute, though not far enough to get in Wilkes troubles of 1768. It might have been profitable to have used as few scruples at the opening of the period.

Similarly, in a study with the ostensible finishing-date of c.1742, the temptation to skip forward to 1765 in order to get in a useful quotation proves irresistible.

In Clark's account, the protean nature of 'the 18th century' has encouraged neglect and underestimation of the period. In the wake of Clark's criticisms, references to 'the long 18th century' appear with increasing frequency, but as far as political prints are concerned, the truncated '18th century' of 1760-1830 continues to be the almost exclusive focus for study. Indeed, the periodisation of the study of English political prints represents nothing less than the inversion of Clark's model of the periodisation of historical studies. Clark's impressionistic estimate of 'the community of professional historians as a whole' suggested 'that for every ten scholars working on the years 1500-1600 there are three for 1660-1832, and thirty for post-1832': so far from being overshadowed by 'heavyweight' periods at either side, 'the 18th century' of the political print enjoys an independent existence.

Where the study of English political graphics diverges most significantly from Clark's model is in the almost total neglect of the 17th century and it is to this 'missing century' that this thesis will repeatedly turn, arguing that its neglect illuminates as does nothing else
the problems and prejudice which have inhibited scholarship in the field in general.

The paucity of reference works and of secondary accounts which address the earlier century other than in passing is revealing. While the post-1832 silence is explicable, if not excusable, in that neither the Catalogue nor EPC1 proceed beyond this date, and the extent to which scholars have depended on both is considerable, 17th-century prints are not undocumented. The first two volumes of the Catalogue cover the period c.1600-1720. These volumes have, however, been described, not unjustly, as 'chronologically capricious and far from complete'. This much is apparent to any scholar using the volumes in question, and while this has by no means invalidated this part of the Catalogue, the task of revision is long overdue. Unfortunately, the lack of interest in this period which has for so long been a distinguishing characteristic of print studies, suggests that this situation is unlikely to be remedied for a considerable time, so that reservations about the 'fragmentary' nature of the main source of documentation for this period may stand.

In addition to the Catalogue, with which a proportion of its entries overlaps, the other important source of documentation must be G.K. Fortescue's Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, & MSS Relating to the Civil War, Commonwealth and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661. In the broader sense of the definition 'political graphics', frontispieces and title-pages are covered by A.F. Johnson, A Catalogue of Engraved and Etched English Title-pages..., and Corbett and Lightbown, The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-page in England 1550-1660. A.M. Hind's Engraving In England in the 16th and 17th Centuries. A Descriptive Catalogue, which in fact extends no further than 1660, reproduces several prints
catalogued by Stephens, together with many other important images. In his History of Engraving and Etching, however, Hind subscribes to the idea that there was no native tradition of graphic political satire pre-Hogarth.

If works of reference are few and limited, the secondary literature for this period cannot be described as anything other than uneven. The aforementioned excellent study of emblematic title-pages, together with several essays of importance to political graphics of the emblematic type, must be set against a paucity of studies examining the prints of this period as political propaganda. I have been able to establish the existence of only one detailed study for the period 1640-60; the (1987) thesis by T.M. Williams, 'Polemical Prints of the English Revolution, 1640-1660'. Its many flaws notwithstanding, its usefulness, and Williams's innovativeness in addressing these decades, must be acknowledged. The claim that 'an excellent and detailed discussion of early satires may be found in the introduction and first three chapters' of EPC is overenthusiastic. The period c.1600 - 1720 is accorded 72 pages, out of a total of 260 and, in terms of illustration, 20 plates out of 96 in EPC1, including the frontispiece are pre-1720. EPC1 provides no more than a comprehensive and intelligent introduction to the period. That, with the exception of Williams, it remains the only introduction to the period of any merit, is indicative of the 18th-century bias of scholarship in the field.

Ostensibly, two of the seven volumes in the Chadwyck-Healey series cover the period from 1600. Unfortunately, the authors prove to have adopted the orthodox account of the 'development' of the genre (cf. Chapter IV), with the result that, although useful in reproducing many prints seldom seen, the works in question do not otherwise serve the earlier period well.
Well might Celina Fox describe this series as a 'source for the study of Hanoverian, and to a lesser extent, Stuart, England.' [my emphasis] 32

The 'fine art' perspective which renders the studies by Hind of only limited use, informs and thus restricts both Richard Godfrey's account of the 17th century in Printmaking in England, and David Alexander's essay, 'English Prints and Printmaking' in The Age of William III and Mary II. 33 Both refer only incidentally to 'political satires', and both repeat the received opinion that little of intrinsic merit or interest was produced during this period, a statement which in the context of Alexander's essay is difficult to reconcile with the array of striking images reproduced in the catalogue as a whole. 34

For the period 1660-1720, a handful of good specialist monographs exist for Romeyn de Hooghe, although as far as I have been able to discover, not one devoted exclusively to his political propaganda. 35 The English artist Francis Barlow (responsible for the scatological satire, The Egg of Dutch Rebellion, [Plate 1]), is the subject of one study, but the author's treatment of Barlow's political prints is depressingly conventional. 36 An essay by Sheila O'Connell on Simon Gribelin, designer of two important polemical prints of the Seven Bishops, mentions these only in passing. 37 As the previous chapter observed, amid a profusion of biographies of Hogarth and the artists of the so-called 'Golden age', a study of Stephen Colledge and of the rival pictorial propaganda produced during the Exclusion Crisis and the respective roles of Colledge and Roger L'Estrange in this episode has yet to be written. 38 Nor, as yet, is there a specific study of the body of prints produced during the Sacheverell Crisis (1709-12) although these were accorded a separate and extremely useful section in the Speck/Madan Critical Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell. 39
The catalogue, *The Age of William III and Mary II* is exemplary not least in that the extent to which it reproduces contemporary political graphics, satirical and non-satirical, throughout the entire text reveals the richness and intrinsic interest of this period, and of this particular vein of source-material. An earlier exhibition catalogue, *The Orange and the Rose: Holland and Britain in the Age of Observation* (1964) is also useful, but contains few plates. A handful of studies which demonstrate the potential of research in these decades exists: Alan R. Young, 'The English Civil War Flags: Emblematic Devices and Propaganda'; M.M. Goldsmith, 'Hobbes's Ambiguous Politics' and 'Picturing Hobbes's Politics: The Illustrations to Philosophicall Rudiments of Government and Society (1651)' and Craig Hartley and Catherine MacLeod, 'Supposititious Prints', a study of the satirical reworkings of mezzotint portraits of the infant James III.

To an extent, the paucity of studies of 17th-century English political graphics reflects the state of research with regard to the other visual arts of this period, and in particular the period 1660-1720; as Robert McCubbin writes, 'the pictorial arts during the 1690s are only beginning to receive adequate scholarly attention'. Still only too prevalent is the received opinion that the 'age of Richardson and Kneller' was 'the most drab in the history of British painting', and, inseparably from this, paradoxically, a highly nativist perspective which would exclude the achievements wrought in this country by continental practitioners and continental influences, the better perhaps to shore up the nativist thesis of the supreme importance of Hogarth.

As far as political graphics is concerned, a similar nativism is responsible for the distorted picture of the 'pre-Hogarth' period. Notably, *EPC1* excludes the work of
de Hooghe on the grounds of the Dutch origins of both the artist and his prints, and in so doing further contracts an already condensed account of the period. EPC1 at least acknowledges the existence of an English tradition pre-1720; the consequences of George's nativism are to be seen in most subsequent accounts.

As recently as 1986 it was possible to read that,

as with so many of the arts, Britain entered late into the field of the political print. Renaissance Italy had pioneered the caricature, heavy with emblems [sic] and animal physiognomy, and the United Provinces mobilized the trade in prints. England's 'century of revolution' produced but a thin crop [my emphasis] [...] and as late as the South Sea Bubble, most visual satires hailed from Holland. [...] Even the age of Hogarth saw only stop-and-start developments [...] It was the reign of George III that put political cartoons on the map. 

That this assertion, which is nothing more than the reiteration of received opinion, should appear in the context of an otherwise robust critique of research in the field indicates perhaps better than anything else the extent to which a negative - and inaccurate - perception of the 'early' period has become historical 'fact', and it is this - the narrative tenor of the secondary literature, as exemplified in the above quotation - which, as much as the absence of more specialist studies, underlines the extent to which the 17th is the 'missing century' of English print studies.

The problem is less that the more general works in the field, to which the scholar might first be expected to turn, exclude the 17th century in the sense of denying the existence of English-produced prints before c.1720; Godfrey's V&A catalogue does, after all, have the ostensible starting-date of 'c.1620', and George can write, in EPC1, that 'if the symbolism of the Middle Ages and Reformation was the seed-bed of the English cartoon, its nursery was the graphic satire of the Great
Rebellion, when many of the perennial devices of the political caricaturist made a seemingly first appearance'. Where the secondary literature has failed the 17th century, and where it has proved so pernicious, is in the cursory and, almost without exception, pejorative picture given of these prints; the extent to which this is the case will become clear in the following chapters.

Arguably, the reiteration of assertions to the effect that prints pre-c.1720 are insignificant, in number and in quality, is more damaging than any outright omission of the period from the text books and exhibition catalogues. Similarly, the relative absence of illustration from this period in much of the secondary literature can only reinforce the erroneous impression of the poverty - artistic and numerical - of the period which is likely to have been conveyed by the text.

It has been estimated that less than 10% of the collection as catalogued in the BM Catalogue (in total some 17,000 prints) dates from pre-1714. Historical and iconographical significance cannot, or should not, be measured quantatively, however, and this is particularly the case with these prints. This 10% represents a century of political graphics of a force and quality - aesthetic and polemical - that gives the lie to claims that 'the propaganda value of printed satires, and their power of influencing the public mind, was not apparent until George II's reign', or that the Bubble prints represent the first 'popular outbreak of cartoons in England'. Leaving aside for the moment reservations about the appropriateness of the epithet 'popular' when applied to these large, elaborate engravings, to present them as 'the first' is to ignore the existence of countless prints of the previous century, certain of which may be argued to have a superior claim to the problematic epithet 'popular'. To describe the Bubble
prints as heralding 'the growing public taste for savage invective that was characteristic of Georgian society' is to ignore the equally savage treatment of individuals and competing ideologies in the prints of the Rebellion, 1640-60 and its aftermath, 1660-1720.

While the quantitative development of, in particular, the single-sheet graphic political satire during the 18th century is both irrefutable and significant, scholarly reappraisal and recognition of the earlier period is long overdue. In 1947 it was asked 'Is there room for another book on [...] Rowlandson?'; the answer was in the affirmative. For as long as research in the period 1600-1720 remains moribund, there is no room for another book - or exhibition - on Rowlandson, or on Gillray or on any of the other artists of the so-called 'Golden Age'.

A moratorium is an unlikely prospect, however. The fact that the concentration of studies on c.1760-c.1830 has not, as far as I am aware, been a subject for comment, let alone criticism, is indicative of the passive acceptance of, and tendency to repeat, received opinion by which too much writing in the field has been characterised. For as long as it remains conventional that 'relatively few political prints were produced by British artists [note the nativism] before the last years of the Stuart century', the incentive to take the study of political prints backwards, outside the safe borders of c.1720-c.1830, will be lacking. The self-perpetuating nature of this, and related orthodoxies, in what in any case continues to be a minor field of scholarship, means that the prospects for the rehabilitation of the period are dim.

That it is possible, at one and the same time, to acknowledge - as EPC1 does - the importance of the period of the Great Rebellion for the development of an indigenous tradition of graphic political comment and satire, yet still speak of the Bubble prints as the
'first' 'significant' 18th-century prints, (thereby excluding the prints produced during the Sacheverell crisis) is indicative of the grip which conventional chronology has exerted, and continues to exert, on the study of political prints.  

In the field of political graphics, then, it would seem to be the 17th century which occupies the uncertain position of its successor in Clark's model; perceived as an 'interlude', as one chapter title would have it, between those heavy-weights 'Graphic Satire of the [German] Reformation' and 'The Golden Age of English Caricature'.

Of the pernicious effects of such periodisation on historical writing, Clark notes that 'fragmenting the continuum 1660-1832 emphasised transitions rather than continuity'. The following chapters will demonstrate the extent to which this has been a characteristic of writing in this field to date.

Clark's observation is equally pertinent to the neglect of post-1832 graphic political satire. Certainly the prints reproduced by Wynn-Jones reveal the extent to which much of the iconography of 1760-1832 survived; an iconography itself derived from 17th-century prints. This iconographic tenacity awaits its scholar; study of this aspect would go some way towards reintegrating graphic political satire post-1832 with the tradition established in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Although it is my contention that it is the neglect of the 17th century which is of greater significance in the context of the historiography of the subject, and although it is with the neglect of this period that this thesis is concerned, the abrupt conclusion of the majority of print studies at c.1830-40, and in particular the grounds on which this has been justified, has some bearing on the neglect of the earlier period.
It is possible to explain the scarcity of studies addressing material produced after 1832 by the fact that the Catalogue ends here, as does EPC, and the dependence of scholars on both is considerable. The almost universal reluctance to pursue the subject beyond this date (at least so far as English prints are concerned; at this point most studies either end or shift to France where Daumier is seen as taking up the 'English' tradition and reinvigorating it), is, for all that, remarkable, although, like the paucity of studies for the 17th century, it would seem to have escaped comment. Where the termination of studies at c.1830-40 has been justified, however, the reasons proffered are significant.

The grounds of 'stylistic' or idiomatic change, for instance, - which alleged change has in any case gone unquestioned and unexplored - is symptomatic of a preoccupation with 'style' and 'stylistic development' which, this thesis will argue, has been detrimental to the study of the material. Similarly, the grounds of a change of format - from single-sheet production to graphic political comment within the journal or the newspaper - is unconvincing in the context of the longer period c.1600-c.1900, in which it represents a return to a 17th-century norm, and in which it is the single-sheet, coloured 18th-century caricature, of which so much has been made, which appears the aberration. That this should be used as justification for not addressing this material is, moreover, symptomatic of a prevalent antipathy towards images which appear in the context of a text; an antipathy that has contributed to the neglect of much of the political graphics of the 17th century. That both justifications have been accepted for so long is indicative of the extent to which a particular perception of 'the 18th century' and of the nature and function of 'the eighteenth-century political print' has shaped the
form and content of the available literature. Although it is not, as I have noted, a subject upon which there has been either comment or criticism, the extent to which research has been confined to so short a period is remarkable. It is not, however, inexplicable. The next chapter will suggest that the periodisation of print studies, and the concomitant neglect of the 17th century, are the consequence of the adoption of a strongly linear perspective in looking at the subject as a whole; this is evident in a preoccupation with the 'development' of the prints, and in an emphasis on the so-called 'Golden Age of Political Caricature' (c.1780-1820). In this schema, 17th-century political graphics cannot be recognised as anything other than 'immature', 'undeveloped' precursors to the 18th century and the 'Golden Age'. It is this which makes it possible for the period c.1600 -c.1720 to be represented as an 'interlude'. This linear perspective, one adopted almost without exception, and it is this which the next chapter will examine.

The neglect of this period is not, however, wholly explicable in terms of this linear, narrative approach to the study of English prints. After all, if it is in the 17th century that the English 'tradition of graphic political satire' can be said to begin, it would be reasonable to imagine that the prospect of extending the linear model to the earlier century, the opportunity to put the 'beginnings' back from the South Sea Bubble to, for instance, 1640, would be welcomed. Yet this is a temptation which has been consistently resisted. This thesis will argue that the neglect of the 17th-century political print which this chapter has identified is neither accidental nor capricious; it is the consequence of a consensus on the part of those who have to date written on the subject as to what a political print is, what it should look like, its function, and the audience at which it is aimed.
1. The period is, of course, covered in general surveys such as English Caricature, 1620 to the Present and Feaver, Masters of Caricature. Michael Wynn-Jones, A Cartoon History of Britain reproduces more than the usual representative handful of prints.


2. Cited in the catalogue, Anglo-French Art and Travel Society/Minto Wilson, Exhibition of a Century of French Caricature, 1750-1850, with some English Caricatures of the Napoleonic Period (London: 1934) p. 8. On p. 77 we read that the South Sea Bubble 'created a fresh, and what was of far more importance, a permanent demand for caricature in England'.

3. Charles Press, 'The Georgian Political Print and Democratic Institutions', Comparative Studies p. 218 'as of 1760, its full political potential had yet to be exploited'; cf. pp. 216, 217, 222, 224. Bevis Hillier, Cartoons and Caricatures p. 36 claims that 'it was the venom and popularity of Gillray's prints that first made politicians realize the importance of caricature as a party political propaganda weapon', after which it replaced verse satire. John Nash, 'Hogarth and Gillray' in ed. Jack Purdie, Aspects of the New Pictish Art (1991) no pagination, 'The political caricature [...] first sprang into being, and achieved wide popularity, during the second half of the 18th-century'.
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4. Rogers TLS, p.898, although Rogers adds 'The natural [sic] date for beginning this survey would have been 1714 or even earlier'. Cf. Wynn-Jones, Cartoon History of Britain p.8 'There is nothing arbitrary in choosing 1720 as a starting point'. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank p.13 'For our purpose, social satire begins with Hogarth, though for a century there had been a sporadic output of political or 'emblematic' prints'; Paulson, 'The Severed Head' in ed. Cuno, French Caricature p.55.

In fact, Political Prints is far from removing this conventional landmark: 'The South Sea Bubble generated the first large-scale production of engraved, satirical prints of good quality. Many, however, came from the Netherlands. Not until the 1720s did an indigenous graphic satire take hold' (p.1); 'The South Sea Scheme [BM 1722] is one of many prints on the subject which marks the beginning of a new period in the history of English graphic satire' (p.48). Atherton's disavowal of the South Sea Bubble as the starting-date for the genre - and his chronology of its 'development' - are grounded in his association of the genre's development as an instrument of organised 'Opposition' (p.260).

7. F.G. Klingender, Hogarth and English Caricature pp.iii,xii; George, EPC2 p.257.

The paradigmatic account is that of George, EPC2 pp.204 (after the death of Queen Caroline 'the Gillray school was in its penultimate phase'), 218 ('The year 1828 saw a last flare-up of the coloured etching in the Gillray tradition before its virtual extinction through the popularity of HB's [...] Political Sketches which dominated the thirties and early forties'), 257 ('By 1832 the coloured etching in the Gillray tradition was virtually dead. As an artform, it was worn out after a run of some fifty years'). This last remark is revealing, indicating the extent to which prints scholarship has been preoccupied with the coloured political caricatures of the so-called 'Golden Age'.

EPC2 continues to inform accounts of this 'decline'; see, for example, Patten, GCLTA p.268 'The separately published caricature experienced a brief revival with William Heath's "Paul Pry" squibs but after 1830 caricature magazines replaced independent plates, lithography superseded etching, decorous jokes and puns supplanted licentious grotesques...'. Patten's footnote; 'See EPC2 chaps 11,12'.

the caricature trade had its last powerful fling during the battle over reform in 1830-32'; Shikes, p. 94 'The ascendancy of the banking and merchant middle-class signalled the decline of the satiric print. But just before it waned, graphic political attack reached its zenith in the agitation for the Reform Bill'; Godfrey, English Caricature p. 97 'The Reform Bill of 1832 was the last great issue to be colourfully debated in the printshop windows' and p. 106 'Caricatures dealing with the Reform Bill represent the last great flourish of the hand-coloured etching, soon to become obsolete'. Patten, GCLTA pp. 308 'at the end of the period the broadsheet caricature temporarily revived under the impetus of Reform'; 341 'the market for broadside caricatures had picked up markedly - its last temporary flare before fizzling [out] after 1832'.

Patten elsewhere (p. 169) suggests that 'the apogee of caricature' was the Queen Caroline agitation of 1820.


12. Godfrey, Printmaking p. 78. Cf. idem, English Caricature p. 97 'By 1830 when William IV came to the throne, the tradition of the hand-coloured etching, often coarse and outspoken, was beginning to fall from favour, and by 1840 it was extinct'.


14. Wynn-Jones, pp. 9, 8; Atherton, "The Mob" in Eighteenth-Century Caricature' Eighteenth-Century Studies p. 57 'By the 1840s, the distinctive caricature print of the Georgian era had given way to what eventually became the modern newspaper cartoon'.

15. Feaver, p. 8; Hibbert, p. 75. Cf. Patten, GCLTA p. 308 'the lithographic cartoon popularized by "HB", the illustrated newspaper, and the caricature magazine superseded the earlier format and mode'; Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p. 227; with the appearance in 1832 of Figaro in London the Georgian print of caricature was dead and a new style of cartoon was born. It would flourish most successfully and even gain its name "cartoon" in the pages of Punch, founded in 1841 [...] The political print, independent of book or magazine, was a dying art form due to technical changes, but its practitioners did not quite know it yet. Changes in printmaking technique are emphasised by Feaver, p. 66, those of format by Godfrey, English Caricature p. 33 Wardroper, Cruikshank 200 pp. 13, 39 accounts for the decline in terms of 'a great growth of illustrated publishing, including journals that could sell for less than the price of a single print'.

16. Shikes, p. 95. Cf. Wardroper, Cruikshank 200 pp. 12, 13, 39: 'rising pressures for decorum were one reason' for the post-1830 decline of 'the traditional independently-printed caricature'. Patten, GCLTA
'between 1828 and 1832, [...] Britain passed from the last flickerings of Georgian culture to the first lights of Victorianism'; p.391 Patten notes that after c.1830 reissues or adaptations of Gillray and George Cruikshank prints were toned down; see also pp.234-36.

Marguerite Mahood, The Loaded Line: Australian Political Caricature 1788-1901 (Melbourne:1973) pp.7-8 'Democracy, with its nose to a mechanically-propelled grindstone [...] had neither the time nor taste for the bawdy frivolity of the eighteenth century. The social and ideological change showed in the satirical print'. The 'political' thesis entails the conflation of the market for the Gillray-type political print and the cheap publications described by Patricia Anderson. The technical and socio-cultural 'explanations' may themselves be conflated on occasion; 'In England, perhaps because it was the Victorian age, the boxwood engraving was preferred' - Press, Political Cartoon p.43.

17. Porter, LRB p.19. Negot of the post-1720, pre-1760 print is acknowledged by Fox, 'The English Satirical Print' pp.465-66 and Godfrey, English Caricature p.12, the efforts of Hogarth's contemporaries 'are too often ignored'. The period saw 'an increase in the quality and quantity of satires, especially in the 1740s' and 'a number of images to rival the better-known prints of the later "Golden Age"'. The exception to this rule is Atherton, with his 1727-63 chronology.

19. ibid, p.8.
22. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion p.7, n..
23. Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xxx n.24. For the need to update the Stephens volumes of the Catalogue see Part II, Chapter IV,
24. 2 volumes, (1908). For the genesis and importance of the Thomason collection see Potter, Secret Rites pp.1-3.
27. A History of Engraving and Etching, p.232. George at least acknowledges (in EPC1) the existence of 81
17th-century prints; many of the statements to be found in the literature obscure this fact: for example, Percival, *Walpole Ballads* (1916), p.xxvii; significantly, Percival sees prints 1720-22 not as the beginnings of an English tradition but as the revival of the 17th-century Dutch tradition of circulating satirical prints in England; Kunzle, *Early Comic Strip* p.151 rightly views the Bubble prints as the last of the international prints by which the 17th century was characterised, prints with inscriptions in English, French, Dutch and Latin. Ibid, p.122 claims that 17th century England saw only 'sporadic outbursts of single cartoons'.

J.H. Plumb, *The Commercialization of Leisure in Eighteenth-Century England* (Reading:1973) p.6, claims, erroneously, that 'there were very few satirical prints' in the late 17th century other than those produced in response to the Popish Plot. Roylance, *Age of Horace Walpole* n.p. claims that the prints circulated in England in the 17th century were Dutch.

Other works which ignore the pre-Hogarth or pre-Bubble print include Iannone, *Comedy and Satire*, Olson, *Emblems*, Patten, *GOLTA*, (p.69 'From Hogarth forward, pictorial satires on contemporary events had been a staple of London [...] book and print dealers'). Michel Melot claims, in 'Caricature and the Revolution' in ed. Cuno, *French Caricature* p.27 'that the first volleys of political caricatures occurred contemporaneously in France and England between 1710 and 1720'. Klaus Herding 'Visual Codes' ibid, p.96 'First established in England in the eighteenth century...'.


To an extent, the chronology of prints literature reflects a fundamental semantic problem; if by 'caricature' the portrait-charge is meant, then Herding is not incorrect; Melot uses 'caricature' generically and as such his statement is incorrect. For the advantages of greater precision in the descriptive terminology of prints study see Part II, Chapter III.

28. See n.41 below.

Williams's list of illustrations, pp.227-63 is itself a corrective to the conventional view that very few prints appeared during these decades. Many of the
prints discussed by Williams would be disqualified by conventional political prints scholarship either on the grounds of their foreign origin (for example the many Royalist prints of the 1650s) or their status as frontispieces or as pamphlet literature. An abbreviated and more lucid version of Williams's thesis may be found in her "Magnetic Figures": Polemical Prints of the English Revolution in eds. Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn, Renaissance Bodies: the Human Figure in English Culture 1340-1660 (London: 1990) pp. 86-110.

30. Dolmetsch, Rebellion and Reconciliation p. 10, n. 1
31. Miller, Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832; Sharpe, Crime and the Law in English Satirical Prints 1600-1832.
32. Fox, 'The English Satirical Print' p. 463. Porter, LRB p. 19 describes the series as 'reproducing the cream of British political cartoons spanning the century from Hogarth to the Cruikshanks'.
33. Godfrey, Printmaking Chapters 1-3, especially pp. 16-17, 23; idem, English Caricature 1620 to the Present, in which 5 out of 205 exhibits are pre-1700 (a similar criticism was made of the exhibition Folly and Vice by Craig Hartley, PtQtlv VII (1990) in which only one print out of 130 was pre-1600, notwithstanding the emphasis on the significance of 16th-century satires); Godfrey, review of Alexander Globe, Peter Stent PtQtlv VI (1989) 338-39, 17th-century English printmaking occupies 'only a modest place in the foothills of European print history'. Cf. Alexander, 'English Prints and Printmaking' in eds Mccubbin and Hamilton-Phillips, The Age of William III and Mary II 272-80.
34. This catalogue and Alexander's essay were reviewed by none other than Godfrey, PtQtlv VII (1990) 322-23, who again expresses his antipathy to the 17th-century satirical print: 'Mezzotint portraits jostle for attention with woodcut broadsides, topography, allegorical frontispieces and ponderous satires' [my emphasis]. Godfrey does, however, suggest that the polemical and propagandist images touched upon in the essays of Alexander and Schuckmaan might have merited a separate essay.
35. Significantly, p. 1, Wilson refers to the years 1680-1715 as a 'lost period' in art historical scholarship. I regret that have not been able to see Louise V. Hunnigher 'Romeyne de Hooghe: A Critical Study' unpublished Master's thesis, UNYC 1964.
36. Hodnett, Francis Barlow p. 30 'the laboured allegories and brutal attacks common in the broadsides of the day, of which his devil and egg cartoon is unfortunately typical, despite its superior draughtsmanship' and 35ff. Conversely, see Godfrey, Printmaking p. 23.
37. PtQtlv II (1985) 27-38. Godfrey, Printmaking p. 31
makes no reference to Gribelin's political prints.

38. Although see Harris, London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II pp.106,118,133,134,135,137; Rahn, 'A Ra-Ree Show', op.cit.

39. A Critical Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell (Lawrence, Kansas:1978); see also EPC1 pp.65-72; Kunzle, The Early Comic Strip pp.149--51; Press, The Political Cartoon (1977) p.39 is unusual in acknowledging these prints and offers an interesting historiographical reason for their neglect:

'the breakthrough for the political and social print occurred in England in 1710. A great number of [...] political prints, relatively speaking, were produced [...] about the affair involving Sacheverell. [...] These cartoons may be of great interest to historians, but few are reproduced today, either because most subsequent historians have been Whigs or because the cartoons themselves do not seem [...] very well done'.

See also Abbie Turner Soudie, The Sacheverell Affair (New York:1939) pp.11-16. G. Holmes, The Trial of Dr Sacheverell (London:1973) reproduces, but fails to discuss, the satirical and polemical prints occasioned by the trial.

40. (London, Victoria and Albert Museum:1964) pp.53-55, Plate XXII.


43. Ellis Waterhouse, Painting in Britain 1530-1790 (London:1953) p.98, quoted M.R. Brownell, Alexander Pope and the Arts of Georgian England (Oxford:1978) p.9; O'Connell, Gribelin, p.32 speaks of 'the moribund atmosphere of late seventeenth-century England'. Conversely, Oliver Millar and Margaret Whinney, p.14; 'The "state of the arts" that we associate with Hogarth was already formed in the age of Kneller and Wren'. For the 'centrality' of Hogarth to the 'development' of graphic political satire, see Chapter IV below.

44. Porter, LRB p.19; idem, P&P p.190 'Relatively few political prints were produced by British artists before the last years of the Stuart century' [my emphasis]. Cf. Atherton Political Prints pp.61,1,31,259; Thomas, American Revolution p.12 'Political cartoons in Britain had been late to start and slow to develop'.

84
Porter's reference to British artists echoes the nativism of the literature: cf. Hodnett, Francis Barlow pp.25,26; Barlow is the 'first identifiable English artist of any distinction to have dealt with contemporary affairs before Hogarth'; p.26 Hollar 'anticipated Barlow both as reporter and propagandist, but he was neither English-born nor up to his usual level in this mode'. Cf. Godfrey, Printmaking pp.19-22.

45. EPC1 p.14,
46. Fox, 'The English Satirical Print' p.463. Cf. Miller, Religion p.15. It should also be borne in mind that the Catalogue does not reflect the holdings of the Department, not least with respect to subsequent acquisitions; see Part II, Chapter IV

47. F. Gordon Roe, Rowlandson, the Life and Art of a British Genius (Leigh on Sea:1947) p.13. Conversely, Paul Goldman, reviewing his own Rumbustious World B.M. travelling exhibition in PtQtly VII (1990) Shorter Notices, claims that whereas Rowlandson's drawings are 'much admired and often exhibited, the same cannot be said of the prints which have been comparatively little studied and infrequently exhibited in any number'. Still more recently, I read that Peter Wagner 'will edit the graphic works of Thomas Rowlandson' Word and Image 7 (1991) 329.

49. Shikes, Chapter IV; Shikes adheres to a conventional chronology for the English print.

50. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion pp.7-8.
51. Scholars have yet to accommodate this iconographic continuity; see Part II, Chapter V. For Tenniel's use of allegorical female personifications in his political satires, see Michael Hancher, 'Tenniel's Allegorical Cartoons'; a paper read at the first Minnesota conference on cultural emblematics, Minnesota 27-28 April 1989; I am grateful to Michael Bath for letting me read this paper.

52. Classically, George, EPC2 p.230; 'The ending of the Gillray tradition coincided with the passing of the leadership in political caricature from England to France'. Hofmann, pp.36,41; English Caricature p.107 'Caricature suffered the sea-change of a Channel crossing'; Wood, Folly p.11 in the 19th century, 'England ceased to be a leading force in print satire'; Wynn-Jones, Cartoon History of Britain p.8 'in France, Daumier and Philipon's publications excelled at a time when the old Gillray tradition in England was running out of inspiration'; Iannone, p.10; Patten, GCLTA p.268 'the cutting edge of satire passed over to France, where Charles Philipon's great weekly La Caricature waged a "guerre de Philipon à Philippe" and the bourgeois monarchy'. George, EPC2 p.230, claims that French supremacy after c.1830 is demonstrated by a comparison of the political lithographs of Daumier and HB. While
Daumier's political work may deserve the praise heaped upon it by prints scholars, his non-political work does not stand scrutiny; English Caricature p.107 may contrast his output with the 19th-century English tradition of 'comic art', but Daumier was responsible for innumerable social satires and 'comic' prints as blandly unfunny as anything produced in England; compare English Caricature nos 160 and 166 with nos 73,93,94,132,149,151,158 in Honore Daumier 1808-1870: the Armand Hammer Daumier Collection (Los Angeles:1981).


For scholarly neglect of the 18th-century French political print, see Cuno, French Caricature pp.14ff. EPC2 pp.185 (the 'revival of the art of wood-engraving [...] the use of cuts in newspapers and periodicals [...] was another factor in the superseding of the old-style print'),258-59: 'But the future of English political caricature was with the wood-engraving [...] with illustrated journalism, not the separately-published print'. George, of all people, must have been aware that this was also the 18th-century print's unsung past.
Chapter IV: Historicism Narratives and Linear Models: The 'Development' of the English 'Political Cartoon'

The long stretch from the 1720s to the 1830s demands subdivision. The first forty years clearly belong to Hogarth to a degree that gives them exceptional unity.

For this and for other reasons there is an abrupt break from about the time of his death in 1764. The golden age of English caricature was to follow - though not at once - with the supremacy of Rowlandson and Gillray.

When both Gillray and George III became hopelessly insane in 1810 and disappeared from the world, it was the end of an age. The Regency followed, and by common consent 'Regency' stands for a longer period than its actual nine years - to 1830, or to 1837.

[...] Our three divisions, then, are 'Hogarth', 'George III' and 'Regency'.

M.D. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank

If this passage exemplifies the limited chronology characteristic of political prints scholarship, George's precis also testifies to a more significant problem, of which the prevalent chronology of prints studies is merely symptomatic. This is the extent to which the study of the 17th- and in particular the 18th-century English political print has been informed by the belief that a single line of 'development' is discernible in the genre over time, whether within the conventional 1720-1840 chronological framework outlined in the previous chapter, or from c.1720 to the present.

In his Cartoons and Caricatures (1970), Bevis Hillier concluded that if his survey of the genre (a classic 'introduction' to the subject)

proves anything, it is that one must not look for a 'development' or 'progress' in this art. There is no 'great tradition' of the kind Leavis has imposed on English literature: only odd influences, such as Tenniel's on Levine, or odd developments with a by-effect in caricature, such as Lavater's rules of physiognomy [...] Neither is there a distinctive thread which, like the air-twist of a glass cane, the lettering in...
Brighton rock or the poison vein of the lamprey, runs from beginning to end.

Yet this is the premise which has - without exception - informed every account of this material, from scholarly monograph to exhibition hand-out, and which has determined both the structure and the content, the emphases and the omissions, of such works.

George's précis articulates several, although not all, of the shibboleths of this thesis of 'development'.

One is that this 'development' is a phenomenon of the 18th century; hence the 1720 starting-point. Another is that it is possible to identify a climactic phase to this development; the so-called 'golden age' of the genre, ca. 1780-1810. With this goes the idea of a break, ca. 1760, with what had gone before. Fourthly, there is the idea that the 'development' of the genre may be charted by the study of a sequence of major artists: Hogarth, Rowlandson and Gillray, and George Cruikshank.

What the passage does not make explicit but which is central to the thesis of 'development' is that the agent of this 'development' was the idiom of caricature; that it was only with the adoption of that technique of representation between 1750 and 1760 that the political print was able to 'develop' and attain its present form.

George might also have presented the 'development' of the genre in terms of changes in the technique of printmaking, namely the substitution of engraving for woodcut, and subsequently of etching for engraving and, ultimately, of lithography for etching. In this instance, too, George fails to refer to the decline of the genre after c. 1830, which decline is, as the previous chapter has shown, something to which most scholars have subscribed. George also fails to present the 18th-century political caricature as the direct ancestor of the modern newspaper cartoon. These were, however, given scholarly sanction by EPC.
The seminal account, although by no means the first to posit a 'line of development' for the genre between the 17th and 19th or 20th centuries, EPC is characterised by a narrative impetus which is not confined to the historical context proffered for the prints. EPC combines historical narrative ('Walpole and After', 'From the American Revolution to the Coalition', 'The French Revolution') with a narrative of the development of graphic political satire in England from the earliest anti-papal woodcuts to the first number of Punch ('Hogarth and English Caricature: Mid-Century Developments', 'The Classic Age of English Caricature', 'Postscript: After 1832').

While it remained within the idiom of its predecessors, EPC may be said to have fixed political prints scholarship in a narrative mode from which even the thematic Chadwyck-Healey series was unable to escape altogether. In the Chadwyck-Healey volumes, the plates may not be arranged in strictly chronological order, but the basic narrative of 18th-century development as sanctioned by George informs the introductory essays, as it does the studies of Vincent Carretta, their dense analytical appearance notwithstanding.

The tendency of political prints scholarship to narrative is suggested by the prevalence of 'from x to y' titles and subtitles in the literature. The greater number of these invoke individuals as opposed to periods (Hogarth to Cruikshank; English Caricaturists from Cruikshank to Leech et cetera). Together with the bias in favour of biography or quasi-biography (for example, the Life, Art and Times approaches of Paulson and Patten), works such as Feaver's Masters of Caricature from Hogarth and Gillray to Scarfe and Levine exemplify the extent to which the 'development' of graphic political satire has been charted by way of a sequence of individual artists, who are presented as 'links in a
chain of progress'.

In a pertinent dissection of some of the shibboleths of modern art criticism, Giles Auty observed that when

Baudelaire said that artists die without issue
[...] what he meant was that artists are not members of a relay team who pass on the baton of progress as they sink to their knees exhausted'.

The canonical basis of the conventional narrative is suggested by Celina Fox's complaint of one exhibition that 'the standard history of satire and caricature' was 'trotted out [...] from the Carracci to Gillray, from Daumier to Grosz'. Bevis Hillier might argue against a Leavisite canon but this does not prevent him from stating (in a chapter entitled 'Great Britain: Hogarth to "Max"') that 'the mainstream, after Hogarth, is represented by Rowlandson and Gillray'.

As far as the 1720-1840 chronology is concerned, the conventional sequence is Hogarth, followed by Gillray and Rowlandson, followed by George Cruikshank, followed by HB. To this may be added Townshend, either with or following Hogarth, and Isaac Cruikshank and, more rarely, James Sayers alongside Gillray and Rowlandson.

Hogarth occupies a central, although, as Chapter V will demonstrate, a contentious, position in the linear model of the 'development' of graphic political satire, looming, Leviathan-like, over the 1720-60 period and variously described as the 'father' or 'grandfather' of political caricature. George writes that 'Hogarth's part in the development of graphic satire is fundamental', Carini that 'Hogarth may be said to have prepared the audience for the caricaturists who followed'; the 'classic British school' of the later 18th century was 'the achievement of Hogarth'. George offers a chapter entitled 'After Hogarth' (Hogarth to Cruikshank) and another entitled 'Hogarth and Mid-Century Developments' (EPC). Another account ascribes to Hogarth an 'immense
and crucial' influence upon the 'brilliant generation [Gillray, Rowlandson and Isaac Cruikshank] that followed. We are informed that 'Rowlandson continued in the Hogarth tradition'.

With Hogarth may be placed George Townshend; certainly it is Townshend rather than Hogarth who is invoked with reference to the central 'phase' of the print's 18th-century 'development': the introduction, ca.1750, of portrait caricature into the established emblematic mode.

George writes of 'the transition from Hogarth to Rowlandson and Gillray' and (on the same page) of 'the transition from Hogarth to Gillray and Rowlandson'. Yet the ease with which this baton race is narrated obscures, if not a break in the chain, a 'satiric interregnum' in the decades 1760-1780, between the Hogarthian era and the later 'golden age'. Ralph Shikes merely articulates a perception more generally expressed tacitly, by their omission from the basic narrative, when he writes that 'between Hogarth and Gillray there were [sic] a host of political and social caricaturists' but their work was 'mostly infantile and hysterical, vulgar amateurish, easily forgettable'. Similarly, Morris Martin can write that 'from Hogarth the line of caricaturists extends through Rowlandson, Gillray, Bunbury and Cruikshank [which Cruikshank is not specified], taking in also a number of anonymous caricaturists'.

Rowlandson and Gillray 'developed political caricature into an art form' (a claim often encountered with reference to Hogarth). They 'were followed in the next generation by a third, George Cruikshank, who carried the form through the Napoleonic period'. Gillray has been hailed as the author of 'a new era in political caricature', who set the tone of the ensuing 'golden age'. Lambourne writes that 'the Golden Age was given its substance by Gillray and Rowlandson'. Godfrey writes that 'Gillray and Rowlandson naturally [sic]
overshadow their contemporaries, none of whom approached their ability even closely', although 'the so-called "Golden Age" is the result of innumerable contributions by humbler artists, often highly individual'.

The same author claims George Cruikshank as 'the leading figure of the Regency, and a worthy successor to Gillray'.

Marguerite Mahood, on the other hand, clearly believes Gillray (1756-1815) and Rowlandson (1756-1827) to have belonged to different generations (Mahood would appear to have confused Rowlandson and George Cruikshank (1792-1878)): 'Gillray's courtly, raffish, rather sinister figures made way after the Napoleonic Wars for Rowlandson's [sic] blowsy, lolloping Regency assemblies' which 'in turn were replaced by the tight angular figures of the 19th century'.

The 'decline' and demise of the genre is also narrated with reference to a sequence of artists. By 1821, according to George, 'the Gillray school was in its penultimate phase'; 'the leading artist of this final [sic] phase was William Heath'. 'The change from Heath to Seymour, from etching to lithography, pinpoints the defeat of the Georgian tradition and the supremacy of HB'.

Godfrey agrees: 'John Doyle, who worked under the initials of "HB", signalled the transition in his mild lithographs, the Political Sketches, which ran from 1829 to 1851'.

If HB personifies the 19th-century shift from one idiom of graphic political satire to another, he is nonetheless placed within the linear model; 'in some degree [HB] had been anticipated by Heath'. His work 'has echoes of Heath, remoter ones of Gillray.' HB in turn 'prepared the way for Leech and Tenniel, to whom this development [i.e. the political print as a vehicle of good-humoured comment rather than savage polemic] is often attributed'.

In those accounts which place the development of the genre in England within a European context, the sense of
an artistic baton-race is still more apparent. In 1944, Klingender suggested that the 1780s saw the development in English caricature of 'imagery which was passed on, through Gillray and Cruikshank, to Daumier and the French caricaturists of the nineteenth century'. Subsequent accounts have not diverged from this. In 1957, Hofmann not only offered the image of Daumier standing on the shoulders of Rowlandson and Gillray, but suggested that Daumier occupies the same position in the development of French graphic political satire as Hogarth in that of England;

before French caricature could rise, as it was to do, to the level of the English, and finally beyond it, the different elements in its development (essentially caricature and emblem) [....] had to be brought together in the hands of one man.

Two years later, George could write that 'the ending of the Georgian tradition coincided with the passing of the leadership in political caricature from England to France'. In 1981 we could read that 'the graphic art of Honore Daumier [....] is both a culmination and an advancement of the English caricaturist's art'; in 1984 that, in the 1830s, 'Daumier and Philipon picked up where the English left off'.

As far as the political print in England is concerned, the line of artistic succession from Hogarth to HB, Leech and Tenniel (or, in more those accounts which embrace the 20th century, from Hogarth to Scarfe) parallels a line of development which sees changes in both the techniques and the format of political images (from the woodcut broadside of c.1700 to the 19th-century wood-engraving or the lithograph in Punch; from uncoloured engraving to hand-coloured etching) but which is above all rooted in a shift in the idiom of graphic political satire, from the 'emblematic' mode inherited from the 17th century to the caricature.
If the precise chronology of this 'development' is never consistent, the fact of such a development, and what it entailed, are never at issue.

The paradigmatic account - its status affirmed by the frequency with which it has been paraphrased - remains that of George. In EPC we are informed that, over the course of the 18th century,

the old-fashioned 'hieroglyphical' print, usually dependent upon a verbal explanation, with a mass of detail, sometimes intentionally cryptic, gave way gradually to the 'caricature' with an immediate appeal to the eye, sold plain or coloured, but generally coloured.[...] The engraving, complicated and sometimes cryptic, seldom comic, conceived in black and white and heavily cross-hatched [was] succeeded by a bold design, immediately striking to the eye, intended (usually) to amuse, and sold plain or coloured but commonly coloured. [...] Important progress toward this development was made in the mid-century.

Again, in the first volume of the Catalogue compiled by George, we read that the period covered, viz 1771-83,

saw a great change in the manner of pictorial satire and a great development in its political importance.[...] The change in the character of pictorial satire is, broadly speaking, the progressive superseding of the old-fashioned 'emblematic' or 'hieroglyphical' print, intricate and complicated, often dependent on a key or explanation, by the caricature or satire dependent on expressive drawing, irony, wit or humour, embodied in design that made an immediate appeal to the eye.

1980s paraphrases secured this a further lease of life:

Prints became less complicated in design and execution, less dependent upon words, emblems and allegories to communicate their meaning, and simpler, and more humorous, with a more immediate appeal to the eye. (Rosemary Baker, 1983)

English graphic satire had inherited a European legacy of heavy symbolism. Early prints were usually emblematic and stylised, or very complicated, and dependent upon verbal explanations.[...] But by [c.1778] formal or stylised satires were beginning to look
old-fashioned alongside the newer vogue for caricatures that had an immediate appeal to the eye. (P.D.G. Thomas, 1986)²¹

The traditional emblematic 'hieroglyphical' style of engraving, with its intricate and complicated message, its involved symbolism and explanatory verses and keys gradually gave way to a bolder, simpler design with more immediate visual appeal. (H.T. Dickinson, 1986)²²

The style of prints changed too. The intricate and often heavily allegorical concoctions of the 17th century became unfashionable [...] if many prints were still [c.1760] complex and even cluttered, most were simpler in composition. (Miller, 1986)²³

The political print 'altered from using the elaborately coded and 'hieroglyphical' tropes of early Augustan satire to simpler, more readily intelligible symbols'; 'even if they never aspired to or attained the heights of Hogarth, his fellow artists slowly abandoned their hieroglyphs, their cryptic or emblematic diagrams and grew more imaginative in their imagery' (note the inference that emblematic imagery is unimaginative; the hostility of scholars to the emblematic idiom is the subject of Chapter VI).²⁴

The agent of this 'transformation' of both the appearance and the rhetorical power of political prints was the idiom of caricature; the distortion of the facial and sometimes of the corporeal features of an individual for comic or satiric effect. What David Kunzle terms 'the revolution of caricature' 'required' the technical change from the 'relatively rigid process' of engraving to the 'free, swiftly flowing and spontaneous line' allowed by etching. The use of colour is also attributable to this idiomatic and technical change; "sixpence plain, a shilling coloured" is a phrase not found before the advent of caricature'. As a consequence of 'the stylistic transformation of caricature, the broadsheet [print] became [...] as never before, a weapon
in the political and social struggle'.

The extent to which the adoption of caricature did in fact alter the political print is the subject of the next chapter. As far as the conventional narrative of the development of the genre is concerned, while neither the fact nor the nature of change are at issue, the extent and in particular the chronology and the pace of that change are less certain. Broadly speaking, political prints scholarship has supported both the notion of a progressive development as the art of caricature was united with the older emblematic tradition and the notion of a vast gulf between the Hogarthian print and the political caricature in the manner of Rowlandson and Gillray. The first thesis informs the idea of a distinct phase of development, or more properly, transition, between 1750 and 1770, the second insists on the divergence of the post-1760 print from those that preceded it: the propensity of prints scholars to equivocation means that it is possible to encounter these at first sight incompatible theses in the same account.

First, the idea that there is an identifiable phase or stage of transition, by consensus occurring between 1740 and 1770, although at least one scholar has put it earlier. George describes the 1750s as a period of transition which culminated in the classic age of English caricature. Lambourne defines the period between Hogarth (d.1764) and the rise of Gillray and Rowlandson (active from c.1775) as transitional. This phase is characterised by the grafting of the Italian idiom of caricatura onto the existing emblematic print, although as far as political prints are concerned, the fusion of idioms cannot be dated earlier than 1756 (although Atherton claims the status of proto-caricature for certain prints between 1730 and
1750, George that 'the two types merge' c.1750). Accounts of this 'phase' have focused on George Townshend, credited with the introduction of facial caricature into the political print. With the disregard for or ignorance of the indigenous tradition of graphic political satire and comment characteristic of prints scholarship, Dale Roylance writes that Townshend 'joined the caricature image of the Italian south with the long-familiar broadsides of the Dutch north' and 'must be credited with inventing the [...] English political cartoon'. Charles Press considers that, while 'it is difficult to mark precise turning-points, the contribution of one amateur artist seems crucial'; Townshend's 'cards' mark the beginning of a new style of political comment through caricature. Townshend's contribution was to introduce the cartoon of personal political attack through artistic distortion; the style that was to dominate over the next seventy years.

Paulson writes that Townshend produced 'the first political caricatures', a genre which was 'fully developed by 1789'. While Townshend's position within the linear model of the 'development' of 'the political caricature' undisputed, that of his contemporary Hogarth is both more and less secure. The desire of both prints scholars and popular historians to claim Hogarth as 'the first English cartoonist' or as the 'father' of English political caricature has survived all attempts to dispute his claims to those titles. The length of his career (1720-1764) and still more its congruence with the chronology of prints 'development' has ensured that his oeuvre has been quarried for evidence of 'transition'; his indebtedness to late 17th- and early 18th-century prints has meant that, far more than of Townshend, it has been possible to claim of Hogarth that he is 'at once the culmination of the old and the progenitor of the new'.
The idea that the political prints of the so-called 'golden age' were the consequence of the grafting of caricature onto the existing form of graphic political satire is one to which most accounts subscribe. In 1989, Paulson claimed that 'Rowlandson and Gillray, in their different ways joined caricature heads to emblematic situations', Wood that the prints of Gillray and his contemporaries 'combine the new forms of political caricature with the old methods based on symbolic or allegorical structures'.

Significantly, however, subscription to the idea that a 'marriage' of the two idioms was necessary to the development of the political print has not prevented scholars - often the same scholars - insisting on the post-caricature obsolescence of the emblematic. The 'development' of the political print is in fact the 'story' of the 'development' of political caricature. The development of political caricature both entails and ensures the decline and demise of the emblematic. Thus George writes of the 'transition that outmoded the emblematic idiom, of a 'transformation from the emblematic print to the political caricature', Carretta that 'the growth of caricature and invective in political satire at mid-century was at the expense of the emblematic tradition'.

It is the idea that the adoption of caricature was necessary to the 18th-century development of graphic political satire which has led scholars to downplay the 1720-60 period, as one which saw, in Porter's words, 'only stop-and-start developments' and posit the idea of a break with the past ca.1760. As will become clear over the course of the following chapters, the idea of such a break is informed by the received chronology of political and social 'developments'; 'the sixties are an accepted watershed in English life'.

George argues for 'an unusually abrupt break' with the
death of Hogarth (1764); 'in the 1760s, there was an unusually abrupt shift in the patterns of graphic satire'. Wood writes that 'there is a huge gulf between the print satires up to and including Hogarth' and those of Gillray, working at his best between 1790-1810. Press's account of 'the Georgian political print' is in reality an account of the post-1760 print:

The Georgian political print after 1760 was different in more than color from those that had preceded it, though the use of color was indicative of the change. Artistically they were less representational, more free in line, and made heavier use of caricature in both face and body action. They were also more journalistic, they focussed their comment on current and often trivial political and social events and were published soon after the event occurred. If possible, they became more calumnious than the prints of the period of the first two Georges.

The same author declares: 'the break with the past was that caricature became central'. In that both insist upon the transformative power of caricature, the thesis of a mid-century 'transitional phase' and that of a 'break with the past' ca. 1760 are complimentary rather than antagonistic.

The extent to which this is the case is evident from accounts of what must be the most enduring shibboleth of the thesis of 18th-century 'development'; the notion of a climactic phase to this development, defined, in a phrase which recurs with monotonous regularity, as the 'Golden Age' of English caricature or graphic satire.

That there was such a thing can hardly be doubted. Its historical reality is enshrined in half a dozen chapter titles and sub-titles and in the subdivisions of exhibition catalogues.
The idea of a 'golden age' was sanctioned by George, who refers to 'the golden age of English caricature, at its peak in the last two decades of the century and slow to decline'. Elsewhere, the period is referred to as representing 'the high point of English caricature'; the years 1770-1830 are the 'heyday' of the satirical print; 'the boom in satirical and humorous prints and drawings between 1780 -1820 has caused the period to be called the golden age of English caricature'; 'by the end of the [18th] century [...] the golden age of English caricature was at its zenith'; graphic political satire was 'a boisterous English tradition that was to reach its pinnacle during the 18th century'; the late 18th century was 'the great age of caricature'; 'the eighteenth century was a golden age of English satirical printmaking'. Press dates the golden age from the Westminster Election prints of 1784: 'Thus began what is generally thought of as the Golden Age of the Georgian print'. The work of Rowlandson, Gillray, Sayers, Newton, Isaac, Isaac Robert and George Cruikshank, 'represented the high point of English cartoons, a golden age that lasted from approximately 1790-1820' and was never equalled:

The momentous events and colourful personalities of the last quarter of the eighteenth century happily coincided with the emergence of a group of brilliant and original cartoonists. The combination was to produce a Golden Age of cartoons which lasted until well after the end of the Napoleonic wars.

The shock of the loss of the American colonies, 'the rapid strides of the Industrial Revolution and the conseqt migration to towns', party rancour, and reaction to the great Revolution in France all combined to render the period c.1780-1820 one of unique restlessness and litigiousness in English life, one which has become variously known as the "classic", "great" or "golden" age of English caricature. In scope and volume alone it
deserves the name. 58

The golden age is the consequence of previous 'development'; 'Townshend wedded the caricature touch to political comment' in the 1750s, and this, 'stimulated by the day's political events, unleashed the political print for its golden age'. 59 More recently, Carretta refers to 'developments', i.e., the joining of personal satire to allegorical satire, which 'made possible at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century the Golden Age of British engraved satire'. 60

After the 'Golden Age', the 'penultimate' (or 'final') 'phase'; c. 1815-1840. By 1814 'the great age of caricature is drawing to a close'. Accounts of this 'phase' are couched in linear terms; George accounts for the decline in terms of 'a transition from the uninhibited old school to a decorous new one', and Press writes that 'the next stage of political cartoon production was in the weekly magazine'. 61

Against the model of 'development' which adheres to the chronology 1720-1840 must be set that which entails the longer perspective of c.1720 'to the present', exemplified by the V&A's English Caricature 1620 to the Present, which begins with Samuel Ward's The Double Deliverance (1621) and ends with one of Steve Bell's Maggie's Farm strips (1982), and by Feaver's Masters of Caricature: from Hogarth and Gillray to Scarfe and Levine. Earlier 'histories' of 'caricature' which took its 'progress' up to the present include those of Malcolm (1813) and Ashbee (1928). English Caricature offers a precis of the past which places present and future firmly within the linear model: with one or two exceptions, it cannot be pretended that English caricature now flourishes with great originality [...] So suddenly did the art develop and expand in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that ultimately its history may seem like the growth
of a monstrous plant that appeared overnight, flourished, but then failed to renew itself. Yet the subject is by nature unpredictable, and the next twenty years will no doubt breed artists to renew this great English tradition.

********

The notion that there is a single phenomenon called 'the political caricature' or, still more loadedly, 'the political cartoon', the development of which may be traced over time, whether to an apotheosis in the 'golden age' or, as in the accounts of Malcolm and Ashbee, in the present, has kept political prints scholarship, whether descriptive or analytical, and irrespective of the chronology of choice, firmly in the grip of a methodology which may be termed 'historicist' in the sense in which that term was intended by Popper; an essentially predictive approach to the past which attempt to discover 'the "rhythms" or the "patterns", the "laws" and the "trends" that underlie the evolution of history'.

This is the explicit aim of EPC, as stated on the first page; 'the object of this book is to find the pattern in the shifting kaleidoscope'. George appears to intend by this historical events ('the pictorial pattern of national life found in a sequence of prints') but, as noted earlier, the narrative impetus of EPC extends to the chronicling of the development of the political print as a genre between c.1620 and 1840.

The 'historicism' of political prints scholarship is reflected in the prevalence in political prints literature of what one historian has termed 'the usefully vague metaphors derived from biology'. The 18th century is characterised by

the evolution of the English political print from a laboured emblematic and verbal treatment
to the exhilarating use of personal caricature by Sayers, Rowlandson and Gillray in the last twenty years of the century. \(^{66}\)

Only with the fusion of the older tradition of graphic satire with caricature could the political print 'fully evolve'. \(^{67}\) 'The political print as a journalistic comment on current affairs [...] began to evolve from 1760 on'. \(^{68}\) 'The evolution of caricature, beyond the conventions imposed by older Italian and Dutch traditions' 'is taken to be the central and most enduring achievement of 18th-century graphic satire'. \(^{69}\) The marriage of emblem and caricature secured 'the metamorphosis of the satirical print'. \(^{70}\)

In 1976-77, the Administration des Monnaies et Médailles, Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances de la République Française commissioned a series of portrait medals of 'Fathers of Caricature' (Hogarth, Gillray, Rowlandson, George Cruikshank...). The conceit of paternity is an enduring one in the literature. Townshend is hailed as the 'progenitor' of political caricature; Hogarth is variously its grandfather, father or (because of the non-caricatural, emblematic nature of his work) its 'step-father'. \(^{71}\) The role of 'father' has also been ascribed to Gillray. \(^{72}\)

References to the 'childhood' of the art are common. 'Modern political caricature, born [...] in France, may be said to have spent its childhood in Holland' before attaining maturity in England. \(^{73}\) Ashbee twice refers to 'the birth of the art in the eighteenth century', and considers 'the age of Hogarth' to have been 'the childhood of the art'. \(^{74}\)

'By the middle of the eighteenth century the cartoon had matured into a legitimate weapon of political warfare'. \(^{75}\) The ensuing 'golden age' is associated with the 'coming of age' of the genre. Thus Langford: 'it is a commonplace assumption [...] that the early Hanoverian period saw the coming of age of the graphic print'. \(^{76}\)
Wood refers to 'the coming of age of the political print at the turn of the century', i.e. 1800, while Godfrey considers that, 'in many respects the English caricature came of age during the administration of Lord North'. Malcolm could write in 1813 that 'caricaturing has reached its full maturity of perfection in this country', Lambourne that, in the hands of Gillray and Rowlandson, 'the medium came to full maturity'.

The corollary of 'maturity' is, of course, immaturity. Thus we read that 'in the early 18th century, the tradition of English visual representation was like a sickly adolescent, neither healthy nor mature'. Atherton, while recognising that the differences between the pre- and post-1760 print should not be exaggerated, can nonetheless consider that in 1763, political caricature was 'a still nascent art', which was to develop over subsequent decades.

Almost as prevalent are botanical metaphors:

If the symbolism of the Middle Ages and the Reformation was the seed-bed of the English cartoon, its nursery was the graphic satire of the Great Rebellion when many of the perennial devices of the political caricaturist made a seemingly first appearance.

Malcolm outlined 'the development of English graphic satire from the emblematic mode of the mid-eighteenth century to the full flowering of personal caricature and visual humour at the end of the century'. Shikes writes that 'a combination of historical forces made it possible for socially-critical art to reach its full flowering in eighteenth-century England'. Atherton considers caricature 'the flower not the seed of the 18th-century political print'. Robert Wark writes that in the 1790s comic draughtsmanship in England was 'in full flower', Press that political caricature 'blossomed in England in the eighteenth-century print'. Wynn-Jones describes the Bubble prints 'the seeds from which one of the greatest traditions of satire and
caricature in the world was to grow'. And so on.

The first point which must be made with respect to this linear model of the 'development' of the political print is that it is the creature of hindsight. Knowledge of the form which graphic political satire and comment was to take at a later date - whether in terms of the introduction of facial caricature or in terms of the newspaper cartoon of the present day - has fostered the idea that print 'development' followed a predetermined course, the pace of which could be facilitated or hindered by other, often adventitious, 'developments', aesthetic, technical or political ('the full development of the journalistic print' was inhibited by Hogarth's reluctance to employ the medium to partisan ends before 1760), but the direction of which was fixed.

It is this which has allowed scholars to present - and to a considerable extent evaluate - the 18th-century print as the ancestor of the modern newspaper cartoon. Wynn-Jones' Cartoon History of Britain adheres to the premise of a single 'cartoon tradition' from the 18th to the 20th centuries, 'from the South Sea Bubble to the Profumo affair'; the author's objective is 'to trace the mainstream of this cartoon tradition and a few of its tributaries'. This is nothing new; Wright's History of Caricature and the Grotesque (1875) presented itself as a history of 'modern political caricature', and both Malcolm (1813) and Ashbee (1928) trace the 'development' of the genre to present perfection.

The Cartoon History of Britain boasts a foreword by Michael Cummings, 'How a Modern Cartoonist Views His Profession'; previously, David Low had addressed Gillray 'As One Caricaturist To Another', and Ashbee had hailed Hogarth as 'the first exponent of the modern art of caricature'. Gillray is 'the father of the modern
political cartoon'. Nicholas Robinson writes that Gillray 'dominated the golden age of political caricature, and was a major formative influence on the modern cartoon' and Hill claims for Gillray an 'emphatic' influence on 'the subsequent growth and development of his profession'. The canonical approach to the 'development' of the political print which has already been mentioned is in this way further entrenched; Scarfe and Steadman, Fluck and Law are the heirs of Gillray, the culmination of an 18th-century phenomenon, 'the development of political caricature'.

The idea of an identifiable 'line of development' to the present is explicit in such compilations as English Caricature 1620 to the Present, but it informs studies less overtly linear in subject-matter or format. Thus Hill writes, in his biography of Gillray, that the hybrid of caricature and allegory pioneered by Townshend 'remains the basis of political cartooning to the present day'; Langford, in a study of the graphic satire of the decades 1720-40, of

what is taken to be the central and most enduring achievement of eighteenth-century graphic satire; the evolution of caricature [sic; Langford is using 'caricature' in the sense of graphic political satire, a common confusion of genres] [...] into the recognisable art of the modern political satirist'.

The same author asserts that by the early 1740s, 'the elements of modern caricature had unmistakably emerged'. Elsewhere one reads that 'the political cartoon, today such a familiar feature of newspapers, first sprang into being [...] during the second half of the 18th century in England'.

The linear model of 'development' both informs and is informed by the perception of the political print as a single, ahistorical, phenomenon. This is implicit in one review of the quintessentially linear English Caricature
1620 to the Present:

the style, naturally [sic] changes: the nightmarish precision of the 18th century gives way to ponderous Victorian jokes, propped up with six- and eight-line explanations, and most recently to the near-abstract grotesquerie of Scarfe and the brashness of Fluck and Law.

The same accounts which insist on the differences between the pre- and post-caricature, the pre- and post-1760, and between the 17th- and 18th-century political print are prepared to blur more fundamental differences of idiom and context in order to assert the congruity of the 'grim anti-Catholic prints' of the 17th century and 'the irreverent cartoons of today'.

Up to a point, this reflects the extent to which studies of the English political print have proceeded from the premise that there is an identifiable 'English tradition' of graphic liberty. This notion is examined in Chapter IX.

The real problem, as I will argue in Part II, Chapter III, is to a great extent a semantic one. 'Cartoon' in the sense of a graphic political satire is a term 19th-century in origin and further complicated by 20th-century connotations. 'Caricature', similarly, has a specific application and is anachronistic before c.1756. Both anachronisms (with respect to the early print) are sanctioned by George. 'Cartoon' is used throughout EPC; George would seem to subscribe to the idea that there is such a thing as 'cartoon history'; a print or an artist is described as representing 'an important stage in the history of the cartoon'. Thus Stephen Colledge's Exclusion Crisis prints [Plate 1] are both a 'foretaste of the cartoon' and 'have more claim than those so far produced to be considered cartoons in the modern sense'.

Unchallenged and unquestioning, this anachronism persists to the present. Thus we discover P.D.G. Thomas in the attempt to isolate from the graphic output of the
1770s those prints which are 'recognisably like modern cartoons'. Langford appears to recognise that 'early eighteenth-century caricatures [sic] rarely served the function of their modern counterparts', but it is by this criterion that they have been judged, and Langford's own usage ('the political cartoon', 'modern caricature') connives in this.

As far as the evaluation of 17th- and 18th-century political prints is concerned, the consequences are wholly negative. As Chapter VII will demonstrate, prints are praised or criticised insofar as they 'anticipate' or fail to anticipate the 'modern cartoon'.

Knowledge of the 20th-century 'outcome' has also encouraged what Chapter V will argue has been a disproportionate emphasis on the idiom of caricature. If 'today [...] caricature is all but essential to the practice we describe as cartooning', it is predictable that George should consider that the appearance of caricature in prints marks 'a stage towards modernity'.

With regard to caricature, if knowledge of the 20th-century 'outcome' has coloured our picture of the 18th-century political print, it is also fair to say that knowledge of the later 18th-century 'outcome', viz the so-called 'golden age', has informed the evaluation of the 17th-century and pre-1760 print.

As far as the political print c.1640-1840 is concerned, the idea that, in George's words, 'caricature and the burlesque were destined to transform the emblematic print', has informed the appraisal of the pre-caricatural, 'emblematic' print, and has precluded objective appraisal of the qualities peculiar to that print, as may be seen in Chapter VI.

The vocabulary of 'development', 'evolution' and 'maturity' is a loaded one; if caricature was the
predestined agent of print development, non- and
pre-caricatural prints must, ipso facto, be 'undeveloped'
or 'immature'; post-caricature prints which are framed in
the emblematic idiom are anachronistic. Hogarth's South
Sea Bubble prints are adjudged 'effective but rather
old-fashioned'.

Early prints are scrutinised for signs of the
late-Georgian 'future' in much the same way as those
later prints have been for the origins of the modern
cartoon. Thus Godfrey; the prints of Romeyn de Hooghe
[Plate 2] 'anticipate the drama of Gillray's prints'.
Shikes considers that Cornelius Dusart's prints Les Heros
de la Ligue ou La Procession Monarcale Conduite par
Louis XIV pour la Conversion des Protestans de son
Royaume (1691)

anticipate by almost 150 years the
free-swinging satire of some of Daumier's
contemporaries. Dusart strikes a surprisingly
modern note in the sceptical realism of his
caricatures.

Edward Hodnett can describe a drawing for a satire by
Francis Barlow as 'a model of the humorous, realistic,
well-drawn political cartoon that will come to be the
pride of English journalism a century and a half
later'. According to Langford:

in retrospect it is clear that The Motion
and its successors broke out of the established
conventions and looked forward to the
Darly/Townshend caricatures of the 1750s - even
perhaps to the great caricaturists of later
age, Gillray, Rowlandson, Cruikshank.

It is a perspective epitomised by Atherton's term,
'proto-caricature'.

Townshend's own prints are subject to the same
treatment. Donald, writing of Townshend's The Recruiting
Serjeant, or Britannia's Happy Prospect (1757) considers

The use of light etching with hand-colouring
imparts an attractive freshness when seen with
other prints of this date, and looks forward to the style of graphic satire of the later eighteenth century.

Similarly, Townshend's *Gloria Mundi* (1756) 'anticipates [...] the visual metaphors or puns devised by Gillray in the later part of the century'. While not inaccurate, Donald's term of choice reinforces the linearity of the received account; it would be as accurate, and less linear, to observe that Townshend's design was later re-worked by Gillray; *Gloria Mundi*, or *- The Devil addressing the Sun* [BM 6012] (1782), itself twice adapted by George Cruikshank, first in BM 12593 Boney's *Meditations on the Island of St Helena* and subsequently in BM 14191 *Meditation at Brandyburgh: or an Address to the Sun*.

Godfrey writes that Gillray and Rowlandson 'set a standard by which later caricaturists must be judged'; in reality, theirs is the standard by which earlier satirists and draughtsmen have been judged and found wanting. The political caricature of the 'golden age' is also the standard against which contemporaneous French prints have been judged, with similar results; 'French caricature of the early 1790s appears retarded when compared with the state of the art in England'. It is thus the more ironic that these prints should themselves be relegated to the status of immature forerunners by at least one scholar who posits the work of Daumier and Philipon to be the culmination of earlier 'developments': 'repulsive, clumsy, lacking in all inhibitions [...] Yet one must put up with this as an important stage of development [...] an indispensable phase in the search for expression'. *Sic transit Gloria Mundi.*

The extent to which hindsight with respect to the direction graphic political satire was to take has coloured the evaluation of the pre-1760 and pre-1720
print will become clear over the course of the following chapters. Here, it suffices to say that whether the yardstick is the political caricature of the golden age or the modern political cartoon, early prints have been evaluated not in their own right and in their own terms, but as 'immature' precursors of later (mature) phenomena. The priorities of prints scholarship are articulated by Hofmann; what Hofmann unhelpfully terms the 'popular satirical art' of the 17th century had only a superficial effect on the development of caricature. It deserves mention, however, because it made use of the subject-matter caricature was to take over, and [...] addressed itself to the public to which caricature would one day appeal. 113

Thus we read that if the Dutch political print declines after c.1690, it 'had served a transcendent purpose [in] providing the initial inspiration for the satirical art that was to flourish in 18th-century England'; 17th-century Dutch prints 'may perhaps rightly be considered forerunners of the eighteenth-century English political print'. 114

Lambourne writes, of English prints of the Rebellion and 'Bloodless [sic] Revolution',: 'crude journalistic hack-work though such productions were, they established a public demand for pictorial comment on political events and social conditions'. 115 So much for the 17th century and for prints such as The Double Deliverance (1621) or The Happy Instruments of England's Preservation (1681) [Plates 3 and 4]. Conversely, George can praise the 1641 print The Sucklington Faction: or (Sucklings) Roaring Boyes [Plate 5] for its 'expressive realism, Hogarthian in spirit and competence, unlike the allegorical designs of the period'. 116

Shikes might suggest that political prints 'must be considered within the framework of their times'. 117 The linear model of 'development' which underpins the study of these prints militates against such appraisal,
relegating prints to the status of 'forerunners' or anachronisms; what Louise Lippincott has objected to, in a closely-related context, as the 'neat division of winners from losers'.

The second point which must be made with respect to this linear model - as reflected in the assertions of prints scholars and in the emphases and omissions of the literature - is that it is prescriptive and, above all, simplistic.

The emphases of the conventional account conspire in the promotion of a picture of absolute change:

nothing could have seemed more unlike the old, highly coloured uninhibited prints [of the 'Classic Age'] than the Political Sketches in black-and-white which gave a new look to caricature;

after 1760, emblematic satires 'are rarely found'. And so on. George writes of a transition from emblem to caricature which was complete by 1800. Kunzle insists on 'caricature' 'completely displacing the "emblematic", "hieroglyphical" and "satyrical" print of old' both as a descriptive term and in real terms. In this, as in so many aspects of prints scholarship, the vocabulary of choice is revealing: 'succeeded by', 'replaced by', 'transformed', 'outmoded', et cetera.

The idea of 'transition', and in particular of an identifiable period of transition, is, as we have seen, central to the conventional narrative. In a strict sense 'transition' implies not gradual change, in the sense of the modification of existing forms, but absolute change, as defined in the Oxford Dictionary: the 'passage from one state [...] to another; (art) period during which one style is developing into another'.

112
'Historicism claims that nothing is of greater moment than the emergence of a really new period'; EPC is to a notable extent the chronicle of the emergence of the 'new' at several points over the course of the period 1640-1840, whether in the shape of Townshend's 'cards' in the 1750s, the illustrated satirical magazines of the 1770s or the beginning of HB's Political Sketches in 1829, even if the 'new' thus identified often prove to have been neither particularly novel nor particularly enduring (thus we read that 'the cartoon was slowly altering, the old-fashioned explanation in verse was becoming less frequent - it was unsuited to the card', even though George is aware that the card format was evanescent). George is equally confident in her pronunciation of 'the end of an age' ('despite innovations, the Sacheverell prints mark the end of an age, not the beginning of a new one'), even when subsequent prints suggest otherwise. Over the course of five hundred pages, the succession of false dawns and premature deaths is bewildering and, ultimately, irritating.

As this thesis will attempt to demonstrate, for every print of a given period which conforms to the linear model, there is one which conspicuously fails to do so, whether in terms of technique, format or idiom. Such prints seldom figure in the illustrative choices of the literature, however, nor are scholars obliged to mention them. The extent to which the conventional narrative of 'development' depends on a selective use of the surviving evidence has become increasingly apparent the more familiar with the whole range of that evidence I become.

The selective nature of the conventional narrative is abetted by both the chronological breadth of many accounts when set against the large numbers of surviving prints; with space permitting the description or illustration of only a handful of prints for any one event or date, counter-examples are the more easily
In EPC, the tenor of George's narrative of change and transformation is undisturbed by the author's passing acknowledgement of the continuing vitality not merely of 17th-century iconography but of 17th-century prints; 18th-century versions of Marshall's design for the frontispiece of Eikon Basilike, and a 1740 copy of The Double Deliverance IBM 1223 are alluded to not in the context of the period in which they appear but in that of the original prints. To what extent such 'revivals' are representative will only become clear when this particular aspect of 18th-century political prints publishing is investigated. What is at issue here is the way in which the coexistence of these prints with contemporary satires is obscured by excepting them from the 'chronological treatment [...] imposed' on the material in general. George does not go so far as to say that these prints are anachronistic, falling outside, and irrelevant to, the mainstream of prints development; their place within the narrative of EPC suffices.

Wood writes, of Hogarth, that 'the continuing impact of old[er] methods of representation on his work 'should not be underestimated'. The post-1760 print might helpfully be regarded in the same light. Continuity is particularly evident in the case of iconography, as Part II, Chapter V will attempt to show. Here, as one example out of potential hundreds, I offer the example of the hand of Divine Justice which may be seen in the 1753 print Vox Populi Vox Dei or the Jew Act Repealed and Gillray's 1798 The Loyal Toast [Plates 6 and 7].

To a considerable extent, scholars have attempted to get round the problem of the visible tenacity of pre-caricatural iconography and print-structure by conceding the slowness of change. Thus George: 'despite this transformation [i.e., of the emblematic by caricature], much of the old symbolism remained, and was
adapted to the new look'; 'it is characteristic of these ps that nothing was lost. Old symbols, old allegories, old forms, were absorbed and adapted'. 127 Thomas writes that, 'since there were a great many designers and engravers at work, changes in the physical appearance of prints were gradual and erratic'. 128 In Carretta's account, caricature 'surpasses' but does not 'eradicate' 'the earlier, more emblematic mode of representation'; Gombrich and Kris write that 'Gillray did not by any means renounce the older and more primitive effects obtained by emblematic allusions' and other tactics characteristic of the 'early' print. 129 And so on.

It cannot be overemphasised, however, that these and similar statements occur in narratives which insist on the eventual obsolescence of the emblematic. Thomas continues 'but there was an obvious trend for recognisable characters [i.e., caricature] to replace' symbolic and allusive modes of representation; Carretta that 'by 1760, caricature had become the dominant form' of graphic satire; the same author writes of 'changes that result in the dominance of caricature'. 130 George in particular alludes to the tenacity of pre-caricatural forms in loaded terms: 'the older type [of print] continued to exist [between 1771-83] its influence not yet exhausted'; 'only in the last three decades' of the century was the transformation complete'. 131 How 'complete' may be seen by a comparison of the 1773 print Sawney's Defence against the Beast, Whore, Pope and Devil &c. &c. and the 1828 print Apoecypha Combatants No.VI - The Idol Bel and the Dragon's Tour to the North [Plates 8 and 9]; clear evidence of how 'progressively the cartoonists' framework expands as originality gains on convention'. 132

Emphasis on emergence of the new and insistence upon the - rapid or gradual - obsolescence of the old ensure that equally significant continuities are obscured; as in a somewhat different context, 'the survival of all
previous patterns is systematically underemphasised'. Together with a marked ignorance of the 17th-century print, this in turn permits scholars to present as new departures what are in fact venerable motifs and conventions; this may be seen in Carretta's idea of a 'recovery' of the earlier mode of allegorical visual satire', in particular in the defence of the established order, after 1789.

The extent to which the conventional account of print 'development' relies on a selective approach to the material cannot be overemphasised. As with assertions as to the greater or lesser artistic merit of prints at any given point between 1640-1840 (for which see Chapter VII), the conventional account is made up of blanket assertions which fail to do justice to the considerable diversity of the evidence, when viewed collectively.

Thus the association of 'development' with the use of hand-colouring, a 'development' associated with the post-1760 print must be set against surviving examples of hand-colouring from the 17th century such as Romeyne de Hooghe's literally pyrotechnical rendering of the firework display commemorating the Prince and Princess of Orange's coronation as King and Queen of England in 1689 [Plate 10]. To present this 'development' in terms of a succession of printmaking techniques is still more problematic. The abeyance of woodcut as a medium for political prints over the course of the 18th century and in particular in the post-1760 period has been exaggerated, although this is to some extent influenced by the bias of the B.M. collection, as catalogued, towards the upper end of the print market. The woodcut survives, as a print of shows [Plate 11]. The post-1760 'development' of the political print has been associated with the gradual supplanting of engraving by etching, with a concomitant 'lightness of line'; it is salutary to turn to A.M. Hind and discover that pure
etching and pure engraving were comparatively uncommon, with 18th-century printmakers tending to use the techniques in combination, as in Gillray's prints. 136 Yet if Press acknowledges the problems entailed in attempting to chart the 'development' of the genre via technological change, he does so in terms which uphold the linear model:

Historical periods cannot always be so neatly marked off, because some men [...] exhibit a contrariness in refusing to adapt immediately to [what posterity has decreed to have been] improvements [...] There are overlaps and even some throwbacks or regressions to a more primitive technology, as presumably Press would view Plate 11. 137 As well as being a prescriptive approach to the material, the association of technical change with aesthetic or rhetorical 'progress' which informs such statements is rooted in the belief in the necessity or inevitability of 'progress' and 'evolution' in this or any other aspect of this genre. It is an association which Giles Auty singles out as one of several 'cliches' of modern art (or more precisely Modern Art) criticism which, despite 'glaring fallacies' have, in the absence of any challenge to them, moved 'insidiously into the realm of received wisdom': 'many [...] confuse the evolution of technology with the evolution of art, often claiming or hoping that the two run in parallel'. Yet if

medical practice and expertise or those of aeronautical engineering, say, have evolved qualitatively through experiment and accumulation of knowledge, the practice of art has merely changed, for the most part without providing the proof necessary to claim genuine progress. 138

The seemingly ineradicable association of the 'crude' and 'primitive' woodcut with 'immaturity' and the hand-coloured etching with 'maturity' has left the former virtual terra incognita as far as political prints scholarship is concerned and has precluded the
comparative studies which might otherwise have established the correspondences of iconography, structure and rhetorical tactics which exist between 17th- and 18th-century prints [Plates 12 and 13]; the fundamental failure to relate 18th-century graphic political satire with its 17th-century origins rather than to its late Hanoverian (or 20th-century) 'outcome', with which this thesis is, at so many points, concerned.

The association of 'development' with the elimination of accompanying texts and decreasing dependence upon other verbal components is, to say the least, unfounded, as I hope to show in Chapter VII and, in greater detail, in Part II, Chapter VI. The extent to which caricature 'transformed' the print after c.1750 is analysed in Part I, Chapter V.

With reference to French prints of the Revolutionary period, Philippe Bordes notes 'the varied and irreconcilable array of stylistic options and creative tools that can characterize a single period'; it is precisely this diversity which the conventional account of the 18th-century 'development' of the political print fails to accommodate.

The problem with the linear model of 'development' is that it is both a Procrustean bed which of necessity homogenises a body of material that is essentially heterogenous, and a model which relies on the selection of prints in its support, and the suppression (sometimes founded in genuine ignorance) of counter-evidence. It has its roots less in sinister motive than in the willingness of scholars to generalise.

Arguably this is compounded by the narrative or quasi-narrative nature of most accounts, as exemplified by EPC. It is ironic that a revival of narrative should have been credited with the revision of the received picture of 17th- and 18th-century politics when in the context of the political print it has been a vehicle for
the entrenchment of precisely the grand teleological premises which it renders somewhat less than tenable in an historical context. Even those studies which appear to eschew narrative for analysis (of which Diana Donald's "Calumny and Caricatura": The Case of George Townshend is an intelligent example) are informed by the larger narrative premises of scholarship in the field in that they invariably integrate their findings into the larger linear model; thus Donald's essay, which offers an acute analysis of the conditions (and the long-term absence of such conditions) which facilitated the use of the portrait charge in a public and political context, and an explanation of the low esteem in which Townshend was held by his peers, is nonetheless concerned to place Townshend within the established linear model.

The linear basis of political prints scholarship is also testimony to the extent to which it has been informed by the conceptual frameworks of conventional art historical study.

Conventional art history was for a long time, and, in its more populist manifestations, remains, preeminently linear in its conceptual frameworks. The 'history' of (Western) art was to a considerable extent the identification of a single line of development over time, in some cases to the present. This was conventionally presented as a sequence of styles; Baroque, Rococo, Neo-Classicism, Romanticism succeeded each other in the manner of stations on a single-track railway line; until recently, branch-lines were subject to an indifference that one can only call Beechingsque. Informing this characterisation of periods was a perception of 'cultural phenomena [...] as historically determined', a belief in an identifiable zeitgeist; an art historicism which was recently analysed with respect to the writings of Nikolaus Pevsner. For Pevsner, 'genius' consisted in submission to the 'spirit of the
age' 'and expressing it to its fullest'. Predictably, Pevsner seized on graphic political satire as an expression of the zeitgeist of Hanoverian England. What one historian has anathematised as an 'unfilled concept' has been hard-worked in this context, as Chapter XI will attempt to show.

The conformity of aesthetic representation to 'the spirit of the age' dictates the obsolescence of the emblematic; as an idiom characteristic of the metaphysical 17th century, there can be no place for it in the rational 18th century. In the context of political prints scholarship, the influence of the writings of Ronald Paulson, in particular Emblem and Expression, in promoting the idea of a fundamental discontinuity between the 17th and the 18th centuries must not be underestimated. Emblem and Expression sets out to demonstrate and contextualise the transformation of an old aesthetic by a new (a process implicit in the title of a more recent work, Breaking and Remaking: Aesthetic Practice in England 1700-1820 (1989)). Such is the emphasis upon transition (vide Chapter Four) that a more appropriate title might have been Emblem to Expression. In the introduction, the 18th century is defined as 'possibly the transitional period':

as Robert Rosenblum's title Transformations in Late-Eighteenth-Century Art shows, process and change are primary concerns in a study of this period.

The 'Hogarthian era' is a period 'in which traditional iconography was moribund, and so other structures of meaning were being sought and developed'; the 'development' of caricature is part and parcel of this process.

Pevsner would have applauded Daumier's pronouncement, quoted by both Shikes and Iannone, 'Il faut être de son temps'. The problem with the 'spirit of the age' is
that it is more readily identified with hindsight than by contemporaries. The contradictory responses to Hogarth reflect this. On the one hand, Hogarth is seen as a link in the chain of graphic progress which cannot readily be dismissed, at same time, unlike Townshend, he refused to submit to the zeitgeist in his hostility to caricature which, had he promoted it with the same assiduity with which promoted other things (indeed, with the same assiduity with which he wrote against it) might have enjoyed an earlier 'development'. Conversely, Lippincott observes the tendency on the part of art historians to place 18th-century

English art in its cultural context by lumping Hogarth together with the forces of artistic vitality leading to the formation of the English school in the 1760s, and the rest [of his contemporaries] with the obsolete holdovers from the seventeenth century.  

The canonical approach is common to both art historical and political prints scholarship, as is the (related) tendency to personification ('The Age of ..., is an enduring component of exhibition titles). The concept of a 'golden age' is not peculiar to prints scholarship; art historical scholarship has inclined to a similar categorization of periods (for example, William Gaunt, The Great Century of British Painting: Hogarth to Turner (1971)). As Lippincott observes, 'the stately succession from one great school or master to the next' is an inadequate conceptual framework for the study of 18th-century English painting, and the several methodological developments and it is one which the so-called 'new art history' (discussed in Part II, Chapter II) were intended to counter.  

In the Cuno volume, French Caricature, Philippe Bordes argues for the reintegration of political prints into 'the mainstream' of 18th-century art history whence it had been deleted from 'a neat succession of periods and
styles', even if this entailed interrupting 'the steady course of the familiar flow'.

It is thus the more ironic that political prints scholarship should continue to adhere to a linear model of 'development'.

It is also, perhaps, appropriate that the B.M. collection as catalogued, or the greater part thereof, should now exist on microfilm, a format which can only reinforce the idea of a single line of 'development'. Prints move past in chronological order; it is impossible to call a halt to the relentless forward progress in order to compare images separated by decades or by a century in order to see if apparent change is more than superficial. The Chadwyck-Healey microfilm is a fine resource in its own right; unfortunately it threatens to perpetuate a linear perception of this material and of its 'development' even as it has the potential to reveal the very multifariousness and particularity of the material which subscription to a linear model of 'development' has so far obscured.

As one historian has observed, 'historians [...] cannot pick and choose which developments in the past to acknowledge - they are stuck with what happened'. Precisely what happened with respect to the political print between 1640 and 1740, and between 1740 and 1840 merits closer and more sensitive attention than the simplistic and prescriptive model of 'development' offered by prints scholars has allowed.

1. Hogarth to Cruikshank, p.17.
3. For technical 'development', see EPC1 p.171; for post-1830 decline, EPC2 'Postscript: After 1832'; for the idea that the 18th-century print is an early
form of 'the modern cartoon', pp.1,3,40n.

4. Models on which George might have drawn include Percival (1916); Ashbee (1928); and Hofmann, (1957). For caricature's 'line of development' see Hofmann, pp.36,38,39,49,50-51.


6. ibid, p.399; something of this kind is hinted at by Atherton, Political Prints p.259 - in 1764 'Hogarth died, and about two years later, James Gillray, aged 11, drew his first sketch'.


8. Hillier, p.43.

9. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank p.21; idem, EPC1 p.111, also p.113, Hogarth's political prints 'are a small part of his oeuvre but important in the development of English graphic satire'; Carini, p.3; F. Gordon Roe, p.27.


13. Shikes, p.80. Atherton, Political Prints while focussing on this period, subscribes to this; pp.1-2 'In time, the individual genius of Sayers, Rowlandson, Gillray and the two Cruikshanks rescued the political print as an art form and carried it to new heights' [my emphasis]. Yet Atherton also states (ibid, p.264) that 'Bickham and Townshend must justly be considered the forerunners of Sayers and Gillray'.

14. 'The Case of the Missing Woodcuts' PtQtily IV (1987) 343-61, p.346; cf. Langford, A Polite and Commercial People p.310; Bunbury, Gillray and Rowlandson are Hogarth's 'successors'.


17. Lambourne, p.15.


19. ibid, p.20; Marc Baer, reviewing Patten, GCLTA suggests that Cruikshank, who worked through the greater part of the 19th century, 'symbolised' the transition from Georgian to Victorian 'precisely because the shift was not so tidy as commonly supposed' (PtQtily X (1993) 295-96).


22. English Caricature, p.20.
24. Klingender, p.vi.
25. Hofmann, pp.36,41; it is possible to divide Daumier's career 'into important phases, equally representative for the whole development of caricature' (p.41).
27. Iannone, p.10; Godfrey, English Caricature p.20
28. EPC1 pp.11,111. Increasing use of colour is associated with 'development' pp.118,173-74 (Sayers's work did not employ colour 'but otherwise belongs to the new school'). Cf. Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xvi; Godfrey, English Caricature p.40,52,89; Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.216. Atherton, Political Prints pp.19,264 notes that the use of colour may be charted over the decades 1740-60.

The point which must be made regarding the use of colour is that while it had the potential to enhance a print, the quality of hand-colouring was immensely variable, and could be crude, garish and ineptly-applied. The tendency of exhibitions and dealers to show only the best examples has perhaps obscured ; an individual collection, such as that of the Hunterian Art Gallery, Glasgow, will in most cases reveal this variety. For the vagaries of hand-colouring see Elizabeth Miller, Hand-Coloured British Prints (London, V&A:1987) esp. pp.24,25,33.
32. Dickinson, Caricatures and the Constitution p.20.
33. Miller, pp.29-30.
34. Patten, GCLTA p.54; Wynn-Jones, CHB p.17.
36. Percival, Walpole Ballads p.xxvii 'this art underwent transition in the Walpole period'.
37. EPC1, p.11.
38. Lambourne, p.12. For the idea of 'gradual transition' as 'an evasion [...] an attempt to cover up up ignorance', see Elton, The Practice of History p.112.
41. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.222. EPC1, p.145, describes 1771 as 'a turning-point in cartoon history - a change of mood, a change of scene, and a change in technique'.
42. Paulson, 'Severed Head' p.56.
43. EPC1, p.111; Hogarth to Cruikshank p.21; Pevsner, Englishness of English Art p.36; Godfrey, English
Caricature p. 12; Hibbert, p. 70; Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p. 358.


45. Paulson, 'Severed Head' p. 56; Wood, Folly p. 8; cf. Godfrey, English Caricature p. 11 'the state of the art at the end of the eighteenth century represented the successful grafting of caricature onto an older emblematic tradition which had flourished since the early seventeenth century'. Variants on this are too numerous to mention.

46. EPC1, p. 147 'and prepared the way for Gillray and Rowlandson'; ibid, pp. 11, 111; Carretta refers to a 'transition toward caricature' Snarling Muse p. 187; Roylance, to the 'transition to the golden age of caricature during the second half of the century'.

47. Porter, LRB p. 19.

48. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank p. 57; cf. Atherton, Political Prints p. 123 'The year 1760 is still, to a certain extent, a watershed, if not in terms of political structure or the normal patterns of political behaviour, at least as regards to issues'.

49. Hogarth to Cruikshank, p. 57.


51. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' pp. 218, 223.

52. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank, pp. 13, 17, 57; Atherton, Political Prints p. vi; Godfrey, English Caricature p. 12; Hill, Mr Gillray p. 150; Wood, Folly p. 13; Press, Political Cartoon pp. 37, 41; Shikes, p. 65; Wardroper, Cruikshank 200 pp. 5, 17. George, EPC1 has, in its stead, a chapter entitled 'The Classic Age of English Caricature' (also used EPC2, pp. 1, 60, 257). Riely, Age of Horace Walpole uses 'classic age'; Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p. 7 refers to 'the great age of caricature'.

53. For example, English Caricature, pp. 89-96; Lambourne, Caricature employs it as a subdivision. Not to mention book-titles: Michel Jouve, L'Age d'or de la caricature anglaise (Paris: 1983).

The idea of a 'golden age' also informs the appraisal of French political caricature and its 'development'. Reviewing Elise K. Kenney, The Pear: French Graphic Arts in the Golden Age of Caricature (Yale University Art Gallery: 1992), Antony Griffiths wrote that 'the subtitle ought to have read "...in the Golden Age of La Caricature" as almost all the prints come from that famous journal. It would also have avoided offending those who believe that the 1830s was not the only golden age of caricature'; Pqtly IX (1992) 291. As far as I am concerned, the offence comes from the continued currency of this trite appellation, in whatever context.

54. Hogarth to Cruikshank, p. 57.

55. Godfrey, Printmaking pp. 75-76; B.M., Europeans in Caricature; Rix, Our Old Friend Rolly p. ix; Hibbert, p. 68; Shikes, pp. 65-66. See also Atherton, Political Prints p. 2 for 'heyday'.
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56. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p. 224.

57. Wynn-Jones, CHB pp. 9, 62; cf. Godfrey, Printmaking p. 75; 'Gillray's work represents the high point of the English caricature'.


60. Carretta, George III p. 326.

61. George, EPC2, p. 218; Press, Political Cartoon p. 41

62. p. 25; cf. the obituary of David Low, The Guardian 21 September 1963:

   In his last years, Low gave all the encouragement he could to younger artists. In that sense and because of his cartoons, he can be said to have given continuity to the tradition of political cartooning. He was a deep student of this tradition, understood it both practically and academically and knew better than anybody else his own place in it.


64. EPC1, pp. 1, 3.

65. Elton, The Practice of History pp. 141, 47.

66. Donald, "Calumny" p. 45.

67. Hofmann, p. 39. Porter, P&P p. 191, writes that Atherton 'valuably drew attention to a process of internal stylistic evolution whose [sic] long-term effect would be to give visual satire a more popular potential'. The fact of this transformation is questioned in Chapter V; Chapter VIII questions the 'popular potential' of such prints in this period.

68. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p. 217.

69. Langford, Robinocracy p. 15.

70. Roylance, Age of Horace Walpole no pagination

71. Donald, "'Calumny" p. 54; Nash, 'Hogarth and Gillray' no pagination.

72. ibid; Low, quoted Hill, Satirical Etchings p. ix

Patten, GCLTA p. 96 writes that 'events had cleared the way for [GC] to make his mark by extending and improving upon the legacy of biological and artistic fathers - Isaac, Gillray, and the whole tradition of British graphic satire from Hogarth forward'.

   Like 'golden age', 'father' would seem an ineradicable cliché of art historical writing; Thomas Bewick is described as 'the father of English wood-engraving' in Martin, 'Missing Woodcuts' p. 343

73. Wright, Histoire de la caricature et du grotesque dans la littérature et dans l'art 2nd Paris edn (1875) p. 372, quoted by Michel Melot, 'Caricature and the Revolution: The Situation in France in 1789' in ed. Cuno, French Caricature p. 32n. Lucie-Smith, p. 21 refers to 'caricature in embryo'.
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74. Ashbee, pp.32,37,46.
75. Wynn-Jones, CHB p.9.
76. Langford, Robinocracy p.13. Cf. Atherton, Political Prints p.vii Hogarth's 'success symbolizes, but does not alone represent, English graphic satire's coming of age'.
77. Wood, Folly p.10; Godfrey, English Caricature p.17
79. Brewer, Common People p.17
80. Atherton, Political Prints p.265, 'developing within the confines of traditional iconography, experimenting with caricature' [my emphasis].
83. Shikes, p.63.
84. Atherton, Political Prints p.33; ibid, p.vi 'the middle decades of the century were the "seed time" of the later flowering'.
85. Wark, Isaac Cruikshank's Drawings For Drolls p.14; Press, Political Cartoon p.32.
86. Wynn-Jones, CHB p.18.
87. Press, 'Georgian Political Print', p.220; thus Wynn-Jones, A Cartoon History of the American Revolution (1975) p.43 'many of the satires in these years are taken from polemical magazines [...] Many of them had a very uncertain lease of life and soon died; but in fostering the cartoonists they played an important part in the development of graphic satire which was to bear fruit in the next two decades'.
88. Wynn-Jones, CHB sleeve note.
89. CHB, Foreword; Low, 'An Imaginary Interview' quoted Hill, Satirical Etchings p.ix; Ashbee, p.33. In Mr Gillray, Preface p.v, Hill describes himself as 'a working cartoonist' who has approached Gillray with a view to establishing 'the roots of modern cartooning'.
90. Low, 'An Imaginary Interview'; Iannone, p.8
92. Hill, Mr Gillray p.1; Langford, Robinocracy
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pp.15,18. Cf. Claude Langlois, 'Counterrevolutionary Iconography' in ed Cuno, *French Caricature* 41-54, p.49; 'for the first time in France - forty years before Grandville, Daumier, and the other collaborators of Le Charivari and Le Caricature - a truly modern political caricature had appeared'.


96. George, *EPC1* p.73, 'the Bubble prints are a landmark in English cartoon history'; p.141 'A new phase in cartoon history begins in 1767'; *EPC2* p.242 'the Reform agitation is a climax in cartoon history'; p.249 assesses *Figaro in London* 'importance in cartoon history' ('it was the direct forerunner of Punch').

97. *EPC1* p.53; Roylance, *Age of Horace Walpole*, Townshend 'must be credited with inventing the sophisticated English political cartoon'.


100. Hill, *Mr Gillray* p.1; *EPC1*, p.69.

101. *EPC1*, p.112.


103. Carretta, *Snarling Muse* p.245 identifies in mid-century verse satire 'the signs of the future which would succeed the older tradition of political verse satire'. Cf. Clark, *English Society* p.3.


105. Shikes, p.36.

106. Hodnett, *Francis Barlow* p.32. Hodnett's arithmetic is interesting; 'a century and a half later' brings us to 1829, when, according to George et al, the genre was in its 'penultimate phase'.


108. Atherton, *Political Prints* p.205; this has been given further currency by Carretta, *Snarling Muse* p.24.

109. Donald, "Calumny"' pp.49-50,52; ibid, p.49. Townshend's caricature of Lord Holderness, *The Patriot of Patriots*, 'anticipates the expressiveness of Gillray'. Langlois, 'Counterrevolutionary Iconography' p.51 'a perusal of Royalist caricatures of the Revolutionary period 'can evoke the caricatures of the July Monarchy or even the Third Republic'. Robert Wark, *Isaac Cruikshank's Drawings for Drolla* p.14 'Hogarth clearly anticipates virtually the whole range of humour that subsequently appears in English comic art'; Robert Douwma, Catalogue 34 *English Caricature to 1800* (London:1993) p.13 claims that Bunbury 'can be seen as a precursor of Victorian comic art'. Then again, he might be seen in his own right and in terms of
his own period.

The conceit of 'anticipation', of course, can only reinforce the impression of a relentless monodirectional 'progress'; indeed, there is a sense in which it is still more pernicious in that it has the effect of telescoping the intervening years.

110. English Caricature, p.73.
112. Hofmann, p.36.
113. idem, p.38.
114. Shikes, p.60; Philippe, p.94.
115. Lambourne, p.9.
116. EPC1, p.24.
117. Shikes, p.xxxv.
119. George, EPC pp.257,111.
120. Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.359.
122. EPC1,pp.68, 70, 73, 82, 90,101, 115-16, 123, 141, 148, 169 ,171-72, 180; EPC2 pp.257, 258-59.
123. ibid, p.71; cf. also pp.141,142,146, EPC2 pp.185,258
124. ibid, pp.35, 64; also, p.45 a print of 1739 which employed the design used in a Dutch satirical medal of 1655 [IBM 2417, The Naked Truth] is discussed in the context of the Great Rebellion.
125. ibid, p.1.
127. EPC1 pp.11,118. It is appropriate that a work which emphasised change and paid lip-service to continuity should do so even in its final sentence: 'And though the pattern was changing rapidly, the imagery of Leech, Tenniel and their successors is deeply rooted in the past' (EPC2, p.260).
130. Thomas, p.14; Carretta, Snarling Muse p.201, idem, George III p.52.
131. George, Catalogue V p.xii; EPC1, p.111.
132. ibid, p.10.
133. Clark, English Society p.3.
135. As acknowledged, in conventional terms, by Thomas, American Revolution p.12: 'The technical standard of their craft improved with the growing use of copper engraving [... ] though the old crude woodcut method survived into the next [19th] century'.
136. Hind, History of Engraving and Etching p.197; see also Atherton, Political Prints p.43n; for the technical eclecticism and virtuosity of Gillray's printmaking, see Hill, Satirical Etchings pp.xxiv-xxvi.
137. Press, Political Cartoon p.33. Press cites Tenniel, who 'insisted that his drawings continue to be hacked out of woodblocks by hand a good ten to
fifteen years after the easier process of reproduction - photoengraving - had been perfected'. Conversely, Wood, Folly p.12 considers that:

One of the most remarkable aspects of the development of the political print in modern Europe lies in the way it has combined innovation with technical conservatism. The woodcut remained a vital part of popular print culture in Europe throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the German Expressionists turned to woodcut as one of the most suitable vehicles for their political art in the early twentieth century [...] Despite the fact that lithographic and photographic processes superseded earlier methods of mechanical print reproduction in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the older printmaking techniques at no stage became entirely obsolete, and indeed at various times would be revived [...] Picasso was to choose etching as the preferred medium for his one experiment in unadulterated political propaganda, The Dream and the Lie of Franco, although he was a superb lithographer.

140. For 'the revival of narrative' and its implications, see Clark, Revolution and Rebellion pp.12,15-20.
142. Cf. Patten, GCLTA p.70 'the growth of caricature is another manifestation of the Romantic movement, the exploration of individuality and difference that confuted Augustan assumptions about universal norms'; Patten made the same claim in 'Conventions', p.331. Godfrey, English Caricature p.10 considers the work of Sayers, Gillray and Rowlandson 'a vulgar curtain-raiser to the Romantic period'; Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xxviii, writes that Gillray 'occupies a special place in that earthquake of the spirit which we have come to call the Romantic Rebellion'; Hill also notes Osbert Lancaster's perception of Gillray as 'the last great exponent of the Baroque'.

146. Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, Ma.:1975); Breaking and Remaking: Aesthetic Practice in England 1700-1820 (Brunswick, NJ:1989). I should point out that I have yet to read the latter; my observation is prompted by its title and by acquaintance with Paulson's other writings. Emblem and Expression provided Carretta with his thesis of a shift in the idiom of engraved satire in The Snarling Muse (pp.xx,233).
147. Emblem and Expression p. 9.
148. Shikes, p. xxiii; Iannone, p. 13. Iannone also cites Courbet; 'historical art is by nature contemporary. Each epoch must have its artists who express it and reproduce it for the future'.
149. Lippincott, p. 5.
150. ibid, p. 6; it is therefore the more interesting to discern residual traces of this linearity in Lippincott's introduction: Lippincott writes (p. 3) of a 'transitional phase' between two periods (the London art world of the 1720s and that of the 1770s) and notes (p. 5) that 'Hogarth's art does not satisfactorily link the baroque classicism of the late seventeenth century and the neoclassicism of one hundred years later'; emphasis upon the importance of Hogarth 'does not entirely explain the emergence of the classically-minded school of English painters later in the century'; observations which presuppose the very linear model of 'development' held to be inadequate. Lippincott is, however to be praised for her demythologising of Hogarth.
151. Bordes, p. 10.
152. Or, more precisely, the order in which they are catalogued; in the case of the Stephens volumes, this means that, for example, illustrations to A Tale of A Tub, including those of 19th-century editions, are placed in the catalogue under 'William III', although the first Tale of a Tub illustration is from the 1724 edition (BM 1298).
Chapter V: Men, not Measures: Caricature and the Political Print

The taste of the day leans entirely to caricature. Morning Chronicle, 1 August 1796

The origins of caricature and theories as to its etymological derivation, together with more or less detailed analyses of the way in which caricature functions, have been addressed innumerable times in the literature. Briefly, caricature is a technique of facial and, to a lesser extent, corporeal, representation which at its most developed deploys physiognomic distortion as means of conveying insights into character. Caricature has been described as 'a deformation that accentuates the features and thereby makes the individual more recognisable' and as 'an exaggerated resemblance in drawing'; another scholar has claimed that

strictly speaking, caricature is not a synonym for satire or even a genre of drawing. It is a language of exaggeration, a method of projecting inner characteristics, real or imagined, into appearances [...] an effort to distill an essence of personality.'

Etymologically, caricature is said to derive from caricare - to 'overload'; it has also been referred to as the portrait charge or charged likeness. Italian in origin, caricature was introduced into England between the late 1730s and the mid-1740s by the artist and dealer Arthur Pond. The late 1750s witnessed the first attempts to apply the technique to graphic political satire, but caricature was not to become an established component of the political print until the late 1770s or early 1780s.

It is not the intention of this chapter to add to the interpretations and explanations of the idiom offered by the existing literature, but rather to note the extent to which caricature has monopolised the attentions of scholars to date, and to consider the implications of
this for our understanding and perception of the 17th- and 18th-century English political print.

Before looking at the ways in which political prints scholarship has placed a disproportionate and sometimes anachronistic emphasis on caricature, it may be appropriate to attempt to account for the fascination which the idiom has exerted. Preoccupation with caricature would seem to be part of a larger preoccupation with graphic humour. In more than one account, caricature is credited with having been the means whereby humour was introduced into a hitherto ponderous and humourless genre. The perception of humour as a desirable, even necessary, component of graphic political satire and comment is examined in Chapter X below. Perhaps still more influential has been the apparent similarity of 18th-century political caricature with that of the 20th, whether in the form of the newspaper caricature or the three-dimensional caricature of Spitting Image: it may not be coincidental that scholars have consistently presented the 'triumph' of caricature over emblematic satire in terms of the former idioms's greater accessibility - caricature 'had an immediate appeal to the eye' and so forth. Chapter VII will suggest that this view of caricature reflects not only modern exposure to graphic political satire that is in many cases - for example, the work of Gerald Scarfe - very close to the pure portrait charge, but also modern aesthetic values; the seeming congruity of many of the characteristics of the portrait charge as it emerged during the 18th century with the graphic qualities esteemed by modern art criticism. Indeed, many of the accounts of caricature acknowledge an agenda distinct from the study of the 18th-century political print, be it the 'psychoanalytic explorations in art' pursued by Kris and Gombrich, or a hostility to the values deemed to inhere in the 18th-century formal portrait which allows
caricature to be celebrated as the portrait's antithesis (for which see Chapter XI below).

The extent to which the study of the 17th- and 18th-century English political print has been the study of political caricature may be ascertained from the prevalence of the word in the bibliography of the subject. Studying this literature, moreover, it will be found that the preoccupation of scholars with caricature has dictated the illustrative choices of books, together with the selection of material for exhibitions, to the extent that few people, including historians, are familiar with pre-caricature English political prints or with non-caricature prints contemporaneous with the political caricature of the later period, an omission which assumes a greater significance in the context of the claims made regarding the 'transformation' of the political print by caricature.

The precise date at which caricature became a consistent component of the political print is something upon which the literature exhibits an uncharacteristic lack of consensus, but there is a case to be made that only for the last twelve years of the period covered by the first volume of EPC - i.e., c.1600-1792 - is the term appropriate. That 'caricature' should have become, with 'cartoon', the most frequently-encountered synonym for the political print is revealing; indeed, it can be argued that, just as anachronistic usage of the term 'cartoon' for the pre-1843 political print has allowed important differences between the political print of 1670 or 1770 and the newspaper political cartoon of today to be blurred, so the use of the term 'caricature' for the pre-c.1780 political print, as in the V&A exhibition English Caricature, 1620 to the Present, is indicative of the priorities of, and the perspective which has prevailed in, prints scholarship to date.
That the seminal study in this field should bear the title *English Political Caricature* exemplifies the extent to which the study of the 17th- and 18th-century English political print has been the study of political caricature. 'The subject of this book', George wrote, 'is pictorial propaganda in England'; this is immediately contracted: ' - the political or controversial print'.

In fact, as noted in the previous chapter, *EPC* is concerned with the development of something called 'political caricature' or 'the cartoon', and the triumph of the idiom of caricature is central to its narrative.

In both her use of the term caricature for the pre-c.1756 political print and in emphasising the importance of the adoption of portrait caricature, George did not diverge from established practice; earlier accounts, such as those of Ashbee and Percival, had treated the 17th- and early 18th-century political print and the political caricature of the later 18th- and early 19th centuries as a single phenomenon, the 'development' of which it was possible to chart. As the first modern scholarly account, and because it remains the model for and source of almost every subsequent account, the fact that *EPC* approaches the 17th- and 18th-century political print from the perspective of 'the development of political caricature' is worthy of remark.

That the political print should have been studied from the perspective of the development of political caricature renders the chronological bias identified in Chapter III more explicable. The bias of studies and exhibitions towards prints of the period c.1760-c.1820 makes more sense if this period is understood to represent the so-called 'golden age of English caricature'; the relative neglect of the decades 1700-1760 is similarly explicable in terms of the belated adoption of caricature; 'not till the [1750s] was the exaggeration of form or feature on which portrait
caricature depends used in English political satires'.

Above all, it explains the neglect of the 17th-century political print. The 17th-century political print has conventionally been defined in terms of the absence of caricature. The difference between the 17th-century political print and the modern 'cartoon' is 'essential' and 'instructive', according to Gombrich: 'there is no element of caricature in the earlier works'. Early political prints 'are scarcely caricatures'; they 'reveal little interest in the idiosyncracies of individual appearance'; 'in the absence of personal caricature, figures were satirised by the absurd situations in which they were represented, and not by distortion of features'. 'A typical print of the pre-Hanoverian period is an elaborate tableau almost devoid of personalities';

Human proportions were seldom noticeably distorted. The imagery was predominantly literary; a man would be represented as a dog not because he behaved like a dog or even looked like one, but simply because the comparison was [...] considered lowering.

Cartoonists were as insulting as they knew how to be to a succession of victims from Sir Giles Mompesson [in the 17th century] to Sir Robert Walpole [in the 18th], but though these might be given the attributes of a fiend, there was no uglification of feature: their characteristics are expressed symbolically, or they are put in some discreditable situation - taking a bribe or conferring with the Devil.

Atherton, referring to The Pillars of The State (1756) [Plate 1], one of the first 'political caricatures', contrasts it with earlier prints: 'Ministers had been lampooned before, but usually as stereotypes or nondescript figures, surrounded by conventional symbolism'. Langford concurs: in the case of Sir Robert Walpole, for example, 'recognition was achieved not by the selection and exaggeration of facial features but rather by more mechanical devices' - the Garter
ribbon, the 'accompanying impedimenta of office and corruption' or by historical analogies; visual or verbal allusions to Wolsey, Burleigh, Gaveston, Cromwell, de Witt, Caesar, Sejanus. 13 Atherton earlier used an image of Walpole in which the latter is identifiable only by inscriptions and context - Idol Worship or the Way to Preferment (1740) [Plate 2] - to exemplify the difference between the iconographic print, in which a person or concept is satirised by association and characterized by appropriate symbols or stereotypes, and the more subjective definitions of caricature; a difference which Atherton, like Gombrich, considers 'theoretically fundamental'. 14

The triumph of caricature after its introduction into the political print in the late 1750s, in the work of George Townshend, is central to the linear model of the 'development' of the political print which the previous chapter identified as the prevalent approach to the material. The conventional interpretation of Townshend's contribution is that 'from that time on, caricature was an essential component of English satirical prints'. 15

Equally conventional is the idea that the political print of the so-called 'golden age' was the result of the 'marriage' or union of caricature with the pre-existing emblematic idiom. 'In their different ways', Paulson writes, Gillray and Rowlandson 'joined caricature heads to emblematic situations. 16

The survival of the emblematic idiom after this union has, however, been consistently downplayed; the 'development' of the political print after c.1750 has conventionally been described in terms of the gradual supplanting of the older idiom. Thus we read that by 1760, caricature was 'well on the way to becoming the dominant form of political satire', and that 'throughout the whole period [i.e., 1760-1832] political prints were
dominated by caricature, in which personalised political attacks were made through artistic distortion'. Carretta may qualify his statement that 'by 1760, caricature had become the dominant form' - the sentence concludes 'surpassing but not eradicating the earlier more emblematic mode of engraved satire' [my emphasis], but the tenor of George's narrative, and of subsequent accounts, insists on the rapid obsolescence of the emblematic mode. Thus Carretta can assert that 'the growth of caricature and invective in political satire was at the expense of the emblematic tradition' [my emphasis], Press that after 1760 'gross caricature of face and form took the place of [...] emblematic imagery'.

The transformation of the emblematic political print by caricature has been referred to, revealingly, as 'the central and most enduring achievement of 18th-century graphic satire' [my emphasis]. While the precise chronology of the triumph of caricature may vary, the fact of that triumph is never in dispute.

It is difficult to read EPC and similar studies without being led to the conclusion that the adoption, and in particular the ultimate dominance, of caricature were somehow inevitable. In her observation that 'caricature and the burlesque were destined to transform the political print' [my emphasis], George reveals the extent to which hindsight has coloured the appraisal of the early- and mid-18th-century print. That, in the absence of caricature, the political print might have survived for the remainder of the century, that it might possibly have experienced the same quantitative developments post-1760, or that it might have been modified by some idiom other than caricature, are possibilities which the literature has failed to consider.
It was a shrewd historian who observed that if something is 'inevitable', the historian is absolved of any responsibility to explain it. The question conspicuous by its absence from studies of the political caricature, is 'Why was caricature adopted when it was?' - i.e. in the latter decades of the 18th century rather than immediately after Townshend first adapted the portrait charge to the political satire. The virtual absence of any explanatory context for the adoption of caricature is an important omission and one which those who, like Porter, have reviewed the historiography of the subject, have failed to remark.

In EPC1, George asks 'How can the long neglect of personal caricature be explained?', which is not quite the same question, but George devotes no more than two speculative sentences to the matter: perhaps the political climate was unfavourable; perhaps engravers were incapable or unwilling to adopt it.

It is this question which Diana Donald has attempted to answer in a detailed study of the contemporary reception of the caricatures of Townshend:

Throughout the 1760s and much of the 1770s, attempts at personal caricature in satirical prints were sporadic, and depended on isolated initiatives. [...] This tardiness in the assimilation of caricature into satirical imagery, after Townshend's striking example, seems to require an explanation more fundamental than the lack of gifted draughtsmen.

Noting the (prurient) hostility with which Townshend's essays in this vein were viewed by his peers, Donald suggests that the belated adoption of caricature may be explained in terms of an ambivalence towards the use of personal caricature in a political - that is to say, a public and journalistic, context as opposed to the domestic, private, sphere of polite amusement to which the idiom had hitherto been confined, and where the art of distortion might be deployed without aggression and
not infrequently with the consent of the 'victim'.

According to Donald, 'the values revealed by [a] survey of attitudes to Townshend have an important bearing on the reception of works by his successors in the satirical field' and go some way towards explaining 'the broad lines of development' in the 1770s, which saw the adoption of personal caricature by the commercial printsellers, but in the field of social as opposed to political satire.

Still more importantly, Donald also suggests that caricature in the Ghezzi mode - that is, caricature as it was first disseminated in England via Pond's etchings -, in which figures were portrayed singly, with the head almost invariably in profile and 'the body turned in a graceful but rather stereotyped three-quarter view',

offered little scope for the characterisation of the subject through idiosyncracies of gesture and gait, and even less for the dramatic interplay of figures. It was, therefore, fundamentally unsuited to the needs of the political print, and indeed existed alongside the latter as a quite separate mode throughout the 1750s and 1760s.

In entering the political arena, Townshend had to adapt his caricaturing skills 'to the ideographic nature' of the political print; 'characterisation and ridicule of his antagonists now had to support the presentation of issues and causes'.

The extent to which the subsequent adoption of caricature in graphic political satire reflects a significant change in attitudes and perceptions towards personal satire is something upon which Donald touches in her "Characters and Caricatures": the satirical view; the decades 1760-80, over which time the gradual incursion of caricature into the political print may be charted, would repay a similarly close study.

As far as I am aware, Donald's essay on Townshend represents the only attempt by a scholar to date and
contextualize the adoption of caricature. It is true that, in *The Snarling Muse*, Vincent Carretta approaches the decades 1730-60 from the perspective of verbal as well as visual satire.\(^29\) As well as being flawed by a Paulsonian belief in the inevitability of the demise of the emblematic as a viable idiom for political satire, Carretta's thesis, in which the 'shift' toward caricature is a response to a 'spoils system' of politics, the visual expression of a period in which no fundamental differences of principle divided political rivals, an ideological vacuum in which personalities assumed an unprecedented prominence ('If the measures were always the same, then the men were all that were left to attack'), is ultimately a caricature of 18th-century politics which is rendered untenable by the very different conclusions of historical scholarship.\(^30\)

Elsewhere, one finds scholars seeking refuge from the potential difficulties of contextualising the adoption of caricature in such empty criteria of explanation as 'the spirit of the age' and 'national character'.\(^31\) Thus Carretta, on the redundancy of emblematic conventions; 'increasingly, the new times demanded new forms'. A discernible increase in ad hominem satire in the 1740s is described as 'a sign of the times'.\(^32\)

Scholarship in the field has proceeded from the view that the triumph of caricature was inevitable 'to the assumption that the known outcome was in some way "right"' or 'desirable'.\(^33\) Porter, for example, can write that it was the adoption of caricature that gave the political print 'real punch in the political arena'.\(^34\) It is a perception which has informed the evaluation of pre- and non-caricature political prints and of the 'significance' of individual artists. George Townshend has been accorded the status of pioneer; as
such, he is more important and worthy of study than those of his contemporaries and successors who failed to adopt the new technique. 35

The ambivalent place which the figure of Hogarth occupies in the linear model of 'the development of political caricature' exemplifies the extent to which the adoption of portrait caricature is central to that model. Held by many to have given graphic political satire its narrative emphasis, as well as being held responsible for a more general advance in the art of engraving and a concomitant expansion of the London print trade, Hogarth remains a primary figure in most accounts of the development of the political print, to the extent that, as noted in Chapter III, his working life has informed the chronology of prints studies. 36

Yet not only were Hogarth's explicitly political prints few, but, while contemporaneous with those of Townshend, in them the representation of individuals is commonly subordinate to a larger structure and iconography or else emblematic [Plate 3]. Worse, 'Hogarth disdained to accept and enjoy himself as a caricaturist'. 37

Hogarth's well-publicised hostility towards the new idiom and his rejection of the title of caricaturist have militated against his satisfactory incorporation into the linear model. The belief that the adoption of caricature was necessary to the development of the political print has made it possible to present Hogarth as misguidedly and unnecessarily obstructing an inevitable and desirable progress. It is for this reason that Press can write that only with the death of Hogarth in 1764 and the liberation of the political print from 'Hogarthian influences' could the genre 'develop'. 38

Reluctance on the part of prints scholars to abandon a figure so susceptible of congenial interpretation, however, has meant that total displacement of Hogarth from the 'story' of English political caricature is rare.
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More commonly, Hogarth has been presented as a 'proto-caricaturist', one who, although he 'disdained any direct connection of his own art with caricature', nonetheless 'set the stage' for its ultimate success. Feaver, for example, dutifully records Hogarth's objections to, and rejection of, the idiom, before reaching the conventional conclusion that 'his work established the tradition of caricature in England'.

Hogarth has also been presented as a caricaturist malgre lui whose protestations and distinctions are not to be taken seriously. For George Kahrl, as for many, Hogarth's rejection of caricature is a 'paradox'; one which Kahrl resolves by observing, with Frederick Antal, that Hogarth often 'slid imperceptibly' into caricature: Kahrl concludes that 'Hogarth's practice belied his prejudices and protests against the increasing dominance of caricature in art and writing'. Another scholar considers that his disavowals of the title 'show more patriotism than logic'.

The determination of scholars to enlist Hogarth as a caricaturist in the face of the artist's explicit renunciation of the term, and the degree to which subsequent commentators have elected to ignore those works in which Hogarth distinguishes between his own studies in character, and caricature, which he viewed as the facile distortion of feature without insight into character [Plate 4], and between his own general application of satire and the ad hominem lampooning of caricature, in order to do so, are worthy of notice.

That studies should persist in referring to Hogarth as the 'father' or 'grandfather' of political caricature is evidence both of that conflation of caricatural and non-caricatural political prints which has allowed them to be studied as a single phenomenon, 'caricature', and the grip, as a conceptual framework, of a linear model by which prints and artists are alike straightjacketed: witness Atherton's use of the term 'proto-caricature' for
prints of the 1740s.\textsuperscript{45}

The aesthetic historicism which measures an individual's 'significance' by his conformity to what hindsight has deemed to have been the zeitgeist has similarly determined the response to pre-caricature and non-caricature political prints. That the 'development' of the political print has been interpreted in terms of the adoption and subsequent triumph of caricature is evident from the fact that, notwithstanding its comparatively late (1756) first appearance in, and very gradual (1756-80) assimilation into, the political print, it is the presence or absence of caricature which has been taken as the measure of a print's 'significance' or 'merit'. 'Early' prints are praised in proportion to the extent to which they seem to 'anticipate' the later idiom. Thus, Langford can write that the 'semi-realistic portrayal' of George II represents 'a major advance on the cartoon of an earlier period'.\textsuperscript{46} Of the decade 1730-40, he writes that

the most that can be detected during this period is a growing interest in the identification of character [...] a much more marked interest in individual politicians.\textsuperscript{47}

The 1741 print, The Motion [Plate 5] can be described as 'forward-looking' because it eschews 'a stylised representation of a typical patriot figure or cause' for 'careful character studies of individuals'.\textsuperscript{48} Carretta, similarly, considers the depiction of the Duke of Newcastle in BM 2604 A Cheap and Easy Method of Improving English Swine's Flesh by a German method of Feeding (c.1743) an 'anticipation' of the work of Townshend.\textsuperscript{49}

The corollary of such praise is, of course, dispraise for those unfortunate prints which fail to anticipate 'the future'. In 1813, J.P. Malcolm could hold it to the demerit of prints pre-c.1770 that 'in no instance' had the artist 'ventured to give a likeness in the extreme of
ludicrous distortion'. The uniformly pejorative references to the political prints of 'HB' at the end of the period, and the related idea that this period saw the 'decline' or the 'demise' of the political print, are at least in part attributable to the idea that 'HB' eschewed facial caricature 'in favour of a representational likeness' [Plate 6]. The fact that French prints of the Revolutionary period similarly eschew caricature in favour of largely symbolic or allegorical modes of representation has long been taken as evidence of the 'backwardness' of the art of graphic political satire in that country compared to England. Claude Langlois may argue for a reappraisal and reintegration of royalist graphic political satire from the margins whence the emphases of previous studies of Revolutionary satire have tended or sought to banish it, underplaying both its existence and its significance, yet he can still write, of these prints, that they 'obstinately refused the deformation of bodies and, more particularly that of the face'.

Having acknowledged that the reproduction of plausible likenesses was not, in fact, a preoccupation of graphic political satirists in the 1730s, Langford goes on to state that 'identifications by association not recognition' 'achieved their main object but would not have appealed or been necessary fifty years later'. The perspective which has for too long prevailed in political prints study is that identified by J.C.D. Clark in his parable of the sedan chair and the motor-car; paraphrased below, with 'caricature' and 'cartoon' replacing the 'liberalism' and 'radicalism' of the original. The specific idiom of caricature, and 'the political cartoon' 'both came into existence at a particular time, neither earlier nor later, and for specific reasons.
To attempt to write the history of [English political caricature] before the [1770s, and of 'the political cartoon' before the 1840s] is thus, in point of method, akin to attempting to write the history of the eighteenth-century motor car. There were, of course, forms of transport which performed many of the functions which the motor car later performed, the sedan chair among them. Yet to explain the sedan chair as if it were an early version of the motor car, and by implication to condemn it for failing so lamentably to ['anticipate'] the motor car, is to turn a modern error of scholarly method into a failure of men in a past society.

The extent to which this perspective has indeed failed the non-, and in particular the pre-, caricature political print is evident from the ease with which the emblematic idiom, conventionally held to have been 'outmoded' by caricature, has been dismissed in the literature. The anachronism which this perspective entails is perhaps still more evident in the aesthetic evaluations of the material which are the subject of Chapter VII.

II

The English Political Caricature 1770-1830: 'the curious absence of really meaningful change'?

... an attempt to free the mind from the pressures of a conventional pattern, to absorb the results of research, and to think about the whole age afresh, suggests that the [...] appearance of revolutionary changes has been allowed, for one reason and another, to hide the curious absence of really meaningful change...

Thus far, I have assumed, for the sake of argument, that the narrative of 'the development of political caricature' which has proved so inimical to a proper evaluation of the pre-caricature print, is, at least in essentials, correct; that caricature did indeed come to dominate the political print after c.1770. Langford's caution that, while historians have been 'understandably'
keen to stress the 'novelty' of later 18th-century graphic political satire, 'notably its divergence from the well-established emblem tradition', 'it is possible to exaggerate the extent and rapidity' of the change from emblematic print to political caricature only serves to underline the extent to which studies of the 18th-century political print have been written from the perspective that holds there to be 'little choice over the direction of change and that what is at stake is normally the pace of change'[my emphasis].

Such is the prevalence of this view that the validity of caricature's claims to have superseded earlier modes of representation in graphic political satire has never been investigated. Yet a comprehensive survey of prints produced between 1770 and 1830, that is, the so-called 'Golden Age' of political caricature, suggests that the impact of caricature upon the political print has been greatly exaggerated.

In the first place, emphasis on the triumph of caricature after c.1770 has obscured the numerous prints in which caricature - indeed the human figure - plays no part whatsoever; prints in which the point is made by a combination of objects, symbols and inscriptions. In this category are rebus prints - for example, the 1778 print America to her Mistaken Mother [Plate 7] - mock-heraldic satires, and images such as the frontispiece to an attack on John Wesley, The Temple of Imposture (1778) [Plate 8].

Just as conventional accounts of the triumph of caricature have failed to acknowledge the continued existence in the prints of non-figurative representation, so they have failed to comment on the numerous prints from this period in which the delineation of individuals cannot be described as 'caricature' as this is conventionally defined, still less those in which the caricaturing is inept, or seems barely to have been
attempted. Carretta writes that, pre-Townshend, genuinely 'individualized [political] caricatures were rare'. As previously noted, Townshend had few immediate imitators or successors. It is, moreover, often overlooked that Townshend's more celebrated caricatures, most notably his numerous images of the Duke of Cumberland are not caricatures in the sense that they play upon facial likeness, for the profil perdu pose ensures that the features are not visible. Townshend was celebrated for catching 'the air' as much as for caricaturing the features of his victims; Patten has described how later artists adopted similar techniques and tricks to hide inadequacies of anatomical drawing and inability to caricature the features of individuals. 

Hill observes that, prior to the 1770s, portrait caricature was not essential 'to the practice we call cartooning'; it is possible to argue, from the evidence of the prints themselves, that, outwith the work of a handful of skilled practitioners, it was far from being so in subsequent decades. Writing of the 'stylised' depiction of the features of Walpole, Langford notes that 'Walpole's expression is usually coarse, even leering, but always in a stylised rather than a lifelike way, not recognisable to contemporaries in terms of verisimilitude'. More than one print from the so-called 'golden age' does not even attempt this degree of characterisation: in The Free Regency [Plate 9] and The Triumph of Liberty [Plate 10], (1789) the Prince of Wales and Charles James Fox are flattered and even Pitt and Thurlow scarcely caricatured in the sense of any aggressive distortion. In another print of the same date, The English Regency [Plate 11] physiognomic distortion is confined to the depiction of national stereotypes. In the context of this print, as with Plates 9 and 10, it is not to be expected that the features of Prince of Wales should be subject to the distortion associated with caricatures of this period,
yet the failure to caricature or even approximate to the resemblance of the target of the print, the younger Pitt cannot be overlooked.\textsuperscript{63}

Describing the awkward and clumsy attempts at portrait caricature which he discerns in some royalist prints, Langlois notes that 'heads were often disproportionate to bodies and were frozen in the artificial attitude of portraits'.\textsuperscript{64} The same might be said of more than one English print of the 'golden age', for example the 1782 print The Captive Prince \textsuperscript{[Plate 12]}. Press observes, as the distinguishing characteristic of prints of the 'golden age', that caricature of face and form was 'common and well-done'.\textsuperscript{65} The numerous prints in which caricature and even characterisation are absent or else inept suggest that the differences between pre-and post-caricatural representation have been exaggerated; indeed, it could be argued that greater effort is made to 'catch the likeness' in the depiction of William of Orange in The Protestant Grindstone \textsuperscript{[Plate 13]} than to delineate the features of Charles James Fox or the Prince of Wales in Plates 9 and 10.

If many post-caricature images are not caricatures, or only poor caricatures, a survey of pre-caricature prints does not bear out the idea that prior to the adoption of caricature the representation of individuals was symbolic or emblematic rather than realistic. Wardroper writes that Townshend 'knew \{his victims\} and pictured them realistically, never turning them into symbols as earlier artists had prudently done'.\textsuperscript{66} In fact, strictly symbolic representation is comparatively rare. George cites the depiction of Titus Oates as\textsuperscript{th} example of the 'failure' of early 'caricaturists' to realise the satiric potential of facial caricature, but while Bob Ferguson or the Raree Shew \textsuperscript{[Plate 14]} and A Popish Whigg \textsuperscript{[Plate 15]} bear little resemblance to caricature in the accepted
Gillray mode, these prints nevertheless represent attempts to satirise the individual as an individual - Atherton's distinction between 'iconographic' or 'emblematic' representation and 'caricature'. Nor was Archbishop Laud portrayed symbolically in Canterburies Tooles, in The Full View of Canterburies Fall, while the depiction of Laud in Great was surnam'd Gregorie of Rome displays a liveliness of conception more commonly associated with the political print following the adoption of caricature [Plates 16-18].

Nor is it the case that pre-caricature prints show no awareness of the potential of physiognomic distortion or animation. Indeed, many a later 'caricature' may be proved to derive from a much earlier image. Gillray's delineation of the physiognomy of radical dissent in the 1792 print A Birmingham Toast [Plate 19] employs established conventions for the depiction of dissenters, from the lank hair and anachronistic dress to the upraised eyes; a physiognomy of hypocrisy masquerading as piety which may be found in much earlier 18th-century images, for example The Calves Head Club [Plate 20], and which has its roots in the work of the anonymous pamphleteers of the decades 1640-60, as well as more obvious literary sources in such works as Hudibras and A Tale of A Tub.

There is a case to be made that Gillray alone exploits to the full the satirical and rhetorical potential of what is in many lesser hands a technique which encourages sketchy draughtsmanship and superficial satire. Whereas

the inferior artist, without insight, merely distorts a version of [his subject's ] features, or else fits them to a mechanical formula which he uses in all his drawings,

the real caricaturist,

the artist with the real gift of caricature
and full command of his medium looks deeper, analyses and selects almost subconsciously, and produces a synthesised whole - the gestalt of the psychologist, which expresses the essence of the subject and shows the observer just what there is to see.

Patten has noted the extent to which Gillray appears to have relied upon 'phrenological and pathognomonical analyses to portray the gamut of expressions'. Many of Gillray's images possess that quality of precis identified by Gombrich, when the caricaturist's interpretation of an individual takes on a peculiar reality of its own. Gillray's genius extended beyond the capturing of likeness; he employs caricature not as an embellishment of, but as a means to, a larger visualisation of ideas; witness his younger Pitt as The Vulture of the Constitution, or as An Excrescence: - a Fungus: - alias - a Toadstool upon a Dunghill [Plates 21 and 22].

In the hands of one as skilled as Gillray, the use of facial caricature could heighten the overall power of an image. Even when Gillray's figures are subordinated to overall conceit, as they are in Camera Obscura [Plate 23], the standard of caricature is better than in many prints by other artists in which the figures are more central. If one visualises the caricatured image of George III, of Queen Charlotte, of the younger Pitt, the images which come to mind are almost invariably those created by Gillray; images such as Anti-Saccharites [Plate 24], or Taking Physick: - or - The News of Shooting the King of Sweden [Plate 25]. For once it is not trite to suggest that posterity has to some extent seen these figures with Gillray's eyes, through the medium of his etching needle.

If the number of memorable images which survive from this period testify to the potential of portrait caricature, there is nonetheless a case to be made that
the alleged triumph of caricature rests to a degree which has been neither recognised nor acknowledged, on the far from representative prints of Gillray and a handful of comparable images by other hands.

It has been conventional, for example, to refer to Gillray and Rowlandson in the same breath. Yet it can be argued that Rowlandson's undeniable talents as a comic draughtsman have obscured the fact that he is an indifferent caricaturist. A survey of his political prints swiftly reveals his limitations. As the print BM 6476 The Hanoverian Horse and British Lion [Plate 26], demonstrates, while competent with the features of Charles James Fox, he never achieves the same standard with those of the younger Pitt: compare Rowlandson's Pitt in Plate 27 Suitable Restrictions (1789) with Gillray's Pitt in John Bull bother'd [Plate 28] (1792). Similarly, compare Rowlandson's Prince of Wales in The Times (1788) [Plate 29] with Gillray's definitive image, A Voluptuary Under the Horrors of Digestion [Plate 30] (1792). Rowlandson's Prinny is all but indistinguishable from the full-thighed, bland-featured, slightly effeminate young bucks whom Rowlandson deploys with great skill in his inventive erotica; it is hardly comparable as caricature.

Nor are Rowlandson's compositions as inspired as those of Gillray. Rowlandson appears to have preferred the single contrast to the concatenation of ideas and events which distinguishes Gillray at his best. It is no coincidence that his more memorable images should concern the rival canvas of the beautiful Duchess of Devonshire and the obese Mrs Hobart during the Westminster Election of 1784; Rowlandson delighted in depicting the female form, whether gross or voluptuous. Indeed, these prints confirm that Rowlandson's art is at bottom more concerned with types than with individuals; the emaciated elderly man and his corpulent counterpart, the curvaceous beauty and the withered old maid. It is also true to say that
Rowlandson's more successful political prints rely more on a rococo exuberance of line, and delight in such contrasts than they do on satirical bite or political insight; his political work possesses none of the ambivalence which commentators have remarked in the involved images of Gillray, which frequently offer a choice only of greater and lesser evils. Nor does Rowlandson's political work stand up to prints by artists who today are all but unknown; for example William O'Keefe's *A Vision, Vide - The Monster of Slaughter, the Distress of Mankind* (1796), not to mention the much-underrated and far less prolific James Sayers - compare Rowlandson's *Lord North in Britannia Roused* or the *Coalition Monsters Destroyed* [Plate 31] and Sayers's transformation of the same figure in *Carlo Khan* [Plate 32]. In later years, Gillray was rivalled only by George Cruikshank, whose images of the Regent, for example *Princely Predilections* (1812) [Plate 33] and 'Qualification' in *The Queen's Matrimonial Ladder* (1820) [Plate 34] - an image which builds on Gillray's *Voluptuary* - testify to his skills in caricature, and who in prints such as *The Prince of Whales or the Fisherman at Anchor* (1812), and *Royal Hobbies* (1819) [Plate 35] demonstrates an inventiveness in composition which echoes that of Gillray.

In 1788, Francis Grose described caricature as a slight deviation from the actuality of appearance, stressing some particular features in order 'to fix the idea of identity'. The focus on facial caricature, the portrait charge, has obscured the continued vitality of other means by which identity might be 'fixed'. The inference of the conventional narrative is that these were inherently inferior and could not survive the introduction of caricature. Thomas, while acknowledging that the 'old-fashioned', i.e., emblematic, mode of
representation persisted into 1770s, can write that 'there was an obvious trend for recognisable characters to replace both [...] symbolism' and the identification of individuals by verbal rather than by visual means.\textsuperscript{74} George notes as one of the characteristics of what she terms 'the old school' of representation in graphic political satire, its dependence on 'attributes or inscriptions'.\textsuperscript{75}

That the adoption of facial caricature eliminated the need for labels and similar means of identification is not borne out by the prints themselves. In a study of the work of the professional caricaturist at the height of the 'golden age', Patten notes the continued use of 'written tags like laundry labels'.\textsuperscript{76} Labelled papers - Parliamentary bills et hoc genus omne - are similarly persistent aids to the identification of characters. In the case of a print such as A Transfer of East India Stock [Plate 36], labelled papers serve to amplify the context of a print, notwithstanding the presence of effective facial caricature.

As will be argued in Part II, Chapter VI, there is little evidence to support the idea that the introduction of caricature diminished the political print's use of words. The English Regency [Plate 11] employs both speech bubbles and a verse commentary, and in so doing is far from exceptional. As has already been observed, in this print the characterization of the protagonists, Pitt and the Prince of Wales is feeble. In another print from the same year, The Modern Egbert; or the King of Kings [Plate 37] an attempt has been made to caricature the features of the protagonists; nonetheless, the sense and wit of the print repose in the title (with its historical analogy) and in the speech bubbles and the punning inversion of the Prince of Wales's motto on the flag. Indeed, there is more than one 'caricature' of the 'golden age' of which it might be said, as Gombrich observed of a 17th-century allegorical print, that 'the
specific viewpoint is worked out in the captions, but different captions would make it apply equally to different political situations'.

Feaver writes of prints of the 'golden age' that 'the personages were characterized by uniforms, badges, tools of trade or staffs of office'. Similarly, in the 'backward' French prints of the late 18th century, individuals were satirised 'by means of the presence of a specific object which could [ultimately] [...] be identified with the personage himself'. As with verbal identification, so identification by costume or by related 'props' also persists, and not only in those prints in which the use of facial caricature is negligible. Bute is identified by a Scotch bonnet or by an approximation to plaid, which itself remains conventional for the representation of Scottish politicians [Plate 38], or by his Garter sash. Between 1770 and 1784 the same sash identified Lord North, as, indeed, it had identified the Duke of Cumberland in Townshend's sketches. The extent to which the professional as well as the amateur caricaturist of the late 18th and early 19th centuries depended on clothing as a means of identification has been noted by Patten.

If, in lieu of facial caricature, the Low Churchman Benjamin Hoadly was identified by the crutch with which he supported his lameness, as in the 1710 print Guess att my Meaning [Plate 39], so, at a much later date, a broom could serve to identify Henry Brougham; evidence, moreover, of a continued reliance upon, or delight in, verbal-visual equivalences which must be set against Paulson's thesis of a 'shift' from verbal to visual idioms of representation over the course of the century.

The metonymical representation of individuals by inanimate objects also persists into the post-caricature era. If the 'Skreen' could develop from a shorthand
allusion to ministerial corruption to serve as a substitute for the figure of Walpole himself, so a boot could function in lieu of the Earl of Bute [Plates 40-42]. In Plate 42, The Bed-Foot, the other victim of the print's satire, the Princess Dowager of Wales, is referred to by the widow's armorial lozenge; in other prints she is represented by a petticoat.

The figure composed of pertinent items also survives the adoption of caricature. In the anti-Bute satire An Exciseman made out of ye Necessaries of Life now Tax'd in Great Britain (1763) [Plate 43] and in Dent's The Free Born Briton (Plate 44), we are not far removed from Hollar's The Patenty (c.1640) [Plate 45], nor from the Mirabeau-tonneau conceit of 'undeveloped', i.e., non-caricatural, French prints of the 1780s. 82

Towards the end of the 17th century, Sir Thomas Browne interpreted caricature as the depiction of men in the form of animals. 83 This was one more form of satirical representation which survived the adoption of caricature - with Grose's Rules for Drawing Caricatures (1788) entailing the exploration of animal equivalences - and one which persists into the 19th century. It was eschewed by neither Townshend [The Pillars of the State, Plate 1] nor, almost thirty years later, by Gillray, [The Lord of the Vineyard Plate 46]. So far from being supplanted by, it was not infrequently used in combination with, facial caricature, as in The Dog Tax [Plate 47]. It was used to particular effect in two Regency Crisis prints by Sayers, in which the Prince of Wales is characterised as the Hanover Colt, manipulated by interested politicians [Plates 48 and 49].

In conception no less than in execution, prints such as Parliamentary Personalities [Plate 50] (1780) and BM 7682 The Return to the Political Ark (1790) differ little from Restoration satires such as BM 966 The Rump in the Pound and 974 The Dragons Forces Totally Routed By The Royal
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Referring to an 1808 print by George Cruikshank, R.L. Patten observes that 'all the elements of a typical political satire are here'. Significantly, his enumeration of these 'elements' not only omits facial caricature but refers to modes of representation which are to be found in the political print independent of caricature and which in each instance pre-date its adoption. 'The distortion of scale to express criticism', for example, while recalling Gillray's famous image of George III and Napoleon as the King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver [Plate 51], pre-dated the adoption of caricature and is to be found in images from 17th century; sometimes by default, as the consequence of composing an image from a selection of unevenly sized blocks, but in many instances as rhetorical tactic; for example Archbishop Laud in the 1641 pamphlet image Canterburies Tooles [Plate 16].

Similarly, 'the imposition of an alternate identity to characterize the protagonists' recalls not only such effective characterisations as that of Charles James Fox as the eastern potentate 'Carlo Khan' [Plate 32], but Titus Oates as 'Bob Ferguson', that is, Robert Ferguson, a contemporary to whom Oates bore some physical resemblance, described by Stephens as 'a great dealer in plots, and a prostitute political writer for different parties, and particularly the Earl of Shaftesbury', and as 'Mamamouchee', a character in Moliere's Bourgeois Gentilhomme [Plate 14].
An important point, and one which should be stressed in this context, is how rarely graphic political satirists employed caricature outwith what might be called a 'narrative' or 'dramatic' context.

In Carretta's account of caricature in The Snarling Muse we read that 'expression replaced content as the medium became the message'; caricature becomes a technique of satiric abstraction or diminution; 'The target's appearance was rendered so idiosyncratic that he was isolated from his fellow men'. The caricaturist reduces his victim to the bare essentials; he becomes 'a lump of fat',

and finally a line silhouette which reduced him to a likeness solely his own. So singular does the target become that the artist does not want him to have a context. In traditional iconography there is necessarily a context external to the self.

This is a reasonably accurate description of the work of Townshend. What Carretta describes is, however, the technique of caricature as it was first disseminated, as opposed to the mode of representation adopted by subsequent political caricaturists. For while it is possible to find prints in which a figure is 'isolated from his fellow men', as for example, the depiction of Charles James Fox in A Demosthenean Attitude [Plate 52], or in which the caricaturist offers an abstracted face, as with, for example, Sayers's The Mask [Plate 53], this was not the approach taken by the majority of 18th- and early 19th-century graphic political satires. In this genre, caricature is almost invariably used in the context of a narrative. As Donald observes, where Townshendian caricature offered satirical precis, graphic political satire demanded amplification, interpretative commentary on issues and situations.

As much as the demonstrable survival of pre-caricatural structures and iconography (for which see Part II,
Chapters V and VI), the rarity of pure portrait caricature suggests that, so far from the introduction of caricature 'transforming' the political print, which nonetheless retained several of the characteristics which it had formerly displayed, it was caricature which was modified and adapted to the requirements of the existing mode of graphic political satire.

This has been recognised; up to a point. Such is the power of the linear model, however, that this modification has been presented not in terms of the strength of the pre-caricature format but as part of a caricature-oriented 'development'. Feaver, for example, writes of the political print c.1780-90 that

single-figure caricature was no longer enough: scenes were needed, fully-elaborated, complicated enough to sustain discussion, dramatic enough to stick in the memory.

Thus we find that the very 'elaboration' and 'complication' which it has been conventional to condemn in the pre-caricature political print finds acceptance in the context of caricature. There is little evidence to suggest that, when it came to political prints, 'single-figure caricature' was ever enough. Like Feaver, Patten claims to discern a 'trend' towards narrative and dramatic scenes after c.1780, so that by 1808 the 'dramatized scene that conveys personality, epitomizes the conflicts and simplifies the issues' is yet another of those elements of 'the typical political satire':

Instead of grotesquely exaggerating the features or dress of one person [as the largely non-political 'Macaroni' caricatures of the 1770s had done] or displaying several small groups of people engaged in unrelated activities [the caricaturists] devised imaginary situations - often based on extremely accurate information about what went on behind the scenes - in which a group of participants all played characteristic roles.

If the plate were to show a cabinet debate over foreign policy or taxation, for instance, not only would each minister be given his place around the table, but also he might deliver a speech, indicated
by a balloon above his head, and by these words as well as by his expression and position within the composition the reader of the plate could re-enact the drama.

Patten's description may conjure up the political caricature of Gillray and George Cruikshank, but it is an equally accurate description of, for example, The Claims of the Broad Bottom (1743) [Plate 54]. Indeed, while the linear model has it that Townshend 'breathed new life' into a moribund genre and indicate the direction which the political print was to take, it is this print rather than Townshend's more static compositions which, in its naturalistic disposition of figures, its 'dramatisation' of an imagined scene, is representative of the pre-caricature 18th-century political print.

The Claims of the Broad Bottom is a 'realistic' dramatisation, but the dramatisation of 'scenes' continued to employ the allegorical mode which the introduction of caricature is supposed to have made redundant. Allegory and caricature have conventionally been presented in antithesis; the use of facial caricature was 'in welcome contrast to the allegories' of the past; Feaver writes that by c.1770 'English public taste had tired of academic allegories, preferring the humour of the light line'. The 1788-89 prints The Times and The Triumph of Liberty [Plates 29 and 101 are unexceptionable in their lightness of line; in composition, iconography and conception they do not diverge from allegorical prints of a century earlier. The same is true of another Regency Crisis image, Britannia's Support, which should be compared with the 1684 image, Carolus everso succurere secolo [Plates 55 and 56].

Such comparisons reveal the extent to which perceptions of the later 18th-century 'political caricature' would seem to derive from adherence to written orthodoxy rather than from direct observation of the prints in question, still less from familiarity with the full range of images.
produced between c.1640 and 1840.

Significantly for our understanding and appreciation of the political print of the later 18th century, the emphasis on caricature has been such that it has been possible to discuss and describe prints without reference to their non-figural, non-caricatural elements, without reference to pictorial structure, the use of text, and, above all, iconography. This has allowed the survival of idioms other than caricature in the political print of the so-called golden age to go unrecognised or unacknowledged. A study of these prints which is less limited in focus establishes the survival of structures, satirical tactics and conceits, and iconographic motifs which pre-date the adoption of caricature.

Both George and Langford are concerned to stress the novelty of The Motion [Plate 51]. In essentials, however, it differs little from the 1709 print, Needs must when the Devil drives [Plate 57]. In 1792, it was possible for Richard Price to be satirised by means of the tub from which he preaches [Plate 58]; a motif for the identification of 'radical dissent' which, as Part II, Chapter V will demonstrate, may be traced back to 1640. Sayers's The Mask is merely one in a line of bifurcated faces and bodies going back to the mid-17th century. Carretta may choose to interpret 'the satiric pursuit of Walpole into the afterlife' as evidence of the increasingly ad hominem satire which anticipated the adoption of caricature, but this is one of the oldest tactics of graphic as well as of literary satire; one which, moreover, survives the adoption of caricature [Plate 59].

Up to a point, such continuities have been recognised. George, who uses the word 'transformation' admits that 'despite this transformation, much of the old symbolism remained and was adapted to the new look' and; 'it was
characteristic of these prints that nothing was lost. Old symbols, old allegories, old forms, were absorbed and adapted'. The longevity not only of pre-caricatural iconography but of pre-caricatural satirical tactics and conceits, is implicitly acknowledged in statements such as that of Richard Vogler: by 'George Cruikshank's time [i.e., c.1810], caricature [i.e., graphic satire] had [...] become a complete genre that had accumulated a corpus of traditional motifs and subjects'. Carretta, similarly, observes that 'by the end of George II's reign almost all the tactics and topics of verbal and visual satire to be used against his grandson had already appeared'.

Such recognition of continuities must be set against the tenor of every account from EPC forward, which has emphasised change; such change is implicit in the 'development' of political caricature.

A comprehensive survey of the post c.1770 political print reveals late 18th-century graphic satire to have been a hybrid form. In this sense, those who have used such metaphors as the 'grafting' of caricature onto emblematic satire have not been mistaken. Where previous studies have erred, however, is in their subsequent concentration on caricature to the exclusion of all other idioms, in many instances to the extent of denying the survival of the emblematic. Carretta can write that 'the study of the development of the imagery in political satire [...] becomes an investigation of the changing proportions of emblematic and naturalistic representation' i.e., caricature; to date this has resulted in accounts of the triumph of caricature. So far from having been investigated, the 'changing proportions of emblematic and naturalistic representation' have been taken for granted and in favour of the latter.
It is not only in terms of pictorial conventions that the evidence of the prints challenges the received account of the triumph of caricature.

Implicit in the conventional account of 'development' of political caricature is the idea that the adoption of caricature introduced effectual personal satire to graphic political satire; this is explicit in Carretta's claim that 'for the first time, the development of caricature made possible a satiric cult of personality in politics'. Arguably the first victim of such a graphic cult was Archbishop Laud, while Walpole sustained such a cult in literary as well as graphic satire. The graphic persecution of Lord Bute over more than a decade has left four hundred anti-Bute prints in which physiognomic distortion plays a negligible part. The only print which Charles James Fox is on record as having resented was Sayers's The Mirror of Patriotism [BM 6380] [Plate 60], in which we see no more than the back of his head. The blank, white oval which serves for Lord Temple's face in Hogarth's The Times Plate 1 [BM 3970] and in BM 4124 The Tomb-Stone [Plate 61] is an acute comment upon the subject's allegedly 'factious and unpredictable disposition' upon which it is difficult to imagine any portrait charge improving. Plate 8 is a scathing attack on the theology and principles of John Wesley in which not one human figure is represented. Those who depicted first Walpole, then Bute and finally Dundas as Colossi [Plates 62 and 38] were making a point about ambition and power which was not dependent upon accuracy of facial caricature. The many weak satires produced during the 'golden age' suggest that aptness of analogy or metaphor and accuracy in accusation are, ultimately, more important to the graphic satirist than facility in portrait caricature. Gillray's A Voluptuary is the definitive personal satire and caricature, but as a political comment on an individual it must rank below
Sayers's depiction of the Prince of Wales as both the stalking-horse and circus pony of the opposition.

There is little hard evidence that the introduction of caricature increased the 'bite' of the political print and made it a more effective weapon of political satire and criticism. Chapter IX will argue that insofar as the gradual adoption of caricature did focus attention on personality this was not necessarily to the benefit of graphic political satire as a genre. Argumentum ad hominem has its limitations, and it is possible to see over the course of the 18th century a diminution in the sophistication of the rhetorical iconology of the genre as a whole, as the number of prints in which 'not the ideas themselves, but the character of their spokesmen [...] were depicted' increase.97 The scope which the physiognomical contrast between Pitt and Fox offered the caricaturist allowed for a certain latitude in the presentation of ideas and arguments (Plate 63).98 There is certainly little evidence to suggest that caricature afforded the graphic political satirists political insights which the emblematic mode had formerly denied them; rather that it had the potential to reduce politics to personalities, to men, not measures. The emblematic idiom has been presented as a straightjacket which guaranteed 'poverty of invention', with an event or issue being presented by a limited number of allegorical configurations, but in the hands of lesser caricaturists, political caricature could be no less trite or predictable.

Still less secure is the idea, explicit in some accounts, implicit in many more, that the adoption of caricature made the political print more 'popular' and 'accessible'. This is an idea that has less to do with the accessibility of caricature than it has with a failure on the part of modern scholars to accommodate the
emblematic idiom. It also derives from a serious misconception of the audience or market for which these prints were produced. This is the subject of Chapter VIII; suffice it to say that not only were the hand-coloured caricatures of Gillray and Rowlandson which are held to exemplify the output of the 'golden age' beyond the pockets of a 'popular' audience, but they supposed on the part of the beholder a more intimate acquaintance with the features of those caricatured than had pre-caricature satires. Indeed, while this chapter has suggested that the extent to which graphic political satire was altered by the gradual adoption of caricature has been exaggerated, there is a case to be made that insofar as facial caricature did become an important part of graphic political satire, this was a 'development' which potentially narrowed the appeal of such prints. The print in which the Duke of Newcastle is identified by a lettered key as 'D. N----s--e' was potentially accessible to any literate man; the same could not be said of, for example, The New Peerage or Fountain of Honor [Plate 64].

In conclusion, there are several points to be made. The first is that, as far as the political print is concerned, the role and significance of caricature have been exaggerated. Facial caricature was one of several options open to the graphic political satirist in the late 18th century and a re-evaluation of its place within the political print is overdue.

The second is that the chronological bias of political prints scholarship identified in Chapter III is a direct result of the preoccupation with caricature; the chronology of prints studies is to a considerable extent the chronology of the post-caricature print: 1760-1830.
The 17th- and early 18th-century political print remains terra incognita. Ignorance of this material has allowed the extent to which both the iconography and the rhetorical tactics of the late 18th-century political caricature derived from earlier, pre-caricature, prints to be obscured. The caricature-oriented linear model of the 'development of political caricature' and the chronological bias which it informs have ensured that the very material by means of which it is possible to reappraise the significance of the adoption of caricature and to question the conventional narrative of 'development' is insufficiently familiar.

If a preoccupation with caricature has contracted both the period of study and the material studied to later caricatures and those earlier prints which 'anticipate' caricature, paradoxically it has also encouraged an unhelpful latitude: the 18th-century political caricature and the political prints which pre-date it have too often been addressed as part of a larger history of caricature as an idiom or a single phenomenon, be it in the framework of 'caricature and other comic art' or that of English Caricature 1620 to the Present. Either way, the historical, still less the political, specificity of the prints is downplayed.

It is also possible to argue that preoccupation with caricature - which is, after all, a specific technique of drawing and representation - has encouraged scholars to focus on the appearance of a print at the expense of more detailed attention to either the content of the print, i.e., its iconography and the means by which it articulates an argument - for example, image-text relationships, - or the context in which it was produced, by which is meant less the specific event which prompted it, than the relationship of designer, engraver and publisher, and its place in the larger context of political journalism at the period. It is one of the more serious failings of prints scholarship that so
little has been done to secure answers to such basic questions as the size and composition of the audience for political caricature, or the geographical limits of its distribution. The ease with which it is possible to compile an illustrated history of caricature must be held at least in part responsible for the paucity of hard evidence in these matters.

This is not to say that the study of caricature cannot not be productive of fresh insights. Diana Donald's work has shown what may be achieved by close attention to the material itself, complemented by attention to contemporary written sources and an interest in the contemporary reception and perception of the art. Caricature's relation to the pseudo-science of physiognomy and the extent to which the adoption of caricature in 18th-century England reflects an interest physiognomy are matters beyond the scope of this chapter and this thesis but which appear to repay attention. More recently, Marcia Pointon, in a study of the discourses of portraiture in this period, has studied political caricature in this context. Pointon's study will contain few surprises for those familiar with the whole range of political prints as documented in the Catalogue, in which the portrait conceit is a perennial. What is important, however, is that Pointon elected to address the political caricature outwith the conventional framework of a 1720-1830 narrative with its all-too-predictable resting points.

It is impossible not to conclude that the focus on caricature and the failure to see it in perspective with respect to the 1640-1840 period as a whole have been deleterious to our understanding of the 17th and 18th-century English political print. There is a place for further study of caricature in the context of the late 18th-century political print. Such study must, however, be in addition to and not, as hitherto, in place
of, research into the non-caricatural aspects of those prints, and the study of the pre-caricature political print. Only if the assimilation of caricature into the political print is seen as neither inevitable nor desirable, so that attention shifts from the presence or absence of caricature in a print to consideration of that print's iconographical, structural and rhetorical characteristics; only when scholars eschew the familiar narrative, and approach the full range of material with independent eyes and minds, will progress be possible.
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Chapter VI: The Emblematic in Pictorial Propaganda: the problem of scholarly antipathy

is it no crime to calumniate or cast dirt [...] in a figurative or emblematic manner?

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, 25 Nov. - 3 Dec. 1645

I own, I don't understand any of those Prints [...] I am too dull to taste them; And, if they are not decypher'd for Me, I could not in the least guess, very often, what they mean

The Duke of Newcastle to the Earl of Hardwicke, 30 September 1762

... are emblems really such dead things?

Mario Praz, Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery

Emblematic imagery and emblematic modes of representation have been the victims of a marked and near-universal antipathy on the part of those who have to date addressed the political print.

Few studies do not include at least one pejorative reference to the 'convoluted' and 'cryptic' imagery associated with the emblematic. The emblematic is allowed to have been heavily influential with regard to the visual appearance of political prints and graphic political satire, but it is an influence which has been almost universally deplored, and which has consistently been presented as having handicapped the 'development' of these media. Common to almost every text I have read, this hostility has certainly contributed to the low esteem in which 17th-century prints have been held; for this reason alone it demands closer scrutiny.

While few accounts of the 'development' of political prints omit the emblematic altogether, few go beyond a brief acknowledgement of the emblematic as a formative influence: 18th-century political prints

made use of a long-established corpus of traditional symbolism built up in the course of the 16th and 17th centuries by a persistent interest in emblems, i.e., the visual
representation of certain abstract ideas and qualities.  

Apart from relevant passages in Atherton and Langford and, to a lesser extent, George in EPC1, detailed exploration of how, and in what ways, the emblematic was so influential, or of the emblem's own origins, influences and peculiar characteristics is conspicuous by its absence.

In several accounts, this neglect, or a downplaying of the role, of the emblematic appears to be linked to the same chauvinism which has underpinned the perception of the English political print as the peculiar product of a peculiar political 'liberty' (for which see Chapter IX); in this view the emblematic tradition is somehow alien to the 'English tradition of satire'. Certainly, the frequency with which attention is called to the emblem's foreign origins would seem to suggest this. Thus Langford, referring to emblematic political prints, can speak of 'conventions imposed [my emphasis] by older Italian and Dutch traditions'. 5 Roots notes that 'many prints, especially of the 17th century, originated on the Continent, and employed a vocabulary of emblems and symbols which had an international currency'. 6 Lambourne writes that 17th century political pamphlets and broadsides 'were often embellished with crude allegorical prints, which owed much to the Dutch satiric tradition'. 7

It is ironic, given that this 'English tradition' version of the development of graphic political satire commonly associates it with the 'liberties' secured by the political upheavals of 1688, that EPC1 should exclude the important Williamite propaganda - in which the influence of the emblematic is marked - of Romeyn de Hooghe on the grounds of the Dutch origins of both the artist and most of the relevant prints, and in this way contract a very important period of graphic propaganda
and satire to four pages, mostly taken up with lamenting 'the sparsity and conventionality' of contemporary English productions.  

This self-imposed restriction of material might not matter if it were not that, in addition to leaving a very large gap in the study of both iconographic and propagandist techniques peculiar to this period, the legacy of George's nativism may be discerned in subsequent studies, in which, as observed in Chapter III, the period pre c.1720 has received scant attention. Yet such 'nativist' accounts of the 'development' of the political print which reject the emblematic as foreign, ignore the existence, in the 17th century, not only of an indigenous tradition of pictorial satire, but the fact that England at this time had her own emblem books and emblematists.  

To return to the hostility which accompanies what limited recognition is afforded the formative influence of the emblematic print on the appearance and iconography of political graphics, satirical and non-satirical, in the literature. The verdict of Gombrich and Kris on the anti-Papal woodcuts of Cranach; 'only at their best do they attempt to go beyond picture-writing and mere emblems', exemplifies the way in which the emblematic has to date been depreciated in prints scholarship.  

The emblematic has been presented as at best a helpfully ambiguous and evasive idiom for political satire. Phillippe, for example, concedes that what he has condemned in political prints up to the French Revolution may have been expedient as much as it was elitist;  

yet this careful preservation of a clumsily symbolic idiom was not merely the consequence of academic tradition and stylistic habit, but also of necessity. By cloaking reality in allegory, the immediate sanctions of censorship could be avoided.
Notwithstanding these advantages, however, the emblematic has consistently been presented as a constraint from which the print needed to be emancipated; the agent of emancipation being caricature. The emblem may have been necessary for the 'emergence', and certainly shaped the pictorial appearance, of graphic political satire and political print, but, for all that, it is seldom allowed to have been any thing other than a stultifying influence. Wood's phrase, 'the grip that the descriptive methodology of the emblem tradition still exerted on the popular print', is suggestive of restraint, even paralysis. Press writes of prints being 'freed from [...] emblematic [...] influences', and of the emblem as a handicap; 'the journalistic print [at the death of Hogarth, i.e., 1764] suffered from several handicaps. One was that many of its artists still favoured the emblematic style'.

Even Langford, who gives an otherwise sensitive and considered account of the influential role played by the emblematic in satires up to and during the period 1720-60, succumbs to the orthodoxy of viewing the emblematic as somehow rooted in the 'past', as backward-looking, and as such ultimately a handicap to the earlier 'development' of English graphic political satire in its approved -even predetermined - direction. Unsurprisingly for one who considers what he perceives to be a shift from emblematic to 'expressive' modes of representation to be central to the development of 18th-century art, Paulson, writing of French graphic political satire, can cite the emblematic nature of its imagery as evidence of the 'intellectually very primitive' nature of the genre at this time. Paulson's phraseology - the political print 'remained at the stage of using emblems' - betrays the linearity of his perspective.

Langford's description of the 1741 print, The Motion, uncluttered by personifications, and with 'no pictorial
emblems or symbols' as forward-looking, anticipating [my emphasis] the satirical prints of the future not only exemplifies the extent to which perceptions of the political print continue to adhere to a linear model of 'development', but serves to demonstrate that that linear model has ensured that the emblematic is viewed as a regressive idiom. This may be seen in George's contrasting of the far-sighted progressive (Townshend), and the dull contemporaries who stubbornly 'turned out emblematical designs on conventional lines' and Press's irritation that 'as late' as the 1760s, artists 'still favoured the emblematic style' [my emphasis]. 16 Donald's choice of the word 'return' also carries strong implications of a retrogressive step, a regrettable relapse; Townshend's contemporaries imitated his small 'card' format, but otherwise 'show a return to the emblematic tradition' described by a contemporary observer; designs 'stuffed full of loaded and blinded lions, in which the same Poverty of Invention is [...] shewn from beginning to end' [my emphasis].17

Arguably, reiteration of the qualifying terms 'old' or 'traditional' in discussions of emblematic imagery marginalises the emblematic.18 If the emblematic is in this way rendered synonymous with 'early' and 'undeveloped', its survival in pictorial satire or propaganda cannot be other than anachronistic by the criterion of the teleological linear model of the 'development' of 'English Political Caricature' or 'the Political Cartoon'.

If, in this way, the emblematic has been associated with visual conservatism, it is also possible to observe that implicit in more than one account is an association of visual with ideological conservatism. It is an association which is made explicit, for example, in Carretta's account, in George III, of what he sees as the 'reclamation' of traditional iconography in conservative propaganda of the period of the Revolutionary Wars.
Isaac Cruikshank's use of emblem and symbol in A Picture of Great Britain in the Year 1793 [BM 84241], a print made up of 'emblematic icons' of monarchy and authority that 'reassure the viewer', is cited as an example of the appropriation of the 'older emblematical tradition' by the 'conservative satirist'; an example which is to be set against its subversion (by Blake) 'in the war of icons that was waged in the 1790s'. Historiographically at least, it is an unequal contest; Blake retains the favourable verdict of posterity for his 'originality'. Blake is on the side of 'progress', aesthetic and ideological; the 'older emblematical tradition' is an anachronism, recourse to which serves as confirmation of 'the Establishment''s ideological poverty.

Atherton rightly alludes to the 'traditional iconography' of emblematic images as 'one of the principal sources' of the iconography of the 18th-century political print; the extent to which this is the case remains unexplored and untested. Hostility towards the emblematic and the predisposition towards caricature outlined in the previous chapter, have meant that in most accounts, the 'development' of the political print is associated with the replacement of the one by the other; witness Carretta in his earlier study, The Snarling Muse:

'although emblematic prints can still be found after the fall of Walpole, so rapidly are they supplanted by caricatures that at least one scholar contends that after 1760 the earlier method of representation is rarely found.'

The prevalence of this view has conspired to obscure the fact, evident even upon the most superficial appraisal of these prints, that for the whole of the 18th century, emblematic iconography and influences survived in 'political caricatures', and persisted into the 19th century. The 'fusion' of the two idioms into a 'hybrid'
form may be central to the received account, but few studies have paid more than lip-service to the idea of the post-caricature survival of the emblematic. Certainly the tenacity of emblematic iconography c.1750-1790 is obscured in George III by Carretta's thesis of a 'reclamation' of this 'traditional' iconography at the end of the century.22

Whether directly, or indirectly via EPC1, in which it is the source for George's account, most, if not all, studies adopt the view of the emblematic as an obsolete idiom after 1700 which is to be found in Rosemary Freeman's 1948 study, English Emblem Booke, for a long time the only monograph on the subject, although, like EPC itself, with which it is in many ways comparable, it is now showing its age.23 Since 1948, scholarship in the emblem has advanced considerably, and there is growing recognition on the part of emblem scholars of the tenacity and survival of the idiom in the 18th century; that the emblem tradition - the emblematic mentality - was far from being a spent force.24 The failure of political prints scholarship over recent decades to revise the received picture in the light of such research is indicative of the extent to which scholarship in this field has stayed still while research in related fields has advanced.

The historicist, linear model of the 'development' of the political print and graphic political satire discernible in most studies, is, as we have seen, caricature-oriented. Not only does this encourage an emphasis on the obsolescence of the emblematic idiom, ('an uncomfortable survival',25), which is presented as waiting for caricature to come along and either 'invigorate' or else 'supersede' it, according to whether the emphasis is on absolute or on gradual change, but that the emblematic print is condemned because it fails
to 'anticipate' or remotely resemble caricature.

That the tenacity of emblematic imagery - possibly of emblematic structures, in 18th-century graphic political satire or propaganda has yet to be adequately explored; that hostility towards the emblematic should be both deep-rooted and prevalent among those who have elected to write about the political print should come as no surprise. If the emblematic is anachronistic (witness George's verdict - 'obsolescent', 'old-fashioned' - on the emblematic Political Electricity), it is also intrinsically undesirable. The emblematic idiom of pictorial political propaganda or satire comprehends the qualities most consistently disparaged and deprecated in political prints in general: interdependence of text and image; intellectually demanding imagery, much of it presupposing a grounding in Classical history and mythology; and iconographic complexity, in that it is commonplace to encounter a considerable number of symbolic and abstract concepts within one print, again, interdependent and needing to be unravelled as such. Emblematic imagery represents that 'elaboration of conceits' deprecated by Feaver as 'witless intricacy'. The presence of these qualities in 18th-century political prints of a non-emblematic kind rarely escapes unsympathetic comment, as will become clear in the next chapter, a chapter which is concerned with the operation of anachronistic aesthetic criteria in the criticism of 17th- and 18th-century political prints; the hostile response to the emblematic is predictable.

It would seem, however, that hostility towards the emblematic is rooted in more than the prejudices of a 20th-century aesthetic. Significantly, Gombrich couples the aesthetic shortcomings of emblematic political prints with their intellectual demands; 'puzzling and often ugly images', 'crude and often enigmatic scrawls'. Atherton, having previously stated that 18th-century
political prints 'pretend to no great genius of invention
or depth of meaning' proceeds to talk of their symbols as
'occult' their figures 'strange [...] often
unintelligible'.\textsuperscript{29} The modern antipathy towards the
emblematic print appears to be exacerbated by the
interpretative challenges it sets. The association of
the emblematic with the 'difficult', 'deliberately
complicated' and 'arcane' would appear to be entrenched:
George writes of the 'old-fashioned, 'hieroglyphical'
print, usually dependent upon a verbal explanation, with
a mass of detail, sometimes intentionally cryptic',
Donald of 'the complex symbolic and verbal apparatus then
usual in political prints' and 'the complicated and
traditional symbolism of most political prints of the
day', and Press of 'the emblematic style, with involved
symbolism and broadsheet verses run rampant', and
'complicated emblematic imagery'.\textsuperscript{30}

Roots notes that while the 'vocabulary of emblems and
symbols' deployed in the early political print may have
had 'an international currency', it was a vocabulary that
had to be learned and which 'can only be acquired now
through effort'.\textsuperscript{31} It is an effort few have been willing
to make.

The same may be said of the deconstruction of
emblematic and emblem-influenced compositions. The
internal narrative and didactic structure of these prints
is typically dismissed as 'laboured'; given that few
modern commentators in the literature under review here,
have paid this the compliment of the patient elucidation
which it demands, that epithet might be seen as
reflecting their own difficulties rather than the
difficulties intrinsic to the prints. Certainly many
commentators seem reluctant to acknowledge the fact that
the requirements of the original consumers of these
prints were different to our own; that they not only had
the time for, but took pleasure in the elucidation of
such imagery over a period of days, weeks, or even
longer. As with the aesthetic counterpart of such criticisms, the (anachronistic) yardstick by which the 'success' or 'importance' of these prints is measured is that of succinctness or 'immediacy'.

It is possible that this emphasis on the obscurity and difficulty of the emblematic reflects more than the difficulties of modern scholars with the idiom. Behind their problems in dealing with the emblematic in the prints lurk, I would suggest, the idee fixe that the political print was a 'popular' idiom, and the related assumption that such images must, as a consequence, be intelligible to the uneducated or illiterate (see Chapter VIII).

The emblematic print runs counter to, and challenges, the equation of the pictorial with the simple which has informed so much of what has been written about political prints. So far from supporting the 'he who runs may read' view of political graphics, the emblematic political print challenges it. The insistence on the anachronistic nature of the emblematic is thus explicable in this as well as in the aesthetic context. The survival of the emblematic print and the persistence into the 19th century of what might be termed emblematic qualities in political prints and graphic political satire calls into question not only the 'triumph of caricature' but the equally cherished picture of political prints as a 'popular' idiom; as a consequence, it is either very much downplayed, or else relegated to the status of an obsolete 'uncomfortable survival'. This would also seem to be the impetus behind the negative response to the political print's reliance upon allegory over the entire period.

Although the influence and tenacity of the emblematic within political graphics presupposes a greater degree of visual literacy than is consonant with the orthodox view of political prints of this period, the potential
challenge to that view which the emblematic represents has been to date successfully deflected by emphasising its obsolescence, and the inevitability of its 'demise'. From this it is a short step to marginalising the emblematic as an 'elite' idiom, and, as such, largely irrelevant to any study of the development of a genre 'essential to the structure of [a] modern democratic society'.

Godfrey, for example, writes of pre-'Golden Age' political prints as 'emblematic, complicated, and aimed at a sophisticated audience'. While prints of the 1740s include among their number images to rival their 'better-known' successors, these too, 'like earlier prints [...] are often laden with emblems and verbiage aimed at a small but knowing [sic: knowledgeable?] audience, who required a solid substance of allusion and detail on which to chew'. Similarly, Hill: 'before the middle of the [eighteenth] century [...] pictorial propaganda [was] an esoteric carnival of symbols and emblems. Aptly termed hieroglyphics, they were commonly arid puzzles to be unravelled at leisure by the well-informed.' In both cases it may be observed that the emblematic print merits mention only in so far as it is antecedent to, and antithetical to, caricature, to which the remainder of both works is devoted.

The degree to which the cerebral, esoteric nature of the idiom, ('intentionally cryptic') and the restricted nature of its audience, are stressed in accounts of the emblematic political print suggests that these are qualities of political graphics with which those who have written about this material are uncomfortable, and that it is its 'elitist' connotations which are central to the rejection of the emblematic in most of the relevant accounts. Not only is there consensus that political prints became 'less complicated in design and execution, less dependent on words, emblems and allegories to communicate their meaning', but that this was
indisputably a Good Thing.\textsuperscript{37}

To present the emblematic as an inherently unpopular idiom may be convenient; ultimately, however, such a simplistic appraisal reveals more about the preoccupations of political prints scholarship than it does about the emblematic political print.

If hostility toward the emblematic would seem to be ingrained in the scholarship of the political print, the consequences of this hostility are several and deplorable. Important questions about the precise nature of the influence of the English and European emblem traditions on the iconography, the structure and the rhetorical capacity of political prints and satires remain unexplored and unanswered, and with them the important subject of visual literacy.

Similarly, in the same way that a cursory reference to the effect that the 'Dutch emblematic tradition' was a formative influence on the political print obscures the existence of an English emblem tradition which may be traced back at least to the beginning of the 17th century, and with it the incentive to explore the nature of this tradition and its influence or otherwise on contemporary and later political imagery, so the orthodox picture of the emblematic as an inaccessible, recondite or 'elite' idiom conveniently ignores the dissemination of emblematic images and conceits at a more 'popular' level, which is peculiarly ironic in the context of the persistent preoccupation with 'popular graphics' which is discussed in Chapter VIII. Godfrey's reference to the 'elaborate symbolism of popular emblem books', is testimony less to the author's recognition of this still-obscurc genre than to the inexact usage of the term 'popular' which prevails in the literature of political graphics.\textsuperscript{38}

More importantly, hostility toward the emblematic
contributes to the more general neglect of 17th-century prints, in that it allows studies to begin at c.1720 with such statements as this:

satirical prints were not unknown in England before the 18th century. They tended, however, to obscure their meanings with too much use of recondite figures and allegories, known only to the educated upper class.

Prints such as Syons Calamitye (1643) [Plate 1]; Sacra Nemesis (1644) [Plate 2]; the frontispiece to The Shepherds Oracles (1645) [Plate 3]; The Royall Oake of Brittayne (1649) [Plate 4]; Eikon Basilike (1649) [Plate 5]; Parallelum Olivae (1656) [Plate 6]; The Embleme of Englands Distractions (1658) [Plate 7]; Britania (1682) [Plate 8]; England's Memorial (1688) [Plate 9] and An Answer to the Liveing Man's Elegy (1710) [Plate 10], may be taken as representative of the material which is being lost as a consequence of the prevalent prescriptive approach. Such images demand reappraisal in their own terms and not in terms of the political caricatures of the later 18th century.

Furthermore, the neglect of such images, and hostility towards their characteristics, has allowed studies to exaggerate the degree to which political prints were changed by the introduction of caricature. Failure to address the degree to which, in terms of structure and iconography, 18th-century prints look back to the 17th century impoverishes our understanding of the prints of the later period.

In some 18th-century prints the survival of the emblematic mode is immediately evident; for instance in The Church Catholick (1733) [Plate 11]; The Life and Death of Pierce Gaveston, Earl of Cornwal; Grand Favorite and Prime Minister (1740) [Plate 12]; Vox Populi Vox Dei (1753) [Plate 13] and The Tree of Life (c.1770) [Plate 14]. With regard to others, closer scrutiny, and more importantly, greater sensitivity with regard to the
emblematic idiom on the part of the scholar is required to identify survivals and influences.

It is worth remarking in this context that 'emblem' and 'emblematic' survive as descriptive terms during the 18th century and into the 19th; the 1803 work, Commemoration of the four Great Naval Victories, viz. Lord Howe's, Lord St. Vincent's, Lord Duncan's, and Lord Nelson's, was described in the catalogue to William Beckford's 1808 sale as a 'folio, with Emblematicall engravings from designs by Smirke'. George, moreover, acknowledges the extent to which William Hone's Facetiae (1827) reflects the author's knowledge of emblem books; the Facetiae clearly antedates the Victorian 'revival' which has been the subject of study by emblem scholars, and it is far from being anomalous.

Underplaying the survival of emblematic elements in later 18th-century prints further marginalises the emblematic as an idiom. In the absence of sympathetic and specialist attention, the epithets 'obscure' and 'difficult' have been allowed to become self-confirming.

For as long as 'emblematic' remains a term of abuse, for as long as it is allowed to retain its pejorative associations, and for as long as the tenacity of emblematic elements in later prints remains unrecognised or is deliberately underplayed, so our understanding of 17th- and 18th-century political prints will remain partial and inadequate.

1. B.L. E310 (9); quoted Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p.216.
4. Lucie-Smith, p.52. Reasonable introductions to the history of emblem books and the usage of emblems in political prints are offered by George, EPCi pp.3-9,14; Atherton, Political Prints, pp.25-30 and Langford, Robinocracy pp.15-18. The terms 'emblem', 'emblematic', et cetera, are too often employed in
the literature with little attempt made to establish precisely what is meant by these terms. In some instances, usage would seem to be grounded in, certainly liable to perpetuate, misunderstanding; McCreery, p.183 describes The Sturdy Beggar [EPC1 Plate 29b] as 'emblematic' on the grounds that Henry, Stephen and Charles James Fox are depicted with the heads of foxes.

5. Langford, Robinocracy p.15.
6. Roots, p.50. Cf. EPC1, p.3 'when English graphic satire established itself it inherited a symbolical language that was international'; Thomas, American Revolution p.13 'English graphic satire had inherited a European legacy of heavy symbolism'.
7. Lambourne, p.9. Cf. Roylance, The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature introduction, (n.p.) 'the English caricature print had its origins in the north and the south. Seventeenth-century Dutch satirical broadsides - themselves evolved from "emblem" prints - had been brought over at the time of William III [...] George Townshend [...] joined the caricature image of the Italian south with the long-familiar broadsides from the Dutch north'. Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xii refers to early prints as 'emblems or allegories in the Dutch manner'; political engravings of the 17th century are 'resolutely Dutch in style and often in execution'; idem, Mr Gillray p.4, 'most of the political prints of the seventies clung to the old northern European conventions'; Hofmann, p.31, Hogarth had 'recourse to the popular tradition of the north in the form of Dutch pictures of social content'; Paulson, 'Severed Head', pp.55-6, refers to 'the northern tradition', assimilated into English prints at the time of the South Sea Bubble, and to Dutch 'emblematic satires' as the source of the English political print; Percival, Walpole Ballads p.xxvii claims that Dutch influence established the political print in England in the reign of William III - 'it was revived again (no English school having yet arisen) in 1720'; Feaver, p.42, refers to 'the emblematic prints of the Dutch engraver'; see also Atherton, Political Prints, p.31, Lucie-Smith, p.47, Godfrey, Printmaking p.32.

Of course, caricature in the pure sense was an indisputably foreign - Italian - idiom and was rejected as such by Hogarth.

8. EPC1, 62-65. For de Hooghe's emblematic influences, see W.H. Wilson, 'Romeyn de Hooghe's Emblem Books' Quaerendo 8 (1978) 135-56. For graphic political satire as a peculiarly English idiom or phenomenon, see Chapter IX.
9. For which the scholarly studies available to the prints scholar have included Rosemary Freeman, English Emblem Books (London:1948) and Corbett and Lightbown, The Comely Frontispiece. But see also ns
23 and 24 below.

11. Wardroper, Kings p.6; Langford, Robinocracy pp.16-17. See also Atherton, Political Prints p.30. For the ambiguity of images without inscriptions in the case of prosecution, see Williams, pp.216-17; idem, "Magnetic Figures" pp.108-109; Michael Bath, review of the same essay, PtQtly VIII (1991) 184-85
12. Philippe, p.22. Hofmann, pp.47,51, has suggested that what he terms 'caricature', i.e., graphic political satire, is subject to a tension between obscurantist and revelatory impulses; it therefore 'possesses a popular and an esoteric zone. Although its aim seems to be to make things visible and to proclaim them publically, it is governed by other impulses that make it tend towards a secret language of pictures', the 'transformation of [reality] into a cipher'. This is something which Paulson takes up, Emblem and Expression p.55; 'there is a contradiction between the desires to avoid "obvious", specified, formulated meanings and to communicate with the general public'.
13. Wood, Folly p.8. Cf. McCreery, p.184; early prints were 'restricted to emblematic representation' [my emphasis]; Hunt, 'Political Psychology' p.36 refers to the 'restriction of subject-matter [of formal Revolutionary propagandist images] to a canonical set of emblems and allegories'.
15. Paulson, 'Severed Head' p.56. Cf. Melot, p.27 'In England, personal attacks against prominent public figures [...] increased, while in France, caricature [sic] remained most often allegorical and abstract; Wood, '1789' p.340 'Abstract personification and emblematization are typical satiric devices of the French prints, caricatured likenesses a rarity'.
16. George, EPC1 p.172; Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.219. See also Langford, p.18.
17. Donald, 'Calumny' p.54. Donald's source is Atherton, Political Prints p.21. The complainant is Edward Sumpter, publisher of The British Antidote to Caledonian Poison, preface, 5th edn; the anti-emblematic tastes of Horace Walpole, couched in similar language, have perhaps coloured the evaluation of the emblematic in prints of this date, not least Walpole's covert admiration of the satires of Townshend.
18. Paulson, Emblem and Expression p.38 notes Shaftesbury's choice of epithets re- the emblematic; 'what he disparagingly calls the old enigmatic [...] use of iconography'. It is interesting to see Paulson adopting Shaftesburian practice throughout: for example, p.17 'the old iconography of saints' lives'; 'or is it one way of using the old iconography in order to get a meaning that is not merely the old, conventional
one?'; on p.35 he writes of 'the old stultified iconography' to which Hogarth attempted to produce 'a viable alternative'; p.36 Hogarth 'begins by rendering traditional iconography dead. It is a series of old, dead, inappropriate postures, displaced to the paintings on the wall, now fit only to be hung in a gallery'; p.37 'the old iconography remains, however, a ghostly presence in the general composition' of The Harlot's Progress, Plate I; p.51 'once the old iconography was understood to be just that' [my emphases].

Carretta, Snarling Muse, uses the term 'old-fashioned' when referring, pp.78-9, to emblematic and allegorical imagery; p.89 'the older patterns of imagery that were employed in the earlier satires of the South Sea Bubble'; p.245 'the rhetorical strategy so influential during Pope's life was virtually untenable by the early 1760s. Churchill and his contemporaries could no longer use the older [i.e., emblematic] traditions of verbal and visual political satire'[my emphases].

For a different interpretation of Shaftesbury's 'rejection' of the emblematic, see Michael Bath, Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture (London:1994) pp.256-58. I am particularly grateful to Dr Bath for letting me see a pre-publication copy of this chapter.


Langford, Robinocracy p.17 would seem to associate the tenacity of emblematic representation in the first half of the 18th century with 'the deep conservatism of contemporary political prejudices'; Langford's idea that emblematic representation was suited to the articulation and depiction of conveniently general 'English virtues' anticipates Carretta's thesis respecting the use of iconography in the 1790s and thereafter.

For the extent to which Shaftesbury's hostility to the emblematic compositions of contemporary Oxford Almanacs - cited in the Characteristics - may have been coloured by political sympathies see Helen Petter, The Oxford Almanacs (Oxford:1974) p.6.

20. Atherton, Political Prints, p.25; Carretta, Snarling Muse, pp.20-21,233; 'to understand fully the nature of engraved attacks on [...] Walpole and his ministry we must consider the kind of satire dominant before he came to power'; 'the popular treatment [sic] of Hogarth's first major print An Emblematical Print on the South Sea Scheme (1721) suggests that we see the engravings in the light of the emblematic and allegorical traditions.
eighteenth-century print designers and buyers inherited'. Unfortunately, one of Carretta's main sources for this tradition is Paulson (Hogarth's Graphic Works, i, 94-6; HLAT, i, 170-77); see n. below.

21. Carretta, ibid, p.201. The scholar in question proves to be Press, 'The Georgian Political Print'. Carretta observes, n.10, that 'Press underestimates the lingering importance [sic] of the emblematic tradition'. Carretta's approach to the emblematic in political prints is almost wholly dependent upon Paulson, in whose work the emphasis is on its decline, together with the larger allegorical mode of representation of which it was one manifestation; cf. Paulson, Emblem and Expression p.36.

'historically, Hogarth found himself in a situation in which the whole system of iconography [...] had become burdensome', and passim; Carretta ibid pp.233, 245, xx; 'I detect, though for different reasons, the same shift from emblematic to expressive representation in popular engravings that Paulson traces in higher art'. On p.250 Carretta quotes this passage from Paulson, Popular and Polite Art in the Age of Hogarth and Fielding p.101:

'A single-sequence deck of 1775 (Cary Collection, Yale) is intended to teach iconography, but while Justice still appears as a blindfolded woman in a Roman dress, Fidelity is now a dog being tempted by a housebreaker with a bone, Wit is Sir John Falstaff [...]. The old Ripan system of correspondences is being interrupted, not only by Biblical equations (Flattery or Deceit is Eve and the serpent) but by rational equations from contemporary experience, decidedly English in reference'.

22. Carretta, George III, pp.333, 311-12, 326. Several of the visual tropes of these prints are discussed by Atherton, 'The British Defend Their Constitution in Political Cartoons and Caricature'; Patten, GCLTA pp.159-65. Doubtless Carretta would view the wholly emblematic portrait 'puzzle picture' cited by Pointon, Hanging the Head p.103 - advertised as 'a striking likeness of the King and Queen of England and the late Unfortunate King and Queen of France' - as another instance of the reclamation of traditional modes of representation in anti-revolutionary propaganda.

23. For criticism of Freeman's 'Blakeian' or 'Romantic' bias against the emblematic, see E.B. Gilman, 'Word and Image in Quarles's Emblemes' Critical Inquiry 6 (1980) 385-410. The forthcoming study by Michael Bath, op.cit., will be the first extensive and comprehensive study of English emblem books since Freeman, and will make available to the non-specialist the results of the past few decades' research in this field.
24. The Victorian 'revival' of interest in the emblematic has attracted emblem scholars in the past two decades; emblem scholars are now beginning to turn their attention to the question of the survival of the idiom in the intervening century.

Peter M. Daly, 'What Happened to the English Emblem during the 18th and 19th Centuries?' in Emblem Books and the Telling Image: Abstracts of the papers and symposium presented at the first Minnesota conference on cultural emblematics (hereafter The Telling Image, Minneapolis: 1989) p.3; the study of 'popular and didactic literature' suggests 'that the emblem mode was put to effective use in England and America during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially by religious writers'. Bibliographic researches 'suggest that Freeman was wrong in asserting that the emblem "virtually ceased to exist" after 1700. Also relevant to the concerns of this thesis; Michael Hancher, 'Tenniel's Allegorical Cartoons', ibid p.10.


Relevant papers read at the Third International Emblem Conference (Pittsburgh, August 16-19, 1993) were: Bruce Lawson, 'Constructing and Deconstructing Oliver Cromwell's Image in William Faithorne's 1658 Emblematic Engraving'; Jane Farnsworth, "An Equall, and a Mutuall Flame": George Wither's A Collection of Emblemes: Ancient
and Moderne (1635) and Caroline Court Culture'; Mary Silcox, 'The Illumination of Robert Farley's Lychnocausia'; and Alan R. Young, 'George Wither's Other Emblems'. Also Victor Morgan, 'Living and Consumable Emblems: the Norwich Evidence'; Klaus Conermann 'The Palatine Marriage (1613): A Case Study in Symbolic Invention and Poetic Innovation' and Judith Dundas, 'Imitation and Originality in Peacham's Emblems'.


26. EPC1, p. 142. See also Langlois, p. 48; emblematic Royalist 'caricature' 'seems a little old-fashioned in comparison with the patriotic variety [...] it relied heavily on formal borrowings [...] took inspiration from old prints'; it appears in the context of a text and functions as that text's 'quintessence or emblem' (p. 45); Godfrey, English Caricature p. 12, Hogarth's Bubble prints are 'effective but rather old-fashioned'.

27. Feaver, p. 23. Paulson, Emblem and Expression pp. 51-52 observes that 'The sort of cognitive experience enjoyed by "reading" Hogarth's prints was recognised and understood in the early part of the eighteenth century, but it has gone against the main lines of art appreciation and/or criticism since the 1750s. Kenneth Clark speaks for our age when he says he is first attracted by a "general impression, which depends on the relationship of tone and area, shape and colour", whose impact is immediate. And his sentiment is essentially an echo of Shaftesbury's assumption that "the fewer the objects are [...] the easier it is for the eye, by one simple act and in one view, to comprehend the sum or whole" and of Sir Joshua Reynolds's denial that a picture can be "read" like a book: "What is done by Painting, must be done at one blow"'.


30. EPC1 p. 11; Donald, 'Calumny', p. 50; Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p. 219. Describing emblematic imagery as 'complicated' appears to absolve prints scholars of any responsibility to decode it.

31. Roots, p. 50. Stevenson, p. 86, notes that emblematic representation in portrait prints 'is in distinct danger of being thought ridiculous if the audience is not fully trained in the interpretation of emblems or personifications'. Political prints scholars continue to avoid engaging other than superficially with the question of emblematic and related forms of visual literacy; McCreery (1993), p. 183 writes that 'the prints rely on [...] symbols as a form of shorthand to convey their messages to viewers. While many of these references may mean little to modern viewers, it seems likely that contemporary viewers possessed a
much more highly developed proficiency in symbolic language'. 'It seems likely' is an inadequate response to what is a central problem in the study of this material and its contemporary rhetorical capacity. Nor does McCreery appear to be aware of the efforts made by emblem scholars to approximate to this 'proficiency in symbolic language'.

32. Langford, Robinocracy p.15, is one who acknowledges that 'early eighteenth-century caricatures [sic] rarely served the function of their modern counterparts, selecting and satirising a particular issue or personality in an immediate, even ephemeral way'. Rather, they offered interpretations of events (with, Langford suggests, a narrative emphasis) that required considerable attention; 'to be read rather than looked at, and deciphered more than read'. 'Nor did the cryptic nature of much graphic satire seem to contemporaries in the least fanciful'. For Langford as for most other commentators, however, graphic and satirical 'progress' alike entail the replacement of this idiom by caricature.

33. For example, Desmond Shawe-Taylor, The Georgians: Eighteenth-century Portraiture and Society (London:1990) p.34 'there is every evidence that the British of the eighteenth century found this kind of allegory [i.e., Kneller, Triumph of the Duke of Marlborough] as silly as we do', although he acknowledges, p.47 that 'just because they ridiculed allegory and mythology, it does not follow that eighteenth-century audiences despaired all symbolic content as such'. Similarly, Press, Political Cartoon pp.19, 24-5; Press rejects as 'muddy allegory' Gillray's Satan, Sin and Death. For the political-historical 'explanation' of the English predilection for 'realism' and caricature over allegory in art, see Chapter IX below.

34. Ashbee, p.147.
37. Rosemary Baker, p.133. See also Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.223.
38. Godfrey, English Caricature p.27. Patten, GCLTA p.176 would seem disposed to polarise as sources for Cruikshank's work in 1820 the 'demotic'/popular ('the theatre, comic verse, nursery rhymes and toys') and 'older graphic vocabularies based exclusively on emblems and allegory'.

39. Carini, introduction, British Caricatures of the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries p.3.
40. For the iconography of Plate 12, see Bernard F. Scholz, "Ownerless Arms or Legs Stretching from the Sky": Notes on an Emblematic Motif' in ed. Peter M. Daly, Andrea Alciato and the Emblem Tradition: Essays in Honor of Virginia Woods Callahan (New York:1988); for that of Plates 11,13 and 14, see

41. I am grateful to Professor Kevin Berland for this reference.


18th- and early 19th-century instances of such usage - which are numerous, for example, Dent's *Exhibition of the Times, Consisting of Emblems and Caricatures Original, Political, Humourous & Satirical* [BM 7328] (1788) - merit further study; certainly the evidence of the BM Catalogue fails to bear out Kunzle's assertion, *Early Comic Strip* p.359, that the term 'caricature' "became consecrated for the humorous broadsheet, completely displacing the "emblematic", "hieroglyphical" and "satyrical" print of old" [my emphasis].


42. EPC2 p.186; also Patten, *GCLTA* p.36 for Isaac Cruikshank's familiarity with emblem books in some unspecified form c.1800-1805. Significantly, 'emblem' does not figure in Patten's index.
Chapter VII: Aesthetic Quality or a Modernist Aesthetic?

If, as this thesis argues, the imposition of a crudely linear and caricature-oriented model of stylistic 'development' onto a far from homogeneous body of material has resulted in a highly distorted picture of the 'development' of political graphics - one which has, moreover, served an entire period very badly -, this distorted picture has in many instances been reinforced by an unsympathetic application of aesthetic criteria inappropriate to much of the material. The secondary literature of the subject is consequently rife with sweeping dismissals and abusive epithets with regard to those prints, or elements within particular prints, which fall short of these criteria. Closer inspection of these criticisms in most instances reveals the extent to which these criteria are themselves determined by the linear perspective which I have questioned above.

In particular, the linear model, with its biological metaphors, its emphasis on 'the coming-of-age' of the genre, insidiously promotes the idea that prints produced before the adoption of caricature, or else before a given date at which the medium achieves 'maturity' (which date, as we have seen, varies considerably) are, with rare exceptions, of 'poor artistic quality', 'crude' or, unsurprisingly, 'childish'. The words 'crude' and 'woodcut', for instance, appear in conjunction so frequently as to render them all but synonymous. [Plate 1] In 1928 Ashbee could declare that 'in the mid-17th century the aesthetic level of the pictures that lay claim to caricature is low enough'. In 1984, we find Godfrey writing that 'throughout the 17th century few prints were signed, and their design is generally such as to preclude curiosity about their authorship.' Godfrey condescends so far as to admit the existence of a 'handful' of 'superior' prints - the work of Wenceslas
Hollar and Francis Barlow - but these, it is emphasised, are 'the exception to the production of designs with figures stiffly arranged and poorly drawn'. Barlow's Egg of Dutch Rebellion [Plate 2] is described as 'one of the very few English satires of the century to possess artistic merit as well as historical interest', which faint praise is then further qualified; 'it owes more to Dutch satires than to any English tradition'. Godfrey's final verdict is that 'the earliest English satires' are 'usually more of antiquarian than visual interest.'

That early 18th century 'satires [...] have been studied [when studied at all] almost exclusively for their historical interest [...] shows a proper sense of priorities', although, as with the previous century, it is conceded that a few exceptions are discernible 'among the mass of crude and hurried prints'.

Hill dismisses Hogarth's political satires, together with those of both his contemporaries and predecessors, as 'wooden'; as 'late' as the 1770s 'there is little stylistic merit in the bulk of these prints', which present us with 'stiff, impersonal ideas, stiffly etched [...]'; the development of the political print was held back by 'mediocre draughtsmanship and a lack of technique'. That 'the artistic level' of graphic political satire was not high during the first half of the century is also to be inferred from Langford's suggestion that this would have been 'raised' by an earlier participation by Hogarth in matters partisan and political. Langford goes on to claim that no amount of retrospective assessment can rescue the reputation of those involved (i.e., the designers and engravers of these prints). It is perhaps one of the minor ironies of the age of Hogarth that the historical interest of the satirical engraving lies so much in its political impact and so little in its aesthetic quality.
In his monograph on the same period (1727-63), Atherton describes the bulk of his evidence as being of 'inferior artistic quality', or of 'indifferent artistry'.

Individual artists are also vulnerable, notably James Sayers, whom Klingender categorises as a 'feeble draughtsman', and his work, together with that of Dent, as 'crude scratchings'; Godfrey, too, describes Sayer's prints as 'crudely drawn and etched'. [Plate 3] Paulson refers to the 'crude manner of Isaac Cruikshank'. The consistency with which the work of Sayers is disparaged is the more significant in that Sayers represents the 'later generation' of political caricaturists against whose efforts earlier endeavours are commonly measured and found wanting.

According to Press, the 'print of social comment' was, at the time of Hogarth's death (1764) 'distinguished by banality, dullness and clumsiness of style'; the 'major difference' between the political satire of 1760 and its counterpart of 1800 'is a sharp improvement in artistic quality'. A 'sudden upsurge' in the quality as well as in the quantity of prints produced post-1750 is accepted as fact by Roots in his review of the Chadwyck-Healey series.

The emphasis on this 'transformation' in the highly-influential narrative of EPC1 has been noted, and while in fairness it must be conceded that EPC1 contains remarkably few value-judgements of the kind in question here - perhaps because George in the main sticks to her professed intention of looking at the prints as 'evidence' of 'opinion and propaganda' rather than as 'art' - the frequent appraisal within the text of the post-caricature political print as having an 'immediate appeal to the eye', or simply 'a more immediate appeal', subtly implants the idea that this was a quality absent in earlier prints.
I have not been able to discover the study which does not at some stage point, be it in criticism or apology, to the alleged deficiencies of the majority of prints produced c.1640-c.1760. Specialist and otherwise sympathetic studies are not immune; Corbett and Lightbown demur at the 'humdrum' execution of many English emblematic title-pages, and 'the contrast between [...] learned invention and [...] dull craftsmanship' which they afford. Even in the context of an essay in which the scholarly neglect of early colonial almanac illustration is deplored, the author deems it necessary to apologise for 'a crudeness and an all-too-frequent deficiency of aesthetic qualities' in the material.

It is the regularity with which such assertions as those quoted above may be encountered in the literature, the degree to which such judgements have been unquestioningly perpetuated in general surveys and specialist monographs alike, which renders them so pernicious. In this way, a particular perception of certain prints and of a particular period has been established which threatens to prove ineradicable. The tenacity of this perception will determine the nature and direction of print studies in future.

Pronouncements of the type with which this chapter deals are characterised by their essentially subjective nature. This much is acknowledged by one persistent offender;

I am acutely conscious that in the brief description of such a large subject and in the selection of illustrations therefrom, the calm tread of the impartial witness must sometimes give way to subjective judgements and even prejudice.

When the same prints - the sketchy 'card' designs of the 1750s and 1760s - can be praised as 'succinct' (Atherton) or abused as 'cramped' (Hill), the disturbingly subjective nature of ostensibly scholarly
criticism becomes apparent. Moreover, as with pronouncements identifying the period of 'transition' or the date at which the political print 'came of age', pronouncements on aesthetic quality (or its absence), reviewed collectively, reveal contradiction in what outwardly reads as consensus. Thus, although it is more common to be informed that it is the prints of the period pre-1760 that are 'over-crowded' and excessively-detailed, Godfrey draws attention to their 'austerity'; 'with figures arranged across the surface as on a stage, they seem austere in comparison with later caricatures'.

Such pronouncements are, moreover, the crudest generalisations. There are any number of prints from the 'early' period which display considerable artistic quality, both of conception and of execution. The oeuvre of de Hooghe springs immediately to mind [Plate 4], as do such prints as BM 837 Dr Dorislaw's Ghost (1652) [Plate 5] BM 1114 The happy Instruments of England's Preservation (1681) [Plate 6], BM 1122 Britania (1688) [Plate 7] or BM 1501 To the Unknown author of The High Church Champion (1710) [Plate 8]. Conversely, there are many prints from the so-called 'Golden Age' which might merit the epithet 'crude'; for example Perdito & Perdita or The Man and Woman of the People (1782) [Plate 9], BM 6422 The Man of Moderation (1784) [Plate 10], BM 7154 Parliamentary Personalities (1787) [Plate 11], BM 7130 The Opening of St Stephen's Chapel for the Present Season (1787) [Plate 12] and BM 7382 The Competitors (1788) [Plate 13].

In some instances generalisation can come disturbingly close to outright misinformation. Satirical prints of the 1740s are dismissed as showing no more than 'the required ability to build up a composition with dozens of small figures; the close-up of the face awaited Gillray and his generation'. Odd then, that perhaps the
closest close-up of all comes from this very period - The Late P-m-r M-n-r [Plate 14] It is not as if the author were ignorant of the existence of this print; it is mentioned on the following page in a different context.

To what degree the tendency towards the blanket statement can be ascribed to ingrained prejudices and to what degree laziness, is difficult to determine; the consequences for scholarship in the field are the same. As well as augmenting the neglect of 'early' political graphics, such assertions convey a false picture of homogeneity with respect to an essentially heterogeneous genre - one which, moreover, remains heterogeneous over the entire period.21 The blanket generalisations quoted above wilfully ignore, and certainly cannot be reconciled with, the evidence of the prints themselves; the discrepancies of technical sophistication, intellectual-ideographic sophistication and aesthetic sophistication evident within prints produced in any given year or decade of the period covered by this thesis.

A pertinent example is Plate 15; a woodcut dating from the Regency Crisis of 1788. This print and others like it can have no place in the linear model in which the 'crude woodcut' is succeeded by the engraving, the engraving succeeded by the collector's hand-tinted Gillray etching.

As far as I have been able to establish, this image has not been reproduced in any other study. This comes as no surprise. For it is not unusual for allegations of 'poor artistic quality' or 'crudeness' to be made in the absence of illustrations of the prints in question. The paucity of studies of 'early' prints is only exceeded by the paucity of examples from this period among the illustrations of most books - illustrations from which it would be possible for the reader to make his own aesthetic evaluation. Here it must be acknowledged that,
of ninety-six plates in EPC1, the first forty-one are pre-1770, and reasonably varied at that. Honourable exception must be made also of the Chadwyck-Healey series; if only as a consequence of their thematic nature, these volumes reproduce many prints seldom if ever reproduced hitherto, for example BM 4570 The Tree of Life, c.1770. [Chapter VI, Plate 14]

It was the range of prints reproduced in the Walpole volume of this series which enabled Celina Fox to challenge Langford's picture of the aesthetic poverty of the period c.1720 -c.1740. Of Langford's claim that their 'topicality militated against excellence', Fox writes scathingly; 'going through his selection, it is clear that anyone who can make such a statement must be aesthetically blind'. This was the era of the French immigrant engraver and of the propagation of the Rococo;

it is extraordinary to be so dismissive of their work, to fail to see the quality of the Craftsman's frontispieces, the importance of George Bickham [...] or the contrast between the lightness of style and sensational vulgarity of content in many of the prints attacking Walpole. 22

The illustrative range of the Chadwyck-Healey volumes in fact allowed Fox to call into question the shibboleth of 'development'; to Fox, the visual evidence suggested that 'the art of political satire was more advanced in [the 1720-1740] period than it was in the third quarter of the century, on the showing of prints included in Thomas's volume on The American Revolution'. 23

In general, however, very few of those studies from which the above selection of value-judgements was taken provide illustrations of those works disparaged; neither do they include among their illustrations prints of a later date which, in style, iconography or medium, deviate from the received view of the genre.

As noted in earlier chapters, it is the repetitious
illustrative choices of the main corpus of writing on the subject, which as much as anything else perpetuate the obscurity and perceived secondary status of 'early' and emblematic prints; this in turn encourages their continued neglect, and further entrenches the rigid perspective responsible for their exclusion and obscurity in the first place. In this respect, the problem of 'aesthetic merit' is inseparable from problems discussed in previous chapters.

Not only are they largely unsupported by visual evidence; the greater number of blanket statements concerning the 'aesthetic qualifications' of 'earlier' prints are made in passing, or else in the context of a few introductory paragraphs previous to the study proceeding to its predictable areas of emphasis, viz., caricature, and the 'Golden Age'. Nothing could be more eloquent of the superficial, and at worst unscholarly, handling of the material by which the study of these prints has for too long been characterised, than the fact that it has been permissible for a degree of generalisation which in some cases amounts to misrepresentation to obtain not only in the absence of pictorial evidence, but without further amplification, not to mention qualification, in the text.

But it is only on closer scrutiny of the criteria by which these tenacious qualitative judgements have been reached, and by which so many prints have been found wanting, that the legitimacy of these evaluations, and with them the legitimacy of the perspective which has for so long coloured the study of these prints, are seriously called into question.

There is evidence to suggest that 17th- and 18th-century political prints are being seen through uncompromisingly 20th-century eyes. In some instances, as in David Low's verdict on Gillray, the perspective is explicitly modern:
Nowadays, of course [my emphasis] many of his vaster plates - The Apotheosis of Hoche, for instance, [Plate 16] teeming with grimacing figures [...] - seem too crowded and suffocating; and the device, often used, of conveying the full point of the idea in enormous legends covering half the picture, balloons full of writing coming from the mouths of the figures and zig-zagging down the margins, seems tiresome to the eye of 1942. [my emphasis again]

Conversely, we are informed that, 'involved as many of Gillray's compositions appear to later generations, he helped to shape the simplicity of approach which, necessarily, has become an essential feature of modern newspaper cartooning' (Hill) [my emphasis].

Similar clues are to be found elsewhere. Political prints of the period 1720-60 appear curious 'to the modern eye'; 'to modern eyes these early drawings before 1700 seem filled with involved [...] allegory'; 17th- and early 18th-century Dutch and English prints 'consisting of groups of diminutive numbered figures, with a key printed underneath, [...] bear little resemblance to what we understand by Caricature today' [my emphasis throughout].

That a print should be celebrated for its apparent 'modernity', that its 'success' as an image should be measured by the degree to which it conforms to the contemporary editorial political 'cartoon' of the newspapers indicates the degree to which a linear perspective prevails regarding this material; such judgements also represent a failure of sympathetic scholarship.

More significantly, assertions as to the aesthetic inadequacies of prints consistently reveal the operation of aesthetic standards inappropriate to the study of 17th- and 18th-century political prints and caricatures. The qualities most consistently deprecated in prints of this period are highly telling; their rejection is rooted in an anachronistic perception of what graphic propaganda
and satire should look like, and of its function.

A recurrent criticism relates to the degree of detail in a print. Time and again with regard to 'early' and emblematic prints the terms 'over-elaborate' and 'over-crowded' are encountered. In EPC1, prints pre-dating the advent of caricature are 'usually over-complicated'. Early eighteenth-century prints continued to be 'characterized by an elaborate and sometimes bewildering complexity'. Godfrey, in Printmaking in England, reveals an antipathy towards 'ornament' in 17th-century prints that is almost pathological. Baker can write approvingly of late 18th-century prints that they became 'less complicated in design and execution', but as Low's criticism of Gillray indicates, the charge of excessive detail is not confined to 'early' designs; Hill writes of Gillray's 'involved' compositions. [Plate 17] In fact, whatever the period under review, the aversion to detail or elaboration of any kind remains constant. Detail is consistently presented as something inseparable from stultification or obfuscation. Thus Dolmetsch can write:

As one views the satires in this volume [Rebellion and Reconciliation], he [sic] will find that it is often the less complex work that has the greatest impact, while those [prints] that attempt to combine a number of messages within a single plate quickly lose their effect in the plethora of detail.

The not unfavourable analogy drawn by both Byron Gassman and George Kahrl between the 'overstuffed' prints of Hogarth, with their several layers of allusion and their plural narratives, and the 'teeming action' and 'crowded detail' of Smollett's picaresque novels, as representing the deliberate choice of multiple-over single-narrative scenes, is a rare exception to the unsympathetic response to detail in political prints and
satires, and to the demands made by such prints in terms of visual literacy. Wood repeats Baudelaire's verdict on the prints of Hogarth; overloaded 'with allegory and allusive details'. These Hogarth justified as necessary to complete and elucidate his thought. For the spectator, however - I was just about to say, for the reader - the reverse happens, so that they may end by retarding or confusing the intelligence.

Wood himself writes that

Hogarth, Rowlandson, Gillray, and Cruikshank might be said to share a pictorial agoraphobia which frequently leads them to cram every available space with detail. Both Goya and Daumier realised the importance of sparseness and concentration in rendering the ultimate horror of man's inhumanity to man. [Their prints] perhaps achieve a moral dimension and a monumental power which is above the teeming busyness of English political satire. They are an irrefutable proof of the dictum that less can be more.

Coupe describes Gillray's plates as 'overburdened', and the vocabulary employed in these criticisms is consistently that of claustrophobia or surfeit. Philippe's description of political prints as 'stuffed' with symbolic imagery subtly conveys an impression of satiety. According to Hill, pre-Gillray, 'even those designs not purposely compressed for the tiny pages of magazines appear unnaturally cramped' or else 'dark and dirty'. Atherton's choice of the verb 'crowd' in his description of the way in which the figures of Newcastle and Fox dominate the sparse enough Townshend design, The Pillars of the State [Plate 18] is both unnecessary and misleading.

Then there is the matter of the ratio of words to pictures:

The frontispieces to the first seven volumes of The Craftsman, which were circulated under the
title of Robin's Reign, or Seven's the Main, are relatively simple; yet they required in their own day a descriptive key.

Abhorrence of detail or elaboration of any kind extends to, and often focuses upon, the verbal components - accompanying verse or prose, speech balloons, explanatory keys - which form an integral part of most prints pre-1770 and which, indeed, persist beyond that date. The recurrent criticism is that this textual material 'encumbers' the prints. For Gombrich, 'early' prints are distinguished by 'the elaboration of the captions, the detailed and somewhat pedantic letterpress'. 40 Wood writes of 'the dominance of texts' and of 'cumbersome explanatory texts', Press of 'that abomination, labels'. 41 Notwithstanding the gloomy verdict that 'prolixity of lettering was no rare thing on caricatures and was to grow rapidly worse', it is, of course, one of the shibboleths of the 'development' of graphic political satire that this 'development' was marked by a gradual elimination of the text; something which is not borne out by satires of the later period. [Plates 19 -21] 42

For Donald, Townshend's Gloria Mundi, a satire of the small 'card' format disparaged by Hill, 'has a visual immediacy which stood in no need of the speech balloons, laboured explanations and accessories usual in political prints of the time.' These are 'slack designs, with small figures, which rely heavily [my emphasis] on speech balloons, elaborated settings and symbolism.' 43 This idea, of the text or caption as bolstering an essentially weak image is common; 'pre-Hogarth' prints (described as 'poorly conceived and amateurishly executed') 'resort to balloons and streamers and verbal devices to compensate for lack of inspiration.' 44 Gillray, too, fails in this respect; 'he often lacked solid conception, and had to resort to long explanatory captions.' 45
Wood rightly draws attention to the importance which his 'text' held for Gillray in the composition of his prints, but for Coupe the speech balloons in the prints of Gillray and his contemporaries are 'no more than an uncomfortable survival from the detailed verses which in earlier times had been appended to satirical prints'.

They are at best tautologous;

> to my mind the subtitle which Gillray gives to the 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.

This is the line adopted by Feaver;

> it was important not to labour the joke, not to polish it up or rely too heavily on ornamental accessories. The approach had to be predatory: each notion stalked, seized and set down in a twinkling. The alternative, the elaboration of conceits [48] often resulted in witless intricacy.

Anything but the most minimal textual component in a print is commonly greeted with hostility. Press writes of 'the extended verbiage to which it was the cartoon's fate to be eternally attached'. As Ashbee puts it,

> the ideal caricature would give us statement without text [...] the pictorial bob once loosed, it should be felt immediately. For, when all is said, the laugh rendered pictorially is more potent than the laugh that comes through words.

Coupe takes this up;

> even in more modern times, it is not difficult to find examples where the text is at best tautologous: a really successful cartoon can speak for itself, without the help of a letterpress, which is, in any case, often not the work of the cartoonist himself.
The strongly verbal context of prints pre-1727 is commonly interpreted in terms of the subservience of the image; prints are described as occupying 'a subsidiary place [...] a frontispiece, or illustration to a pamphlet or broadside', but it can be argued that it is print scholarship which has relegated such prints, and words in general, to the sidelines. To write that 'the Puritans attacking Charles I in the 1640s [...] effectively used this snappy technique to lighten their soggy prose' is to debase and trivialise the innovative incorporation of the pictorial into the printed polemic of the Great Rebellion.\(^5\)

In an inversion of the iconoclasm and 'blindness to all but words' deplored by Porter, writing on political graphics has consistently asserted the primacy of image over text to the detriment of those prints in which the relation of word and image is either finely balanced or in which the textual component is the greater.\(^{[Plate 22]}\)

In this way, the antithesis between word and image which Porter remarks, - and which he argues, rightly, to be not only cliched, but inappropriate to prints of the seventeenth, and much of the eighteenth, century, which are characterised by a marked interdependence of word and image, - is further entrenched.

Antipathy to words in these prints is of a piece with the rejection of detail and 'the elaboration of conceits'. The ideal is spareness and simplicity; Donald lauds Gloria Mundi as a print of 'devastating epigrammatic simplicity'.\(^5\) Notwithstanding the fact that 'the elaboration of conceits' is central to 17th- and 18th-century prints, critics of these prints hold grimly to 'the dictum that less can be more'; in the era of Walpole 'caricature had still to learn that it, more than any other art, must cultivate elimination'.\(^5\) Streicher places similar emphasis on 'the art of omission' as necessary to caricature.\(^5\) Gombrich writes
at length of the art as one of 'condensation', 'the telescoping of a whole chain of ideas into one pregnant image'; it is in 'the condensation of a complex idea in one striking and memorable image that we find the continued appeal of [the] great cartoon.'

With the 'art of omission' goes 'economy of line' and the achievement of at least the appearance of spontaneity; again, it is a shibboleth of the linear model of the 'development' of graphic political satire that only when the image became 'more free in line' was progress achieved. For Kahrl, 18th-century satirical prints in general lack this desirable simplicity and spontaneity; its attainment was frustrated by the reproductive process of engraving:

the transformation of the informal [i.e., a sketch] to the formal [i.e., a print], and the conventionalized practices of engravers obliterated some of the simplicity of the originals; only later did some of the caricaturist-engravers [unspecified] learn to catch and preserve this simplicity.

We are informed that 'the simpler and more rough-hewn' a caricature or political satire, 'the greater its range', although what is intended by 'range' is not specified. The ideal would seem to be the 'lightning pencil sketch', but, Hogarth's pronouncement that 'the passion may be more forcibly expressed by a strong, bold stroke than by the most delicate engraving' notwithstanding, the emphasis on sparseness of design and apparent spontaneity of execution is a more accurate reflection of 20th- than of 18th-century aesthetic standards.

The same 20th-century - or more precisely, the same modernist - aesthetic accounts for the privileged position which caricature has for so long enjoyed in most studies. 'It is a modern trait to regard the more portentous art of the past as comic, and to take its
caricatures seriously', claims Bevis Hillier. The notion that a caricature functions as 'a corrective to the suavity of official portraiture' which has underpinned the perceived 'value' of the caricature as an historical document derives from this.

It is not accidental that caricature should so frequently be presented as an idiom which 'anticipates' Modern Art. Caricature's 'original protest, its expressive method of opposition to the 'rules' has become a commonplace today when there no longer exists a valid norm of beauty'. 'In caricature there is transgression of an aesthetic norm'; 'the caricaturist perverts the rules of ideal representation'; caricature 'often breaks through the artistic conventions of the time [....] it is set free from the demands [for which read the 'tyranny' or the 'constraints'] of artistic decorum'. 'It was caricature which first gave artistic expression to the realization that definite elementary forms could be interpreted in a variety of ways' which 'we come across [....] today in the abstract picture'. Not for nothing did Gombrich devote a chapter to 'the Experiment of Caricature'. Philippe Bordes' claim, in relation to French revolutionary prints, that an appreciation of such prints 'is necessary for a better understanding of the emergent conceptions of modern art' exemplifies the misplaced priorities which continue to inform the study of 17th- and 18th-century political prints.

That its 'proto-modernism' constitutes the appeal of caricature is made explicit in several works. The 'new status of the caricature' is explained by Hillier in these terms:

Rather as Charlotte Bronte in Vilette anticipated Freudian psychology without having formulated its principles, so caricature contained the elements of twentieth-century art: distortion for effect; the avoidance of cloying lyricism and sentimentality, and of pedantic academicism; the idea that art should reflect
one's own day; fragmentation (Cubism); frozen movement (Futurism); abstraction itself. Above all it seemed 'unfinished', possessing the quality of eloquent suggestion.

The other relevant twentieth-century development was the great formal science of psychology, which again suggested a way in which caricature might be thought superior to academic painting: the chance it gave for free [...] expression of the artist's personality, not to mention that of his subject. The caricature was only one stage nearer formality than the 'doodle', the alleged seismograph of the unconscious.

According to Hofmann, 18th-century canons of taste and beauty precluded not only the appreciation of many earlier works of art, but a full appreciation of caricature; only in the 20th century has it become possible to perceive caricature as 'a true art, a positive, meaningful method of expression' rather than as a 'counter-art':

we have a new attitude to the frontiers between caricature and other spheres of expression. In short, together with our attitude to all questions of artistic representation, our opinion of caricature has changed as well.

Yet while it is possible to account for the long-standing preoccupation with caricature observed in Chapter V in terms of a prevailing modernist aesthetic, it is significant that the reappraisal and rehabilitation of caricature has not been accompanied by a similar interest in, and recognition of, early and emblematic prints. The neglect of the emblematic by those who sought to rehabilitate caricature was not inevitable. So far from prints produced after 1760 becoming 'less representational', as Press has claimed, it is prints of the period c.1600-c.1720 which are the more abstract. Their tendency to juxtapose disparate images, their peculiar handling of spatial and temporal relationships and their tendency towards abstraction might have excited similar attention; Hofmann, after all, can write of
Hogarth as having discovered 'afresh the simultaneity of different, various and disparate elements', and of his filling pictures with 'events that had no logical connection', which 'because of their lack of connection, attain a symbolic power that cannot be overlooked.' Yet prints in which these qualities are far more marked than in the work of Hogarth - for example, The Prospect of a Popish Successor [Plate 23], - have consistently been overlooked, or else, as the previous chapter has shown, deprecated.

The partial and distorted picture of 17th- and 18th-century political prints which has resulted from an evaluation of these prints on aesthetic grounds, calls into question the idea, advanced by Porter, that political prints should be approached as 'art' and not merely as another form of historical 'evidence'. There is a case to be made that aesthetic considerations are largely irrelevant to the study of these images, few of which were conceived as, and few of which would have been received as 'art' by their contemporary audience. If aesthetic considerations get in the way of objective study of politically-inspired images, as when woodcuts such as those in Plate 1 are not considered worthy of serious attention because 'early' woodcuts are deemed primitive or crude, then something is seriously wrong. The historian who ignores such images because he ignores all images stands accused of 'iconoclasm'; the imposition of anachronistic aesthetic criteria on this material, and the prevalence of subjective value-judgements represent, I would suggest, an iconoclasm which, if more subtle, has been the more invidious.

Porter's request that political prints be treated as 'art' is something to which Part II, Chapter II will return. The extent to which the modern perception of 17th- and 18th-century political graphics may have been shaped by the employment of an anachronistic aesthetic
yardstick is something which gives a new twist to Porter's phrase, 'seeing the past'.
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concludes that 'artistry is supplementary and contributory rather than central' to the ideographic success of a given print. The notion, forwarded by Rosemary Baker (p.135), that 'because the main purpose of these prints was to provoke a specific response, to satirize, their value now lies in part in their lack of conscious artistic qualities', is, to say the least, disingenuous.
Chapter VIII: Consumers and Spectators: 'evidence' and evasion

the question arises, who bought these prints in such numbers at the not inconsiderable prices which engravers or print-sellers charged for them?

TLS, review of George, Social Change in Graphic Satire 21 December 1967

It might be tempting to assume that in a hierarchical society of limited literacy, it was a matter of pamphlet politics for the patricians [...] and picture politics for the plebs, with visual satire a simplified sign language for the non- or barely literate, equivalent to the [...] woodcuts of broadsides and chapbooks.

Porter, London Review of Books 1986

Most scholars have approached the 18th-century political print from the perspective that such prints represent a 'mass medium', 'popular' or 'democratic' in appeal, and catering to a 'mass market'. Although, as this chapter will argue, the grounds for so thinking are tenuous to say the least, it is a perception of the idiom which has yet to be eradicated even from more 'academic' studies; Carretta, for example, considers political engravings as a 'low, or popular art form'. More recently still, R.L. Patten's George Cruikshank writes of political prints as 'popular prints' and 'popular art'.

Assertions as to the essentially popular nature of the idiom abound. Political prints are 'a largely popular form of expression'; 'print is a mass medium - universal, direct, immediate'; 'prints came about in order to elucidate for the common man the personalities and events of political, social, military and religious life'.

'Caricature [...] is essentially a democratic art', 'a genuinely popular art'; political caricature is aimed at 'the man in the street'. 'The appeal of the political cartoon is generally to the masses'. 'Caricature is genuinely popular, the most universal and democratic form
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of visual art'. The Bubble prints 'were aimed at the amusement of the general public'. "The semi-literate London populace depended for its topical amusement on satirical prints and cartoons'. Anti-French graphic propaganda from the 1790s onwards was directed at a 'popular audience'. Paulson refers to 'the popular tradition of graphic satire' in which Hogarth 'participated'. Elsewhere we read that Hogarth's 'speciality was the social cartoon for the masses', and so on.

In more than one account it is the 'popular' nature of political prints which makes them a 'special' form of historical evidence and particularly worthy of study;

The political cartoon is more than a comic drawing. It is a reflection, not of the historian's idea of history, but of the common man's reaction to the political events of his day.

Similarly, the print's comparative immunity from suppression and censorship has been explained in terms of its popular patronage:

British citizens [sic] might quietly submit to having their political liberties eroded or literary propaganda suppressed, but they would fight to the death to preserve their idea of a joke and their own free comment on current affairs. And so the political print or caricature was best left alone.

Fundamental to this perception of the political print is the idea that these images would have been intelligible even to the illiterate. The notion that 'Imperitis pro lectione pictura est' ('For the unlearned, pictures serve as words') is at least implicit in most accounts and Gombrich is not the only one for whom the 'cartoon' appears 'the heir' of the didactic imagery of the medieval Church; Carretta's choice of words in describing political prints as functioning 'as a
political biblia pauperum' is revealing. Thus, one reads that: 'Prints are a Universal Language, understood by Persons of all Nations and Degrees'; 'prints conveyed ideas dramatically' and 'were more easily understood than words'; 'to enjoy printed images one does not even have to be able to read'; 'the brightly coloured pictures' of political caricature 'could be understood by every class from the highly educated to the illiterate'; graphics have the ability 'to communicate even with the illiterate or semi-literate'; 'the relatively simple and succinct messages and brightly coloured pictures could be understood by large sections of the population, from the highly educated to the barely literate'. 'With their appeal to the illiterate, and the impact of immediacy, the prints reached a wider public than the newspapers.'

With political caricature, 'the set-up is no sooner seen than understood.' This meant that 'in principle' at least, 'the cartoons [of the 1730s and 1740s] were comprehensible by a much wider audience' than those for whom they were originally designed and who could afford to purchase them. Even Porter qualifies his picture of a non-popular idiom with the notion that a print 'could be read on many different planes'; 'a cartoon featuring Henry Fox and labelled Volpone could be appreciated by those who had never even heard of Ben Jonson'.

I have yet to find an account which presents the uneducated and illiterate as the intended audience for these prints; however, the idea that pictorial images could exert a particular influence on such persons is widespread and indeed in some accounts, central to the perceived importance of the medium. Coupe, for example, considers that 'it is probably true [...] that the lower the level of education and sophistication, the greater the impact of a picture is likely to be'.
Peter Burke can write that

if popular culture in 17th-century England was predominantly oral it was also extremely visual. Obviously [sic] the two were linked, for the non-literate were at home with visual images. [my emphasis]

Like other visual forms [...] caricatures could be especially influential in a society [late 18th-century France] in which half the adult men and three-quarters of the adult women could not read [...]; for the illiterate populace, images fixed the impression of revolutionary happenings much more indelibly than the printed word, [my emphasis]

argues Lynn Hunt. 28 As for the English counterparts of these prints, 'the extent and diversity of the types of image produced in England and especially in London in the revolutionary period' suggests to Brewer 'a widespread belief in the efficacy of images as a means of persuasion, especially of the uneducated' [my emphasis]. 29

In the 1750s and '60s, we are told, 'engraved pictures of all sorts were available for rich and poor alike'. 30 In fact, scholars have tended to polarize the respective audiences of prints and paintings in this period; 'painting was primarily destined for elite exhibitions and appealed to the upper-class spectator, while the caricature could be cheaply produced and made available to the wider community'. 31 David Solkin, writing of the exclusion of ordinary Londoners from the exhibitions of the newly-established Royal Academy, asserts, triumphantly, that

those 'Improper Persons' did have an art of their own - engraved illustrations in magazines, for example, or the cheap and often defiantly crude satiric prints which sold for pennies in the streets. 32
The idea that the political print was a 'popular' idiom, has not, however, met with universal assent and, significantly, not a few of those who initially employ the term 'popular' subsequently retract or qualify this.

Langford, for example, considers it unlikely that a market for prints existed 'in the classes below the middling sort'. Political prints were bought by

the great mass of people involved in trade, industry, or the emerging professions who had both the resources and the literacy to take an interest in the press [...] Such people constituted a substantial section of society, stretching between the polite and propertied ruling class and the plebeians who, in theory at least, possessed no political role at all.

Similarly, although Dickinson reiterates the familiar idea that the prints were potentially intelligible to 'large sections of the population, from the highly educated to the barely literate', he concedes that the available evidence points to a limited circulation among the political elite and 'the propertied middle classes'.

French print scholars have long been accustomed to explain the 'late development' of 'political caricature' in France in terms of the absence of the politicised 'middle class' which had facilitated its earlier 'development' in England. In French Caricature and the French Revolution we read that 'the emergence of a powerful and liberated bourgeoisie' was needed 'to provide the stimulus and means for the rapid production and wide distribution of political caricatures'; a stimulus which was lacking in France for the greater part of the century. 'English caricature', in contrast, 'developed rapidly before 1760, with artists, a public, and organised sales and production networks';

the reason for this [being] the typically English importance of a "middle class" (distinct from the high bourgeoisie which was
linked to the aristocracy) with a strong collective self-consciousness, producing its own economic, moral and aesthetic values. [...] Thus, in England was born a true culture, or counter-culture, of the middle class — a middle class more homogeneous than that in France, more conscious of its rights and its identity. 35

That the 'emergent middle class' should be cited as the probable market for political prints is predictable enough. 36 For the best part of this century, the 'birth of the novel' in England in the first half of the 18th century has been explained in terms of the appearance of a 'new audience' or a new, 'middle class', market for literature. 37 More recently, as part of a larger preoccupation with the entrepreneurial and commercial as opposed to the aesthetic aspects of art, art historians have claimed to discern a similar broadening of the market for art in England for this same period. 38 As with literature, the thesis is one of a shift from dependence on aristocratic patronage to responsiveness to a wider market:

some of the more innovative painters and printsellers like Hogarth and [Arthur] Pond experimented with new commercial techniques, particularly the use of all kinds of print media, to reach literate audiences. As a result of these methods, early eighteenth-century English artists discovered a large audience for their work.

Prints

played an important role in the development of the early eighteenth-century [English] art world. Unlike paintings, they were numerous, cheap, accessible, and responsive to rapid shifts in public tastes. 39

In fact, the author of Selling Art in Georgian London, from which these observations are taken, doubts whether it is really possible to speak of an expansion of the print trade before the late 1760s; it was only in the
context of the founding of the Royal Academy - and the concomitant interest in British art - and the Academy's exclusion of engravers that these and the printsellers 'began to develop large-scale production techniques and mass audiences'. Elsewhere, however, it is possible to read that 'by the middle of the 18th century, print dealers had begun to court 'a middle-class and even lower-class market - the same market that early newssheets were trying to reach and please'.

The expansion of the market for political prints has indeed been presented as part of a larger expansion of the press. The political print appealed to the 18th-century 'newsmongering public', claims Porter:

print culture formed a subset of print culture, or in other words [...] the political print was addressed to a British reading public already awash in the political words cascading from printed speeches, pamphlets, treatises, ballads, journals, and increasingly from newspapers.

The 'development' of the political print should, therefore, be seen in the context of the expansion of the market for other journalistic media and with 'a vast expansion of the organs of expression and the embryonic evolution of a professional vox populi from Grub Street to intelligentsia'. These prints were purchased by those who 'customarily purchased books and newspapers', claims Langford:

the newspapers, ballads and pamphlets which emerged at increasing rate from Grub St were necessarily concerned with the doings of the rulers, and in some measure dependent upon them. But without this great body of 'middling' opinion in the capital and provinces, there would have been no audience for the newly-established popular [sic] press.
This picture, of a 'middling' audience for, or 'middling' consumption of, political prints, is invariably accompanied by, indeed is dependent upon and inseparable from, the idea of the development of political literacy; the 18th-century political print was produced for 'and bought by the politically articulate metropolitan middle classes'.\textsuperscript{44} The 'commercialization' thesis which increasingly informs accounts of the development of the print trade is familiar from accounts of politics 'out of doors' for the same period: the desire for political information was 'catered to by those who realised that politics, so long a luxury good was beginning to transform itself into yet another mass marketable commodity'.\textsuperscript{45} The political print and its post-1760 quantitative development are symptoms of this 'commercialization of politics' and of the growth of 'public opinion'. Thus P.D.G. Thomas: 'in the reign of George III cartoons were the latest evidence that public opinion was coming of age in politics'.\textsuperscript{46} What was 'new' about the 18th-century print, and what would influence a whole current of political graphic art to our own day - was that it seemed to be committed to participating in the making of policies by serving as a vehicle for the expression and formation of public opinion itself. [...] There now appears in society - and hence also in the production-consumption cycle of the political print - a group of individuals, relatively homogeneous and sufficiently aware of its own autonomy and importance, commonly known as 'public opinion' [...] the active audience at whom political graphic art will henceforth be aimed.\textsuperscript{47}

The political print is thus perceived as material evidence of a growing 'democratization' of political awareness and political involvement; the print becomes part of the material culture of 'urban politics'.

In this context, the distinction between 'popular' and 'middling' audiences is likely to be blurred. An example
of this is Carretta's account. Carretta would have us believe that post-1760,

political satire was addressed more consistently than it had ever been before to a mass audience composed mainly of the unenfranchised. Satirists, like the designer of the 1762 print The Boot and the Bruisers, or Scotch Politics [BM 3818] clearly enjoyed the power of the mob.

'Political engravings brought politics out of Parliament and into the street, where even the mob was able to see its king and his ministers displayed'; satirical prints were an aid to political literacy, they 'familiarized the populace with the actors on the political stage'. Similarly, Atherton can describe George Townshend as a 'radical populist'; his application of his caricaturing skill in the public domain intended 'to bring [the] larger political nation "without doors" into the tighter world of oligarchy.' Having first restricted consumption of these prints to the 'middling' consumers of newspapers and books, Langford concludes that the ultimate importance of political prints 'lies in the way in which they sustained and reinforced [...] popular participation in politics'. Political prints 'played a part in the political education' of 'the metropolitan lower orders', 'and exploded any hope that the political battles of the 1730s could be kept within the ranks of the wealthy and educated.' In 'The Georgian Political Print and Democratic Institutions', Charles Press argues for an ever-widening market for political prints between c.1760-1830 and claims to see in the expansion of political journalism after 1760 'the beginnings of a popular mass market of opinion'.

The notion that the political print was a 'popular' idiom, one which addressed a 'mass' audience or a 'popular market', is, however, wholly untenable with respect to the prints for which this claim has been made.
Genuinely 'popular' prints did exist during this period; it is one of the finer ironies of the long-standing subscription to the notion of 'popular political prints' that these prints have been almost completely ignored by scholars. It remains the case that the prints on which attention has been focussed to date, and of which such assertions as those of Press have been made, are the antithesis of 'popular'.

First, there is the matter of cost. Solkin alludes to 'prints which sold for pennies in the streets' and Paulson refers to Hogarth's 1747 series, Industry and Idleness as 'simply penny prints'. This series in fact sold at 12s. complete. The woodcut versions of the last two Stages of Cruelty - Hogarth's sole attempt to address a popular market - were, at 1s. each, similarly beyond the means of those at whom they were directed. The enduring myth of Hogarth the populist cannot be reconciled with the prices which his prints commanded, still less with his attempt to secure his work from piracy. As Louise Lippincott observes;

the 'popular' market was served by the cheap, pirated versions [of prints] offered by a lower class of printseller, whom Hogarth sought to drive out of business with his 1735 copyright Act. [my emphasis]

It is not only with regard to the prints of Hogarth that the case for a 'popular' market founders; the kinds of print which appear in the pages of the studies which blithely refer to 'popular prints' were sold not 'for pennies in the street' but for anything between 6d. and several guineas in the printshops. As one scholar has observed, 'the popular association of the phrase "penny plain, twopence coloured" particularly with eighteenth-century hand-coloured caricatures has no basis in fact.'

It has been suggested that at sixpence a print would
have been accessible to at least some of the lower orders. Porter's claim that the Chadwyck-Healey authors agree that 'the eighteenth-century [political] print made its appeal to a limited circle' ignores the fact that, en route to that conclusion, Sharpe, for example, can write 'that the price of some of these prints was as low as 6d. put them within the financial reach of artisans and skilled workers', and that Thomas, who inclines to the view 'cartoons were a popular form of propaganda', considers them, at the 'usual price of 6d.', within the financial reach of an ordinary soldier.\(^59\)

In general, however, the cost of these prints is acknowledged to have been beyond the means of the artisans and labourers who might be expected to have comprised a 'popular' or 'mass' audience.\(^60\) Thus, while the indisputable expansion of the print trade in 18th-century London and the consequent proliferation of printshops - 71 by 1790, according to Hill - have been cited as evidence of what one scholar has called an 'insatiable public demand', the idea that these shops served a 'popular market' can only be maintained in defiance of economic realities.\(^61\)

In this context, the fact that the one account to date devoted to the thesis of a 'development of a mass market' in England for prints of political comment and satire during the period 1780-1830 can cover twenty-two pages - incorporating four statistical tables - without once referring to the prices of the prints in question is, to say the least, interesting.\(^62\) Press's is not, however, the only account in which a 'popular' market is claimed for these prints without a single reference to the prices charged.\(^63\) Other works, meanwhile, have referred to the prices of the prints under review only in passing; nor, when prices are given, are they always related to particular decades or to particular types of print.
Nor is it possible to reconcile the claim that the political print was designed for a 'mass market' or a 'popular' with the circulation figures currently available. Incomplete as these are, they none the less suggest that all but the most celebrated or notorious satires were printed in runs of no more than a few thousand, with runs of a few hundred being far from uncommon. The increase in print production over the latter half of the 18th century which so many studies remark refers to the number of different prints published per. week or per. month, rather than to the number of copies produced of an individual design; Wood, for example, writes of satiric etching as having become 'a major propagandist force in England in the 1790s', but subsequently observes that even in the later 18th century 'it was normal for print satires to be produced in relatively small numbers for sale to individuals'. The hand-coloured etching of the 'Golden Age' - the type of print with which most studies to date have been concerned - was 'slow and relatively expensive' to produce: 'in Britain such prints cannot usually have been printed in editions larger than a few hundreds [...] they were purchased by a political and social elite'.

The problem of reconciling belief in the 'popular' nature of graphic political satire with the known costs of the prints in question and with comparatively low circulation figures has, however, been to a large extent evaded by widespread subscription to the idea that popular access to these prints was not dependent upon purchasing power.

It was possible, we are told, to see political prints on the walls of taverns and other public places. George writes that prints 'were pasted up at street corners and in ale-houses and gin-shops'; twenty years later, Alexander, referring to the commercial failure of Hogarth's 'cheap' (i.e., 1s.) versions of the Stages of
Cruelty, claims that 'those that did sell were no doubt seen by many people, for example stuck up on tavern walls, like posters' [my emphasis].

Yet there is little evidence to suggest that the prints which were accessible in this fashion were the prints of which this claim has been made. In one of the (significantly) few investigations of prints of this period which genuinely merit the epithet 'popular' written to date, Morris Martin concludes that the 'large popular woodcuts [which] were commonly pasted on the walls of cottages, inns [or] taverns' 'are not to be identified with the products of the caricaturists, nor are they political in the sense that barbershop and coffee-house' prints were.

Claims that political prints were accessible in this fashion have depended, to a degree that has not perhaps been made sufficiently clear, on the conflation of very different types of print. The 'penny prints' alluded to by Solkin existed, and many of these would also have merited the epithet 'political'. It is not these, but rather the costly hand-coloured etchings of the 'Golden Age' for which a 'popular' market or plebeian audience has been claimed. [Plates 2 and 3]

In Popular and Polite Art, Paulson cites, as one of the sources of imagery so universal that it was taken for granted by contemporaries at every level of society, 'the engravings in shop windows', and the printshop window display is the 'evidence' of choice - in some cases the sole evidence - for plebeian access to political prints of the Gillray type; that is, the sort of print with which most studies have been concerned.

The printshop window is one of the most prevalent and enduring cliches of the literature. In the first month of 1993 alone it appeared twice, with John Carey's review in The Sunday Times of R.L. Patten's biography of George Cruikshank referring to the 'goggling crowds' which were drawn 'to bookshop windows' by 'satirical prints and
cartoons', and the leaflet accompanying the B.M. exhibition, *Europeans in Caricature*, asserting that the audience for such prints was not restricted to their purchasers; 'they were seen by a much larger public in the windows of printshops throughout London.'

The sole allusion to popular exposure to political prints in *EPC1* is to the role of the printshop windows as 'the picture galleries of the public', a phrase which is reencountered with monotonous regularity in subsequent literature. Thus, while admission charges set by the more fashionable printshops in the 1780s 'may have kept out poorer people [...] they could still enjoy the window displays', by means of which 'many satires were well-known to those who could not afford to buy them'.

There was something for everyone. For the lower classes who could not afford to buy the prints at '1s. plain, 2s. coloured' and who could not afford the admittance fee often charged to peruse the exhibitions inside the shops, the printsellers' windows provided a constantly changing source of amusement.

People too poor to buy a single print could still stand laughing (and extending their political education) in the crowds which since Hogarth's day had been notorious for blocking the pavement in front of a printshop's crowded panes.

In *Printmaking*, Godfrey not only reiterates the stock account of the 'free window display' but reproduces Gillray's depiction of Mrs Humphrey's window in the 1808 print *Very Slippy Weather*,[Plate 4] 'showing gawpers of various rank enjoying the window display'; the handful of prints which depict the printshop-window audience - for example, *The Macaroni Printshop* (1772) [Plate 5], *Good Humour* (1829) [Plate 6] and *Honi Soit Qui Mal Y Pense* [Plate 7] - endlessly reproduced, have been invested with a significance which, arguably, they do not merit.
By invoking the printshop window display in order to answer the objections of cost and limited print runs, scholars have evaded a further difficulty entailed in claiming plebeian access and exposure to political prints; the intelligibility to such an audience of of the prints thus displayed. Langford and Donald both quote the Public Advertiser (5 June 1765); 'Every window of every printshop is in a Manner glazed, and the shop itself Papered, with libels [...] he who runs may read', and Feaver writes of the 'popular spectacle' of such displays, in which contemporary politics was 'transformed into colourful pantomime that every man in the street could understand', but while this is the premise on which so many accounts of these prints are founded, it has not found universal acceptance. Porter, for one, has difficulties reconciling the visual complexity of most prints, not to mention their strongly verbal component, with 'popular appeal'; 'many of these prints are "difficult", a far cry from the eighteenth-century equivalent of "Gotcha!":

the prints [...] presented challenging hieroglyphics to be deciphered whose full messages [my italics] can have been intelligible only to those familiar with the features and foibles of the great and steeped in the learning of Bible and classics.

Roots agrees; 'the eighteenth-century print made its appeal to a limited circle':

the audience ('readership' might be apter, but there is no exact term) for prints had to be literate, reasonably well-educated, even perhaps classically-educated. [...] To see Britain [sic] as John Bull, Charles James Fox as a fox, Bute as a boot, is easy enough, but to connect Tiberius with Sejanus called for more effort.

Indeed, shortly after asserting the inherently popular and populist nature of political prints, Philippe performs one of the more striking voltes faces in the literature, claiming that by the 18th century, the
language of the political print had become 'a language for the cultivated minority [...] the language of a cultivated elite';

the allegorical armoury of the print was that of classical Humanism, which presupposed a solid cultural grounding or more precisely a knowledge of the cultural impedimenta of the ruling social class to be intelligible.

'Political graphics was thus hardly for the hoi polloi'; the weapon of (elite) factional as opposed to revolutionary ('class') conflict, the print 'gained a popular edge only when one of the parties or factions needed to mobilize the masses in its struggle for power'; 'cloaked in allegory, comprehensible only to those initiated into its linguistic conventions', the language of political prints 'was not a language of the people [...] even when pleading the peoples' cause.'

Phillippe's acknowledgement of the demands made by political prints is unusual; the potentially exclusive nature of the iconography or allusions of the 18th-century political print has tended to be downplayed. The linear model of 'the development of caricature' has conspired to give the impression that the abandonment of the emblematic heralded the era of the immediately intelligible, accessible print satire. The terms 'difficult' or 'arcane' or 'complicated' commonly appear in the literature solely in the context of 'early' or emblematic prints; prints peripheral to a narrative which elsewhere is likely to refer to, and in all other respects treat, political prints as a 'popular' idiom. (Philippe in fact holds resolutely to his original picture of an inherently popular idiom; if the iconography and allusions of political graphics in our period cannot be reconciled with this picture, it is because the idiom was commandeered and 'suborned' by elites.)
A different response to this problem has been to argue for a greater degree of visual literacy at the lower levels of society than has sometimes been assumed. The idea that images could communicate 'even' (or 'especially') with the uneducated or illiterate continues to inform the orthodox account of the political print and its significance in this period. Carretta, following Paulson in this as in so much else, opts for an uneducated but visually-literate audience; 'although the viewers of popular engravings [i.e., prints by Gillray or Isaac Cruikshank...] were often uneducated, they were frequently quite sophisticated in their knowledge of iconography'.

Certainly, the gulf that separates us from the highly visually- and Biblically-literate culture of that period should not lead us to assume that our own difficulties, the effort that is necessary if we are to understand particular images and allusions, were shared by contemporaries. The extent to which the scholar can assume full visual literacy on the part of the otherwise illiterate is another matter. The problem is that, to date, the visual literacy of 'ordinary people' is something which has been taken for granted. In those accounts in which the audiences for 'high' and 'low' art are polarized, the 'popular' nature of graphic political satire is never queried. In the same way, scholars of popular culture have yet to subject visual images to the same degree of investigation as has been applied, for example, to popular literature or public spectacle and ritual. Peter Burke's statement, that the illiterate were 'obviously at home with visual images' betrays the essentially superficial approach to the pictorial which has, unfortunately, prevailed in that field.

Similarly, Brewer may argue, in *Party Ideology*, for greater literacy on the part of those gathered before the printshop window than has sometimes been supposed, but he then proceeds to write of prints in terms that render the
question of literacy irrelevant:

nor did those who gathered at the printshop window have to be literate, they could easily understand the simple pictographic messages of Bute's supposed intrigues with the Princess Dowager, Pitt's patriotism, or parliamentary bribery and corruption.

Brewer's is a view of the operative power of images to which historians continue to subscribe; most recently, Paul Monod in his appraisal of Jacobite imagery: 'An art that depends upon vision has been able to claim an immediacy and a universality that are lacking in written forms'. The perceived value of visual material to the historian and the historian's marginalising of such material, both, Chapter XI will argue, derive from this belief in the operative power of images.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the notion that the political print was a 'popular' idiom has proved difficult to eradicate. For reasons which will be examined at the end of this chapter, the many inconsistencies and problems which such a claim entails have failed to invalidate the picture of an idiom seen and appreciated by all.

The more cautious conclusion, that the market for these prints extended no further than the 'middling sort', promises to be similarly resilient. The longevity of 'the rise of the middle classes' as an explanation of other phenomena within 18th-century studies is such as to render its application in this context unexceptionable, while the eagerness with which the so-called 'new' art history has embraced the 'commercialization' thesis - notwithstanding the failure of the seminal texts - The Commercialization of Leisure and The Birth of a Consumer Society - to include prints, political or otherwise, among the consumer goods reviewed, promises to give the 'new audiences', and the 'rising middle class' familiar
from literary and historical study a further lease of life. The conventional account of the 18th-century political print has assimilated the 'commercialization' thesis.

In contrast to the 'popular' or 'mass market' thesis, the flaws in which may be readily identified, the validity or invalidity of the alternative thesis remains to be established; superficially more plausible, it currently rests on foundations scarcely more secure. It is interesting and perhaps significant that the study which specifically examines the nature and extent of 'middle class' exposure to or consumption of political prints has yet to be written. In the absence of such a study and in the absence of any attempt to delimitate 'middle class' or 'middling sort', it is difficult not to conclude that, to date at least, recourse to these terms is an attempt to identify the audience for these prints by default; from consciousness of the problems entailed in claiming a 'popular' audience or 'mass' market rather than from any concrete evidence. With the exception of those for whom such a market for this material is a corollary of 'middle-class politicization', the thesis of a 'middling' market for these prints would seem the choice of circumspection rather than of conviction.

Significantly, 'the rise of the middle class' has been characterised, in a different context, as an explanation 'so vacuous as to serve the polemical purposes of any historian for any period'. The same historian questioned 'its too general validity: an account so elastic as to fit several periods tells us little of specific value about any of them.' This elasticity is discernible in this context. The 'new', 'middle-class' market is most commonly invoked with reference to the 18th-century political print - in particular with reference to the decades 1720-1760 or 1760-80. Yet the few works which have addressed the 17th-century political print have been written from the same premise.
Moreover, the same 'rising middle classes' who have been held responsible - at least indirectly - for the 'birth' of political caricature in the 18th (or 17th) century have been invoked to explain its demise after 1832. It is a matter for concern that the preoccupations of the 'new' art history promise - or threaten - to entrench the 'emergent middle class' even as its position as an explanatory category is assailed elsewhere.

******

Until a clearer picture of the size and social composition of both the market and the potential audience for political prints of the kind discussed here, i.e., prints sold at the major Westminster and City print shops, the significance of the political print as an instrument of propaganda or an expression of 'public opinion' will remain obscure. Only by establishing the size and nature of the market for the more expensive kinds of political print will it be possible to speculate about the consumption of similar material at a lower level.

The evidence on which the prevalent wisdom regarding the question of the audience/market is based has long been acknowledged to be far from complete and far from conclusive; circulation figures in particular remain fragmentary. The metropolitan caricature trade awaits its scholar.

Lack of evidence has forced many to conclude that the circulation of political prints was essentially restricted to London in our period. Those who have
suggested otherwise have offered little in the way of evidence to support their claims. Fox, for example, claims not only provincial circulation of London-produced prints but provincial production of print satires; without, however, furnishing examples of either.97 Langford entertains the possibility of provincial distribution via 'the slightly cumbersome means available for distribution of London publications generally'; we are not told what these were.98 Melot refers to the English print's widespread 'sales and distribution networks' and advertisements cited by Wardroper for the end of the 18th century suggest that rapid dissemination of pictorial propaganda was possible.99 It is pertinent to question whether the trade in political prints could be sustained by London alone. Scholarship, however, remains at the speculative level exemplified by Atherton's lame 'many doubtless circulated elsewhere'.100 The case of the provinces remains not so much unproven as untried.

If the questions - who saw and who bought these prints? - have yet to receive satisfactory answers, the answers which have so far been proffered raise several questions respecting both the use of evidence and the quality of scholarship which has prevailed in the subject to date.

'Looking at caricatures was truly a national pastime', claims Patten.101 In fact, and notwithstanding the many references to a 'mass market', even an 'urban mass market', there is as yet no evidence to suggest that it was one which could be pursued anywhere other than London. The authors of the Yale catalogue The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature assure us that 'the best evidence of the increasing popularity of the caricature in England'[my emphasis] is 'the proliferation of printsellers during the mid-Georgian period' and again that 'the popularity of satirical prints in England during the later eighteenth century is evident from the
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increasing number of printshops': the examples proffered - characteristically in the form of prints of printshops - are exclusively metropolitan.\textsuperscript{102} It is with regard to London alone that the most-frequently cited 'evidence' for plebeian access to political prints - the printshop window display and the 'gaping multitude' - is of any relevance.\textsuperscript{103} Moreover, the 'proliferation' of printshops during the later 18th century must be set against the fact that in the first quarter of the century 'only two printshops of any magnitude existed in London'.\textsuperscript{104}

Yet this distinction between the exceptional - the metropolitan - and the representative - the rural and provincial - is regularly blurred. Press, for example, speaks of 'a mass urban market', and, like Patten, gives the impression that the political print was a national phenomenon, yet at no point does his account refer other than to London.\textsuperscript{105} Similarly, Carretta initially speaks of 'the populace'; 'popular' political prints served to 'familiarize' 'the populace with the actors on the political stage'. While this is subsequently qualified, George III leaves the question of the availability of political prints beyond London conveniently open and unresolved.\textsuperscript{106} Even Porter, who considers the market for these prints to have been essentially 'metropolitan', can employ the less precise terms 'urban' and 'British' in this context.\textsuperscript{107}

This is not the only instance of the deployment of evidence which is essentially of limited application in the context of a larger thesis than it can plausibly sustain. A handful of contemporary references to the accessibility and impact of these prints have been proffered without any attempt to establish the extent to which they reflect historical realities and the extent to which they are conventional rhetoric.\textsuperscript{108} More significantly, the circulation figures available not infrequently refer to particular celebrated or
controversial images; cited out of context, a false impression of the average size of press runs may be conveyed. In *Party Ideology*, for instance, it is The Repeal or The Funeral of Miss Ame-Stamp; 'we know that one political cartoon [...] eventually sold about 16,000 copies'[my emphasis]. Far from representative, this is the sole circulation figure proffered by Brewer. 109

The readiness of scholars to generalise from evidence which remains slight, and in some instances inconclusive, is a disquieting characteristic of what has to date been written with respect to this aspect of the material. Illuminating - and disturbing - parallels with the received account of the market for political prints and of their potentially wider public exposure may be found in one scholar's critical examination of the 'popular' credentials of 18th-century French almanacs. In 'Popular French Almanacs of the Eighteenth Century' (*BJECS*, 1985), Neal Johnson wrote that:

> a certain scepticism is in order if by the word 'popular' we wish to imply significant penetration of the countryside during the ancien regime. 
> [...] Those who would like to think of le Grand Calendrier and similar works as popular almanacs attempt to get out of some of the difficulties [this entails] by invoking two venerable and complementary institutions of the Old Regime: the colporteur and the veillee. The first goes some distance towards explaining the physical presence of books in the countryside, the second seeks to explain how these books were 'consumed' by a largely illiterate public.

> [...] What is disquieting in this theory of the penetration of printed works into the countryside is the way in which the function of colportage and the veillee is simply deduced: it must have happened that way, for no other explanation is possible.[my emphases]

As Johnson sees it, the problem is not that neither phenomenon existed at this period, but that they
have [...] been made to assume roles unsupported by evidence presently available, and have become myths in their own right to justify assumptions that would otherwise be untenable. [my emphasis]¹¹¹

For colportage, substitute the printshop window display and for the veillee, the idea of the intelligibility images 'even' or 'especially' to the illiterate or uneducated. Indeed, the concept of veillee informs more than one account of plebeian access to these prints. Wardroper, for example, writes that the printshop windows 'drew knots of people, in which the politically literate could be heard explaining every subtlety', while in Williams's account of the consumption of graphic propaganda between 1640 and 1660 great emphasis is placed on 'reading aloud'.¹¹² Williams and Brewer resort to the concept of 'bridging' to support the thesis that circulation figures alone cannot give an accurate picture of the actual audience for political prints and that, while 'the ability to read and purchase a tract' may have been socially-determined [...] this is not to say that only a third of the population set eyes on printed material. Methods of distribution and the ways in which papers were handled meant that the audience for polemic was open.¹¹³

Johnson's account of the weight which was for a long time placed on 'an engraving [...] which was thought to show the reading-aloud of an almanac at an eighteenth-century French veillee' - an interpretation now disputed - is uncomfortably reminiscent of the extent to which scholars have relied on images such as The Macaroni Printshop or Good Humour as 'evidence' of 'mass audiences' for these prints and on interior scenes as 'evidence' of the presence of prints within a plebeian environment.¹¹⁴

What Johnson is questioning is the 'straining' of
evidence which is not conclusive in itself in order to 'institutionalise' a picture which is likely to be of only limited accuracy; from this perspective the continued recourse to the printshop window comes to seem less an irritating cliche, than a barrier to a more accurate estimation of the audience for these prints. As with Johnson's examples, both the printshop window and a potential interest in political prints on the part of those who could not have afforded them are plausible and, to an extent at least, supported by contemporary evidence. The reluctance of scholars to acknowledge the limitations of this picture - and of the evidence which sustains it, however, has meant that the printshop window in particular has come to be a 'myth in its own right'; a substitute for original thought and investigation.

Johnson concludes: 'Given the thinness of evidence now available, it would be rash to make sweeping generalizations about the readership of "popular" almanacs'.115 To date, whether accounts have inclined towards a 'popular' or a 'middle-class' audience or market for these prints, more has been assumed than can be supported by the existing evidence. The received account of the audience/market for political prints is characterised by what one scholar has described, in a different context, as the triumph of assertion over evidence.116

There can surely be no better indictment of scholarship in this field to date than that so pertinent and so elementary an aspect of the material remains largely uninvestigated.

Indeed, the limitations of the received account of the audience/market for these prints call attention to shortcomings common to the literature of the subject as a whole.
First, there is the over-catholic, over-general nature of the greater part of the secondary literature, which has seen the specific study eschewed in favour of the convenient overview. More than one study has contrasted the ignorance which prevails with regard to this aspect of the material with the ever-increasing information available concerning the circulation and distribution of newspapers and journals for the same period.  

In this context it must be said that scholars of the 17th- and 18th-century press have at no stage seen fit to extend their studies to the political print. This neglect can be said to have had several deleterious consequences, of which not the least is that the political print has yet to be studied in the broader context of the contemporary political press. The neglect of these prints by those in the best position to estimate their market and their place in the market for other forms of political propaganda has indubitably contributed to the ignorance which still prevails with respect to the consumption and dissemination of this material. It is only fair to say, however, that this has been compounded by the refusal of those who have elected to address this material to replace surmise with original scholarship. Well might Brewer contrast the 'twilight zone' of political prints with 'the well illuminated realm of newspapers, pamphlets and periodicals'. Illumination in that realm has been hard won, the result of scholarly effort which no print study to date has been willing to make. Until that effort is made, even if the results remain inconclusive, observations regarding the audience and market for political graphics will remain on the level of cliche and generalisation.

The preference for ease over effort which to a large extent explains the over-general 'introductory' nature of so much of the literature has meant that the problematic
- e.g., the intelligibility or otherwise of complex images to the illiterate, or the geographical boundaries of print circulation - has consistently been skirted over. The complacency with which the inadequacies of the available data are acknowledged is revealing. Phrases such as 'we can only guess', 'the data cannot of course demonstrate the fact, but...' abound. Adequate circulation figures are 'unascertainable'. Atherton, for example, in a study in which the political print is represented to be an instrument of opposition manipulation of public opinion, concludes that it is 'impossible' 'to place any quantitative or qualitative measurement on the consumption of the political print.

Conveniently inspecific phrases such as 'public patronage' or 'the demand of important sections of the people' take the place of any attempt to define the limits or chart the operation of this patronage; 'the kinds of visual images that [were] used embodied the issues in a way to which a number of people could have related'. [my emphasis]

Indeed, it could be argued that the continued currency of the epithet 'popular' has been assured by the marked reluctance of most of those who have employed it - or 'the masses' or 'the man in the street' or any of the other phrases with which the literature is peppered - to clarify what is meant by the term. With the exception of a non-definition from Griffiths ('definitions of the popular print can never be watertight: perhaps the best approach is to assert baldly that everyone can recognise a popular print when they see one') a gnomic statement from Philippe ('popular prints were a means of popular communication, however that ambiguous term is defined') and a highly contentious definition from the pen of Paulson, made in the broader context of 'popular art', that 'popular culture' 'is, for the first half of the 18th century the least unsatisfactory term for what has been designated in a later period radical or
working-class culture and in an earlier the popular heretical culture' [my emphasis], definitions of 'popular' have been conspicuous by their absence.\textsuperscript{124} This indeterminacy is compounded by the fact that the term 'popular print' not infrequently appears to have been employed merely as another synonym for 'political print', 'caricature' or 'cartoon' - as it is in the title of Miller's Chadwyck-Healey volume.\textsuperscript{125}

The 'popular' nature of these prints is not infrequently asserted in phrases and claims which are not meant to be scrutinised. In an analogy which is as painfully inapposite as it is banal, both Alexander and Carey refer to the hiring of albums of caricatures - at a cost of a deposit of one pound, plus 2s.6d. per. day - as 'the 18th-century equivalent of hiring a video', while the printshop window display has been described as 'equivalent to the newspaper headline and television newsflash of today'.\textsuperscript{126}

The essentially derivative nature of the greater part of the secondary literature will have become apparent over previous chapters. The tenacity of the received picture of the audience/market for political prints is at least in part ascribable to the tendency to defer to previous studies, however inadequate. Whereas, in the context of the 'development of caricature', or in the context of the aesthetic merits or demerits of particular prints and particular periods, the result has been to entrench subjective judgements, in this context it is ignorance which is perpetuated as the reiteration of old claims and old disclaimers takes the place of original research.

To take one example, Press's deeply flawed and unsatisfactory 'The Georgian Political Print' has been sanctioned by at least two of the Chadwyck-Healey volumes.\textsuperscript{127}

Then there is Brewer's \textit{Party Ideology}. As a later
critic observed, 'what purported to be a survey of "an alternative structure of politics" for the 1760s displayed little concern with this aspect' of the press. Brewer provides little in way of new information on the consumption or circulation of prints, but his is the account on which Carretta's account of the audience for political prints in *George III* is based.

The information in *Party Ideology* is itself largely derived from *EPC1*. At no point, however, does *EPC1* address the questions of circulation and distribution, the size and composition of the audience/market for political prints in the period up to 1792. It is an omission which has gone unremarked; possibly the confidence with which George writes of the prints as 'shapers' and 'reflectors' of 'public opinion' has obscured the fact that *EPC1* is silent with respect to how they effected that role. George can, for example, devote an entire chapter to a discussion of the importance of political and satirical prints as partisan propaganda during the Great Rebellion without once referring to the number of prints produced, the geographical range of their distribution and the means of dissemination, their cost and the sections of society to which they appear to have been addressed. It is perhaps the greatest weakness of *EPC* that, while resolutely harnessed to an historical narrative, the political print is to all other intents and purposes treated as if it existed in a vacuum.

The derivative nature of scholarship in this field has ensured the survival of a picture of consumption of or exposure to political prints that is both deficient and incondite. Nor is this all. The continued currency of the conventional responses to the questions 'who bought, and who otherwise saw, these prints?' may be seen to perpetuate emphases and omissions remarked in other chapters.

The idea that prints addressed, if only indirectly, a
'popular' audience encourages the bias toward caricature already remarked. In more than one account, the increasing 'popularity' of political prints is associated with the adoption of caricature and the outmoding of the older elitist idiom of the emblematic print. In Press's study, for example, this association is explicit: the pre-1760 print is described as 'handicapped' by its 'emblematic style'; 'too clearly directed at court cliques to earn a mass audience'. Porter, similarly, writes of 'a process of internal stylistic evolution whose long-term effect was surely to give visual satire a more popular potential'. Caricature, in the hands of Gillray, Rowlandson, Sayers, and the Cruikshanks 'transformed a rather low and obscure genre into an exciting art form; and in so doing gave prints real punch in the political arena'.

The alleged obsolescence of the emblematic idiom by c.1760 is explained in terms of the expansion of the market for political prints. The fact that the appearance of the prints 'altered from using the elaborately coded and "hieroglyphic" tropes of early Augustan satire to simpler, more readily intelligible symbols' is attributed by Patten to the fact that the market for the prints had 'opened up beyond a politically-knowledgeable elite'. In the post-1760 world as presented by Brewer et al, the emblematic had to be outmoded; it was unsuited to address the 'new' audiences, with their 'new' political literacy. A transformation of the iconography of political satire - literary and graphic - between 1740-1770 is the basic premise of Carretta's Snarling Muse; by 1760 'a satirist could no longer assume that his audience shared his iconographical vocabulary [...]. The rules had to change.' Carretta underpins a Paulsonian account of a sea-change in the iconography employed by the graphic satirist with a Brewerian picture of a shift in the patronage and audience for such material:
a study of post-1764 verbal and visual satire would have to consider the growing political influence of the less-educated an unenfranchised, the rise of Methodism, the divided domestic political response to the French Revolution and its aftermath, and the efficiency of political censorship during the war with France. All greatly influenced the kinds of iconography satirists could use.

In fact, it is not at all clear that the adoption of caricature effected any change in the composition of the market or audience for political prints. Indeed, it can be argued that so far from representing a more 'popular' and accessible idiom, caricature, as it emerged in political prints between 1750 and 1800, was potentially more exclusive and elitist than the established mode of graphic comment and satire. The success of a caricature depends to a considerable degree on the spectator's familiarity with the original; such familiarity is essential if the distortion effected by the caricaturist is to be appreciated. Although, in the political print, caricature was seldom employed outwith the context of a real or imagined scene, an intelligible narrative framework, full appreciation of the print would have demanded 'familiarity with the foibles and features' those depicted.136 Later 18th-century political caricature, in particular, was characterised by what might be described as an 'intimate topicality'; it was an idiom for insiders.

Of course, this is not to say that, particularly in case of individuals such as George III or Charles James Fox of whom portrait engravings of varying sophistication abounded, appreciation of their caricatured images was restricted to intimates, but in a great many instances, full appreciation of a print would have been limited not only to those familiar with the protagonists, but to those with the latest political information, the latest insider jokes and rumours. Arguably, the more caricature encouraged an ad hominem approach to political satire and
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the handling of issues, the more potentially exclusive and restricted in its appeal it became. The fact that the larger, hand-tinted etchings of the 'Golden Age' were produced in limited runs corroborates a picture of an essentially Westminster-oriented idiom.

It is also pertinent to observe that caricature, as opposed to emblematic political satire, appears to have been regarded by the French as an elite idiom, and as such was never extensively employed or wholeheartedly adopted in French revolutionary - or indeed counter-revolutionary - graphic satire. 137

That the 'increasing popularity' of political prints should be associated with the adoption of caricature, moreover, reinforces the post-1720, or, more commonly, post-1760, chronological bias shown by study to date. The same can be said of the perceived association between the expansion of the market for these prints and the general expansion of the political press. Yet it can be argued that 'the expansion of the political press' is as much a phenomenon of the late 17th and early 18th centuries as of the post-1760 period. 138 The British reading public had been 'awash in [...] political words cascading from printed speeches, pamphlets, treatises, ballads, journals and increasingly from newspapers' since the 1640s, certainly from the 1660s. Only by ignoring the wealth of material, including prints, from the Exclusion Crisis and the Popish Plot, the succession crisis of 1688, or the Sacheverell affair of 1710 can the 'newly-popular press' of the post-1720 period be so described. 139
The failure of the many studies of the political press in this period which have appeared in recent decades - studies in which the late 17th century has not been neglected - to acknowledge the existence of political prints must be held at least partially responsible for the ignorance which prevails with regard to the significance of printed images in the broader context of political publishing in the period 1660-1720, or, indeed, the century 1660-1760. This neglect is the more exasperating because during this period the specialisation and 'professionalisation' of graphic satire remarked by Press had yet to occur, so that the London printing-publishing nexus was common to both visual and literary political material. It is to the credit of the Madan/Speck bibliography of material relating to the Sacheverell controversy that the many prints which the crisis elicited are accorded parity of treatment with pamphlets, verse collections, Addresses et cetera; and that where a pamphlet contains pictorial material, this too is documented. The result incontrovertably demonstrates the Sacheverell prints to be part of a broader 'print culture' to use Porter's term. Certainly, before accepting Porter's verdict that 'public opinion was one of the great inventions of the Georgians', the place of printed images in the context of the role of the press in the manipulation and 'marketing' of political crises in the 1660-1715 period merits investigation.

If the thesis which associates an expanding market for political journalism, including prints with an increasing political literacy (e.g., Press, Brewer) further confirms the post-1760 bias, the Lippincott 'entrepreneurial' thesis reinforces the equally-familiar post-1720 chronology. Yet in this context too, there would seem to be good reason for looking beyond the conventional chronology. While the quantitative increase in the production of political prints and in the number of
London printshops after 1760 is undeniable, research into the 'commercial' and 'entrepreneurial' aspects of the publishing and marketing of political graphics could profitably start with the period 1660-1720. Preliminary investigation of painting and reproductive engraving in London in the period 1688-1702 suggests that the conventional view of the period as moribund should be reconsidered.

In an account which does much to challenge the conventional picture of pre-Hogarthian dullness, Martha Hamilton-Phillips claims that:

the recognizably British school of painting that was well-established by Thornhill's death (1734) owed more than has perhaps been acknowledged to the expanding entrepreneurial art market of the 1690s, and to artists as well as writers, who stimulated public awareness of the arts during the reign of William and Mary.141

That accepted indicator of 'commercialization', advertising, also makes an earlier appearance in this context than Lippincott's study might suggest. In the 1690s, for example, the London Gazette carried printsellers' advertisements for mezzotints after Kneller, alongside those for other commodities and the perennial notices of lost and stolen dogs.142

The degree to which non-English talent contributed to the development of this market, and combined with indigenous talent to make this a particularly rich period for political graphics, threatens to remain a stumbling block to reappraisal the period, but such reappraisal is necessary, if only to provide a perspective on such developments as did occur in the second half of the 18th century.

Of greater concern, perhaps, is the extent to which the perception of the political print as a 'popular' idiom is at one and the same time the result of, and in turn
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insidiously promotes, the idea that these prints were 'simple', their interpretation of politics simplistic. The reiteration of phrases such as 'relatively simple and succinct messages and brightly coloured pictures' cannot but implant notion that political prints were, in Porter's words, a 'baby-food mode of communication, pap for those whose minds could not digest real words [...] a simplified sign-language for the non- or barely-literate'. 143 Williams, for example, claims, of the images on broadsheets and pamphlets, that they 'not only made printed legislation more attractive, they reduced complex issues to neat and satisfying formulae'. 144 Lynn Hunt clearly associates the medium with simplification and condensation; even for the 'literate populace [...] images captured on a single page a vision of events that could only be described at length in newspapers and pamphlets'. 145 Mahood describes political prints as 'simplified versions of history': 'these popular pictures reassured and heartened the public more than any political argument could have done'. 146

The disappointingly superficial treatment of political prints in Marie Peters's Pitt and Popularity is of a piece with this perception: opposition attitudes respecting foreign policy 'appeared in their most stereotyped and crudely simplified form in the prints'; hostility toward Pitt was 'simplified in visual form in the prints'. 147 It is significant that, like Party Ideology, Peters's study of Pittite and anti-Pittite propaganda fails to accord prints parity of treatment with written forms of satire and propaganda, while Brewer's failure to do more than reiterate the stock inadequate account and the limited and predictable 'evidence' of the printshop window and the alleged communicative power of the pictorial for the illiterate exemplifies the somewhat patronising approach to material of this kind which, notwithstanding the book's
fashionably egalitarian manifesto that 'as much attention is deliberately devoted to the examination and use of pamphlets, handbills and cartoons, as to the manuscript sources of the great' and the reproduction within the text of three images, perpetuates the subordinate status of visual evidence. 148

********

If, as Johnson has argued, scholarly understanding of the place of almanacs in French popular culture has been frustrated by the unquestioning acceptance of insecure assumptions regarding their distribution and their consumption by the illiterate or uneducated, how much more must the continued currency of similar assumptions with respect to the political print inhibit the progress of knowledge in a field of study which, in contrast to that of 'popular culture' and popular literature, remains underpopulated.

Whether the picture of the audience for political prints is revised in future will depend as much on the willingness of scholars to assimilate fresh evidence as it does on efforts to uncover that evidence. The highly derivative and cautious nature of the secondary literature of the subject to date - the tendency on the part of those addressing this material to adhere to the received account, however incomplete or inconsistent - suggests that the assimilation of evidence that revises the received picture may be painfully slow. To take a pertinent example: Hogarth continues to be interpreted as the innovator-populist, a figure whose importance does not reside in any executant powers but in his realisation that prints could be a democratic art, not confined to [...] the collector's portfolio, but composed of images that reached thousands of people. 149
The fact that Hogarth's prints were beyond the means of 'ordinary people', or that, as Lippincott has observed, the celebrated 1735 Act was more protectionist than populist in intent, has never been allowed to challenge this picture. In 1990 it was still possible to describe Hogarth as the first English engraver 'to win an international reputation as a maker of prints for a popular audience'.

In any subject, the process of reappraisal and revision depends on the refusal of scholars 'to safeguard the classic traditions of interpretation and ensure that new research confirms rather than challenges them'. To many scholars, however, the 'importance' of political prints, their potential value as historical evidence, has lain in a perception of the print as an at least quasi-popular idiom and many will be reluctant to abandon this. Moreover, revision in this context will necessitate the revision of other cherished and tenacious orthodoxies, of which not the least, as the next chapter will suggest, is that of the political print as a 'radical' or 'subversive' idiom. The received picture of 'the 18th-century political print' resembles nothing so much as a house of cards; remove one card and the others are jeopardized.

2. Patten, GCLTA pp.70-71; idem, 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature', prints are a 'popular art' (p.331); 'popular prints' (p.334). Other recent examples of the continued currency of the term include: Langlois, 'Royalist Caricature' in ed. Cuno, French Caricature (1988) p.43, who refers to caricature as 'a popular form' and to 'popular political engravings'; Nash, 'Hogarth and Gillray' (1991) [no pagination] 'these popular prints' and the political print 'achieved wide popularity during the second half of the 18th century'; Thomas, The American Revolution (1986) p.11, 'cartoons represent a form of popular propaganda'; Iannone, Comedy and
Revolution (1981) p.7, satirical prints enjoyed 'a mass market'. Historians have followed suit: Roy Porter, English Society in the Eighteenth Century (London:1982) p.244 refers to 'popular moralistic print series such as The Rake's Progress and Marriage à la Mode'.

4. Ashbee, p.145. Mahood also employs the term 'the man in the street', pp.1,2,4; the sub-heading for the chapter covering 1788-1850 is 'The Political Print, the Man in the Street, and History'.

5. Press, Political Cartoon, p.56.
6. Lucie-Smith, pp.18-19 and, p.9, 'a genuinely "popular" idiom'.
7. George, EPC1 p.73.
10. Paulson, Emblem and Expression pp.43,70. Cf. Klingender, p.iii Hogarth's prints are part of a 'popular' tradition. The B.M. press release for an exhibition of drawings and preparatory studies for Industry and Idleness (2 June - 18 September 1983) has Hogarth 'exploiting the tradition of the popular print'. Cf. also Godby, Battle of the Pictures p.21; Shesgreen, p.149.
12. Mahood, p.4.
13. idem, p2. Cf. Wynn-Jones, Cartoon History of Britain [CHB] p.8; it was their 'close identification with the popular spirit of the times [...] which has been the hallmark, and to some extent the protection, of [English] cartoonists'. The 18th-century political print was an expression of a 'grass-roots morality, born of Gin Lanes'.
   It is a notion which is challenged in an incisive essay by Lawrence C. Duggan; 'Was art really the "book of the illiterate"?' Word and Image 5 (1989) 227-51. Of particular relevance is Duggan's survey of the tenacity of this notion in the work of historians and art historians.
19. ibid, p.238.
20. Dickinson, Caricatures and the Constitution p.11.
22. Feaver, p.9.
23. Langford, *Robinocracy* p.30; ibid, pp.17-18, refers to 'accessible' pictorial vocabulary of political prints; iconography 'readily appreciated both by a popular audience [...] and by a better-read class'; p.31, pictorial satire had 'the added advantage that its significance was obvious to a mean and illiterate audience'.
24. Porter, *LRB* p19. For the influential idea that prints could communicate more than one set of meanings, according to the level of education of the beholder, see Paulson, *Emblem and Expression* pp.53,78.
25. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p.46; 'the sort of illustration discussed in this thesis was not primarily for the benefit of the illiterate'; for a 'first-hand' understanding, literacy was necessary. Brewer, *Common People* p.46 'there can be little doubt that most prints were intended for an audience that was aristocratic, genteel and often bourgeois'.
26. Coupe, pp.83-4. This is challenged by Duggan, *Word and Image* op. cit.. Cf. also Philippe, p.76, with reference to The Royall Oake of Britayne [Chapter VI, Plate 4] and similar prints; 'the more cultured and informed the person looking at the picture, the better able will he be to decipher its message.'
28. Lynn Hunt, 'The Political Psychology of Revolutionary Caricatures' in ed. Cuno, *French Caricature* p.33; idem, 'Engraving the Republic: Prints and Propaganda in the French Revolution' *History Today* 30 (1980) 11-17, pp.13,14, prints were 'comprehensible even to those who could not read'. Patricia Anderson, *The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture 1790 - 1860* [hereafter Anderson, *Printed Image*] p.3; 'novelty and attendant commercial appeal were by no means the most significant distinction between the printed image and the word. The more crucial difference lay in the image's greater ability to communicate in a time when literacy was not universal.' It is interesting to observe that Williams, Hunt and Anderson each present their respective period as one of limited literacy.
29. Brewer, *Shadow*, p.35 Significantly, in *Common People*, Brewer does not touch upon this, nor upon the use of prints as political propaganda aimed specifically at the lower orders. The potential for popular exposure to political prints is hinted at, but not the accessibility - or otherwise - of the prints thus seen (p.46).
Caricature' in, ed. Cuno, French Caricature p.68.

The idea that prints could be cheaply produced and widely circulated is central to the perception of the print as an inherently popular medium; David Dabydeen, Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain (1990) p.131, writes that 'The print was the most natural vehicle for pictorial political commentary - it was relatively cheap to produce, it sold for a few pence, thus having a potentially large market'; Iannone, Comedy and Revolution p.4 'By its nature, printmaking is given to [...] inexpensive mass production, allowing for the dissemination of large numbers of images to a wide spectrum of viewers'; Lynn Hunt, 'Engraving the Republic' pp.12-13 'Popular art in the form of cartoons, caricatures and simple engravings offered more potential for political propaganda. They were easily reproducible and therefore capable of reaching a sizeable audience'; James A. Leith, 'Ephemera: Civic Education Through Images' in eds Robert Darnton and Daniel Roche, Revolution in Print: The Press in France 1775-1800 (Berkeley:1989) 270-71; Lucie-Smith, p.12; 'print is a very special mode of communication. It speaks to us privately, as individuals, yet the cheapness of materials and rapidity of production make it available to almost anyone'; Kunzle, Early Comic Strip pp.2-4; Godfrey, Printmaking p.9.


33. Langford, Robinocracy p.29; 'Whether a market could be found in the classes below the middling sort is more problematical'; there can be 'no question of a mass market'. Cf. Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.426; Atherton, Political Prints p.64. Anderson suggests, Printed Image, p.18, that until 1832, the benefits of 'the burgeoning of pictorial publishing' did not extend below 'the middle strata of society'.


37. At least since Leslie Stephen, Ford Lectures, 1903 English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century (London: 1904), 97-98, the classic statement of this thesis; Fielding had to 'find a literary form which should meet the tastes of the new public'. See also Arnold Kettle, An Introduction to the English Novel (London: 1959, second edn. 1967) 29-36; Christopher Hill, 'Clarissa Harlowe and her Times' Essays in Criticism, v (1955), cited by Pat Rogers, The Augustan Vision (London: 1974) p. 247; Arnold Hauser, The Social History of Art; Rococo, Classicism and Romanticism (London: 1962) - the development of the novel as a literary form was facilitated by the existence of a well-to-do middle class numerous enough 'to guarantee a sale of books sufficient to provide writers with a living' (Rogers, p. 247).


Not all scholars have accepted this picture, however: Diana Spearman, The Novel and Society (London: 1966); Rogers, Augustan Vision pp. 250, 253 'by no stretch of the imagination had the trading groups achieved the hegemony in political and cultural life which the theory requires' [...] while 'a genuinely new form [i.e., the novel] did emerge in this period to answer fresh needs', there is no reason to suppose those needs to have been class-specific, or that literary change must have its roots in socio-economic developments.

Unsurprisingly, analogies have long been drawn between the development of the political print and that of the novel, most consistently with reference to Hogarth. Thus Paulson, Emblem and Expression pp. 12, 49-50 'The names we associate most often with Hogarth are not of painters but writers [...] above all, Fielding'; 'the verbal phenomenon parallel to Hogarth's progresses was the novel'. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p. 218, writes that Hogarth's narrative pictures are a pictorial version of the novel 'also newly born'. Rogers devotes several pages of The Augustan Vision to Hogarth (pp. 178-82); Pevsner, Englishness of English Art p. 55 discusses Hogarth's pictures in the light of the novels of Richardson; Fielding is described as 'the Hogarth of eighteenth-century literature'.

For a more intelligent appraisal of the Hogarth/Fielding analogy, see P. J. de Voogd, Henry Fielding and William Hogarth - The Correspondences of the Arts (Amsterdam: 1981); pp. 3-4 'the habit of casually bracketing Hogarth and Fielding has a long history and its underlying assumptions have to a
certain extent defined readings of their work'. de Voogd does not eschew the conventional view of Hogarth, however; on p.41 we are informed that Hogarth's portraits 'emphasize the virtues of middle-class values'. Thomas Coram is described as a 'self-made man [...] proud of being a member of the middle class'. Cf. also Peter Wagner, 'Hogarth's Graphic Palimpsests: intermedial adaptation of popular literature' Word and Image 7 (1991) 329-47, esp. pp.330,343.

38. An early articulation of the thesis was Michael Foss, The Age of Patronage: The Arts in Society 1660-1750 (London:1971); pp.163-73,204 ('Hogarth understood that the European tradition of the Renaissance, dependent upon aristocratic patronage, could not apply in the modern commercial state [i.e., Hanoverian Britain]; his work was addressed to 'a new society and a new audience'). More recently, Lippincott, Selling Art in Georgian London: the rise of Arthur Pond (New Haven:1983) Introduction, esp. p.6 and Chapter III 'The Search for Patronage'; Sheasgreen, Four Times of Day pp.90 ('the ascendant middle classes') 106,132,151; Wardroper, Kings p.64 ('rising middle class'); Feaver, p.43 'the new middle classes'); Wagner, Eros Revived: Erotica of the Enlightenment in England and America (London:1988) p.263 ('in England, eighteenth-century graphic artists responded to a largely bourgeois clientele'). Peter Earle, The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society, and Family Life in London 1660-1730 (London: 1989) adheres, p.74, to the theory of a shift in patronage, not necessarily away from the aristocracy and gentry but extending for the first time to those of 'middle station'.

The thesis is most frequently articulated with reference to Hogarth. Thus Godby, pp.12 (Hogarth addressed 'a new kind of patron') 19 ('Hogarth's art is, in short, a middle-class, materialist art') 20-21 (Hogarth's 'topical political engravings' sold 'generally to a middle class audience'; Hogarth's 'middle-class public [...] was in effect a new audience for art') 23 (Hogarth's prints 'communicated a message that had never been made before to an audience that had never existed to receive it before' [my emphasis]); David Bindman, Hogarth (London:1981) p.85. Pevsner, in his version, falls into bathos: Hogarth 'did not only belong to the middle class, he did so demonstratively. His sisters sold frocks and haberdashery' (Englishness of English Art) p.54.

For the 'new' art history, see below, Part II, Chapter II.

39. Lippincott, pp.32,158. For the expansion of the print trade in general in England in this period, see Lippincott, pp.70,126-59, esp. pp.146-48. The
standard line on Hogarth, that he found engraving more lucrative than painting for a single patron, and that he sought a broader market than that which was dependent upon aristocratic patronage, may be found in Iannone, p.5; Godby p.21 'Hogarth had both to identify a new commodity [i.e., his prints] as an art product and to find ways of bringing this product to his market'.

40. Lippincott, p.148 'It is doubtful that either entrepreneur sold many prints to the lower middle class. That market would eventually be cultivated by Sayer, Boydell and Darly, who made further drastic concessions to popular tastes and pocket-books'.

41. Press, Political Cartoon p.37. Similarly, Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.426 'If the broadsheet artist and his publisher tended to come from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, his clientele was not restricted to this class. It reached perhaps a little farther down (how far depended on the price of the product)' [my emphasis].


43. Langford, Robinocracy p.29. Similarly, Langlois, p.52; royalist prints were addressed to 'the same public that Grandville and Daumier would find; the readers of the newspapers, the attentive connoisseurs of daily parliamentary developments; this was a potential clientele of a few tens of thousands at most'. Langlois's estimate of the size of the market for relatively sophisticated prints reflects the findings of Jean-Paul Bertaud, Les Amis du Roi: Journaux et journalistes royalistes en France de 1789 à 1792 (Paris:1984); Langlois considers Bertaud's estimates 'generous'.

44. Porter, P&P p.194; cf. Atherton, Political Prints Chapter III 'Prints and Opinion "Without Doors"'.


47. Philippe, p.94.


49. Atherton, 'George Townshend Revisited' pp.16-17; idem, Political Prints p.61 'the tight little arena of parliamentary politics'.

50. Or the 1760s, 1770s, 1780s; the thesis, if not the chronology, remains consistent.


53. Paulson, Emblem and Expression p.59; Paulson subsequently retracts and says that the series would have been bought by masters rather than their apprentices. David Dabydeen, Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain p.131 says, of the political print, 'it sold for a few pence'.
54. Evelyn Cruickshanks, *Hogarth's England* (London, Folio Society: 1957) facing p. 27 and p. 49; Paulson, *HLAT* ii, 61, quotes the contemporary advertisement of this series; this includes the information that a superior set, printed on better paper, was to be had for 14s. (quoted in Elizabeth Miller, *Hand-Coloured British Prints* p. 17); Lippincott, p. 148.

55. Godfrey, *Printmaking* p. 35, refers to this only as 'an unsuccessful attempt to enter the cheapest market of all, that of woodcut broadsides.' Alexander, *York*, p. 2 'at a shilling they were too expensive for the wide sales which Hogarth hoped for' [sic]; Wood, *Folly*, p. 48 'an attempt to reach as large an audience as possible' - previously, p. 10, prints at 1s. are referred to as highly priced. Godby, p. 21, is one of the few to emphasise the discrepancy between the received view of Hogarth's work and the prices charged for the prints: 'apparently popular prints - Beer Street, Gin Lane and *The Four Stages of Cruelty*, which Hogarth claimed were specifically made for "a lower class of people" were in fact beyond the reach of the artisan class - for example a coachman'.

56. Lippincott, pp. 163, 145-6; Godby, p. 21 writes that Hogarth's Act 'had the effect of considerably raising the cost of prints'; the subscription cost of the Harlot's Progress sold at one guinea for six prints, 4s. for a pirated set; the Four Times of Day and *Marriage à la Mode* (published after the Act) sold for as much as 5s. per print. Godby remarks Hogarth's 'ability to demand for his work never less than double the price of popular prints, and generally a great deal more' [my emphasis throughout].

Within a month of the Act's being passed, Hogarth complained that *The Rake's Progress* had been pirated by several printsellers (*Post Boy* 14 June, 1735); Foss, *The Age of Patronage* p. 183. For the limitations of the Act, see Lippincott, pp. 145-6; Kunzle, 'Plagiarisms-by-memory of the Rake's Progress and the Genesis of Hogarth's second picture story' *JWCI* 29 (1966) 311-48; Atherton, *Political Prints* pp. 40-43.

57. EPC1 p. 52, refers to a 1679 Popish Plot illustrated almanac at 6d. - this is the first price mentioned by George; on p. 90 it is suggested that 'the usual price' for political satires was 6d, 'or perhaps a shilling' and that at 3d. *The Motion* was 'clearly subsidized'; on p. 116, that small 2½ by 4 inch 'cards' of the Townshend type which appeared after 1756 'sold at 6d.'; p. 118, from mid-century it is not uncommon to find the term '6d. plain is. coloured'. Reprinted collections of published prints, such as the two volume *The British Antidote to Caledonian Poison* would have cost more; in 1762 the latter was advertised at 10s. 6d coloured, 5s.
plain'; p.135 The Repeal (1766) sold at 1s., pirated versions at 6d.; by 1807 'the usual rate' was 2s. coloured, - 1s. in Thomas Tegg's Cheapside shop; EPC2 p.1 notes that a reduced version of Rowlandson's The Contrast [BM 8149], sold at 3d. plain, 6d. coloured 'half the price of the original' and was also available for distribution at one and two guineas per. hundred; pp.35-6 that BM 9180-83 The Consequences of a French Invasion, another attempt to produce cheap propaganda, sold at 6d. plain instead of 'the usual 2s.'

In Hogarth to Cruikshank p.17, George suggests that prices ranged from 6d. to 10s. 6d. and 1 guinea coloured for long strip designs. Beer Street and Gin Lane sold in 1s. and 1s.6d. versions. Atherton, Political Prints p.63, regards the prints as cheap, quoting 6d., more rarely 4d. [probably The Motion], and 1s. coloured. Wardroper, George Cruikshank pp.9,77 quotes a price of 6d. plain, 1s. coloured, 2s. in the West End printshops; idem, Kings p.9, suggests that 'outsize' versions of Gillray prints could sell for as much as 5s., the usual price being 2s. Miller, p.14 gives the 'average' price c.1750 as 6d. plain, 1s. coloured, and notes that this had doubled by 1832, with McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures costing several shillings. Langford, Robinocracy p.29 writes that prints were not cheap; The Motion at 4d. being an exception. Godby, p.21, claims that 'topical political engravings' sold at 6d.. Porter, P&P p.190 'at around sixpence a sheet (or two shillings for coloured ones) the political print was never cheap - it cost three times as much as a newspaper'. For the 1640-60 period, Williams, 'Polemical Prints' pp.49-50 suggests that 'good' quality, engraved broadsheet prints would cost from 2s., 'inferior' work from 1d. Tessa Watt, Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640 (Cambridge:1991, paperback edn, 1994) p.142 suggests that the cheapest engraved prints c.1640 would cost 6d. 'which puts them at the top of our range for "cheap prints"', most copperplate engravings Watt adjudges 'out of range' for her rigorous study of 'cheap print'.

The cost of commissioning a political print may also be considered in this context. Hill, Mr Gillray p.29, states that in 1789, Gillray charged two guineas for working up an ordinary design - 'by no means a pittance at the currency rate of the day'. Wardroper, Kings p.9 gives the same figure, adding that this would have been 'an artisan's monthly wage'. Patten, GCLTA p.119 notes that George and Robert Cruikshank charged three guineas against a previous standard of twenty-five to thirty shillings for executing a broadsheet caricature (inclusive of copper, design, etching and coloured template). These figures should be set against
Charles Press's picture, in Political Cartoon, of the late 18th century as a time when 'almost anyone' could design a political satire and see it published; 'seldom have so many of the public themselves had the opportunity to try their hand at being caricaturist-critics' (p. 41). Brewer, Shadow p. 31, remarks a resurgence of amateur involvement in the designing of political prints after 1789. Philippe, p. 112, states that in this period prints were 'used for propaganda but always by a social group that could finance the artist and his work'. Hunt, 'Embracing the Republic' p. 14; 'Like the supposedly popular newspapers, prints could be designed for the popular classes [sic] but they were not produced by them.' This further calls into question the applicability of the term 'popular' in the context of political prints.

58. Miller, Handcoloured British Prints p. 11, claims that the term 'penny plain, twopence coloured, was popularised by R.L. Stevenson. Stevenson used it to refer to cut-out prints destined for use in toy theatres, a phenomenon of the early 19th century.

59. Porter, P&P p. 192; Sharpe, p. 39, Thomas, American Revolution pp. 11-12. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p. 49 suggests that prices from 1d. 'confirm suspicions that the mass of engraved broadsheets [...] or simpler forms of satire were not too expensive for a broad audience; 'soldiers, cobblers, agricultural and building workers whose wages amounted to 8-12d. a day probably had few qualms about buying the occasional pamphlet or broadsheet'. Williams cites Joan Thirsk, ed., Agrarian History of England and Wales (Cambridge: 1967) iv 864; Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p. 50, claims that anything beyond the 'occasional penny paper' would have been beyond the means of an ordinary servant in the period 1640-60. Wardroper, George Cruikshank p. 9, notes that a shilling was a day's wage for farm labourer; Godfrey, Printmaking p. 77, that Tegg's prints at 1s. would have been beyond the means 'of most'. Philippe, p. 22 considers that the 18th-century political print would have been 'out of the ordinary person's price range'. Baker, 'Satirical Prints as a Source of English Social History' p. 133, the cost of prints meant that the audience for them was limited. Dickinson, Caricatures and the Constitution p. 15; their cost was beyond the means of the lower orders.

60. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p. 50, claims that Anderson, Printed Image Chapter 1 'The Printed Image in Transition: Popular Pictorial Experience 1790-1832', pp. 16-49, argues convincingly that it was not until the mid-19th century, i.e., after Press's closing-date of 1832, that cheap images came to be widely available; p. 19 'at an average cost of 2s. 6d. each, the quality printseller's wares were beyond the means of even the relatively well-off
artisan. ' And so on.

61. Klingender, p. iii; the phrase recurs in Godfrey, Printmaking, p. 76, who is in turn quoted by Rix, Our Old Friend Rolly, p. 2. The information about printshops is given in Hill, Satirical Etchings p. xvi; Olson, Emblems of American Community p. 10 suggests that between 1754-84 there were 140 printshops and print publishers active 'in London alone'. Atherton, Political Prints p 63, states that the printshops 'did not cater to a mass market'; cf. Wood, Folly p. 10.

Conversely, Patten, GCLTA pp. 76-77 observes that while West End printshops 'catered to all the nobs', City printshops catered to 'clerks, shopkeepers and the petit bourgeois', and that establishments such as Johnston's, Fairburn's and Laurie and Whittle served the lower end of the market. A similar distinction between City and West End print sellers is made by Miller, Hand Coloured British Prints, pp. 10, 25, 33. For Laurie and Whittle, see P.H. Muir 'The rolling press in Georgian times: the firm of Laurie and Whittle' Connoisseur CXVI (1945) 92-97.

Thomas Tegg catered for the lower end of the market; see Wood, Folly p. 11. With regard to chronology, however, it is worth observing that Tegg entered late into the market (1807) with his half-price prints and cheap reissues; see EPC1, p. 176 and EPC2, p. 95, Godfrey, Printmaking p. 77. See also Celina Fox, 'Wood Engravers and the City' in eds. Nadel, Ivy Bruce and F. S. Schwartzbach, Victorian Artists and the City (New York: 1980) 1-13.

62. Press, 'The Georgian Political Print'.

63. For example, Iannone, Comedy and Satire. George, EPC1 p. 18 refers to 'cheap woodcuts' in the context of prints produced during the Great Rebellion without any attempt to clarify what is meant by 'cheap'. On p. 73, we read that Bubble prints are 'aimed at [...] the general public'; again, there is no mention of their cost. Solkin, 'Battle of the Ciceros' p. 422 n. 41, refers to the 1770 print, BM 4422 Political Electricity, one of the largest and most complicated compartmental engravings produced that century as a 'popular broadsheet'; significantly, Solkin omits to mention its cost - it would certainly not have been available for 'pennies' on the street'. Similarly, with the exception of a reference (p. 359) to the hire charge for the latest caricature (1s.), at no point does the otherwise excellent study by Morris Martin, 'The Case of the Missing Woodcuts', PtQtly IV (1987) 343-61 offer any prices although Martin refers to 'cheap prints'. Olson, Emblems of American Community uses the terms (p. 6) 'inexpensive' and 'popular' of the political print but at no stage cites prices.

64. Porter, P&P pp. 190; idem, LRB p. 19. The source for
Porter's figures would appear to be Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution* p.14; a run of five hundred impressions was average, with at most 50,000 prints being produced in an average year; Dickinson's account is mostly based on Press, 'Georgian Political Print'. Atherton, *Political Prints*, pp.63-64 notes that Matthew Darly was able to purchase one hundred copies of a print from a rival printseller, while 'one Bispham Dickinson bought almost five hundred copies of another [print] and sold them all' (PRO S. P. Dom Geo. II Bundle 111, ff.173-74). Atherton writes that, with an upper limit of between three and four thousand impressions, printsellers were not catering to a mass market.

Press, 'Georgian Political Print' claims that 'a good run from a single plate was 1,000 to 1,500'; idem, *Political Cartoon* pp.39-40, 1,500 impressions were possible before the plate was worn down. Hind, *A Short History of Engraving and Etching* p.15 suggests that only a few hundred impressions might be made before the plate deteriorated; Hill, *Satirical Etchings* p.xxvi that the logistics of printing dictated that only a few hundred impressions of a print would have been available during the first month or so after the plate was engraved; 'However, plates were customarily hammered to increase their toughness and were capable of supplying excellent impressions for years' thereafter.

67. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p.50.
68. For example, Brewer, *Common People* p.46. Hibbert, p.68, 'They were displayed in coffee-houses and taverns, in clubs and theatres, and on the walls and in the windows of coaching offices'. Wood, *Folly* p.11, 'the poorer sections of society' could 'look at them on the walls of taverns' - this after having claimed that Gillray's prints 'were collectors' items from the moment of their production, going into the folios of gentlemen'; a classic conflation of evidence. Thomas, *American Revolution* p.12 'like newspapers, [...] prints were available for perusal in taverns, clubs, coffee houses and other places of public resort'. Wardroper, *Kings* p.7 'Like broadside ballads, they were pasted up on the walls of alehouses and select coffee-houses, in barber-shops and gentlemen's clubs'; idem, *George Cruikshank* p.9. Olson, *Emblems of American Community* p.9, prints were 'passed from hand to hand in the street and in public forums, displayed prominently in local coffee houses and pubs'; Anderson, *Printed Image* pp.20-21.

As far as popular exposure to political prints is concerned, Anderson suggests, p.21, that such
exposure would have been of secondary importance to
exposure to the broadside and chapbook.

69. George, *Hogarth to Cruikshank* p.17; Alexander, York
p.2.

70. Martin, 'Missing Woodcuts' pp.349,359.

71. Genuine penny political prints include J. Lewis Marks's *The Chronologist* series 1831-2, selling at 1d. plain, 2d. coloured [see Feaver, p.651], and prints by Charles Jameson Grant. Certainly not all the prints of which the epithet 'popular' has been used stand scrutiny: William Hone's 1819 collaboration with George Cruikshank resulted in 'small shilling pamphlets' (EPC2, p.185). For Hone, see Anderson, p.36; a 'standard' edition of a pamphlet such as *The Political House that Jack Built* 'cost is., while a deluxe edition with coloured illustrations sold for 3s. - both prices well out of reach for all but the most prosperous of artisans.' Hone himself later presented them as a populist venture; W. Hone, *Aspersions Answered* (1824), p.49 n.,'by showing what engraving on wood could effect in a popular way, and exciting a taste for art in the more humble ranks of life, they created a new era in the history of publication. They are the parents of the present cheap literature, which extends to a sale of at least four hundred thousand copies every week.'

EPC2, p.202 refers to a 2d. broadside from the Catnach press, *An Attempt to exhibit the leading events of the Queen's Life in Cuts and Verse* (1821) [BM 142551], and, p.249, to the reissue of twelve numbers of *John Bull's Picture Gallery* (1832) at 1s. plain, 3s. coloured.

Anderson, *Printed Image* pp.27,38 argues that broadsheets 'remained the most affordable source of political illustration' in the period 1790-1830, but that the greater number of genuinely 'penny prints' were not political, but on such perennial themes as courtship and matrimony.


June 1993 saw the publication of a further instance: McCreery, 'Satiric Images' p.164 'Yet if satiric prints reached a relatively small audience, they were received with enthusiasm by both the London elite who patronised the print-shops and the less well-off who saw prints on tavern walls and in shop windows' [my emphasis].

74. George, *EPC1* p.175; *idem, Hogarth to Cruikshank*
p.17; Martin, 'Missing Woodcuts', p.346 and n.24, writes of the caricaturists of the Golden Age 'who were the delight of the urban shopwindow watchers, "the crowd of grinning, good-natured mechanics". Such crowds would block Fleet Street, as the printshop windows became, in Dorothy George's words, "the picture galleries of the public". The phrase is used, without acknowledgement, by Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.359 'The caricature shops were an institution, and their windows were the picture galleries of the public'.

75. Alexander, York p.4.
76. Rix, Our Old Friend Rolly p.8.
77. Wardroper, George Cruikshank pp.8,9. Other instances include: Atherton, Political Prints p.64 'Who were their consumers? The audience extended among all classes: to anyone who could view the latest satires in the print shop windows'; Brewer, Common People p.46 'Though almost none of the labouring poor and probably few artisans and master craftsmen bought prints, they nevertheless would have seen them in print-shop windows', idem, Party Ideology p.152; Godfrey, Printmaking p.77 even at 1s., Tegg's 'lower quality' prints 'were beyond the purses of most who had to be content with the free window display'. Thomas, American Revolution p.12 'their window displays meant that even the poor could have a free look'. Patten, GCLTA p.77 'There were other means of obtaining access to caricatures, too. [...] the bow-fronted, many-paned windows of the period supplied an exterior gallery [...] It was not uncommon for throngs to block passage along the street in front of print shops, especially if some major victory or scandal was being celebrated; crowds became at times so pressing that railings had to be installed to protect the glass'; idem, 'Conventions' pp.333-34; Wood, p.10; Hibbert, p.68; Anderson, Printed Image p.36, plebeian access to 'satirical cartoons by artists such as Gillray and Cruikshank' would have been restricted to their display in shop-windows. The print-shop window display also makes an appearance in the context of French 'popular' political prints and politicisation-through-prints: Rolf Reichardt, 'Prints: Images of the Bastille' in eds Darnton and Roche, Revolution in Print (Berkeley:1989) 223-51, p.225 (Reichardt is, it should be acknowledged, quoting from a contemporary source; Louis-Sebastien Mercier, 'Caricatures, folies' Le Nouveau Paris (Paris:1799) i, 164).

78. Godfrey, Printmaking pp.73, 77. EPC1 reproduces The Magaroni Printshop (BM 4701; EPC1, plate 43) as does Wardroper, Kings [plate 1]. Wardroper also reproduces Good Humour, [Kings, plate 2] as does Feaver, p.67. The Yale exhibition The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature included [nos. 10-12] The
Macaroni Print Shop, Miss Macaroni and Her Gallant at a Print-shop (John Raphael Smith, BM 5220, 1773) and Caricature Shop (P. Roberts, 1801, not in B.M.)

The Macaroni Print Shop also appears in Feaver, p.44. Fox, 'Satire and Censorship', p.330 reproduces George Murgatroyd Woodward's Caricature Curiosity (1806). Anderson, Printed Image p.19, n.9; 'for an illustration showing people's fascination with a print-shop window display, see Robert Dighton's 1790 A Windy Day: Scene outside the Shop of Bowles the Printseller, reproduced in Thomas Burke, The Streets of London (London, 1940). Donald, "Characters and Caricatures" p366 reproduces an image of the Carrington Bowles shop, Spectators at a print shop in St Pauls churchyard 1774 and notes that 'a genre of prints depicting print shops developed in eighteenth-century England'.

79. Langford, Robinocracy p.30; Donald, "Calumny" p.56; Feaver, p.45.

80. Porter, LRB pp.20,19.

81. Roots, pp. 50-51; cf. also Rosemary Baker, 'Satirical Prints as a Source of English Social History' p.135. Baker observes that a 'surprising' number require a knowledge of Latin; this is surprising only if preconceptions as to the print's audience are entertained.

82. Philippe, p.20.

83. ibid, p.20.


85. It is difficult to believe that by this, Burke really intends, for instance, the ceiling of the Banqueting House, Whitehall.


87. Monod, Jacobitism and the English People pp.71-72; Monod goes on to qualify this. See also Olson, Emblems of American Community p.xv.

88. For example, Lippincott, p.4; Shelley M. Bennett, 'Anthony Pasquin and the Function of Art Journalism in Late Eighteenth-Century England' BJECs 8 (1985) 197-208 - Bennett refers, p.197, to 'Pasquin's efforts to influence this burgeoning class by means of popular publications' and, p.198, the publishing industry and art journalism catered 'to the new middle class audience'; John Barrell, 'Sir Joshua Reynolds and the Political Theory of Painting' Oxford Art Journal 9 (1986) 36-41, p.36 'a middle class whose economic power had grown out of all proportion to its directly political power [...] What was coming to be seen as the distinctly commercial society of mid- and late-eighteenth-century Britain'; David Solkin, 'Great Pictures or Great Men? Reynolds, Male Portraiture and the Power of Art' Oxford Art Journal
9 (1986) 42-49 p.43 refers to 'rapid acceleration in the commercialization of British society. [....] For the very first time in English history, even the working classes could join a burgeoning petty bourgeoisie in buying commodities which were somewhat like the luxury goods of the rich'; see also n.9, pp.48-49; T.H. Breen, 'The meaning of "likeness": American portrait painting in an eighteenth-century consumer society' Word and Image 6 (1990), 325-50, esp. pp.329-38; p.348 describes Georgian England as a 'society that was being transformed by broad popular consumption'; Iain Pears, The Discovery of Painting. The Growth of Interest in the Arts in England, 1680-1768 (New Haven:1991, paperback edn) p.24 'the cultural unity that was being formed in this period had many of the characteristics of what might be termed "bourgeois ideology". It was meritocratic, divorced from metaphysical hierarchies and grew directly out of an urban and commercial environment. Moreover, it had as its chief propagandists those who, if not "middle class" in the classical sense [sic] nonetheless came almost exclusively from the "middling ranks"'; Wagner, 'Hogarth's Graphic Palimpsests' (1991) p.343.

89. Alexander, York, p.4, by c.1780 prints of all kinds had become part of a 'fashionable consumer industry'. Wolf, Goya (Boston:1991) includes The Birth of a Consumer Society in her bibliography (n.15, p.91 and p.99).

90. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion p.31.

91. ibid, p.25. Its demise as an historical concept is a protracted one, however; Langford, A Polite and Commercial People p.60 writes that 'however difficult to quantify, the growing affluence and influence of the middle class were widely recognised'; the neglect or downplaying of this phenomenon are attributed (p.61) to 'the poverty of historical sociology'.


93. Shikes, p.94 'the ascendancy of the banking and merchant middle-class signalled the decline of the satirical print'; George, EPC2, p.259 'Already in 1832 political caricature was visibly trickling into journalistic channels suited to a new public' [my emphasis]. Wood, Folly p.11 also speaks of a 'new market for satirical prints' in the first decade of the 19th century.

94. For example, Atherton, Political Prints p.63; Brewer, Party Ideology p.147.

95. French prints have been somewhat better served;

Atherton, Political Prints pp.1-24, 38-43, is useful for the early 18th century, but this account is much in need of amplification; Lippincott is useful but deals only in passing with relevant material. For the period 1640-60, Williams, 'Polemical Prints' pp.35-46, touches on, but does not enter into any close study of, the questions of production and distribution. Tessa Watt, Cheap Print provides a superb introduction to popular printed images and their contexts up to 1640 - the more to be admired given the fragmentary nature of the evidence - and it is to be regretted that nothing comparable has as yet been essayed for the following two centuries, although see below. For the print trade in general in the later 17th century, see Alexander, 'English Prints and Printmaking'; Leona Rostenberg, English Publishers in the Graphic Arts 1599-1700 (New York: 1963); Sarah Tyacke, London Map-Sellers 1660-1720 (Tring: 1978).

Much is, therefore, to be hoped of Tim Clayton's forthcoming extensive study of the 18th-century London print trade, the first such study.

96. Miller, p.14 defines the the market as 'comparatively affluent and essentially metropolitan'; 'not one' of the prints reproduced by Miller is marked as being printed or sold in the provinces.

97. Fox, 'English Satirical Print' p.465; 'most towns were capable of producing their own squibs directed against local heroes or villains.'

98. Langford, pp.29-30. Similarly, Wood, Folly p.11, 'most of the prints in the provinces were sent out from London' - Wood does not expand on this. Patten, GCLTA p.76, is the latest to hint at provincial outlets; 'from Hogarth forward, pictorial satires on contemporary events had been a staple of London (and some provincial) book and print dealers' [my emphasis]. Brewer, Party Ideology p.152 refers to the printshop window displays of 'Dicey in Northampton', a reference derived from EPC1 p.74, but one which George does not amplify. Wood, Folly p.11 refers to 'Baldrey in Cambridge', again, without further information.
99. Melot, p.27; Wardroper, Kings p.155, refers to an advertisement of 1793 offering a print, Massacre of the French King! at one guinea per. hundred to "every bookseller, stationer, et cetera in England, Scotland and Ireland", promising supplies "at a day's notice, from one to ten thousand copies". Brewer, Party Ideology p.7, suggests that by c.1760 communications between London and the provinces were such that the 'widespread dissemination' of political material was possible. Anderson, Printed Image pp.18-19,20, considers the degree to which exposure to printed images was determined by geography.

100. Atherton, Political Prints p.64.
That there is room for research on this question is illustrated by the allusion to the printsellers of Oxford in Petter, The Oxford Almanacs p.12. Petter cites a complaint concerning "the great Licentiousness of those Prints and Pictures [...] with which the Printshops, in both Town and Country, to the great Offence of his Majesty's loyal, and modest subjects, are crowded", made in the specific context of the 1754 Oxford election. The author of this sentiment was a Tory Fellow of All Souls; B. Buckler, A Proper Explanation of the Oxford Almanac for the Present Year MDCCCLV. Cf. also Clark, English Society p.154, ns 159-61.

It was possible for gentlemen to order prints from London dealers; George Townshend's request that he be supplied with Hogarth's John Wilkes is noted by Atherton, 'George Townshend, Caricaturist' p.438; see also Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xvi.

101. Patten, GCLTA p.75 'that crossed all class boundaries'; idem, 'Conventions' p.334
102. Roylance, 'Introduction', and Riely, notes to nos. 10-12. Wardroper, Kings p.7 and idem, George Cruikshank p.8, hints at provincial displays; London shops displayed prints 'and no doubt the other shops of Britain and Ireland did the same' (my emphasis), and 'caricatures in the window of a London printshop or a stationer anywhere in the kingdom'.

103. Peter Borsay, The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in the Provincial Town, 1660-1770 (paperback edn Oxford:1991) can write (p.132) that 'To assess the full impact of printed matter it is important to examine not only the facilities for production and sale but also those for circulation'; unfortunately, neither here nor in his 'The English Urban Renaissance' Social History 5 (1977) 581-603, does Borsay touch on outlets for the sale or display of political prints in the provinces. The same is true of Ian Mitchell, 'The development of urban retailing 1700-1815' in ed. P. Slack, The Transformation of English Provincial Towns 1600-1800 (paperback edn London:1984) 29-83. Similarly, Porter, English Society discusses p.234 the
provincial press and the consumption of newspapers, but his sole reference to provincial exposure to the print is, p.230, that 'Cheap engravings of Old Masters sold briskly in the print shops which were springing up everywhere' [my emphasis].

Even assuming the existence of such outlets, the nature of their stock is a different matter. Samuel Bamford's recollection of the prints displayed in a Manchester bookseller's window suggests that there was nothing political, certainly nothing of the quality of the West End printshops (Anderson, *Printed Image* p.22). Martin, 'Missing Woodcuts', p.359, refers to a 1795 advertisement aimed at provincial dealers by wholesale print merchants Laurie and Whittle, but observes that while the dealers advertise "the greatest variety of whimsical, satirical and burlesque subjects" they add "not political", which suggests to Martin that 'the London caricaturists were not to the taste of the provinces'[my emphasis]. The degree to which references to provincial window displays involve a conflation of evidence similar to that identified in the context of taverns and ale-houses must be considered.

104. Lippincott, p.128. The shops were those of Overton and Bowles.

Atherton, *Political Prints* quotes Hogarth to the effect that in 1735 there were twelve major publishers of all types of print, but that between 1727-63 'many times that many shops were in some way involved in printselling'; quoted in Press, 'Georgian Political Print', p.216, n. This is borne out by Rostenberg, *English Publishers in the Graphic Arts 1599-1700*. Timothy Clayton, 'The Print Collection of George Clarke at Worcester College, Oxford' *PtQtty IX* (1992) 124-41 reappraises, p.134, this figure. See also Griffiths, 'A Checklist of Catalogues of British print publishers c.1650-1830' *PtQtty I* (1984) 4-22.

105. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' passim; p.236 'I have attempted to show that a market [...] for prints developed in England between 1760 and the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832' [my emphasis]. Similarly, Paulson, *Popular and Polite*; the 'almost everybody' of p.ix becomes '18th-century Londoners' on p.xi.

106. Carretta, *III* pp.53, qualified in the next sentence; 'for most Londoners, satiric engraving served a purpose analogous to state portraiture on a higher level'.

107. Porter, *P&P* pp.190,194 ('metropolitan'), 189 ('British'); *LRB* p.19 'urban', and 'British', ibid, p.20 'metropolitan'; 'urban' is also used by Kunzle, *Early Comic Strip* p.4 the caricature strip was aimed at 'the urban [...] masses'. Kunzle quotes, p.426, Vyantas Kavolis, *Artistic Expression: A Sociological*
caricatures were intended for 'the masses, that is, mainly for the petty bourgeoisie of pre-industrial cities'.

108. For example, Carretta, George III p. 53 and Brewer, Party Ideology pp. 139, 227 (Con-Test XXXI 18 June 1757 and the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Hardwicke, 30 September 1762); Langford, Robinocracy p. 30 and Donald, "Calumny" p. 56 (Public Advertiser 5 June 1765); see also Gassman, 'Smollett's Briton and the Art of Political Cartooning'.

The same caveat obtains with reference to contemporary assertions as to the intelligibility of printed images to the illiterate or semi-literate. Williams, p. 201 quotes The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer 25 Nov. - 3 Dec. 1645 [B.L. E319 (9)] that a printed image was potentially 'obvious to any ordinary apprehension upon a short view'; Williams acknowledges the possibility, pp. 206, 209, 212-13, that the potential intelligibility of printed images to a plebeian audience was in many instances a tactic used to denigrate the propaganda of opponents, although Brewer, Party Ideology p. 141, does not accept this in the context of post-1760 printed political polemic.

109. Brewer, Party Ideology p. 147. See also Godfrey, English Caricature pp. 16, 33, 58; EPC1, p. 135; Wardroper, Kings pp. 6-7.


111. Johnson, p. 144.


113. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' pp. 50, 51. Brewer, Party Ideology p. 155: 'Moreover, there may well have been [my emphasis] those who, although they could not read, were acquainted or familiar with the different materials of political propaganda. There is ample evidence [...] that in pre-industrial, partially literate societies such as eighteenth-century England, a process known as "bridging" was likely to occur. Bridging is the transmission of printed information in traditional oral forms: the establishment of a link between the literate and non-literate'. Ibid, pp. 141-2, 148, 151, 153.

Williams refers obliquely, p. 51, to 'the way in which papers were distributed'; Brewer, Party Ideology, pp. 147-8 'There is abundant qualitative
evidence [which is not given] to show that leafleting was endemic in London, and was a fairly common practice in the provincial towns; sadly, however, quantitative information does not survive."

Both Williams and Brewer have an irritating tendency to conflate literary and pictorial material under the umbrella terms 'printed material' or 'propaganda'. Williams, for example, refers in this context to Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in 17th-Century England' P&P 112 (1976) p.67 in which, I have established, there is no mention of pictorial material of any type; Brewer, Party Ideology p.227 quotes the Duke of Newcastle's complaints about 'Prints, & Burlesques' but proceeds to write of Newcastle's recognition of 'the importance of the printed word' [my emphasis].

114. Johnson, p.144; 'Georgian Caricatures' TLS. For such internal evidence and its limitations, see Martin, 'Missing Woodcuts' pp.346-49; Lorna Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760 (London:1988) p.5. See also Jean Chatelus, 'Thèmes picturaux dans les apparetements de marchands et artisans parisiens au XVIIe siècle' Dix-Huitième Siècle 6 (1974) 309-24. George, London Life in the Eighteenth Century (London:1925; paperback edn, Harmondsworth:1985) pp.100-101 cites a pamphlet, Considerations on the Expediency of raising at this Time of Dearth the Wages of Servants that are not domestic, particularly Clerks in Public Offices (1767) pp.6-7 the inventory of the possessions of an unmarried clerk in public office on £50 p.a. living in a furnished room in the 'dirtiest and meanest' part of the town possessed 'two large prints cut in wood and coloured, framed with deal but not glazed' one of which was 'Hogarth's Gate of Calais'; precisely the type of cheap print which Hogarth's Act sought to control.

The following studies of material culture make no mention of political prints: Weatherill, op.cit., Carole Shammas, The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America (Oxford:1990) (nor, it should be noted, does the chapter 'The Rise of the English Country Shop' have anything to say about prints of any kind). The assembled essays in eds Porter and Brewer, Consumption and the World of Goods are similarly silent.

115. Johnson, p.150.


118. See Chapter I above, note 25.


120. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.231.
121. Atherton, Political Prints p.63.
122. Patten, 'Conventions' p.334; idem, GCLTA p.71; Klingender, p.iii; Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p.69.
123. Mahood, having employed both 'the common man' and 'the man in the street' proceeds to ask, p.4:

"Who is the man in the street for whom the political cartoonist produces these simplified versions of history? As a static entity he does not exist, and like any generalization he can vanish at the hint of a statistic [...] He is a concept difficult to define [...] his assessment may change from context to context and sometimes even from decade to decade."

Mahood suggests that he is represented on the title-page image of Hobbes's Leviathan (p.6) and proffers the following coy historical pot-pourri:

'political philosophes have exalted and deplored him. In 1690 he was Locke's "tacitly consenting citizen"; in 1762 he was ennobled by Rousseau as "the sovereign people"; and in 1790, Edmund Burke [...] condemned him as "the swinish multitude". In the early 19th century he caused alarm and despondency among the intellectual elite. De Toqueville, surveying him in America, saw "with almost religious terror" that the future lay in his hands, and in 1859 J.S. Mill shuddered at the thought of "the tyranny of the majority". [...] In modern times he is The Voter.'


For criticism of such conflation, see Anderson, Printed Image pp.7,8. Anderson writes of the need "to clarify certain key terms and concepts [...] in particular "popular", "mass", and their cultural opposite, "high"."

Anderson elects to use 'high' of 'expensive limited-run prints', i.e., those of the Gillray type. With regard to the term 'popular', Anderson questions, p.8, the 'common tendency to add a class dimension to its general dictionary sense of prevalent among and approved by the people. Adherents to E.P. Thompson's approach are particularly apt to equate "popular" with "working-class". This interchange is not only conceptually confusing but also inimical to a nuanced approach to the relationship of class and culture.' Anderson criticises, p.9, the similarly
loose usage of 'mass'. Suggesting that the transformation documented in *Printed Image* might be interpreted as a change from 'popular' to 'mass' printed material, Anderson observes that 'much of the literature on periodicals, leisure, and entertainment tends to lack rigour in employing the term "mass"'.

For relevant definitions of 'popular' see Johnson, p.140; T. Harris, 'The problem of "popular political culture" in seventeenth-century London' *History of European Ideas* 10 (1989) 43-58; *idem*, *London Crowds* p.15. For the problems entailed in claiming a 'mass' production, audience, circulation or consumption of any item in this period, see the incisive essay by John Styles, 'Manufacturing, consumption and design in eighteenth-century England' in *eds Porter and Brewer*, *Consumption and the World of Goods* 527-54, esp. pp.529-41.

125. *Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832*; *Cheap Print* p.142 is critical of Miller's usage with reference to the 16th- and 17th-century engravings reproduced under this heading (Miller, p.14).

126. Alexander, *York* p.4; *Carey, Sunday Times* op. cit.; also, it is only fair to note, Miller, *Handcoloured British Prints*, p.11 'the relative costliness [of hand-coloured caricatures] is evident from the practice towards the end of the century of hiring out hand-coloured caricatures for an evening's entertainment, much in the same manner as video films are hired out today'. The 'television newsflash' analogy appears in Feaver, p.53.

127. *Brewer, Common People*; *Dickinson, Caricatures and the Constitution*.

The main flaw in Press's account is, of course, his failure to mention prices. This alone invalidates his attempt to gauge the intended market for a print from its subject-matter. Press believes that the subject-matter of a print may be taken as an indicator or the 'class' at which it is directed:

my assumption is that if the audience for prints widened, their content would shift somewhat to the interests of the new viewers.

Press then presents 'a series of subjects [reflecting] the [interests and] life styles of the aristocratic and lower classes' and traces their incidence in prints over this period. Press's 'aristocratic lifestyle subjects' are 'Hunting, Racing and Turf, Shooting, Card Playing, Gaming and Gamblers, and Riding and Horsemanship', his 'low income life style subjects', 'Low Life, Chimney Sweeps, Pawn Shops, Gin Shops, Prisons and Debt, Imprisonment' - categories as tautologous as they are inspecific. Aside from the fact that several of the pleasures of the first category were pursued or
aspired to at more than one level of society (card playing, for example, being a long-established topos of 'low life' genre scenes), Press makes no attempt to account for the alleged appeal of prints of 'low life' to those for whom this subject-matter would have been only too familiar, or why these dismal scenes should have been preferred over those of the first category, all of which pursuits would have been of interest to many at the lower levels of society. Why a poor man should wish to spend money on an image of a pawn shop or chimney sweep when he might buy a print of some feat of horsemanship is never satisfactorily explained.

The real determinant of an image's consumption was its cost; at, say, 1s., the sufferings of the little chimney sweep would have been available only to those with means sufficient to indulge their compassionate sentiment.

That racing scenes were hardly restricted to 'elite' consumers, as Press would suggest, is borne out by Anderson, Printed Image p.20: 'Many working people would have been familiar with such stock images as the horses and riders commonly used to illustrate race bills. One typical example, an 1829 advertisement for the Yarmouth races, presented viewers with a tiny cut of two jockeys and their mounts in a neck-and-neck race; the well-detailed composition also incorporated a flagman and two cheering spectators'. This print is reproduced in John Lewis, Printed Ephemera (Ipswich:1962) p.118; for an earlier (1771) example in the same genre see Apollo CXXXVII (1993) p.106 (Helen M. Clifford, 'The Richmond Gold Cup: Social, Sporting and Design History').

Press's content-analysis of prints is further flawed in being based entirely upon George's subject-indices to volumes V-XI of the Catalogue, in which there is no consistent programme for inclusions and omissions and in which the subjects indexed are as much a reflection of George's concern with the larger picture of '18th-century social life' than they are representative of the concerns of the prints themselves.

It is also worth observing that the original data for the 'hypothesis that the expansion of the mass market, particularly after 1810, resulted in wider print viewing by the lower and even illiterate classes' were political prints; Press's subsequent extension of his thesis to non-political prints, and that fact that it is on the latter that he appears to base his content-analysis, are never satisfactorily explained.

128. Thomas, American Revolution p.11.
129. Party Ideology, p.274 n.18 reveals Brewer's dependence on Atherton's account of the geography of the London print trade. Otherwise, Brewer relies on
EPC (Brewer, pp.301-2, ns.40 and 81). Anderson, Printed Image also relies on EPC for her discussion of prints of the period 1790-1832.

130. Cf. 'Georgian Caricatures' TLS review, Hogarth to Cruikshank.

131. Thus George makes much of the role of the pictorial in the Exclusion agitation as a concerted 'Whig campaign' [EPC1, p.58] but is silent as to the means by which such images were disseminated and, more importantly, as to the geographical range of exposure to pictorial polemic.

132. Press, 'Georgian Political Print', pp.219,216n.


134. Patten, GCLTA p.54.


136. Porter, LRB pp.19,20; also Patten, 'Conventions' p.334.


Similarly, Marcus Walsh, 'The superfoetation of literature: attitudes to the printed book in the eighteenth century' BJECS 15 (1992) 151-61, questions the received picture of a sudden flood of books in the same period.

139. Langford, Robinocracy pp.29,13.

140. Porter, P&P p.189. Press, Political Cartoon p.37, suggests that the Sacheverell prints have been unduly neglected and that they 'portended [...] the commercial possibilities associated with widespread print sales'.

about 1700 the state of Print Engraving on Copper was at a low ebb' (p.27). Alexander's account of the 1688-1702 period in The Age of William II and Mary III, pp.272-80 is similarly conventional and negative.

142. Hamilton-Phillips, p.245; Alexander, 'English Prints and Printmaking' ibid p.273. The extent to which the exponents of the 'commercialization' thesis have relied on advertising is queried by Peter Borsay in his review of The Birth of a Consumer Society, BJECS 8 (1985) pp.235-6. The danger in chronological revision of this kind is that it will leave untouched, indeed, merely transpose to an earlier date, the larger problem, which is the validity of the 'commercialisation' thesis.

144. Williams, pp.199,201.
146. Mahood, p.2. Cf. Thomas, American Revolution p.30. It is the more ironic, therefore, that Press should conclude his 'Georgian Political Print' with this explanation of the print's 19th-century demise (pp.237-8): 'The print, with its ability to communicate even with the illiterate or semi-literate, had perhaps some special advantages in this early period of democratization (i.e., 1760-1832) but it increasingly suffered from a need to tell its message quickly and succinctly' [my emphasis].

149. Godfrey, Printmaking pp.36,32; Hogarth's Act 'although not entirely effective,[...] was still a stimulus to the print trade'; 'Hogarth's example did much to stimulate an increase in the number and quality of satirical prints'; by his 'example' perhaps, certainly not by his actions.

150. Cf. Wood, Folly p.10 'Hogarth was a pioneer both in terms of his interest in protecting his prints from piracy and in his desire to have them reach as large an audience as possible.' Iannone, p.5 'Addressing his work to the widest possible audience was precisely in keeping with his stated purpose: to disseminate "modern moral Subjects." Visual didactic lessons in prints [...] were both appealing and affordable to a broadly diverse English audience'. Feaver, p.43 Hogarth produced 'suitable and moderately-priced art for the new middle classes [...] His proposals for the copyright laws were eventually accepted by Parliament, protecting artists [...] from the piracy he had suffered.'

151. Doyle, op.cit. p.92. As may be seen from the continued currency of the printshop window display as 'evidence' for the thesis that exposure to these prints was not restricted by their cost; for
Chapter IX: Representations of Revolution or Reluctant Revolutionaries? The political print and graphic political satire as 'subversive' or 'radical' genres

It is no accident that the vocabulary of printmaking techniques - the 'acid' and 'bite' in an etching, the 'cut' in a woodblock - is also the language of attack.

Ralph E. Shikes, *The Indignant Eye: The Artist as Social Critic*

All political caricature tends to be radical, oppositionist, disruptive. In the eighteenth century [...] the bias against authority was more extreme.

M.D. George, *English Political Caricature*

In the history of the graphic arts, caricature represents a significant development in the traditional uses and power of the printed image. Anti-art, anti-hero, anti-establishment, caricature questions the authority of ideals.

Dale R. Roylance, *The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature*

Caricature is always Us against Them [...] The joke is shared; so is the hate

William Feaver, *Masters of Caricature*

This study has already questioned the disproportionate attention which the idiom of caricature has received in studies of political graphics. Particular criticism has been levelled at the anachronistic aesthetic criteria which have to no small degree determined this bias towards caricature, and which is evident in the enthusiastic description of caricature as 'anti-art' quoted at the head of this chapter; the disproportionate and largely uncritical attention which this idiom has for so long received is explicable in part in terms of the perception of caricature as 'aesthetic subversion'.

Equally prevalent and similarly tenacious is a perception of caricature, the political print and graphic political satire as genres which are invariably -
inherently, even, - 'subversive', 'radical' and 'anti-establishment'. Exemplified by the above quotations, it is a perception of both the purpose and the operative power of these genres which has informed the way in which scholars have addressed this material.

This perception of the political print is discernible to a greater or lesser degree in virtually every work addressing this material. In many instances, indeed, the 'subversive' or 'radical' nature of the political print is the premise upon which a study is founded. This is the case with Wood's Folly and Vice, subtitled The Art of Satire and Social Criticism (1989), Philippe's Political Graphics: Art as a Weapon (1982) and Shikes's The Indignant Eye: The Artist as Social Critic In Prints and Drawings from the Fifteenth Century to Picasso (1969 and 1976), which devotes a chapter to 'The English Artist as Social or Political Critic from Hogarth to Cruikshank'. Wardroper's Kings, Lords and Wicked Libellers, subtitled Satire and Protest 1760-1837 (1973) might also be included in this category; its narrative structure being informed by this perception of the material.

Outwith such manifestoes, it is to be discerned in the phraseology employed and in the illustrative choices of a work. A word frequently encountered is 'weapon': '[graphic] satire is a weapon of the dispossessed'; '[graphic] satire was one of the few weapons with which the powerful could be attacked'; Hogarth was to give caricature 'a new and profound dimension that was to transform it from a minor branch of art into a weapon of universal application against the abuses of man by man'; the caricaturist works 'in the conviction that a picture is the most effective weapon of moral accusation'; 'caricature is primarily a weapon of combat'; by the mid-18th century 'the cartoon had matured into a legitimate weapon of political warfare, patronized by Government and Opposition alike', and so on. Atherton
writes of 'the aggressive, hostile, anti-social quality of all [graphic] satire'.

According to Wood, 'aggression' and 'anger' are qualities that invariably exist in 'effective satire'. Hofmann writes of the 'shrill, aggressive intensity' of late 18th-century English caricatures. Streicher claims that 'caricature organises mass hostilities and aggressions'.

For Lucie-Smith, caricature is 'the most democratic form of visual art'. Elsewhere, one reads that caricature is 'the most concentrated form of criticism', that prints have always been 'virulent in their condemnation of abuses'. 'The print was in opposition, essentially aligned with the people's cause; [...] pictures at least could render justice to the meek [...]

prints were for the people a breviary of imaginary revenge'. 'In the struggle for social justice [the caricaturist has] often been the spokesman of the people'.

The general nature of so much of the secondary literature means that many assertions as to the aggressive or subversive nature of caricature or political prints incline to the generic; for example, P.D.G. Thomas's statement that 'political cartoons tend to be anti-government in all ages and places' - the premise of many an exhibition and compilation-with-pictures. The more specific context of the 18th-century English political print has been similarly characterised; these prints 'tended to reflect the point of view of those out of power'. George's definition of 18th-century England as an 'oligarchy tempered by caricature' has informed most subsequent accounts of the function of political caricature in that period. Thus Wardroper: the existence of the political print meant that 'although power was in a very few hands, political argument and political laughter were the privilege of all'. Feaver, writing of the beginning of
the 19th century states that,

In those Gag Act Years, when Hone and Cruikshank likened Wellington to a scorpion, poised to sting any who dared question the edicts of Tory Rory rulers, caricature spelt defiance.

Similarly, Baker views the political print as an important expression of public opinion in an age of great political corruption. When Britain was dominated by a comparatively small number of rich and powerful families and the King was still a force in political life, satire was one of the few weapons with which the powerful could be attacked.

At the end of the century, moreover, a number of prints 'increasingly [... ] reflect the [...] views of the lower orders'.

Patten writes of 'the anarchic potentiality' of George Cruikshank's art. According to Thomas, 18th-century political caricatures did not merely attack individual ministries in turn [... ] They [...] reflected a permanent anti-establishment tradition of 'liberty' against 'tyranny'.

According to Wood, Hogarth's 'primary motivation' was 'the depiction of the failings of an entire society'; and so on.

Belief in the potentially subversive nature of the political print or graphic political satire would appear to derive in part from belief in the 'aggressive' or 'subversive' nature of humour. The idea that humour is a necessary ingredient of the political print ('the humor within [political] caricature reinforces its power') is questioned in the following chapter. In this context, it suffices to observe that both caricature and humour are consistently presented as debunking and dissident forms. As Cuno sees it, both the portrait charge and the
political caricature exploit

the subversive potential of humour [...]. This capacity can be used for different ends and with varying degrees of intensity, but it nonetheless remains an essential feature of all caricature.26

In the 18th century, comic art (by which the author also intends graphic satire)

challenged certain [unspecified] assumptions about the nature of art and society.[...] It often revealed social contradictions, took liberties, provoked anxiety, fear and embarrassment.27

Elsewhere one reads that 'humour can be a weapon, [...] subverting [...] dignity and high ideals'; humour in political prints is a means 'of bringing to the oppressed the intimate consolation of justice'.28

Though not all caricature is humorous, as the bitter, sardonic satires of Callot, Goya [and] Daumier [...] attest, humour is a powerful weapon. It disarms the viewer's own entrenched prejudices while it inanuates its message. It deflates pretensions more effectively than bitterness, it subverts authority, and brings the mighty low by exposing the ridiculousness that underlies their sublimity.29

This perception of humour is to a great extent derived from Freudian theory. Citing Freud, Crown writes that humour is not passive, 'it is defiant [...] it is able to assert itself against unfavourable real conditions'.30 Cuno claims that 'Freud's remarks on the joke and its capacity to undermine and attack are essential for understanding the role humor plays within caricature'; the hostile joke serves as an outlet for aggression, the 'obscene' joke serves the purpose of exposure; both are means of subverting authority.31 Atherton's Political Prints contains more than one reference to 'the humour of release'; Atherton concludes that satirical humour had the potential to act as a 'safety valve' in a society [18th-century England] 'in which deference and authority
are the ideals'. 32 This 'safety valve' interpretation of the function of graphic political satire is taken still further by Shikes, who claims that, in addition to 'failing to grapple with the conditions crying for redress',

by suppressing healthy criticism, by creating an atmosphere in which artists had to conform to exist [...] the rulers of many of Europe's countries made violent upheavals inevitable. If a Daumier had been allowed to exist in the late 17th- or early 18th-century, perhaps there might not have been a French Revolution.33

Caricature has itself long been interpreted in Freudian terms, notably in the writings of Gombrich and Kris. 34 According to Freud [Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious];

The charm of caricatures lies in this same factor [i.e., jokes against exalted persons, or against authority]: we laugh at them even if they are unsuccessful simply because we count rebellion against authority as a merit. 35

That Freud's interpretation of caricature continues to influence writing on caricature is evident from the essays assembled by Cuno, notably those by Boime, Hunt, and Paulson. Boime would have us believe that;

the political caricature permits the displaced manifestation of the desire to oust the father. The political enemy, or the subject of distortion, becomes a projection of the hated parent and through caricature can be struck down. Political caricature allows for the gratification of the desire to eliminate the rival parent.36

Boime's reading of caricature is echoed in Patten's verdict on the Regency caricaturists; these 'deployed their humor to kill off not the old king but his prodigal son, not the parliamentary system but its corrupt ministers...'. 37 More conventionally, one reads that caricature functions by the destruction of personae, by
revealing the 'essential littleness and ugliness' behind the ideal or respectable mask. Caricature's 'kicking-off point' is 'the destruction of so-called personality, i.e., the breaking-down of repeatability and inviolability'. Some of the most effective prints 'have a thumb-at-the-nose quality - a suggestion of the hoot of the slum kid who has just tossed a snowball at the rich man's hat'.

According to Melot, 'caricature and revolution are words that seem to go together. Revolution is indeed a form of satire, and caricature, a form of revolt'. Caricature is at one and the same time aesthetic and political subversion:

    caricature is a subversive weapon whereby a political model is dismantled by means of an aesthetic model. The caricaturist perverts the rules of ideal representation [...] Hence, in caricature there is transgression (of an aesthetic norm) for the purpose of aggression (against a social model).

Underpinning this perception of the inherently subversive nature of humour and caricature, is a belief that the political print is potentially subversive by nature of its very medium. The reproducible image is inherently democratic; according to Philippe 'the modern age began with this negation of uniqueness'. Thus we are informed that it is no accident that social criticism has been expressed largely in prints. [...] The print is the ideal medium for communicating messages, since multiple images can reach comparatively wide audiences.

By its nature, printmaking is given to rapid execution and inexpensive mass production. [...] These qualities make prints the ideal medium for spreading visual caricature, satire, and protest.

It is not surprising, therefore, that social criticism
should be seen as the natural function or predetermined purpose of the political print. Wood, for example, states that the purpose of the satirical print is to depict 'the ultimate horror of man's inhumanity to man', while Phillippe concludes that, 'of the two tendencies, eulogistic and condemnatory,' which he discerns in political prints,

the latter or nonconformist is indisputably more naturally suited to the medium of the print. In it the print constantly finds fresh material [...] and discovers its own essential logical development. 45

The extent to which the 18th-century English political print was 'subversive' or 'radical' in either intention or impact is, as this chapter will show, a matter on which scholarship to date is uncharacteristically divided. That it was at least potentially subversive is, however, generally accepted. Contemporary observations to this end are scattered through the literature: Atherton abandons his chosen chronology of 1727-63 in order to include one such observation; exposure to political prints

...must necessarily have a powerful influence on the morals and industry of the people [...] This humorous mode of satyrising folly is very injurious to the multitude in many respects. 46

Crown writes that in the 18th century, 'satire was seen as harmful to the lower orders', and quotes an unidentified contemporary; 'satires cannot fail of exciting opinions in the vulgar highly indecent to characters that ought to be surveyed with respectful awe'. 47 In Hogarth to Cruikshank, George refers to contemporary fears that a print such as Rowlandson's 1784 The Vicar and Moses would diminish respect for the clergy on the part of those, and in particular those of the lower orders, who saw it. 48
According to Philippe, 'exposure of broken commitments or of corrupt moral principles among the ruling classes precipitates their fall [...]'; graphic art hastens their dispossession'. As usual, Philippe is not referring to any specific period or culture, but others have been similarly confident in their belief that 18th-century England political caricature 'taught people not to view their superiors with excessive reverence'. Langford, for example, writes that plebeian exposure to political prints 'encouraged questioning, irreverence and even opposition among those classes of whom unquestioning acceptance was expected.' Political caricatures were potentially subversive in that they allowed 'humble men' see through the illusory guises of their rulers, an idea which Streicher's account of the mechanics of this 'subversion' amplifies:

A caricaturist may represent the only informed critic of [contemporary] propaganda and he may create in opposition a counter-image of reality. Free communication between citizens, or what Speier has called 'secondary processes of communication', may be encouraged by the differential between the prestigeful [sic] or official public image and the relatively negative image presented by the caricaturist. The probability may exist that public opinion is modified to that extent by caricatural imagery.

Fox certainly believes the political print to have been a subversive genre, if only indirectly:

visual satires did play their part in undermining the country's fixed points of authority.[...] Though few appeared bent on root-and-branch reform, slowly, insidiously, they helped to build up a questioning, irreverent and sceptical attitude. Press goes so far as to present the capitulation of an 'archaic' and 'authoritarian system of governing', i.e., that of England in 1832, as something which a climate of graphic criticism and satire had made 'inevitable':
What makes defeat inevitable [sic] is that comment that begins as criticism of specific government policies usually balloons rather quickly into a questioning of the legitimacy of the system itself. 94

Similarly, with regard to pre-revolutionary French caricatures (which include some notably pornographic representations of Marie Antoinette), Hunt suggests that 'ridiculing the king and queen in printed images [...] helped prepare the way for their executions in 1793'. 55 Carretta suggests that

by 1770, attacks primarily upon his person [i.e., in the form of portrait caricature] had undercut George III's royal dignity or honour. Such diminution of a particular king facilitated succeeding satirists' attempts to undermine kingship's general foundation. 56

Indeed, while it is possible to find accounts which attribute specific effects to particular prints or groups of prints - 'there is every reason to believe that [...] these pungent satires helped to bring about Sir Robert Walpole's fall' - belief in the potentially subversive nature of the political print has conventionally found expression in words to the effect that 'the political cartoon played an important part in democratizing politics in the late eighteenth century'. 57 In the previous chapter, I noted Carretta's claim that the iconography of the political print reflects the 'growing influence of the unenfranchised' in politics; political engravings brought politics out of Parliament and into the streets'. Political prints 'played a part in the political education' of the metropolitan lower orders 'and exploded any hope that the political battles [of the time] could be kept within the ranks of the wealthy and educated'. 58 According to Patten, political prints were a 'democratic' idiom, in that they involved 'the people' in the political process:

as citizens [sic] began to perceive their representatives in the caricatures, they began
to think of themselves as [...] participants in the national drama. Caricatures helped people see their lives in relation to national and abstract issues and to conceive of their own existence not as meaningless, obscure or archetypal, but as narrative, consequential and individual.

In Charles Press's 'democratization' thesis, the political print assumes a more active role. As Press sees it, political prints 'were part of what was evolving [...] as a new democratizing force in the politics of England: a stream of mass media criticism of current political practices'. The prints contributed to an important 'opinion-forming process, as the government reluctantly edged across the line that separates aristocratic from democratic forms of government'.

It is an interpretation of the role of the prints sanctioned by George:

that the multiplication of these channels of popular information has produced a great change in our domestic [...] politics. [...] It has, in truth, produced a gradual revolution in our Government. By increasing the number of those who exercise some sort of judgement on public affairs, it has created a substantial democracy infinitely more important than those democratical forms which have been the subject of so much contest.

In Press's account, the political print gradually became an 'institutionalized' form of criticism; Press charts the gradual acceptance of criticism 'by the governors'. This is itself proto-democratic;

the institutionalized critic [...] is the link that makes the formation of a public opinion possible, makes election of rulers seem reasonable [...] and so makes the phrase, consent of the governed, meaningful.

The political print has been viewed as more than an agent of 'democratization'; its very existence has been
seen as 'evidence' of such a process. 64

********

The perception of graphic political satire as a potentially or inherently 'radical' or subversive genre has several corollaries, all of which have informed the emphases and omissions of political prints scholarship to date.

One is that 'the practice of caricature presupposes conditions of freedom'. 65 In 1928, Ashbee could write that

"caricature needs license of expression [...] Your tyrant cannot afford to laughed at [...] Caricature, as we now see it, is essentially a democratic art; it can only flourish under democratic conditions. It needs liberty of speech and expression [...] An autocracy cannot afford to suffer laughter." 66

If graphic political satire and political caricature are accepted as at least potentially 'radical' or subversive genres, it is not difficult to accept their existence at a given period as evidence of political or journalistic freedom. The incidence of graphic political satires may be taken as 'a good barometer of the political and cultural climate'; it is taken as such in Press's flawed quantitative study of 'The Georgian Political Print and Democratic Institutions'. 67

This may be seen to underpin at least one strand of the historical contextualisation of 'the development' of political caricature or graphic political satire in England. The society in which political caricature 'developed' and flourished was, of course, 18th-century England, and it has been conventional to view political caricature as a phenomenon facilitated by or 'reflecting' a freedom of criticism peculiar to England. This view is to be found as early as 1813, when J.P. Malcolm
celebrated England as 'a land of freedom in caricatures'.68 Hind accounts for the emergence in England of a 'school' of graphic satire; 'in no other country has the caricaturist been left such complete liberty'.69 We read that

most European nations had governments which censored etchings as rigorously as other printed forms. In England, however, the political print enjoyed a seeming immunity from prosecution;

in EPC1 that 'the classic age' was distinguished and facilitated by the caricaturist's 'virtual immunity from proceedings for libel or sedition'.70 Hogarth's Royalty, Episcopacy, Law [Some of Ye Principal Inhabitants of the Moon] ('a remarkably blunt attack on the Establishment' [Plate 1]) is described by Shikes as a print which 'could not conceivably have been published except in relatively democratic England', where

despite moments of stress and violence, the struggle for religious tolerance and constitutional government and the development of parliamentary tradition had evolved in relative peace—a condition conducive to freedom of expression.71

Donald writes that 'the ebullition of graphic satire in [18th-century England] seemed to foreign visitors, dazzled by British liberty, to be a vivid example of the freedom of printed material, even of a libellous or scurrilous' nature, and the literature is full of foreign observations to this end.72 If, by the 1780s, the political print 'stood out [...] as the most striking symbol of the freedom of expression in England' to contemporaries, it has been accepted as such in the eyes of posterity.73

The idea that the exercise of graphic satire and criticism requires conditions of freedom may be shown to have informed the conventional chronology of prints study
with respect to the neglect of the 17th century. We read that graphic political satire makes only an 'intermittent appearance' in the 17th century 'since this was an age of absolutism'. The very absence of censorship of satirical prints in the 18th century which facilitated the 'development' of political caricature has been linked to the absence of such graphic satires in the previous century; in Political Prints, Atherton writes that 'no state machinery had been devised in order to deal with' the genre because 'the independent satirical print hardly existed in England before the eighteenth century'. Conversely, Porter suggests that the earlier development of graphic satire may have been impeded, if not precluded, by censorship, so that, the association of the development of graphic satire with conditions of political conflict notwithstanding, England's 'century of revolutions' produced few prints.

In this way, it has been possible to present political caricature or graphic political satire as a legacy of 1688, albeit one which was not to be fully realised until after 'liberty' and 'stability' were secured with the Hanoverian succession. According to Lucie-Smith, the fact that 'caricature became a recognised mode of political discourse' in the 18th century was the result of the freedom of expression that was the legacy of the country's escape from 'continental-style absolutism'; 'this, coupled with a series of turbulent events [unspecified] and a popular need for information and comment fostered the growth of caricature as we know it today'. Lucie-Smith was writing in 1981; in 1928, Ashbee could write that political caricature originated in England 'and is part of the Englishman's mental equipment, the necessary condition of a sanity that has to do with his political environment and sense of freedom'. The 'birth of the art' at the beginning of the century and the 'golden age' (a 'sudden outburst of riotous freedom and laughter') at the end are 'the result
of the freedom of the Press—something that had come out of the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688. Again:
'caricature with us developed earlier than it did in the rest of Europe, because of our conditions of political liberty'. Hill similarly describes political caricature as a 'peculiarly British phenomenon', the 'golden age' of which 'was made possible by a timely convergence of political [and] economic' as well as 'technical and aesthetic' developments:

18th-century intellectual life was notable for the gusto with which criticism was directed against authority. A climate of freedom established as a consequence of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 stimulated the growth of modern journalism.

The ready association of 'continental-style absolutism' with Catholicism and an enduring association of print, and perhaps especially a prints culture, with Protestantism, lend their weight to such a chronology. For Lucie-Smith, graphic printing is 'the result of Protestantism'; the religious dimension to English graphic liberty is identified by Wolf in her analysis of the influence of the English satirical print on Goya:

visitors from the continent were keenly aware that the satirical print was so visible a part of London life due to the fact that England, unlike the neighbouring Catholic countries of France and Spain, was largely free of censorship.

The perception of the political caricature as a quintessentially English artform is rooted in this association. Like the portrait, the political caricature and graphic satire generally have been seen to develop in the absence of, and in the case of graphic satire, in reaction against, continental artistic traditions, in particular the Baroque. Thus, Hogarth's failure to build on the achievement of Thornhill has been accepted as evidence not of technical incompetence and lack of appropriate training, but of the inappropriateness of the Baroque to the political and cultural realities of
Hanoverian England; 'an art which expressed the final triumph of the counter-reformation and of absolutism could not but conflict with everything Hogarth, the painter of eighteenth-century England, stood for'.

More recently, Paulson could account for the early development of political caricature in England and its insecure foothold in France in terms of a 'dissident' artistic tradition in England which ensured that even Reynoldsian essays in High Art entailed irony and 'subversion'.

At its most extreme, this perception of the political print and its 'history' has secured for the political caricature the status of artefact of a libertarian heritage. Thus Wynn-Jones: since the 18th century British 'cartoonists have continued to speak freely with the voice of dissent, radicalism and cynicism'; for two hundred and fifty years, the caricaturist has 'represented and safeguarded the freedom of expression which is one of Britain's most valuable bequests':

We can not unfairly claim to have in Britain the longest unbroken tradition of graphic satire in Europe [...]. What is unique about the British tradition of cartoons is its freedom of expression, the status almost of a national institution achieved in this country in an unbroken succession from the anonymous 'bubble' prints of 1720 to the daily outpourings of the newspaper cartoons of today. [...] Political cartoonists in this country [...] have traditionally been granted a licence not tolerated, to this day, in some countries, and even here withheld from other kinds of communication.

Such accounts of the 18th-century political print have in them something of the implicit chauvinism of 'Why was England first?' familiar from traditional textbook explanations of the 'Industrial Revolution'. England alone had the necessary combination of preconditions ('liberty', Protestantism and stability) to secure a 1720 'take-off point' after which 18th-century London became the caricature workshop of the world.
The perception of the political print as a potentially subversive or 'radical' genre has informed two at first sight conflicting contexts of its 18th-century 'development'; a context of stability and fundamental consensus, in which the print functions as a vehicle of a loyal Parliamentary opposition in the identification of egregious abuses, and a context of proto-revolutionary conditions and an inequitable and corrupt political system the ultimate collapse of which was both inevitable and hastened by the critical spirit which found graphic expression in the prints. In this context the existence of graphic political satire becomes evidence of the impotence of a morally and ideologically bankrupt system to prevent criticism and, ultimately, reform.

In his Chadwyck-Healey volume, Sharpe offers George's conclusion that vicious satires were tolerated because 'basically, society was assured, stable and content'.

Certainly, as far as the pre-1760 print is concerned, the context proffered is tranquillity if not total inertia. Thus George:

"prosperity and peace with Walpole's policy of conciliating his adversaries produced a period of calm after the excitements of 1721-22. In the placid interval, the art of graphic political satire advanced."

The era of the Hogarthian print

overlaps with that moment in our national development in which the political historians tell us that nothing of importance happened in England. After a century of wars and revolutions, the broad middle strata of English society had cast off their religious and political 'enthusiasm'. Content that their interests were being looked after by Walpole and the Whig oligarchy and little perturbed by the intermittent fever of Jacobitism in Grub Street and among rural backwoodsmen, the middle classes soberly concentrated on their proper business of economic enterprise. [Plate 3]
of graphic political satire between 1720 and 1760 - particularly that produced against Walpole on the theme of 'corruption' - is never denied, but from this body of satires is adduced a picture of basic stability; Carretta reiterates the Athertonian thesis that satires on the crown in the century 1660-1760 reflected and paralleled 'the growth of a recognised opposition loyal to the premise of monarchy'.

The idea that graphic satire is nurtured by conditions of conflict, whether between states or within a state - that graphic political satire 'flourishes at periods of crisis in the established order and of questioning of the rules of the game' - and that the incidence of prints correlates with such points of conflict, will be examined later in this chapter. The bias of the literature in favour of the post-1760 graphic political satire is to some extent rooted in this idea. Thus, while, for Atherton, the development of the political print was facilitated by, or paralleled, the 'emergence of a Constitutional Opposition' between 1720 and 1760, Atherton concludes his survey of this period with the view that 'great events provide great material'. By consent, these 'great events' occur post-1760 and the great quantitative increase in the production of political prints after 1760 and again after 1780 have been taken as evidence of this. Carretta is one of many for whom the real 'development' of graphic political satire takes place in the context of post-1760 conflict:

In the 1760s new blood began to flow in the body politic. The cause celebre of Wilkes, the birth of radicalism, the organisation on a mass scale of 'opinion without doors' and the contests of George III with his ministers and would-be ministers produced real constitutional issues.

For Wardroper, the later Hanoverian period was uniquely an age of caricature because it was an age of conflict, an age in which:
The ruling men seemed foolishly deaf to every reminder that their power could be questioned and that things-as-they-were might be changed. It was a conflict that nourished the arts of the caricaturist.  

As Press sees it, 'some of the best cartoons [....] spring from' the 'kind of anti-authoritarian conflict over special privilege' exemplified by the reign of George III; indeed, Press goes so far as to claim that it is 'in authoritarian systems [that] the political cartoon reaches its full glory'. Feaver celebrates political caricature as both symbol and instrument of defiance during the 'Gag Act years', Wardroper, the fact that, in the 'oppressive scene' of post- Revolutionary repression 'there was one place to turn for a fearless running commentary on the world as it was: the caricature printshop'.

The development of graphic political satire in 18th-century England has been associated with 'the growing demand for Parliamentary and administrative reform'. The association is implicit in the chronology of Press's thesis of 'democratization'; 'a market of public opinion for political prints developed in England between 1760 and the passage of the Reform Bill'. Indeed, Press is concerned to establish 'how print development paralleled the development of democratic forms of governing in England'. According to Press, English political history through [sic] the crowning of Victoria can be viewed as the struggle to bring [George III] and his successors to terms with the conditions created by new social and political alignments and forces. Somewhere along the way democracy became a fact in England.  

Graphic political satire, in particular the quantitative development of the genre after 1760, should be seen as both agent and symptom of this process of 'democratization'. Press goes so far as to explain the violent,
scatological nature of 18th-century graphic satire [Plates 4 and 5] in terms of this confrontational context; 'a mood of incivility, that is today characteristic of the revolutionary or underground cartoon, is found in these prints' which is markedly different from

the prevailing mood of laughing satire in the political cartoons of today's stable democracies. Perhaps because criticism was risky in this authoritarian period, its form bordered on the subversive and irresponsible [...] Civility in criticism, just like the institution of a loyal opposition, possibly only follows the institutionalization of democratic forms.

If some, like Wardroper, have presented graphic political satire as a corrective to government apologia, which, notwithstanding the exaggeration natural to the idiom, articulates fundamental 'truths' about the period, Press is not blind to the eristic and often factious nature of the material. He can accept the excesses of the Georgian political print because it was, ultimately, on the side of liberty, justice and democracy. Alluding to the 'demonization' of George III in the American Declaration of Independence, Press observes that the fact

that distortion and misrepresentation [...] enter the anti-government propaganda effort should not blind us to the fact that the revolutionaries of 1776 and most others who have fought authoritarian systems, were essentially correct. Those governing systems were kaput morally and politically, and required drastic changes to survive. The old system of redistributing [sic] the benefits of status, power and material resources was archaic for new times.

Press's defence of distortion and misrepresentation recalls Freud's observation that 'we laugh at [caricatures] even if they are unsuccessful simply because we count rebellion against authority as a merit'.
The emphases, and perhaps still more the omissions, of the literature both reflect and perpetuate the perception of caricature and graphic satire as 'radical' or subversive idioms. The illustrative choices of the literature in particular have connived in this, at the same time affirming the related picture of an authoritarian context and a struggle for 'liberties'. George Cruikshank's Massacre at St Peter's or 'Britons Strike Home'!!!, A Free Born Englishman and Poor Bull & his Burden [Plates 6-8] are staples of the textbooks; we have seen The Sleeping Congregation, Parsons Drowning Care and The Pluralist [Plates 9-11] so often that we have come accept them as only slightly exaggerated pictures of the 18th-century Church of England. Collectively, such images create what is, in effect, itself a caricature of 'Georgian England' and never more so than in the Cranach-to-Scarfe framework of exhibitions and compilations on the theme of 'the art of satire and social protest', in which predictable images support and are supported by a trite relativism; a series of ahistorical protests against ahistorical abuses by those who 'have used the most effective weapon at their command [...] to needle the Establishment [sic] duel with oppressive governments, satirize corrupt or indifferent churches' et cetera; a framework in which the Cranach anti-papal woodcut has its place next to Newton's 1790s image of a bibulous Anglican clergy to represent 'anti-clericalism' or 'the corruption of the Church'.

In Shikes's The Indignant Eye the 15th century is accounted for as 'a period dominated by superstition'; the 'age of Hogarth' as 'a day when politics was synonymous with corruption' (Folly and Vice offers, among other prints, Gin Lane, The Sleeping Congregation, Credulity, Superstition and Fanaticism, Parsons Drowning Care and The Pluralist).

The problem with such assemblages of 'visual soundbites' is not so much the accuracy of the picture of
both the genre and its 18th-century context thus proferred, but the extent to which this picture depends on a handful of prints. The Sleeping Congregation and Parsons Drowning Care may epitomise the 'anti-clerical satire' of the 18th century; they and similar images must, however, be viewed in the broader context of the many satires from this period in which the Church of England is defended from various encroachments upon her status and authority. How many of the satires on the ambitions of 'radical dissent' in 1790s [Plates 12-14] are as familiar? The omissions of the literature - in terms of both the prints discussed and perhaps still more of those reproduced - assume a larger significance when they are seen to conspire in the promulgation of a picture of the material produced and of its contemporary function that is limited and - in both senses of that word - partial.

Perhaps the most significant corollary of the perception of political caricature or graphic political satire as inherently or at least potentially 'radical' or subversive genres is the failure of prints scholars to accommodate those prints which cannot be reconciled with this picture.

Most obviously, it has marginalised the non-satirical, 'straight' political print. It is not chronological bias against the pre-1720 print alone which has militated against the study of prints such as that of Charles II as defender of the Church of England [Plate 15] or the broadsheet image The Unfeigned Respect of an English Tory to the Queen of Great Britain [Plate 16]. Ashbee excludes 'propaganda' from his otherwise inclusive definition of 'caricature', Shikes, similarly, propagandist polemical images, because even those which depict the triumph of the hitherto oppressed 'can never have the vivacity or interest of critical art'.

Central to the perception of such images is the idea
that they are contrived and insincere. Thus David Dabydeen on a portrait engraving of the future George II:

Certainly [Hogarth] would not have believed the rubbish about Prince George being great and glorious, the paradigm of heroic virtue - his real attitude towards Royalty was to be revealed in works like Royalty, Episcopacy, Law. The experience of having to engrave, out of financial necessity, such an image [...] would have shaped [Hogarth's] perceptions about art and the propagation of false values and untruths; art and the demands of the Patron and Printseller; the artist and his enslavement by the upper classes; realities which were to concern him throughout his life.

It is when we come to the genres of political caricature and graphic political satire, however, that the extreme selectivity of the conventional account and its illustration becomes evident. If belief in the inherent 'subversiveness' of graphic satire and caricature accounts for the attention to these idioms by which prints scholarship has been characterised, the literature reveals a marked failure to engage with the many violent, satirical images which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be described as 'radical', but which, on the contrary, articulate anti-'radical' sentiments. While it may be true, as Patten contends, that 'caricature does not lend itself readily to encomia' both graphic satire and caricature were put to politically- and socially-conservative ends, and not solely in the two decades following the French Revolution. To accept Melot's dictum that 'Caricature can only function satisfactorily in opposition [...] An opposition that holds power is no longer an opposition' is to eliminate at a stroke some of more celebrated images of the 'Golden Age' as well as many less well-known.

Up to a point this is what has happened; it is possible to read, for example, Wardroper's Kings, Lords and Wicked
Libellers and remain ignorant of the existence of a large body of prints contemporaneous with those illustrated and described by Wardroper, but which take a very different line on the events described therein. Carretta's George III is only slightly less partial; a work in which the — by Carretta's own criterion — marginal figure of Blake figures more prominently than either Gillray or James Sayers. Carretta devotes one chapter to conservative iconography in the representation of George III and the monarchy, in which this is erroneously presented as a reaction to events in France rather than as the culmination, or the heightened application of an extant iconography and rhetoric. Even in this chapter, moreover, Carretta is as much concerned with the identification of 'ambivalence' and irony as he is with the positions thus articulated.

The proliferation of anti-Jacobin images and satires against 'radical dissent' between 1790-1815 is especially problematic for those who have emphasised the 'radical' credentials of the genres. Falling plumb within the 'golden age' and too numerous to be conveniently or convincingly ignored, such prints have been accounted for in ways which serve to underline the association of these genres with subversion and 'radicalism'.

In the light of the conventional celebration of the 'golden age', it is interesting to observe that for some scholars the period 1789-1815 is disappointing. Indeed, to some it marks, if not a low point, then the beginning of the 'decline' of the genre. Press, for example, remarks, of these years, that while the mood of vilification and incivility stays at a relatively constant level [...] it [...] differs in that it becomes patriotic rather than subversive. [...] As the Napoleonic Wars moved to a climax, the print [began] a decline in quality, and possibly also in influence.'

It is particularly significant, given Press's
subscription to the idea that crises or points of conflict act as catalysts of 'great' graphic political satire, that the Reign of Terror, what Press terms the 'invasion jitters' of 1803 - which saw a peak of print production - and Waterloo should be dismissed as 'secondary', 'conservative rallying points', which deflected attention from the 'real' issues of the day;

while of interest [the prints produced in response to these crises] appear to lack the drama and the stimulation of the points of confrontation when reformers claimed to have caught the Establishment with their [sic] hands in the till.  

One response has been to see them as 'ironic' and thus subversive malgres eux; this is a common response to the admittedly polysemic images of Gillray [Plates 17-19]. Both Brewer and Gillray's biographer Hill have argued that there is little reason to doubt the sincerity of Gillray's anti-Foxite Whig and anti-Jacobin satires of this period [Plate 20], but prints commentary has been distinguished by a reluctance to credit these and similar prints with sincerity and conviction.  

They are, significantly, presented as pragmatic; cynical exercises in scaremongering which were not taken seriously even by their author. Sincerity and conviction are the preserve of one 'side' in a contest which is itself seldom presented as one of opposed ideologies, but rather as one of ideals versus self-interest. 'The Establishment' is never allowed to have been motivated by anything other than self-preservation; it is not surprising that the articulation of the regime's legitimacy should have attracted little interest and less sympathy.

A notable exception is Atherton's excellent 'The British Defend Their Constitution in Political Cartoons and Literature' (1982); Atherton's account stands alone, not least in its recognition of the fact that, 'alone among [France's] foes, [Britain] was able to confront the
ideas of the Revolution with an alternative set of ideas, a counter-ideology of national principles commanding wide [...] support' and articulated in concrete and powerful imagery, not least in graphic form. 113 Significantly, Atherton's remains the only attempt to address this material in its own right as well as on its own terms; in George III, Carretta's less satisfactory account of this material emphasises its marginal status by addressing it belatedly in a study otherwise concerned with satiric assault as opposed to satiric defence. 114 In general, the literature has offered a picture of a political system that was 'kaput morally and politically' and which 'stumbled toward reform or revolution in 1832' (as recently as 1992, Patten could dismiss Burke as the sole spokesman of conservative philosophy, account for the 'weakness' of the government in terms of 'the conflicting ambitions of a relatively small number of aristocratic families and their placemen' and suggest, albeit obliquely, that in fighting the French Republic and the demand for internal reform, England 'fought against the irresistible spirit of the age'). 115 Anti-Jacobin scaremongering is 'evidence' of this ideological bankruptcy.

It must be remembered that few political prints scholars have been historians, and that, as a consequence, the historical context proffered is often second-hand. The failure of prints scholars to accommodate this material is only one manifestation of a larger historiographical indifference to both the arguments by, and the channels through, which the 'radical impetus' was countered and frustrated. 116 It is, then, all the more unfortunate that where counter-revolutionary argument has been examined, logocentrism has ensured that pictorial material has been treated cursorily, if at all; prints receive only a conventional and cursory mention in, for example, Robert Hole's essay on counter-revolutionary propaganda in
It is the less surprising, therefore, that the idea that anti-revolutionary, anti-'radical' prints somehow do not 'count', that they are not genuine expressions of 'public', or, more often, 'popular', opinion, lurks between the lines of many an account of the graphic output of this period.

Against such insecure or 'unconvincing' images must be set the paucity of revolutionary and 'radical' images. The failure of 'the radicales' to counter the pictorial scaremongering which had so little basis in 'popular opinion' has been accounted for with reference to a 'big parliamentary effort at repression' - this by the same government which the same author describes as 'inefficient and largely ineffective' in its efforts 'to tone down criticism' and who has described the Six Acts, so often invoked in this context, as a 'paper tiger'.

The same author has, however, observed 'sharp decreases' in the number of political satires which are signed in the years 1817-20 and again in 1831-32; this is, nonetheless, to be set against a basic pattern of a steady increase post-1780 of signed prints, a fact which does not seem consonant with repression. Neither Wardroper nor Patten, who cover the 1789-1832 period in considerable detail, furnish one single instance of a legal prosecution - successful or otherwise - of a political caricature or graphic political satire. As far as political caricature was concerned, 'repression' appears to have taken the remunerative and sometimes ineffectual form of the buying-up of an entire impression - the favourite response of the Prince Regent.

The problem with many accounts, exemplified by that of Wardroper, is that prints are reproduced, referred to and described in the same breath as those works of the press which were subject to prosecution, fostering thereby an
impression of the 'repression' of 'radical' political caricature which is not borne out by the available evidence. Thus Wardroper refers to a print by Robert Cruikshank, The Devil's Ball; its publisher Thomas Dolby was 'to be prosecuted but not for this'. The trial of Hone, to which Patten devotes an entire chapter, was for verbal, not visual, satire; caricatures and graphic satires figured in the trial only when Hone himself employed them as evidence of blasphemous parody which, because of its political tenor, had escaped prosecution.

George, who claims to discern an unprecedented cynicism and even-handedness in graphic political criticism after c.1780, remarks that;

in the past, simple-minded print-gazers had learned that ministers were nearly always wrong and often wicked. Anything to the contrary could be attributed to hirelings. The new lesson might be that there is more than one side to most questions.

The 20th-century 'print-gazer' has been no less willing to attribute anti-revolutionary and anti-radical graphic satire to government sponsorship, although there is little evidence of any concerted attempt to harness graphic satire at this or any other point in the 18th century. Gillray's predominantly anti-Foxite and anti-Jacobin output during this period has been explained in terms of his being 'bought off' by a government pension; George Cruikshank was similarly and ineffectually bribed by George IV in 1820. Gillray's rival James Sayers has been dismissed in the literature as a long-term Pittite sinecurist and marginalised as a consequence. In the case of Gillray, the fact of his ministerial patronage has allowed commentators to reach the satisfactory conclusion that the prints produced between 1795-1810 did not represent his 'true' political sympathies. Thus Hill speculates:
The extent of the gap between Gillray's political philosophy and his practice as a caricaturist remains conjectural; one can only guess at the effects such a tension might have had. In 1840, Thackeray could write of 'the whole course of Gillray's humour' having been diverted 'into an unnatural channel'; Landseer, nine years earlier, that Gillray was always a reluctant pensioner of the administration; 'his heart was always on the side of whiggism and liberty'.

To Shikes, on the other hand, Gillray's anti-revolutionary satires were a reflection of his 'provincial tendencies' (this of one who left London rarely and reluctantly); the same author concludes, namely, of George Cruikshank's failure to commit himself other than sporadically to the cause of radical reform; 'perhaps, like most Englishmen, he was reacting traumatically [inference, 'irrationally'] to what was regarded as the extremism of the French Revolution'.

That the anti-'radical' images of this period should so consistently have been explained in terms of repression, bribery, or a failure of nerve - or all three - is testimony to the ineradicable association of both the medium and the genre of graphic political satire with subversion and 'anti-authoritarianism'. Certainly, failure to conform to the role assigned the political print by a liberal-minded posterity has in many instances been met with an illiberal ascerbity. Hogarth's anti-Wilkes, pro-ministerial prints of 1762 are a case in point [Plate 21]. These have been presented as aberrations from an otherwise right-minded (if non- or apolitical) oeuvre and as a lapse of taste and/or of political judgement on Hogarth's part. Langford describes them as 'injudicious', Wynn-Jones as 'misconceived' 'blunders'. Press, more in sorrow than in anger, writes that, at the end of his career:
Hogarth turned frankly partisan and attacked his old associates, the radicals. One print, *The Times*, not widely circulated, defended George III and his ministry. He also did a nasty caricature portrayal of his old friend John Wilkes, the hero of liberty [...] These he should have lived to regret, because they brought him misery and a flood of personal vilification from general citizens and from the radical intelligentsia [sic].

Ashbee asks 'Are we to estimate the greatness of a caricaturist by his political vision?' Of those artists whose work has been consistently criticised, there is evidence to suggest that it has been as much their political as their technical shortcomings which have informed this criticism. James Sayers produced many graphic political satires of note, including several of the definitive images of the 1780s and 90s. His output, and contemporary evidence as to the impact of individual prints, compares favourably with that Rowlandson, of whose total graphic output political satires were only a small part, and that not the most distinguished. But if Sayers's prints were praised as notably effective and hard-hitting by his contemporaries, their impact upon modern prints scholars has been largely negative. The few lines accorded Sayers in the literature invariably allude to his failings as a draughtsman. George, for example, describes *The Repeal of the Test Act: A Vision* (Plate 12) as 'crude', although it is no 'cruder' than the (very different) draughtsmanship of his 'radical' contemporary, Newton (Plate 4), of whom the term 'neglected genius' has been used. George's observations on Sayers's print and on the 17th-century spirit with which it is informed suggest that its real crime is that it forces George to acknowledge the religious dimension to political argument, which she had previously declared obsolete after 1710.

In the Catalogue, George writes of Sayers:

He is the only satirist in the volume in whom consistent political views can be discovered.
These are support of Pitt, support of Hastings, hatred of dissent and [of] Jacobinism, and they have not recommended him to posterity. 136

A very different artist, 'HB', has had a similarly bad press. 'HB' personifies the 'decline' of print satire after c.1820; Gombrich calls his work 'feeble', Press 'inept' and 'tepid'. 137 His 'gentlemanlike' prints have been found wanting in 'aggression' and 'anger', those qualities which Wood has pronounced essential to 'effective' satire. 138 George credits him with initiating 'the tradition of the cartoon as a good-humoured comment as opposed to the weapon of offence': significantly, perhaps, George also quotes his obituary of 1868 in which he is described as having been 'attached to the purest ameliorative Conservative principles'. 139

The extent to which a narrow conception of what qualifies as 'subversive' and therefore 'significant' has prevailed in prints scholarship may best be seen, however, in the failure of the literature to accommodate Jacobitism and Jacobite graphic satire.

The notable failure of prints scholarship to make much (or anything at all) of Jacobite graphic satire is particularly ironic; here are prints genuinely and uncontrovertably critical of, and hostile towards, the status quo; prints which seek to cast doubt on the very legitimacy, and not merely the probity, not merely of a ministry but of an entire regime and the premise upon which it is founded; prints which were more vulnerable to censorship and 'repression' than those of the French Revolutionary period because they challenged the legitimacy of the governance of Great Britain.

It is not as if there is a paucity of material, at least as far as the 18th century is concerned. 140 George writes that there are 'quite a number' of Jacobite prints between 1746 and 1750, mostly satires upon the Duke of
Cumberland; prints such as BM 2833 The Agreeable Contrast between the Formidable John of Gaunt and Don Carlos of Southern Extraction and BM 2834 John of Gant in Love; prints credited, in another account, with the introduction to the political satire of the concentratedly ad hominem satire which prepared the public for the gradual adoption of caricature.\textsuperscript{141} George also suggests that the numerous anti-Hanoverian, anti-German mercenaries prints of the early 1740s might have been Jacobite productions.\textsuperscript{142}

Yet such prints have merited only a footnote in the history of the genre; the graphic response (on both sides) to the 1745 rising is accorded less than three pages in EPC1. The very chronology of the literature, and the context of the 'development' of the English print which has placed such emphasis on post-1688 'stability', marginalise Jacobitism.

To some extent, the neglect of Jacobitism by prints scholars reflects a larger neglect by historians. It is not altogether surprising that in 1944 Klingender should have dismissed Jacobitism as an 'intermittent fever' confined to 'Grub Street' hacks and 'rural backwoodsmen' and irrelevant to an 18th-century England personified by Hogarth and Defoe; Jacobitism has only relatively recently, and not without resistance, been placed within the mainstream of 18th-century history.\textsuperscript{143} The slowness with which prints scholarship assimilates historiographical revision does not augur well for a similar reappraisal of Jacobite prints.

That said, there is a sense in which the banishment of Jacobite satires to the margins of the conventional history of 18th-century English graphic satire says much about the criteria of 'significance' which have been applied to graphic political satires to date. The Jacobite cause was defeated, and, as Langlois observed of
royalist 'caricature' in the Revolutionary period, it therefore 'has the verdict of History against it. The vanquished are necessarily held to be in the wrong'.

Yet, within the context of the period studied, the 'radical' impetus was similarly frustrated, yet has long engaged the interest and sympathy of prints scholars. The difference is that it is possible to present the latter as early manifestations of later phenomena. In the interpretation of 18th-century graphic political satire,

the present exerts a teleological pressure on the past: the quest for anticipations of future outcomes privileges parts of the past and relegates countermovements to oblivion, and complex effect are traced to simple causes.

Thus a single phenomenon, 'political caricature' or 'graphic political satire' may be associated with another, 'the campaign for parliamentary reform' and 1832 and all that followed tacitly if not explicitly presented as the 'inevitable' consequence of a 'radicalism' that found its expression, or was 'reflected', in graphic satire. As far as prints are concerned, the vanquished or unsuccessful are held to be in the wrong only when the subversive potential of the medium is harnessed to ends which posterity has adjudged socially and politically regressive.

Jacobitism, still less Jacobite graphic satire, moreover, fits uneasily into the secular, materialistic and entrepreneurial oligarchy which survives, post-Klingender, as the conventional pre-1760 'context' of the development of English graphic satire (most recently in David Dabydeen's *Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain*, (1987)). At the same time, the conventional post-1760 context of a 'revival of issues' after, in Atherton's words, 'the absence of major controversies and ringing issues' in previous decades (cf. Carretta's reference to 'the relative political
tranquillity of the 1740s and 50s') similarly marginalises both the material and what it represents. 146

This is not the only way in which Jacobite graphic satire sits uneasily with the conventional account of the development of graphic political satire in 18th-century England. While sufficient material exists for study, the relative paucity of such prints, and evidence of their regulation and suppression, casts new light on the freedom of the press in post-1688 England so readily invoked as a 'factor' in the development of the genre, and calls into question the claims of Atherton and Langford that 'effective machinery' for the regulation of satiric prints did not exist at this time. 147

The treatment of anti-Jacobite prints has been coloured by belief in the necessary obsolescence of that which they oppose. These prints also place an emphasis on religion as a motivating force in society which is difficult to accommodate within the conventional account of the increasingly secular nature of both society and graphic satire. 148 Interestingly for one who categorises both the '15 and the '45 as 'popish plots', Kunzle claims that in the pictorial response, 'human curiosity [i.e., ad hominem satire] is substituted for religious passion'. 149 Can Kunzle be referring to BM 2636 The Invasion, or Perkins Triumph, which describes itself as 'a Protestant Print. Inscr'bd to all true Lovers of their Religion and Liberty', in which Prince Charles Edward holds a mask to indicate that his Declaration, in which he declared himself 'utterly averse to all persecution' is false, and in which traditional anti-Catholic images abound? Or does he mean BM 2658 The Procession, or the Pope's Nursling Riding in Triumph described by George as 'ultra-Protestant propaganda at its most extreme', with emblems of 'Popish Errors Rage and Infernal Cruelty', 'Bulls and Indulgences Fines Tortures Excommunications Death by Fire and Sword' and
the reclamation of Church lands, a theme repeated in BM 2661 Briton's Association Against the Pope's Bulls?

*****

A perusal of the literature, its emphases and omissions, suggests that graphic satire is valid and valued only as far as it expresses dissatisfaction with the status quo in Church and State (not counting Jacobite satire), or as far as it conforms to or 'anticipates' a secular, democratic future. Wardroper may exhort us to 'attend to all the voices in the Georgian dialogue, and look for them in caricatures and broadsides', but Kings, Lords and Wicked Libellers exemplifies the partial approach to the material which has seen so many of those voices, to use a word of which the author is fond, 'gagged'. 150

The 18th-century 'political cartoon' has acquired, in Wynn-Jones's words, 'the status almost of a national institution'. Small wonder, then, that political prints scholarship has seldom offered more than the chronicle of a desirable achievement. To question the claims of 18th-century political caricature and graphic political satire to the status of most outspoken critic of the age, is tantamount to questioning the desirability of that role. Thus far I have found it convenient to quote and to summarise the received wisdom concerning the iconoclastic status and subversive potential of these prints. It has become clear, however, that in this as in so many respects, the received account is far from secure.

II

Let us consider the allegedly 'subversive' nature of
the idiom of caricature. This perception of caricature owes more to Freudian theory than it does to 18th-century fact. Aside from the fact that, as argued in Chapter V, the role of caricature in 18th-century graphic political satire has been exaggerated, with many prints even of the so-called 'golden age' scarcely qualifying as 'caricatures', it should be remembered that caricature as it was adopted in England was an idiom which amused and flattered as much as it abused and subverted. Gillray's simian Thomas Paine [Plate 22] has its roots in the cognoscenti caricatures of Lady Diana Beauclerk and Lady Burlington, of Thomas Patch - who, we are told, invariably sought the consent of those he caricatured; thus,

although the desire to undermine was certainly present in the exaggeration of physical traits, it was, in most cases, tempered by the shared values of the caricaturist, subject and audience. 151

It was his abuse of this consensual tradition which would seem to account for the ambivalence with which Townshend's political caricatures were received.

If Townshend introduced an element of political partisanship and spleen into an hitherto largely consensual and domesticated idiom, there is a case to be made that political caricature retained this coterie element into the nasty 'nineties and beyond. So far from 'radicalising' graphic political satire, as has been claimed, the situation with respect to the English political caricature after c. 1780 would seem to be comparable to that described by Cuno with respect to pre-Revolutionary French portrait caricatures. If the increasing professionalisation of graphic political satire meant that prints were no longer 'the [first-hand] creations of the cognoscenti whose uncomplimentary depictions of one another provided a source of entertainment for a privileged circle', there is a sense in which, could, nonetheless, and 'paradoxically',
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function as a form of flattery. To be the subject of such mild ridicule was, after all, to receive confirmation that one had achieved an elevated position and could be 'brought down' wittily without any [...] permanent loss of authority. Such an 'attack' was therefore actually capable of reinforcing the sitter's sense of invulnerability and confirming his status within an elite group whose members exclusively enjoyed the right to mock one another.

Cuno suggests that Revolutionary France for the main part eschewed portrait caricature in the English mode because its capacity for 'inflating as well as deflating its subjects' was recognised. 152 If many of Gillray's caricatures seem far removed from 'mild ridicule', there is little to suggest that their effect was negative. Why else would figures as disparate as Wilkes and Canning be so eager to be pictorially-traduced? 153 Why else were such satires collected and preserved by their victims? In a wider sense, too, caricature could be the reverse of negative in its effects: Streicher writes that

the social criticism implied by caricature may in some cases actually not be so. Often debunking may actually improve the public image of political figures by making them more human, although this [may be offset by a] loss of prestige. 154

Coupe concurs; 'the constant repetition of a given [individual's] features establishes him as a person in our minds'; so far from the process of 'dehumanization' cited by Hunt, facial caricature humanises to the point that it may subvert the satiric process, even in those prints which depict the punishment, defeat or humiliation of the subject. 155 This is something which Carretta and others have discerned in the caricatures of George III. In the early, more hostile, prints of the first two decades of the reign, in the absence of portrait caricature, the king is 'dehumanized' as an infant or as the British Lion; the greater use of the techniques of portrait caricature, however hostile and scatological the
satire, has the reverse effect: in Taking Physick; or - The News of Shooting the King of Sweden [Plate 23] both George and his wife are risible, grotesque, but for all that, human, pathetic even. While the greater ambivalence in the satiric depiction of George III after 1789 may reflect the greater sympathy towards the monarch which historians have identified in this period, the role of that subversive idiom, caricature, in the creation of a sympathetic royal persona cannot be discounted.¹⁵⁶

Then there is the aggressive impulse, and the subversive potential, of humour, the notion of humour as a 'weapon', similarly rooted in Freudian theory. Aside from the fact that, like caricature, humour was neither a constant nor an essential component of 18th-century graphic political satire, the aggressive impulse and the subversive potential of graphic political satire have been questioned. In 'The Cartoonist's Armoury', Gombrich questions the effects of employing a humorous convention for the treatment of non-humorous subject-matter, concluding that such a treatment encourages uncritical passivity on the part of the observer, however pointed or apt the point thus made.¹⁵⁷ Coupe, who discusses this subject in greater detail, concurs:

The attribution of the old device castigat ridendo mores to the comic satirist is [...] highly questionable. As often as not we subconsciously label laughing satire as being 'for amusement only' and then sit back and enjoy it.

Those who 'harness laughter to their satirical purposes [...] run the risk of doing no more than amuse [...] and so of failing in the fundamental moral aim the theoreticians are wont to ascribe to them'. The forms of graphic satire may connive in this:

the tendency is to represent serious problems in humorous allegorical guise and to invite us to laugh at our political predicaments, thereby in a
way robbing them of their reality.

Coupe also argues that, so far from being aggressive, humour, like the shrinking of 'little Boney' [Plate 24], may be a defensive tactic, a means of 'neutralising' fear. The 'cartoonist represents that which is a source of real anxiety' - a French invasion, plebeian politicisation, et cetera - as comic. 'The conclusion advanced' - Napoleon as diminutive and impotent, an insect, - testifies to the caricaturist's underlying anxieties. The image 'may be aggressive in the sense that it reveals' or asserts the 'ugliness' or the 'littleness' of the (feared) victim,

but the unmasking is, in a manner of speaking, positive in that it demonstrates that our fears are really groundless and invites us to share not so much in the cartoonist's hostility, in his self-induced false sense of security.

In its perception of the print as the expression of the caricaturist's own emotions and perceptions, Coupe's thesis, while raising points which are not readily dismissed, perpetrates an error which is central to the appraisal of graphic satirists with respect to the political tenor of their work. The much-vilified Sayers was an exception - and an amateur; for the most part, graphic political satirists and political caricaturists were hacks, Grubeans of the visual, hired needles, in the profession of, in George Cruikshank's words, the 'washing of other people's dirty linen' and capable of preliminary sketches for two ideologically-opposed designs on the same sheet of paper.

Together with 'aggression' and 'anger', 'independence' makes up the triumvirate of qualities which Wood has claimed 'must exist in effective graphic satire', but there were few senses in which the 18th-century graphic satirist, and particularly the political caricaturist of the 'golden age' was 'independent'. The idea of an
independent critical spirit sacrificed for a pension, tacit in the discussion of Gillray's later work, misses the point; Gillray and his competitors were pensioners by profession who worked up the roughly-sketched designs of others, or invented complete designs following 'hints'.\textsuperscript{161} Outwith such direct patronage, the caricaturist was constrained by an indirect patronage, that of the print purchasers. The political print's 'dependence upon public patronage' is one of the shibboleths of the literature as the guarantor of the veracity of the print's 'reflection' of 'public opinion' and of the 'freedom' of its criticism. The reality of that dependence was that the satirists interpreted events with reference to the market. What would sell was not necessarily the caricaturist's own vision.

Any attempt to extrapolate from the material evidence of the caricaturist's political sympathies is, therefore, with one or two exceptions, insecure. That scholars have so attempted testifies to the extent to which their approach to the 18th-century political satire is informed by 20th-century perceptions of the genre. This has been recognised by at least one scholar. Donald writes of Gillray that

> the layers of irony in his prints make it impossible to discern his own opinions, although writers have tried hard to make him, at different times, a radical Whig, or, alternatively, the voice of 'the populist reaction'.\textsuperscript{162} Such efforts reflect the trend since the nineteenth century to see the cartoonist as a personality in his own right, committed to a cause or at least to a point of view, and therefore estimable. Given the conditions of eighteenth-century politics and publishing, this approach to Gillray and his contemporaries is anachronistic.\textsuperscript{163}

What of the idea that there is necessarily 'a correlation between the volume and quality of print satires and the occurrence of great social [or political] upheavals'?\textsuperscript{164} It is an idea which informs the post-1760
chronology of Press's account of 'the Georgian Political Print', with Press tabulating 'peaks' of print production (coincidentally years which saw 'radical rallying points'). Yet the correlation of print production with conditions of political conflict, and the related idea that the incidence of graphic political satire provides the historian with a barometer of such 'conflict' have not met with universal acceptance.

As far as English print production is concerned, it is less the accuracy in real terms of this association than the way in which it has informed the limited chronology of prints scholarship that is at issue. Prints scholarship has consistently marginalised material relating to such significant periods of conflict as the decades 1640-60 and 1680-90, and to such particular 'points of confrontation' as the Sacheverell crisis of 1710 and, over a longer period, the Jacobite challenge, and while the years 1831-32 represent one of Press's 'peaks', the conventional truncation of accounts at any point between 1832 and 1840 is question-begging with respect to the 'conflictfulness' of the 19th century; one might be forgiven for concluding that it was the 19th, and not, as has so often been the implication of historical scholarship, the 18th century in which nothing of moment or significance occurred.

The correlation of graphic satire and conditions of 'conflict' is at best simplistic, and must be set against the idea that it was in the absence of conflict post-1688 that English graphic political satire 'developed'; it has been possible for prints scholarship to subscribe to both theories only by the selective approach to the period and the material outlined above.

This is not the only sense in which the chronology of prints scholarship has some bearing on the thesis of the print as potentially 'radical' or 'subversive'. If those scholars who used the term 'popular' to describe the
comparatively expensive political caricatures and graphic political satire of the period ignored the genuinely popular, the literature reveals a similar neglect of incontrovertably 'radical' images, as opposed to the Gillrays and Rowlandsons cited and illustrated in this context.

The period 1830-50 offers much in the way of such images, often products of the unstamped illegal press. To claim, as does Wood, that 'by the mid-nineteenth century the sting had gone out of the tail of English print satire' is to ignore the work of, for example, Charles Jameson Grant, whose woodcut series The Political Drama (Plate 251), in all one hundred and thirty-one prints, represents a 'sustained effort' which one would have thought it impossible for scholars to ignore. George describes Grant's work as 'crude, primitive, forcible, [...] Radical - proletarian, anti-Tory, anti-Whig, anti-clerical, indictments of the social order and highly disrespectful to monarchy' and suggests that they mark a departure from the basic loyalty of the cheap pro-Reform broadsides.

The relative neglect of these and similar prints is in no small part due to the 1832 cut-off point of political prints scholarship, in this context exacerbated by the implicit association of the genre with 'the (note the singular) campaign for Parliamentary Reform'. George, for example, presents the 1831-32 agitation as 'a climax in cartoon history, reflecting the sustained pressure of popular opinion, and yielding to anti-climax after the passing of the Bill'.

More importantly, the work of Jameson and others in the same vein is difficult to reconcile with the decline into decorum and good-humoured comment which the linear model requires, and just as the survival of another idiom - the emblematic - which conflicted with the predetermined line of graphic satire's 'development' could be downplayed by declaring the idiom 'obsolete' or 'anachronistic', so
with these far from good-humoured or respectable political commentaries. Thus George can describe the imagery of Grant's prints as 'old-fashioned', while Godfrey's account places him firmly outwith the main line of 'development', establishing him as an interesting anachronism:

One man at least fought against this move into respectability; the obscure and bad-tempered Charles Jameson Grant. A violent Radical, with Anarchist sympathies, he launched himself at the throat of the Establishment first with etchings, then with lithographs and with the broadsides of the Political Drama, crude cheap woodcuts which have all the subtlety of smashed window panes. He reserved special hatred for the clergy and the newly formed Metropolitan Police. But Grant was out of time and out of place, and he gradually faded from view [my emphasis].

English Caricature clings to the securities of the linear model, with a Golden Age followed by 'Regency, Radicals and Reform' ('the climactic years of the old style') followed by 19th-century decorum.

Yet the neglect of genuinely 'radical' prints cannot be explained entirely in terms of adherence to the conventional chronology. If, as both George and, in a more recent and detailed study, Patricia Anderson have suggested, there was little recourse to the printed image as the vehicle for radical sentiments much before 1832, the period 1800-1832 saw many relevant 'street papers, woodcut broadsides and cheap illustrated pamphlets'. In 1830, threepence could buy Richard Carlile's Life and History of Swing the Kent Rick-Burner, its title page adorned with an emotive woodcut image of a 'grossly bloated landowner' on horseback looming over a ragged labourer, his dying wife and five weeping children. Pictorial comment on social and constitutional inequalities could come still cheaper in broadsheet format; Anderson cites, as subjects thus covered, the reform of rotten boroughs, the commemoration of the Cato Street conspiracy, and the 'blood-stained crew at
Peterloo'.

Anderson writes that such images 'have been well-documented and copiously-reproduced elsewhere', but as far as political prints scholarship has been concerned, 'Peterloo' has meant a coloured George Cruikshank.\textsuperscript{173} The 1832 cut-off point reflects the limited focus of prints scholarship in more ways than one. The idea of a 'decline' or shift in the temper of 'the prints' underlines the extent to which accounts have been oriented towards the expensive productions of the London printshops.\textsuperscript{174} Thus A.E. Popham, in the preface to the final volume of the \textit{Catalogue: 1832}

marks not only the end of an historical era but also the virtual end of the type of political caricature which has formed the bulk of the material catalogued in this and the preceding volumes.\textsuperscript{175}

Similarly Godfrey: 'caricatures dealing with the Reform Bill represent the last flourish of the traditional hand-coloured etching, soon to become obsolete'.\textsuperscript{176}

If the equally traditional cheap woodcut was more tenacious, no matter. Not only are woodcuts seldom mentioned in an 18th-century context; their survival as a medium for radical political satire and comment into the second half of the 19th-century has merited little more than a footnote in the literature. The glib synonymity of 'crude', 'cheap' and 'woodcut' notable in descriptions of \textit{The Political Drama} underlines the aesthetic elitism which has informed the study of that 'popular' genre, the 'political cartoon', while the residual notion that images in formats other than the single-sheet print do not 'count' militates against the study of Chartist and similar newspapers, another source for the study of radical images.\textsuperscript{177}

The failure of prints scholars to address the genuine article is testimony to the ovine nature of political prints scholarship. Where George has not led, catalogued
and described, none will venture.

Turning from this material to the political caricature and graphic political satire which has been the focus of study, the literature offers little in the way of evidence to support the idea that these prints were 'radical' or 'subversive' either in intention or effect. Indeed, rather as assertions as to the 'popular' nature of these prints are often qualified at a later point in the text, so with assertions as to their 'radical' nature. Thus Philippe, having defined the political print as 'essentially in opposition, essentially aligned with the people's cause', writes that in many periods, including that with which we are concerned, the print was a 'weapon for those in power':

> on the whole it reflected loyalty and submission to the constitutional powers. The scope of its criticism was thus narrow, and its bite never strong enough to militate for the overthrow or upset of the social hierarchy. 178

Roots observes that 'the vast bulk' of the prints reproduced in the Chadwyck-Healey volumes,

> even [...] the most powerful [...] offer not an onslaught on 'the system' itself but upon (often very specific and somewhat trivial) abuses and abusers of its institutions (the constitution, the monarchy, the church, et cetera) precisely because they were abuses of what was generally acceptable. 179

It is this fundamental conservatism which is deprecated by Wood:

> even in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the so-called 'golden age' of print satire in England, there is a strong sense in which some political, and most of the social satires, were more an affirmation [...] than a criticism of the faults and failings of a nation. 180
As far as 'democratization' is concerned, Brewer's analysis of the representation of 'popular politics' between 1750 and the 1790s leaves little room for explaining away the anti-radical satires of the French Revolutionary period as aberrations born of a 'failure of nerve' or of censorship; in portraying plebeian politicisation as alternately risible and menacing, the prints of this period differ little from those of earlier decades.\textsuperscript{181}

The conservative tenor of 18th-century graphic political satire and political caricature as it has been studied is less surprising, or 'paradoxical' as Porter puts it, when it is considered that all the evidence points to a very limited circulation for such material. Internal evidence alone suggests that far from being conceived as, or having the potential to act as, agents of 'democratization', the prints were designed to sell to the already informed and politicised, less to persuade than to confirm existing views. They make few concessions in the way of broad contextual explanations, but rather presuppose a degree of political literacy and up-to-date knowledge of affairs [Plate 26].\textsuperscript{182}

The rhetorical 'failings' of the prints, in terms of subjects covered and subjects omitted, make sense if we accept that what we see is a Westminster-oriented idiom; politics as viewed from the perspective of insiders. If, in the place of a graphic indictment of the system for Parliamentary representation, we find a print such as The Twin Stars - Castor and Pollux [Plate 27] in which the concurrent Members for Bridport, Dorset, who, in Hill's words, 'cannot be found to have distinguished themselves above and beyond their generosity of proportion and their shared constituency', are cast as the inseparable brothers of Greek mythology; if, as Dickinson notes, the prints consistently neglect or downplay the role of
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political organisations between 1760-1832, focussing instead on the polarities, visual and ideological, of Fox and Pitt [Plate 26]; if, as Brewer has noted, the radical threat is so often personified by Charles James Fox [Plate 28], is this not suggestive of a genre geared towards the subjects of the prints, and their peers?\textsuperscript{183}

In this context it is appropriate to touch upon the question of the sheer volume of political caricature and graphic political satire which has survived, particularly for the years 1780-1820. If, as has been suggested, the point of political caricature was to shame its victims into good behaviour, then the very proliferation of political caricatures which has allowed the period to be cited as the genre's 'golden age' might fairly be interpreted as evidence of failure.\textsuperscript{184} Charles James Fox's was a graphic career spanning almost forty years, in which his character and principles were exposed and traduced, but if there is evidence to suggest that one or two such prints were resented, there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that fear of graphic reproach or exposure prompted Fox to modify his behaviour or his rhetoric at any point.\textsuperscript{185}

Yet to interpret the proliferation of political caricature as evidence of the failure of the genre fails to explain that proliferation, in particular the increase in the production of such prints over the course of the century. The 'Golden Age of Political Caricature' is, however, explicable if we see the trade as Westminster-oriented, licensed satire, licensed in terms of the patronage of the genre by its victims and their peers.

In his Chadwyck-Healey essay, Brewer accounts for the emphases and omissions of graphic political satire in terms of such patronage; certain subjects, notably the meanness of the king and queen, and 'satires in the Whig oppositionist tradition that lauded the Englishman's
rights' persist throughout the Revolutionary period because there was a market for satire in this vein among 'the genteel opponents of Pitt'; 'natural rights radicalism' was a different matter. Similarly, Thomas accounts for the body of prints critical of the government's stance toward the American colonies in terms of a market 'sufficient to sustain' their production.

The precise extent to which the emphases and omissions of graphic political satire and political caricature in the 18th century were 'market-led' will only become clear when the direct and indirect patronage, the consumption and instigation of prints, are considered worthy of research. If, as noted in the previous chapter, our picture of the consumption of, and the limits of exposure to, political prints is woefully inadequate, our knowledge of 'the patronage and business ties between politicians, paymasters and printmakers' is no more secure. The sponsorship and instigation of prints is at no point explored in its own right in _EPC_, although George does offer several instances of such patronage in the course of her narrative [Plate 29]. In this as in much else, subsequent accounts have compounded George's omission. As with circulation figures, scholars have offered more in the way of admissions of ignorance than they have hard evidence: 'evidence on the sponsorship and motivation of most individual cartoons has yet to be discovered [...] Very little is known [...] about how far there was political sponsorship [of prints] by either the government or its critics'.

To view graphic political satire and in particular political caricature as essentially Westminster-oriented genres explains much about the material which is inconsistent with the 'radical' thesis. To date, however, the thesis which would have the political print function, however indirectly, as an agent
of 'democratization' has depended on the idea that the print was a 'mass' medium, which addressed a 'popular' audience; that is to say, it has rested on assumptions concerning the audience for the print which, it was suggested in the previous chapter, are largely unsubstantiated and far from secure.

Thus we read that 'cartoons defending the oligarchy are usually scarce because the appeal of the political cartoon is generally to the masses, and the masses do not receive pro-government propaganda gracefully' [my emphasis]. Press's influential thesis of 'democratization' rests entirely on the author's perception of the print as a 'mass media outlet'. More recently, Lester Olson's account of the use of pictorial rhetoric in the self-definition of colonial America and in the English response, founders on the author's claim, never substantiated, that in England the 'mass-produced' political print enjoyed a wide exposure.

Central to the perception of the material as potentially subversive is the belief in its ability to communicate with the illiterate or semi-literate and thus reach a larger audience than the written word; the print's great advantage in the process of 'democratization', according to Press. The literature reveals a continuing faith in 'the radicalism of the image'. We read that 'the rolling-press (for etchings) was potentially a more dangerous weapon than the press which produced the printed word'. Langford writes that recourse to the pictorial not only allowed the articulation of ideas and sentiments which it would have been injudicious to express in words, but enjoyed 'the added advantage' that the message would be 'obvious to a mean and illiterate audience'.

The problematic nature of such claims has already been discussed. What is worth repeating in this context is the extent to which exposure to such prints appears to
have been economically- and above all geographically-determined. Brewer asks

what was the popular reaction to these prints? Did the poorer members of society see cartoons portraying the common people and politics in the same way as the affluent men who patronised the printshops?

when what is at issue is the extent to which 'the poorer members of society' saw such material at all.198

The proliferation of graphic political satire and political caricature after c.1780 must be seen in perspective. Whether immediately intelligible or less than democratic in their visual codes, the subversive potential of such prints was limited by the small print runs and by their relatively high cost.

The fact that political caricatures were not subject to the stamp duties imposed upon newspapers and pamphlets suggests that there was little need to control exposure to this material by economic censorship beyond that which already limited the market for such prints. In 1795, when the rising price of bread prompted a demonstration as George III drove to the opening of Parliament, Gillray's reinterpretation of the scene (Plate 281) would have cost approximately two shillings; a pound of bread, threepence. The very accounts which place most emphasis on the economic hardship which whetted 'demands for political reform' in this period are those which prove most shy of the economic realities of the 'golden age of political caricature'.199 To date, the only evidence for popular politicisation by political caricature outwith direct purchase of prints remains that problematic and overworked institution, the printshop window.200

A proper perspective on the insignificance of the political caricature as a medium relative to other products of the 18th-century political press is provided by a comparison of the respective circulation figures of print and newspaper (insofar as we have representative
figures for the former). It has been suggested that even after 1760, the average print run of a political print would have been between 500 and 1,500; a fraction of the print run of a London newspaper pre-1750. As far as the provinces are concerned, all the evidence suggests that graphic political satires are unlikely to have impinged upon perceptions of politics, while so far from endorsing the 'emotional, transformative and [...] subversive' potential of the pictorial, those in the business of plebeian politicisation placed their faith in the printing and distribution of cheap copies of The Rights of Man.

Given the problems entailed in claiming an influence and a significance for the political print when the evidence is less than satisfactory, it is not surprising that many accounts have sought refuge in inspecificity when it comes to such terms as 'public opinion', 'the public' et cetera. Thus we read that the 18th-century English political print is evidence of the coming-of-age of 'public opinion'; the print 'seemed to be participating in the making of policies by serving as a vehicle for the expression and formation of public opinion itself' and 'English political prints at this time were aimed at influencing the circles (i.e., public opinion) that determined, or thought they could determine, future policies'. Such pronouncements often conspire in the promotion of the 'radical' thesis; thus Patten: 'popular prints [sic] in general favoured those out of power', 'satire is a weapon of the dispossessed'. Rosemary Baker's variant on this - the late 18th-century political print 'tended to reflect the point of view of those out of power' - is meaningless in its inspecificity.

'Tended' and 'reflect', favourites in George's vocabulary, are usefully vague; 'the point of view', on the other hand, is disturbingly singular, implying a
consistent and homogeneous ideology on the part of 'those out of power', another usefully undelimitative term, encompassing, potentially, Foxite Whigs, frustrated would-be placemen and unenfranchised day-labourers.

When it comes to evaluating the contemporary significance and influence of this material in terms of hard evidence, most accounts have offered some variation on George's impressive-sounding and indeterminate verdict that prints both 'reflected' and 'shaped' 'public opinion'. Thus Atherton; 'prints reflected as well as affected public opinion; to distinguish clearly the influence of each factor is not possible'; 'the matter of intent in their creation is difficult now to ascertain'. Hunt opts for a more active role; 'caricatures did more than convey information [...] they actively shaped views of events and personalities'; unfortunately, Hunt's account is more concerned with Freudian 'family romance' and 'gender' than it is with the mechanics of such opinion-formation. Hunt is still more evasive in 'Engraving the Republic'; 'the political effects of the prints were more indirect and oblique'. Hunt opts for the usefully non-committal 'shapers and reflectors'; prints played a part in 'the subtle process of shaping and expressing political attitudes'; a process so subtle that it has defied analysis in the thirty and more years since George first wrote of prints in these terms.

The literature is in fact riddled with evasion when it comes to evaluating the part played by prints in opinion-formation. Thus Dolmetsch, on the role of prints in the American Rebellion: 'How effective this pictorial propaganda was during the Revolutionary period is difficult to define'. Thomas considers prints to have been vehicles for the expression of 'opposition' opinion 'but the precise significance of their role is not susceptible of any distinctive evaluation'. Langford
writes of 'the general impracticability of weighing the precise effect of polemic on public opinion' and considers that 'the dependence of graphic satire on the press makes it particularly difficult to assess its relative impact and importance'. 211

Reviewing the Chadwyck-Healey volumes, Porter refers to the scepticism of 'latter-day Namierites' with respect to the question of 'precisely how politics out of doors engaged with "high politics". 212 As far as political prints are concerned, I would suggest that scepticism respecting these prints as phenomena of something called 'public opinion' is less a matter of historiographical allegiance than of recognition of the extent to which the 18th-century graphic political satire and political caricature have been 'made to assume roles unsupported by evidence presently available'. 213

Porter suggests that to question the significance or the role of prints 'as engines of opinion-formation' is to encourage the historian to marginalise this material. Arguably, however, it is the failure on the part of those who have addressed the prints to delimit both the market for and the limits of popular exposure to, these prints, the failure to give a convincing account of the mechanics of politicisation-by-prints, which has allowed the material to be marginalised by the historian, who wants answers respecting such basic aspects of the material before employing it alongside less problematic evidence. The historian's reappraisal of this material will depend upon prints scholarship replacing evasion with evidence.

If it is to be of more than marginal value political prints scholarship must deal in realities and not myths. For as long as the 18th-century political print is celebrated as an icon of 'the struggle for democracy in Britain' its mythic status is assured. Only its status as historical evidence will be insecure.
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Chapter X: No laughing matter: political prints and humour

In George III, Carretta includes a quotation from the journal The Con-Test (no. 31, 18 June 1757), in which the London printshops are described as swarming with 'productions both grave and comic'.\(^1\) Few studies of 17th- and 18th-century political graphics, however, have accorded the 'grave' parity of representation with the 'comic'. On the contrary; with few exceptions, the available literature has promoted the idea that humour is an essential, and in some accounts an inherent, component of the political print, 'political caricature' or graphic political satire. Ashbee, for example, concludes his list of qualities 'essential' to the 'good' or 'successful' caricature (by which is meant 'political print') with a triumphant 'and always humour', while according to Philippe, as a 'mass medium', the print 'will always favour satire and caricature over plain narrative'.\(^2\)

The modern usage of 'cartoon' - with its humorous connotations - as a descriptive term for political prints of all kinds is partly to blame for this, as are the concentration on caricature as an idiom and the predisposition of most studies to emphasise political 'caricatures' of the 1780-1820 period, in which humour is more prominent. Whatever its origins, a glance at the secondary literature reveals the extent to which the concept of humour has coloured perceptions of the function of the political print.

The idea that political prints - as distinct from the more obviously and irrefutably 'comic' idioms of 'social' caricatures, 'drolls' and the like - were created solely for amusement and entertainment is widespread. Atherton writes of political prints as having been produced 'primarily for amusement', and this is a perception of political graphics to which even Roots succumbs in his
History Today review article, concluding, from the material as presented in the Chadwyck-Healey volumes; 'above all, they seem to be there to entertain' and, again, that 'the sole function of the prints was to influence and [sic] amuse, and of the two functions [!] the second, entertainment, was more significant.' That English Caricature, 1620 to the Present should open with an admonishment to this effect:

it must be remembered, before the subject is harnessed, footnoted and led off to the stables of art history, that its intention is often merely to amuse, to deflate the pretentious, or expose a plump backside for a coarse laugh suggests that this is a perception of the political print that will be eradicated, if at all, only with difficulty. If humour is perceived as an essential or desirable quality, and amusement as the purpose, of the print, it is not surprising to find its presence or absence being taken as a measure of the 'development' of 'the political cartoon' or graphic political satire. In this, as in so many other instances, EPC1 proves the seminal text. EPC1 begins by stating that 'it is a characteristic of [...] early English prints that the comic is rare'; the shift from a didactic and emblematic idiom to one 'intended (usually) to amuse' is subsequently celebrated. Langford similarly associates 'development' in the idiom during the 1740s with what he discerns as a comparatively new 'concern with the comic potential of a particular episode or situation'. A similar association of 'development' with 'greater humour' is made by, among others, Baker (in a paraphrase of George), by Carretta in George III, and by Mahood, in whose account it becomes the eighteenth-century achievement;

In the growing prosperity of eighteenth-century Britain, and relative amity between king and parliament, the British political print began to laugh.'
In fairness to George, it should be noted that, although hers is the most frequently paraphrased account, it is not the first instance of humour being used as the measure of 'development'. As early as 1813, J.P. Malcolm presents humour as the element by which the graphic satire of an age already being presented as golden had been perfected:

It is a positive fact that a degree of levity, and mirth-exciting fancy plays in caricatures for the last twenty years, which merely dawned in the days of Hogarth, who forces a smile, while the moderns excite hearty laughter.

The same yardstick was subsequently used by Thackeray to measure the 'decline' of the genre, the hearty 'roar' being contrasted with the decorous smile of 1840:

You never hear any laughing at H.B.; his pictures are a great deal too genteel for that - polite points of wit which [...] cause one to smile in a quiet, gentlemanlike way."

The contribution made by humour to the force of political satire and criticism has not gone unquestioned; the previous chapter has queried the influential shibboleth of humour as 'aggression' and 'subversion' which has informed much that has been written on graphic political satire. Asserting the centrality of humour to the political print leaves other questions to be answered which the corpus has proved by and large reluctant even to pose.

For a start, it is notable that, notwithstanding the rambles into 'the Early Comic and Grotesque in art' with which many accounts of graphic satire are prefaced, most of the works in the bibliography prove evasive and inspecific when it comes to defining the concept of humour itself. When they are not left unsupported, assertions as to the 'comic' nature of graphic satire too often rest on theorising that is digressive or
anachronistic. Hofmann is one of the few to express scepticism about both the rigour and the relevance of such theoretical discussion, even when restricted to contemporary theories of humour and the comic; 'as soon as one begins to deal with abstract terms, with ideas that cannot be defined objectively one becomes involved in a maze of speculations' which frequently prove to have little to do with the primary evidence - the prints themselves. 10

The degree of certainty with which a print may be described as intentionally or primarily 'comic' is open to question, and never more so than in the case of those 'early' woodcuts of the kind appended to pamphlets and newsheets and frequently re-used, not always in the same context. [Plate 1] The limited nature of much of this imagery makes gauging both the intentions of the printer (creator of the whole, in his judicious combination of individual blocks, as opposed to the original artist of the pictorial block) and the effect of the image on its (still ill-defined) audience, particularly difficult. It may or may not be possible to determine the comic nature of certain images and combinations of images; closer attention to these early prints, and above all to their verbal context, than scholars have so far cared to give, is necessary before assertions as to the humour - or humourlessness - of these prints can be made with any certainty.

It is all very well for Wood to pronounce that early 18th-century quasi-emblematic political satires 'exploited their didactic inheritance to hilarious effect'; without more specific research into what might be called the 'reading structures' of - in particular - pre-caricatural prints, and without information regarding their reception by contemporaries, pronouncements as to their humour or humourlessness cannot be other than speculative. 11 Hofmann, for one, urges caution;
From the historical point of view the comic element in a caricature is frequently a residue, which remains [after] the original symbolic content has disappeared. In other words we laugh at what we do not understand.  

The same point is made by Gombrich and Kris - 'who knows how often [...] strange meanings lie hidden in bygone works of art which simply appear comic to us?' - and by Atherton, (although the latter inclines to accept without question that humour is necessarily present); many prints of the period 1727-63 which 'today seem laughable, perhaps childish, sometimes indecent and often unintelligible [...] meant something [...] to contemporaries, who delighted in their imagery and humour.'  

Conversely, an image may have been perceived as comic by contemporaries the humour of which escapes the modern eye. It is pertinent to query the place of objective certainty in categorising something as subjective as humour. Atherton's remark 'sometimes indecent' is a reminder that few commentators have dealt in other than a patronising or censorious fashion with the strong vein of scatology that is present in satirical prints. The contemporary humour - in the broadest sense of that word - of which it is a manifestation, is itself clearly a source of unease for some scholars.  

Nor should it be assumed that where humour is intentional it is necessarily central to a print. Even in those prints in which humour is an identifiable component, amusement or entertainment may be only one function among many, and not necessarily the most significant. As Hofmann has written, 'great' political satires, or as he chooses to call them, 'caricatures', pass sentence of death, and their moral seriousness is not content with simply making their subjects ridiculous. In Hogarth, Goya, Daumier, there is an intensity in the exposure and unmasking that only a fool could find comic.
I dissent only from Hofmann's restriction of 'moral seriousness' to a handful of canonically-enshrined 'great' graphic satirists.

Few studies, however, have elected to address these and similar questions other than in passing, with most proffering a humour-based account of the 'development' graphic political satire.

It can be argued that the notion of humour as a defining characteristic of the political print has further restricted research in political graphics. Like the notion of graphic satire-as-subversion, it has conspired to keep what is written regarding this material at an over-general level, with both aesthetic and historical specificity playing second fiddle to the blithe relativism of 'humour down the ages';

Big noses, bulbous bottoms, politicians and foreigners - that is what made the English laugh in 1620 and very little has changed since. The Victoria and Albert Museum's exhibition [...] chronicles this national delight. [my emphasis] 16

(Plate 2)

The priority which humour has been accorded to date has meant that even in studies ostensibly specific in subject-matter and/or chronology, such as Klingender's Hogarth, a proportion of space that would be better spent in addressing some of the unresolved problems posed by the material is liable to taken up by a search for comic prototypes in primitive, ancient, medieval and Renaissance art, prior to the emergence of caricature as a distinct artform. This despite the fact that such digressions seldom prove of assistance when it comes to informed discussion and intelligent evaluation of the later political prints, not least when, as is frequently the case, the putative examples illustrated and cited differ in media; ranging from misericords to the Greek stage. 17
Such digressions are more than a minor irritation; they are symptomatic of the grip in which the preoccupation with humour continues to hold research. For as long as an emphasis on humour in political prints encourages such eclecticism under the guise of a search for comic prototypes, the same fundamentally speculative ground is destined to be retrodden.

More serious is the part that this perceived association has played in the continued neglect and downgrading of most 'early', and all 'emblematic', imagery. It is significant that Baudelaire's sorting of the 'timeless' sheep from the 'topical' goats of graphic political satire took place in a work entitled An Essay on Laughter; the preoccupation with humour, when the presence or absence of that quality is used as the measure both of the perceived 'success' of a print and of the stage of 'development' reached by graphic satire in general, underpins the inappropriately judgemental appraisal of periods and prints which this thesis argues is one of the defining characteristics of writing on the subject to date. Thus Godfrey; before the 1770s, political prints

were often long on meaning but short on humour [...] often elaborately engraved, they tend to be earnest and humourless, intended to inflame opinion, and not to amuse.

Unduly influenced by the didacticism of the emblem book, they show 'little interest in idiosyncrasies of personal appearance [i.e. they are not caricatures] and even less in humour'.\textsuperscript{18} Seventeenth-century anti-Catholic prints, satirical and non-satirical, are held at arms' length by the epithet 'grim', used by both Godfrey and Mahood.\textsuperscript{19} Referring to the same prints, Lucie-Smith's qualification is significant; 'for a modern audience such images have no recognisable connexion with humour.'\textsuperscript{20}
Absence of humour is the justification for this sweeping dismissal of pre-18th-century political graphics; 'among the iron-clad army officers who in 1647 challenged the divine right of kings, there was little taste for humour', only for the 'heavily burdened emblematic'. 21 Samuel Ward's seminal image, the Double Deliverance, (Plate 3) is grudgingly conceded to be of some historical importance, 'as one of the first major English satires, or polemical prints', but, like too many of its successors, 'it has the air of a sermon'. 22

Statements of this kind exemplify the way in which, as well as encouraging unjustifiably pejorative evaluations of non-humorous images, the emphasis upon humour has contributed to the divide between pre- and post-18th-century prints and more particularly between pre-and post-caricature which has been so pernicious for the study of political graphics. With so many accounts presenting humour in political prints as the achievement of the 'Golden Age', emphasis on humour has tended to reinforce the linear, progressivist 'Golden Age' model. If humour is the measure of 'development', and if it is perceived as a prerequisite to the 'full flowering' of the idiom, it follows that prints which fall short of this measure are at best patronised as 'undeveloped' precursors of later prints, at worst dismissed altogether. In this way the primacy accorded humour has encouraged the neglect of prints produced before 1760-1770, with the exception of the work Hogarth and Townshend; the prevalence of this perception means that Press's dismissal of pre-c.1780 prints as 'dull' is not only permissible but unexceptionable. 23

Conversely, there is a sense in which, just as the use of the modern term 'cartoon' with regard to earlier prints encourages a spurious relativism, exemplified by generalisation of the 'big bottoms, bulbous noses' kind, so the entrenched perception of the idiom as 'comic' or 'humorous' may have contributed to their prolonged
neglect by the historian by absolving him from the need to take them seriously.

In addition to the anachronistic aesthetic criteria identified in Chapter VII, the frequently-asserted association of humour with brevity and spontaneity connects the primacy accorded humour in so many studies with the rejection or misunderstanding by so many scholars of other qualities characteristic of many prints of the 17th and 18th centuries. Pictorial elaboration and textual elucidation, both particularly characteristic of early and emblematic prints, and consistently criticised on aesthetic grounds, are as consistently presented as hampering 'the joke'.

The humour-based account of the 'progress' of English graphic political satire which claims the existence of a great divide between 17th- and later 18th-century prints, is not only to be lamented in that it encourages the neglect of the earlier period; it is inexcusable because inaccurate. It fails to acknowledge and to do justice to the many 'early' prints - those of the 1640s in particular - in which humour is detectable, humour which appears to be intentional. The risk of modern misjudgement in this respect has been touched upon, and ought not to be underestimated, but, notwithstanding the dangers of misinterpretation, a study of these prints suggests that not only are many prints of the period 1640-60 - i.e., those most consistently neglected - and thereafter, 'humorous', but that they represent an early use of tactics which, when employed in later prints, are acknowledged to be so. (Plates 4 - 7) Our understanding and appreciation of those tactics is, as a consequence, impoverished. Given that many of the relevant images are of impeccable visual simplicity (if that criterion is being used), the prolonged neglect of these early examples of particular satirical tactics is explicable.
only as part of the general neglect and downgrading of the period which is evident in the literature.

With regard to the period c.1640 - c.1830 as a whole, it must be stressed that humour is a quality necessarily absent in political imagery of the didactic and propagandist kind, nor is it an invariable ingredient of political satires. (Plates 8 - 10) Preoccupation with humour may thus be identified as another of the aspects of the study of prints to date which can be said to have retarded the study of non-humorous and non-satirical political graphics. We will continue to misread the 'messages' of such prints if we persist in looking for humour, and deprecating its absence. The study of the qualities intrinsic to prints like The Double Deliverance or Eikon Basilike has yet to be undertaken. If, as more than one study has noted, albeit in criticism, such prints appear designed to perform as 'sermons', should they not be analysed and appreciated as such?

The failure of print studies to date to do so is rooted in their failure to discriminate between different types of imagery as much as it is the result of a preoccupation with the comic; the persistence of so many studies in treating, as an homogeneous genre, under the loaded blanket descriptive terms of 'caricature' or 'cartoon', prints whose shared characteristics are often no more than those of date and medium. This is something which will be addressed in Part II.
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Chapter XI: Through the looking-glass; political prints as historical evidence

To view history through the eyes of cartoonists is [...] both a puzzling and an illuminating experience.

Michael Wynn-Jones, *A Cartoon History of Britain*);

[Those who] seek to re-present the face of an era through its own devices must scrutinize [...] assumptions, formulated and inherited from the self-promoting entusiasms of the Reformation itself. And as historians turn more and more to visual evidence to sustain their observations of social and ideological change, the extent to which images can serve to validate the analysis of historical change merits more urgent scrutiny.

Peter Parshall, 'The Luther Quincentenary: Prints as Illustrations of History'

Cartoons are memorable [...] a good way of learning history.

Kenneth Baker 3

The reappraisal and rehabilitation of political prints as primary historical evidence predicted by Pat Rogers in 1974 has been at best perfunctory. The Chadwyck-Healey series was promoted and appraised in these terms, but proved a poor advocate for either the integration of political prints into 'mainstream' historical analysis or for the study of such material in its own right. The place of the political print and of related images in other media (for which see Chapter XII) in historical study remains largely confined to the decorative (sleeve illustration) or the illustrative (scene-setting plates).

At least one reviewer of the series, however, was concerned lest rehabilitation be taken too far:

The historian must beware of the temptation when approaching them to go from the view that such prints have been unduly neglected to believing that they have more to tell us than they do have, or that what they tell us can only be told by them, which seems hardly true of even the subtlest and most graphic.
Ivan Roots concluded from the series that the auxiliary status of political prints as historical evidence reflected their rhetorical limitations: prints reinforce rather than challenge the received picture of the period. This may come as a disappointment to anyone who imagined that this 'unduly neglected source' would somehow turn upside down our ideas about [the period]. But is it really surprising that it does not? The issues [of the period c.1640-1832] could hardly be convincingly presented in graphic terms, even when reinforced by extensive prose and verse.4

In this, Roots was merely echoing the views of, among other contributors to the series, Miller, Dickinson and Langford.5

Yet prints literature does not lack justifications for the study of political prints, above all for the study of political prints by the historian; that is, assertions which bear upon the status as historical evidence of the political print and its claims to the attention of the scholar of 17th- and 18th-century politics and society. It is these - and their implications - which this chapter will consider.

*****

To an extent, the perceived value of the political print to the historian derives from the perceived contemporary function of the prints.

For many, the historical 'significance' of the political print, political caricature or graphic political satire has resided in its 'popular' status. The perception of graphic political satire as a 'popular' or 'mass' art-form provided the basis for, for example, F.D. Klingender's Hogarth and English Caricature (1940) and, more recently, informed David Solkin's references to
such prints in his study of the discourse of painting in Wilkesite London. It is a perception of the material the insecure nature of which has long since been identified ('the logic of Atherton's case is that anything widely-circulated must be revelatory. The [...] difficulty is that we know next to nothing about circulation figures - Atherton scrapes together a few vaguish paragraphs') but which, as Chapter VIII attempted to show, has survived in the absence of any attempt to quantify or otherwise delimit the audience and/or market for political prints.

Thus, in the Chadwyck-Healey series, P.D.G. Thomas could refer to the political print as 'a form of popular propaganda much neglected by students of eighteenth-century Britain'. More recently, Lester Olson has approached the prints as a means of studying the 'underlying beliefs of a society' as articulated by and for a semi-literate culture; Olson's study is a self-conscious corrective to the logocentrism of previous accounts of the rhetoric of the Rebellion, which, confined to written sources have ignored the rhetorical vehicles available to 'ordinary people'. To Olson, the significance of political prints lies in the fact that they were produced in 'large numbers', were widely-dispersed and accessible to the semi-literate and illiterate and, as such, 'the single most influential vehicle for the image makers to express their beliefs about the American colonies in the revolutionary era'. Lynn Hunt and Rolf Reichardt, among others, have approached French prints of the Revolutionary period from the same perspective.

The idea that political prints carried political information and comment to 'the man in the street' or 'the common man' informs the perception of political prints as agents of popular politicization and thus, ultimately, of 'democratization'. This is a perception
of the contemporary function - and, subsequently, the
historical significance - of political prints which is
central to, for example, John Wardroper's account of
prints of the decades 1760-1837, *Kings, Lords and Wicked
Libellers*: sanctioned by George in *EPC*, it finds its most
tendentious expression in Press's 'The Georgian Political
Print and Democratic Institutions'. I have argued
that, like the notion of a 'popular' or 'mass' audience
for this material in which it is to some extent rooted,
this perception of political prints is untenable with
respect to the types of print which have hitherto
commanded the attention of scholars, and I have attempted
to demonstrate the extent to which, in the absence of
hard evidence, it depends on the evasion of difficult
questions.

The same might also be said of the perception of
political prints as expressions of 'public opinion' -
another justification for their study. In *EPC*, George
asserts that 'their great interest is that in the main
they reflect opinion' and the Chadwyck-Healey series does
not, in the main, depart from this view of the
material. Thomas, for example, can write that the fact
that they were 'in the main' 'commercial ventures' 'is a
prima facie reason for regarding them as barometers of
public opinion, or at least a segment of it'. The same
association had been made thirteen years earlier by
Wardroper; the commercial nature of the genre determined
that, in their interpretations of events, graphic
satirists and caricaturists

had to look at a body of opinion. It is for
this reason that caricatures are one of the most
sensitive as well as much the liveliest guides
to the many-sided truth of past times.

Rogers rightly deprecated the vacuity of Atherton's
statement, itself derived from George, that the 'prints
reflected as well as affected public opinion': hard
answers to the necessary question, 'whose opinion', and precise accounts as to how the prints effected this role have been conspicuous by their absence, those who have subscribed to George's characterisation of the prints as 'reflectors' and 'shapers' of 'public opinion' having sought refuge in non-committal paraphrase.\textsuperscript{16}

As Rogers notes, by itself, 'the graphic evidence' tells us little if anything 'about the public reception of political ideas'.\textsuperscript{17} In the absence of any attempt to investigate the patronage and instigation, the dissemination and consumption, of political prints, and in the absence of any attempt to delimit 'public opinion', the idea that political prints serve the historian as the 'barometer' or 'thermometer' of 'public opinion' is another of the numerous overworked and unhelpful cliches with which political prints scholarship might profitably dispense.\textsuperscript{18}

That said, it is true that most political prints were commercial ventures and that, potentially at least, this characteristic of the material must render it of interest to the historian. Without research into the precise limits of their commercial patronage, however, it is a characteristic which cannot be invested with significance.\textsuperscript{19}

To date, then, with regard to the contemporary exposure to, impact and significance of political prints, more has been claimed than can be supported by the existing evidence; to claim for this material on these grounds the attention of the historian is to ask the historian to compound the failures of prints scholarship.

The distinctive value of prints has been seen by some to reside in their being 'immediate' and 'first-hand' responses to events, on the grounds that 'the real central theme of history is not what happened but what people felt about it when it was
Thus we read that the political print 'is not merely an amusing side-light on history - it is part of history itself - the evidence of what people thought about events when they were happening'; that Gillray 'responded to the daily change of events as rapidly as any modern newspaper journalist'; political prints 'are immediate, struck from the very flow of events'; 'almost the only rapid pictorial reactions to events in France' in the Revolutionary period; theirs are 'immediate reactions to news'; they offer 'a vivid and first-hand commentary' on the political events of the past. Wardroper justifies his study of prints and written political lampoons and satires on the grounds that

the weapons fashioned in the heat of the skirmish can give better clues of the hopes and agitations of the day than what was written later to justify a disaster or patch up a reputation.

Seven years later, Hunt offered a similar justification; 'since they were engraved or etched in the heat of the political moment, [the] prints offer a wealth of information about political attitudes'. In the topicality which was their original selling-point and which distinguished them from, for example, allegorical engravings and formal portraits, resides their historical value: 'much of what is rough-hewn and clumsy' in French polemical prints of the 1790s bears the mark, not simply of haste, but of historical shock. Surely this, if anything, links us to those anonymous French citizens who, for a penny or two, purchased these images.

Viewed collectively, 'they suggest what was then and still is a common apprehension of history as something [...] frighteningly jumbled, running at fatal speed'. As such, they have the potential to act as a corrective to the deceptive securities of hindsight:

this is precisely the print's importance. They [sic] show us how history felt as it happened, not
the long chain of events of which we, looking backward, see only the outcome. The caricaturist knew nothing of the outcome. He felt only the sharp spur of the moment.

George, similarly, valued political prints as 'the immediate reactions to events'; they offer 'a sequence of presents in a series of dissolving views' - a phrase which is echoed by Hibbert; they 'illustrate the past as a sequence of presents'.

As a justification for the study of political prints by the historian this begs several questions.

In the first place, with respect to Wardroper's rationale, few historians would disagree with the value he places upon an immediate response to events, although they would perhaps be less swift to dismiss subsequent interpretations (or reinterpretations); but to claim for the political print a veracity and significance superior to such accounts, or even to the pamphlet which appeared a week later, or to the premeditated Parliamentary speech, is to misrepresent what was an inherently eristic idiom.

Secondly, while it is undoubtedly true that for the greater part of the 18th century a fairly rapid response to events was possible, for the previous century an equivalent rapidity of response cannot be assumed; this cannot be allowed to diminish the significance of these prints as contemporary interpretations of both the present and the recent past.

It is, moreover, a perception of the contemporary function of the prints which has encouraged an approach to 17th- and 18th-century prints which, as expressed in inapposite and anachronistic analogies, for example that of the printshop window display and the television 'newsflash', or Nesca Robb's unhappy reference to Romeyn de Hooghe as 'so to speak William [of Orange]'s press photographer', blurs their historical specificity.

In addition, the implied veracity of the immediate,
first-hand response fails to take account of the relative
detachment of the professional caricaturist or graphic
satirist; few if any 18th-century political prints can be
said to constitute a personal response in the manner of a
diary entry, or in the sense that Blake's unpublished
images may be so taken: not only were many prints
collaborative efforts, but the caricaturist could, and
frequently did, comment on an event or issue from more
than one perspective. In the absence of any comparative
research into the instigation and circulation figures of
these prints, their value as 'first-hand responses' to
events is limited.

A phrase frequently encountered in the literature would
have it that political caricatures and satires
constituted 'a running commentary' on events.29 This is
a view of only limited accuracy. The regular production
of political prints outwith major crises and events has
been viewed by Press as a significant phenomenon, but it
is one which he restricts to the years post c.1780.30
Even once regular as opposed to occasional production of
prints became usual, the production of political, as
opposed to social, satires has been shown to have
followed a seasonal pattern determined by the sitting of
Parliament (something which further suggests a
Westminster-oriented genre).31 This is not to say that
publishers could not respond to events outwith the
political 'season', but the realities of print production
and of the print trade militated against a 'running
commentary' in any real sense.

As well as encouraging scholars to view the more
'sporadic' response to events of earlier decades as
evidence of the 'undeveloped' nature of graphic political
satire in England, without reference to the prints
themselves, there is a case to be made that it is
precisely this perception of the material - this notion
of a 'running commentary' on events, which has allowed
scholars to present prints as a pictorial historical narrative or chronicle of a period, as exemplified by EPC and, on a broader canvas, Wynn-Jones's Cartoon History of Britain. 32 Thus Roylance:

English caricature of the eighteenth century offers a remarkable pictorial chronicle of the political and social life of the age. The rise and fall of statesmen [. . .] scandals and follies are all vividly recorded.

It is not surprising, therefore, that scholars should have claimed for political prints a documentary, as opposed to a rhetorical, interest. We read that we are 'indebted' to Rowlandson for the marvellous record which he left of the England he knew, perhaps the most important contribution to our knowledge of the manners of the Englishman during the extraordinary years from 1780 to 1825;

as the pictorial chronicler of the hardhitting, hard-riding, hard-drinking age in which he lived, [Rowlandson] can never be neglected by the Georgian Historian.

Similarly, Iannone writes of Daumier; 'the real significance of Daumier's art [. . .] lies in the fact that, in the form of the satirical print, it documents almost an entire century'; Daumier 'faithfully portrays his own nineteenth-century bourgeois French society'. 35

A related idea, central to EPC, is that the prints 'reflect' the politics and sensibilities of 'the age': 'seldom did the prints reflect ideas in greater conflict than in 1791-2'; prints such as The State Tinkers (1780) 'reflect the spirit of near-revolution expressed in the vast movement of Associations and Petitions early in 1780' and so on. 36 Thus Riely can write that the work of Hogarth, Gillray and Rowlandson 'reflected' 'the political [. . .] life of the age', Godfrey that the work of Gillray, Rowlandson and Sayers 'provided the most
appropriate mirror to the historical drama of their
times', the reviewer of George's Hogarth to Cruikshank
that

nowhere (not even in France at the time of
Daumier and Grandville) does pictorial satire
reflect so accurately society in the making as
in Georgian London from Hogarth through Gillray
and Rowlandson to the Cruikshanks. 37

This is a perception of the historical function of the
material which has proved singularly enduring. In part
derived from the conceit of satire as a revealing mirror,
it is to be found in Hogarth criticism from day one: in
BM 3278 A Club of Artists (1754), Hogarth is addressed as
'Thou all-reflecting Mirror of the Age', while
Lichtenberg could write that, in a 'paper age' which
preferred pictorial representation to reality,

it is fortunate if the reflection is always
at first-hand and if the page itself is always
as clear [...] and [...] mirror-bright that
which our great artist holds up to us. 38

Sean Shesgreen notes of Hogarth's The Four Times of Day
that 'the suite was received by its first commentators as
a journalistic narrative of London life'. 39 Subsequent
commentaries have continued to accept - and present -
images such as Beer Street and Gin Lane or The Four Times
of Day as verisimilitudinous representations of
mid-18th-century London. 40 The Four Times of Day [Plate
1] has been

a victim of the sociologizing tendency of
historians and critics to regard pictures of all
kinds as illustrations of the contemporary scene
[...] Geoffrey Grigson went about as far in this
direction as he possibly could when he stamped
the cycle's first design "the authentic London of
Hogarth's visual experience". 41
Other recent commentators such as Derek Jarrett
and Jack Lindsay, ignore the question of formal
referents, on the conventional assumption that The
Four Times of Day is a reportorial account of
London life, a kind of four-part journal of
eighteenth-century urban manners, executed in a vivid but untutored slice-of-life realism.

In 1920, E. Beresford Chancellor paid homage to the 'consummate truth' of Hogarth's prints; Beresford Chancellor describes Hogarth as having made 'pictorial history', a verdict which has been taken all too literally. It is a view of Hogarth's work which has withstood the analyses of Paulson and his followers. Gin Lane, Beer Street, The Four Times of Day and The Four Stages of Cruelty, et al, continue to do service as reportorial 'snapshots' in textbooks and popular histories. In her highly-regarded London Life in the Eighteenth Century (sleeve: a detail from The March to Finchley), George asserts: 'Gin Lane is a historic document whose essential truth is confirmed in numberless details incidentally recorded in the Old Bailey Sessions Papers'. Social Change in Graphic Satire From Hogarth to Cruikshank presents an unproblematic 'recorder' of "the customs, manners, fashions [sic], Characters and humours of his times".

Such assertions, and not least the terms of choice ('reflect', 'mirror', 'record' (verb and noun), and 'chronicle' (ditto)), recall Ashbee's analogy of the 'good' caricaturist and the photosensitive plate; they assign to the political print or graphic satire a role that is essentially passive; instead of subjective interpretations of contemporary politics and mores, we are offered disinterested reportage.

Regardless of whether the picture thereby bequeathed to posterity is an accurate one, this is to confuse results with intentions. If nothing else, this perception of the value of the prints begs the question of the original function and appeal of such images. It was not as a verismilitudinous record that contemporaries bought such prints as Light Expelling Darkness [Plate 2] or even Stealing off; - or - prudent Secession [Plate 3].
In this context, the tendency of the literature to subsume political prints under the general umbrella of 'graphic satire' is particularly unhelpful. The veracity and the resulting historical usefulness of 18th-century prints are asserted by Graham Hood with reference to the role of such prints as aids to research and communication at Colonial Williamsburg:

In order for many prints to be successful from the start, they needed to convince potential purchasers that they were seeing themselves [...] in recognisable situations [...] Verismilitude was at least as important an ingredient as hyperbole. Hood is using 'prints' loosely and inclusively; no less than 'hyperbole', 'verismilitude' was incidental to the appeal of the graphic political satire. It was with reference to social, as opposed to political, satires that it was claimed that

so long as the topical allusions with which they are stuffed were still easily accessible at first sight (without requiring extensive explanations and comment of the kind Lichtenberg provided [for Hogarth's prints] for outsiders), they seem to have been taken as realistic representations of familiar sights in daily life, seen in an absolutely convincing if somewhat distorting mirror, to be read and studied for their visual rhetoric much as one might immerse oneself in a novel of manners.

There is little evidence to suggest that contemporaries regarded political subjects in this light (although at least one account would seem to imply this). The fact that so much of the literature has treated political and social satire as a single genre, however, and the use of indeterminate descriptive terms such as 'prints' or 'satires' have confused the issue.

This, together with the fact that political satires frequently contain incidental, non-political detail, has
encouraged scholars to view all but the most uncompromisingly allegorical prints as repositories of accurate information on dress, furniture, et cetera. This is, indeed, the premise on which at least two of the more important American collections of prints, including political satires, were established. W. S. Lewis saw prints as

a primary source for investigation of everyday living, especially the neglected caricatures and satirical prints because their artists showed streets, vehicles, rooms, and costume as they were.

With unconscious anachronism, Lewis continues:

The print room was the closest the Lewises could come to the train that would take them to London in the eighteenth century and they embarked upon it in that spirit.

Riely writes of the Lewis Walpole Library collection as a repository of information concerning 'those aspects of daily life ['how people lived and what things looked like'] which every age takes for granted' and which are less likely to figure in written records. Hood writes of the function of the print at Colonial Williamsburg in similar terms. To Hood, prints are 'small windows', to Hibbert 'peepholes', on 'the past'.

As far as political prints are concerned, there is a case to be made that their documentary value has been exaggerated. Patten has demonstrated the extent to which - setting aside the claims of satire - the impetus towards accurate reportage was offset by the exigencies of print production and, in many cases by deficiencies in draughtsmanship, leading, in both cases, to the development of shorthand representation of interior and exterior locations alike.

Non-political prints are no less problematic. Riely writes of Rowlandson that 'observed life' in the literal
sense plays only a small part in his work; many of Rowlandson's 'scenes are imagined or recollected than actually taken on the spot' and

he is always willing (indeed, finds it difficult not) to alter, adapt and exaggerate in order to project his larger than life vision of the human comedy.

Those seeking 'accurate, detailed, realistic portraits of everyday life' must seek them in the work of Hogarth, Gillray or Cruikshank (which Cruikshank is, as is so often the case, unspecified). 58

As far as the work of Hogarth is concerned, scholars have come to recognise in the apparently unproblematic (if didactic) scenes of 'observed life' a more complex visual representation. Even for contemporaries, the presence in Hogarth's prints of recognisable details still left a market for interpretative commentaries; the volume of modern critical analysis of the Hogarth oeuvre testifies to the polysemic nature of his compositions. 59

What we must keep in mind when looking at Hogarth's eighteenth-century scenes is, on the one hand, that they contain encoded messages in the form of interpretations of eighteenth-century reality, and, on the other hand, that our own mentalité interferes in any reading of his graphic art. What makes the Hogarthian engravings fascinating is thus not so much their realistic dimension but rather the artist's ideology and hermeneutics, his satirical strategy that was both 'true to life' and symbolical [...] embedded in verbal and iconic frameworks generating meanings within a larger satirical matrix.

This greater sensitivity to the ambivalences of representation in, and the polysemic qualities of, Hogarth's prints is to a considerable extent the result of recent developments in art history (developments which will be considered in more detail in Part II, Chapter

385
In recent years, art historians have come to view
the totality of practices and artefacts which constitute 'culture' [...] as constituting or
constructing value systems, beliefs and ideologies, rather than reflecting or expressing
them.

and

have come to question the ways in which works of art are said to reflect the values, ideals,
beliefs and ideologies of a particular social group, nation, or even "age", or to reflect social processes or social realities of one sort or another.
Reflection theories (and versions of them which say that works of art "express" such things) are adequate in world-views which see cultural systems as being in an essentially passive relation to the "real" world. Vulgar marxism is one of these, classical political economy another. For those who think that ideas somehow exist independent of their expressions, reflection theory is unproblematical [;
for others, it is increasingly unconvincing.61

The mainstream of political prints scholarship (as opposed to art-historical or literary scholarship which happens to address these prints) has yet to accommodate this perceptual revisionism. Scholars continue to write that such prints 'reflect' the political conflicts, or 'public opinion', of the day, or that they 'reflect the society of the period in a unique way', studies continue to be written which focus on a particular event as 'reflected' in the prints, untroubled by the need to establish precisely what is meant by 'reflect' (indeed, it is difficult not to suspect that the appeal of the term is its very emptiness).62

The (in this context, positive) influence of Paulson notwithstanding, the visual codes, and conventions of representation, of the political print remain largely
unexplored. Political prints scholarship continues to be characterised by a willingness to take prints at face value, by a preference for contextualisation over deconstruction, description over analysis.

Brewer's is, significantly, the only one of the Chadwyck-Healey volumes to address the veracity (or otherwise) of the graphic image, although another Chadwyck-Healey author indicated an awareness of such problems in his review of Carretta's *George III and the Satirists*: while Carretta is careful to relate the prints discussed to his written evidence,

unfortunately (and perhaps surprisingly for a literary critic), Carretta tends to take most of these prints at face value. He seems to believe that satiric prints speak the same language as the written evidence [...] fails to recognize that [...] visual satires speak in different languages and say more than immediately meets the eye,

that they have 'hidden agendas' which need to be 'deconstructed' (or, rather, reconstructed). Scholars are, it would seem, extremely reluctant to abandon their perception of the material as more or less faithful representation; thus Riely, even as he questions the documentary status of Rowlandson's work, upholds that of the prints of Hogarths and Gillray; indeed, he concludes by affirming the essential veracity of Rowlandson's vision:

Yet his drawings and etchings retain their usefulness as social documents. He provides a vivid and truthful picture of his time, although it is not a literal picture.

As far as the print's status as historical evidence is concerned, there is a case to be made that the very grounds on which its study has been recommended subtly affirm its auxiliary status.

The idea that the prints constitute a more or less
truthful 'record' or 'chronicle' of 'the age' cannot but support the use of such prints as textbook illustrations; the 'quotes in pictures' approach deprecated by Porter. Klingender considered that, 'from Court to garret', 'there are few aspects of English life at this period which could not be illustrated with hundreds of contemporary prints'; George's Social Change in Graphic Satire, from Hogarth to Cruikshank deployed satirical prints to this end, and by so doing sanctioned such usage. It may be the case that the historian is no longer so naive as to 'believe that political prints give us an uncontaminated, ideological "snapshot" from which we can "read off" the past', but the dustjacket status of the print insidiously promotes this.

The illustrative status of the material is implicit in such glib statements as 'to think of Regency England is to think of Rowlandson and Gillray'; 'we see the London of his age through [Hogarth's] eyes', and so on. Such statements, and the illustrative status of the print which they uphold, are eloquent of a fundamental lack of interest in graphic political satire as a genre and in the different idioms which subsist in that genre.

In much the same way, the idea that the prints 'reflect' ideas, opinion or phenomena assigns to the material a passive - and essentially illustrative - function.

Those who would 'quarry prints to archaeologize the material culture of the past', for answers to such questions as 'what were the coffee-houses and brothels [...] actually like?' affirm the print's auxiliary status. They focus on the fly, indifferent to the amber in which it is preserved.

The Print Room at Farmington was conceived as an adjunct to the library and as an auxiliary source of information for those involved in editing the correspondence of Horace Walpole (although Lewis prophesied that the collection would come to be valued in
Its own right); the print collection at Williamsburg has been described as forming 'a superb and graphic pedagogic resource, helping to amplify the larger messages of Colonial Williamsburg'.

It is not merely in terms of documenting 'ordinary life' that the prints appear to offer the historian a peculiarly direct route of access to the past. The print as an 'immediate response' to events has already been considered. The historical value of the prints has also been asserted in terms of their rhetorical characteristics. In this thesis, the historical value of the prints resides in their contemporary 'unmasking' function. Thus Wardroper; in the 'oppressive atmosphere' of the early 19th century 'there was one place to turn for a fearless running commentary on the world as it was: the caricature printshop'.

The polarisation in aesthetic terms (the direct, immediate, and free in line versus the studied, worked-up and polished) of portraiture and caricature which was touched upon in Chapter VII has informed, and has in many instances been accompanied by, a polarisation of these genres in terms of the value of the latter to the historian. It is a shibboleth of this thesis that in its own day the caricature served as a corrective to the formal portrait. Thus we read that Gillray's images,

George III, relishing a boiled egg in Temperance Enjoying a Frugal Meal (1792), the Prince of Wales as a Voluptuary under the Horrors of Digestion (1792), William Pitt, sprouting from the Crown, as An Excrecence - a Fungus; alias - a Toadstool upon a Dunghill (1791); all served as an acid corrective to the more seemly mezzotints after Reynolds or Lawrence to be found in other shop windows [Plates 4 and 5].

The same author explained the 'increase in vitality of satires in the late 1730s and 1740s' as
at least in part, [...] a reaction against the dried up conventions of the early eighteenth-century portrait, dull mezzotints from which clogged the print-shops. The smug, bewigged faces, uniform in feature and pose, and backed up by hackneyed props to suggest sagacity, rank and virtue, were a standing affront to the satirist's art. Thus, if Hudson makes Handel look like a statesman, then Goupy depicts him as a hog; Kneller's Alexander Pope is a soulful aspirant to higher things, but Gravelot's version is a libidinous hunchback; the Robert Walpole of Kneller or Van Loo is responsibility embodied, but an anonymous satirist makes him bare his buttocks to be kissed by a toadying placeman.\textsuperscript{72}

The subversive intention and subversive potential of such pictorial defamation is to a considerable degree offset by the coterie origins of the idiom, and the failure of scholars to establish the social composition of their intended audience and market. Arguing convincingly against the portrait/caricature antithesis beloved of the literature, Diana Donald has suggested that the Reynolds portrait, the mezzotint after that portrait and the Gillray caricature did not necessarily serve different markets.\textsuperscript{73} The idea that these critical contemporary interpretations of political figures are more 'truthful' than the necessarily encomiastic portrait is, however, a singularly enduring one, and continues to inform perceptions of the historical value of political caricatures.\textsuperscript{74} In this thesis, the political caricature does not merely show us the protagonists of 18th-century politics and society as contemporaries saw them; it shows them as they really were.

It is a perception of the historical value of the prints which was sanctioned by George - 'Throughout, the prints are a corrective to the suavity of official portraiture' - and which is central to John Wardroper's assessment of both their contemporary and their historical value:

Unaided, humble men can easily forget that the
great personages of their day may well be as fallible and passionate as themselves. We need such help still more when we try to seize the truth of an earlier time, and especially perhaps, the dazzling and unquiet Georgian age [...] We do not have our eyes and our doubts sharpened by the direct experience of the errors, insolence and expense of ministers long dead [...] or catch those fine gentlemen in moments of indignity, reeling perhaps out of White's [...] at dawn, broken at faro. We see them instead in portraits displaying them as they wished to be remembered, in moments of grace, amid the artifacts we now long to possess. The rapid work of the London printshop artist helps us to come nearer the truth.

The same author writes that political caricatures 'paraded the likenesses of public figures more tellingly than suave official portraits ever do, and this in itself gives them lasting value', that:

the caricaturists' images of public characters were a salutary alternative to flattering formal portraits. Which is nearer the truth, Sir Thomas Lawrence's portrayal of the Regent, or Cruikshank's? 75

The answer, of course, is that neither portrait nor caricature are 'true' in the sense of an objective record. As far as the historical value of either is concerned, it might be suggested that the way in which individuals elected to be seen by their peers and contemporaries and preserved for posterity offers insights comparable to those to be gained from caricature.

That an idiom to which distortion and exaggeration are central and inseparable should so consistently be described in terms of 'the truth' testifies less to any real faith in the veracity of caricature than to a modern hostility towards the conventions of the 18th-century formal portrait, and, particularly on the part of many so-called 'new' art historians, towards the patrician (and, more recently, the patriarchal) values which such portraits are deemed to embody or articulate. 76

Caricature and graphic satire have been presented as the
antithesis of contemporary history painting for much the same reasons. 77

Historians have themselves been no less eager to polarise the 18th century in pictorial terms:

... alongside Gainsborough, Reynolds, Zoffany or Stubbs must be placed the savage pictures of Hogarth and the brutal squibs of Rowlandson and Gillray. Although caricature plays an undeniable part in their composition, the world which they depict is closer to the historical records of Georgian society

(it will be noted how the idiomatic bias of the genre is minimalised; graphic satire has left to posterity a picture which is psychologically even if it is not literally 'true to the age'). 78

The portrait/caricature antithesis, and the emphasis on the superior veracity of the satirical image, are manifestations of a larger impulse to present 18th-century graphic satire, both political and social (as far as this is concerned, the 17th century does not exist), as a salutary corrective to the picture of the period derived from, in particular, other images and artefacts. In Political Prints, Atherton explicitly offered the prints as an alternative to Georgian grace as offered by the National Trust. 79 This is a thread which runs through the literature and which is also to be found in historical textbooks. The pictorial, architectural and material legacy of the Georgian period has 'created the idea of an age which agrees but little with its reality'; for the layman in particular, graphic satire offers a more truthful record. Not only does it offer an alternative image of Georgian life but - and here the documentary status of the material explored above is reaffirmed - it is one of the few sources which have survived in which the living conditions of 'the common man' are recorded. Again, this is a perception of the historical value of the material which was sanctioned by
George in her *London Life in the Eighteenth Century*; the material culture of Horace Walpole and his kind has survived - the poorer sort 'live for us chiefly in the pictures of Hogarth - Southwark Fair, The March to Finchley, the crowd at Tyburn'.

This, of course, affirms the illustrative status of the prints, and not merely in terms of the actual reproduction of images in historical textbooks. So far from the historian deriving fresh insights into the period, his recourse to prints has too often been productive only of simplistic polarisations - the 'Age of Elegance' versus the 'Age of Squalor', Reynolds versus Hogarth, Gin Lane versus Spencer House - crude personification ('Hogarth's London'), and generalisations the most striking characteristic of which is their elastic and ahistorical nature. Thus Beresford Chancellor defines 'contrast' as 'the essential characteristic of the age' - as it is of any age; George writes that 'the splendour and glitter of high life, the sordid squalor of low life, are the outstanding contrasts of the century' - as they are of any century.

In the course of previous chapters, I have suggested that the illustrative choices of political prints literature are far from incidental to the received picture of the material, its nature and function, as identified in this thesis. The use of prints as illustrations in historical textbooks must exert a more enduring, because more subliminal, influence. As noted in Chapter IX, the illustrative choices of such works (An Election Entertainment, Fast Day, et cetera) may conspire in the promotion of literal caricatures of the period and its institutions. It is not only the past which is, by this means, diminished; repeatedly enlisted to illustrate cliches, many prints have become cliches themselves.

It is less that the satirical print cannot offer a corrective to a picture of the age composed from the
paintings of Reynolds, Stubbs et al, or the material legacy of the brothers Adam; but the historian (or prints scholar, or, indeed, 'new' art historian) cannot assert the primacy of one type of pictorial evidence over another without first addressing the status of the pictorial as historical evidence - and it is this which such textbooks, and related assertions in other accounts, fail to do.

The place of satirical prints in historical textbooks reflects the perceptions of the material outlined above, but it it is also guaranteed by certain other seldom-examined shibboleths concerning the rhetorical capacity of the prints which have informed the way in which this material is presented in other contexts, most notably in the exhibition.

In Chapter VIII, I considered the claims made for the print in terms of its contemporary rhetorical capacity, namely its ability to communicate 'even' or 'especially' to the uneducated or illiterate. Williams, for example, claimed that 'prints conveyed ideas dramatically' and were 'more easily understood than words'. Given the problems associated with this and related claims, it is interesting - and of some concern - to see similar claims made for the print in its modern capacity as an historical document. Thus William Wilson; 'most of Hogarth's works communicate with little or no explanation'.

In more than one account, the rhetorical capacity of the material is asserted in terms of the primacy of the pictorial over the verbal. We are informed that the prints 'hit off the political moment more vividly than any historian's writing can', that Hogarth's 'prints and paintings recount more clearly than any book or document, the social history of his contemporary world'. It is a
view of the rhetorical and didactic capacity of the material which has been sanctioned by a former Secretary of State for Education - on record as saying that prints are 'a good way of learning history' - ; 'the comment of a cartoon is economical in conveying information which would otherwise need pages of writing'.

Those who in this way polarise word and image misrepresent the compound nature of the material; prints were always as much verbal as visual, and even the least verbal (in terms of the actual presence of words within the print), such as Hogarth's images, were 'to be read rather than looked at, deciphered more than read'.

More importantly, such statements tend to affirm the primacy of the verbal and the secondary status of the visual. Porter claims that the Chadwyck-Healey authors do not make the mistake of seeing 'pictures as a sort of baby-food mode of communication, pap for those whose minds could not digest real words'; in fact, Thomas's essay concludes:

> among the media of the time, they represent the "soft sell" aspect of political propaganda, being light and easily digested, in contrast to the heavier fare of the written word and a similar view is implicit in the emphasis upon the rhetorical limitations of the prints found in the accounts of Miller, Dickinson, and Langford. Dickinson, for example, considers that 'because of its inability to express complex political programmes, the political caricature never attained the aura of authority associated with the written word' (in this, Dickinson echoes Atherton; the print 'did not possess the mysterious aura of authority and veracity that had always been associated with the printed word').

The physical manifestation of this perception of the 'superior' rhetorical capacity of the image is the exhibition, in which the emphasis is placed on looking
rather than reading, and in which there is seldom any extensive or consistent attempt made to alert the spectator to the different levels of representation in a given print, to present graphic political satires as rhetorical constructs deploying verbal and visual satirical tactics, and pictorial conventions - and thereby give some indication of the rhetorical capacity of the genre. In the absence of such an effort, the prints remain, in the (erroneous) verdict of Rogers, 'illustrative rather than directly revelatory'. 90

The minimally-captioned general survey of the subject or the often uncaptioned illustrations in the historical textbook reflect the same perception of the material. Anything more than a minimum of contextual information may, indeed, get in the way of, or override, the print's capacity to speak directly to the viewer; hence the New York Times on Shikes's The Indignant Eye: 'just the right amount of commentary unobtrusively surrounds about 400 reproductions'. 91

What such statements, and the exhibitions and books which prompt them, both reflect and promote is a subtle, or, as I suggested in Chapter I, an inverted logocentrism, whereby the word is associated with difficultas (and becomes the preserve of the scholar) and the image with claritas (fitted to the needs and capacities of the layman). The exhibition offers the layman who has neither the inclination nor the capacity to read the collected speeches of Edmund Burke the Burkeian vision of the French Revolution as interpreted by the graphic satirists; acquiring thereby an understanding of the debates of the 1790s which is as valid as, but more 'memorable' and 'immediate' than, that to be derived from written sources. The image as thus deployed functions as a substitute for the 'real', i.e., written, sources (the preserve of the serious historian); 'a baby-food mode' of historical communication, graphic
political satire is 'a good way of learning history' - for the non-historian.

Prints scholarship has itself emphasised both the accessibility of the print (in particular the claritas of the post-emblematic print) and its precis function. 92 Atherton writes of the prints 'they pretend to no great [...] depth of meaning'; 'the complexities of an issue are sacrificed to the wit of invention and the limitations' of the medium. 93 Lambourne describes The Plumb-Pudding in Danger as 'a brilliant summary of events'. 94 Mahood refers to the prints as 'simplified versions of history', 'concentrated impressions [which] stay in the mind'. 95 According to Patten, 'not the ideas themselves but the characters of their spokesmen' were presented. 96 Dickinson claims that 'anything which could not easily be satirised, simplified or rendered concrete for dramatic visual effect was largely ignored by the caricaturist. 97 It is therefore perfectly acceptable for an historian to claim that opposition attitudes towards foreign policy 'appeared in their most stereotyped and crudely simplified form in the prints' and that the case against the elder Pitt was 'simplified in visual form in the prints'. 98

In order to convey something of the flavour or character of the prints (it should be noted that 'the prints' in this context almost invariably proves to mean satirical prints and caricature) scholars have described - indeed, celebrated - them in terms which, like claims for the 'superior' rhetorical capacities of image over word, unconsciously trivialise and patronise the material. Thus Patten:
Ideas, policies, philosophies were [...] translated into dramatic narratives [...] theories of government, taxation, military or diplomatic strategy [...] were treated, not in the measured cadences of reasoned discourse, but in the exaggerated lines - verbal and visual - of theatre.

The 'inverted logocentrism' of the word-image polarisation discussed above is, indeed evident in such statements as that made by Nicholas Robinson on the value of political caricatures to the historian:

in general the caricaturists present us with a less sober and more vivid comment on the events and personalities of the late eighteenth century than that provided by other contemporary sources.

Wardroper describes them as 'much the liveliest guides' to the period. Roylance writes that they have 'all the color and easy appeal of fireworks at Vauxhall' [Plate 6].

The greater depth and seriousness of written sources is subtly affirmed by this emphasis upon the brightly-coloured one-dimensionality of the print, as is the auxiliary, illustrative, role of the print. Thus Robinson;

these prints together comprise a great body of subversive [sic] material which can enliven and augment our more conventional historical studies, and give us a new and often lighter insight into political life at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century.

The phrase 'amusing and vivid' appears in a piece revealingly titled 'Research Resources: Illustrative Material [note, not 'pictorial source-material', or 'visual evidence] in the Wellcome Institute for the Social History of Medicine'; presumably the author would find the use of satirical prints as deployed in a preceding article, in which they serve a purely decorative, auxiliary function, unexceptionable.
The use of prints as illustrations, and the subscription of scholars to the allegedly superior rhetorical capacity of graphic satire, as far as a modern audience is concerned, reflect the idea that the familiarity of the idiom overrides any problems of historical distance which might reasonably be supposed to be entailed in the study of such images. Thus while, on the one hand, the historical remoteness of the genre is stressed, on the other, there has been a tendency to downplay such problems of access; 'the vivid power of many of these images strikes us before the topical allusions are understood'.

This is because the compilers of exhibitions et cetera can presuppose a familiarity not with the minutiae of 18th-century English history but with caricature and 'the political cartoon' as they exist in the present. The layman familiar with the puppet caricature of Spitting Image will experience few problems with the prints of Gillray, or so the thinking would appear to go. There has been a tendency to downplay the differences between the contemporary and the 18th-century graphic political satire, a reluctance to acknowledge that, for all the apparent similarities (not all of them to be underestimated, not least iconographical continuity), 17th- and 18th-century prints spoke a different language from that of the modern newspaper cartoon and Spitting Image; above all that they addressed an audience which, if as yet insufficiently delimited, may nonetheless be taken to have been both far smaller and more literate, in every sense, than that of both modern phenomena, the latter in particular.

This tendency is identifiable in the anachronistic analogies with modern media - the television newsflash, the renting of video entertainment, and so on, - which the literature has favoured. It finds expression in, and has its roots in, the relativism which Rogers described
in the context of the study of 18th-century English literature; faced with a difficult text, one option open to the modern reader is to

pretend that not much has changed, that the issues are the same at bottom, and that if you look hard enough, the conflicts and tensions of 1760 are identical with those of 1960.

Thus we find Paul Goldman pondering on what subjects Rowlandson would poke fun at if he was alive today. No doubt he would take a malicious pleasure in upsetting people such as joggers, health fanatics, 'yuppies', wearers of Walkmans, and New Georgians.

It has been claimed that it is only by the aid of analogies drawn from the life of today - however little this may be consciously before the mind - that we reach the causal explanation of the events of the past, but, so far from establishing political prints as a route of access to the mentalités of the past, recourse to such analogies is evidence of a failure to address them on their own terms, a tendency to address the past in terms of the present which cannot be other than problematic as an historiographical tactic. To refer, as does Langford, to today's newspaper cartoon as the 'modern counterpart' of the prints of the 1730s is not necessarily wrong in absolute terms; it is, however, unhelpful as far as understanding the earlier prints is concerned. It is unhelpful when it leads, as Chapter VII attempted to show, to the qualities of the modern newspaper cartoon (economy, sketchiness et cetera) being taken as the yardstick for the evaluation of earlier prints; when Thomas can divide the corpus of prints produced between 1765 and 1783 into 'those that were recognisably like modern cartoons' and those which were not.

The 18th- (and to a lesser extent, the 17th-) century
political print is at one and same time the counterpart
of the modern cartoon (blurring its historical
specificity; a 'cartoon' of 1790 is at bottom the same as
that of 1990) and the modern cartoon's ancestor. This
perception has informed its study; Hill, like Low before
him, approached Gillray from the standpoint of 'a working
cartoonist' seeking an understanding of 'the roots of
modern cartooning'.

In one respect the problem is, as I will argue in
greater detail in Part II, Chapter III, a semantic one.
The acceptability of 'cartoon' as a blanket descriptive
term, as a synonym for political print, has conspired in
fostering a perception of a single phenomenon from the
15th- to the 20th-century about which it is possible to
generalise, and the linear 'development' of which it is
possible to trace.

The perception of the 18th-century political print as
the counterpart or ancestor of the 20th-century newspaper
cartoon has led scholars to view such prints as early
manifestations of a modern freedom in graphic criticism;
Ashbee, for example, considers the practice of political
caricature to be both evidence of and the guarantor of
'democracy'. The history of so self-evidently
desirable a phenomenon must merit study; thus scholars
have essayed to identify the beginnings of this tradition
in England and its subsequent 'development'. Those who
have seen the political print as part of a larger
political journalism, find in its existence signs of that
'freedom of the press' which is part of 'the world we now
have; this has ensured that the 18th-century print has
been approached in much the same way as Lise Andries
approaches French almanacs of the Revolutionary period;
'by the force of their conviction and their appeal to the
political conscience of a mass readership, these almanacs
belong to the press of the modern era'.
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If the 18th-century political print informs, or may be seen as an early manifestation of, modern phenomena, it is not surprising to find the study of such prints justified with reference to modern concerns. Thus, in one of the forewords to Cuno's *French Caricature*, one reads that,

> Considering the political climate of the late 1980s as well as the bitterly ironic art that has been created to critique [sic] it [unspecified], an exhibition devoted to eighteenth-century caricature can effectively aid in drawing needed parallels between our own time and the past.\textsuperscript{114}

Previously, Wardroper had concluded, and justified, his study of the political satire of the period 1760-1837:

> now [1973] that polemical indecorum is once again thought to be not entirely deplorable, the contenders of this age can profit by a study of the free-speaking of pre-Victorian times.\textsuperscript{115}

More recently, the perennial search for a 'usable Hogarth' has seen that figure enlisted in the politicised aesthetic conflict of contemporary South Africa.\textsuperscript{116}

\begin{quotes}
The historian must beware of the temptation when approaching' political prints of believing that they have more to tell us than they do have, or that what they can tell us can only be told by them, which seems hardly true of even the subtlest and most graphic.\textsuperscript{117}

Roots pronounced political prints sphinxes without
secrets. What he took to be the limitations of the genre were in most instances the limitations of the Chadwyck-Healey series. Yet, as this thesis has attempted to show, the limitations of the Chadwyck-Healey series themselves reflected the larger limitations of scholarship in this field over the past forty years. Prints scholars have themselves largely avoided engaging with the articulacy of these images, but have also failed to delimit the audience/market for the material, with the result that most pronouncements on the prints, their historical significance or their rhetorical capacities, have been made in an empirical vacuum.

In 1988, Hunt concluded that 'there are many different ways to read the prints'; in 1989, Reichardt observed that 'we have only recently begun to recognise that the genuine and unique value of [polemical] prints as historical sources lies not in their depictions of individuals and events but in their symbolic, metaphorical and allegorical interpretation of collective ideas and the questions of the day. Yet a similar conclusion had been drawn by Atherton in 1974. The problem would seem to be in developing methodologies adequate to the task of engaging with this level of meaning in the material; Roots's verdict, in this sense, illustrates what happens when high expectations of a body of evidence are coupled with methodological inadequacy.

I use the plural, 'methodologies', because a significant problem has been the idea, implicit in much of the research undertaken to date, that there exists a single methodology, a single key (sufficient historical knowledge, aesthetics, et cetera) by which the prints may be unlocked. The expectations of this material as historical evidence which Roots felt to have been disappointed by the Chadwyck-Healey series reflect the idea, for a long time central to art historical analysis,
that

through reconstructing the intellectual, cultural and social world of the artist [...] we should be able to abolish the historical distance between the moment of creation and our own moment of beholding.

That,

surrounded by a notionally sufficient body of historical texts, these representations might be made to yield up some artistic intention that could then be claimed as historically 'correct' [...] that there was some sort of unequivocal, unambiguous, monovocal purpose on the part of the artist that, if disclosed, could yield a 'definitive' reading.

The problem of the 'history' in 'art history' is that

'history' is still conceived as at once 'over' (completed) and 'over there' (distanced); art historical research is seen as working on the past in much the same way as certain chemicals work on a latent photographic image, an image which simply needs to be adequately developed in order to emerge in all its immutable detail.

'Reflection theory' as deployed in prints study is in part an attempt to establish such a definitive reading by default; a way of rendering highly problematic material less problematic. It is easier to claim that political prints 'reflect' something ('opinion', 'society', 'events') than to demonstrate how they articulate ideas, opinions and perceptions. The same may be said of the faith which continues to be placed in historical contextualising.

Roots's response to the Chadwyck-Healey series suggests that historians require such 'definitive' readings of the material before they can accommodate it as historical evidence. If this has proven problematic with reasonably well-documented paintings, the in many instances anonymous constructs of the political prints
are still less likely to yield such readings.

Arguably it is only by recognising that no such definitive reading is possible with these prints, that there is no single methodological key by which the political print may be unlocked; only by acknowledging the polysemic nature of the material, by recognising that there are numerous locks in every print for which several methodological keys will have to be cut and tried before we can arrive at anything like general conclusions that will advance our understanding of the material and of its role in 17th- and 18th-century society, can prints scholarship advance.

Here I trespass on the territory of Part II. Part I concludes with a consideration of the place of the political print in the study which attempts to establish 'the visual syntax of eighteenth-century political power', arguing that a much broader base of visual images than the 'cartoons' which have hitherto monopolised the attentions of those few historians for whom the visual has a place in historical study. 123
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Chapter XII: 'Political graphics'; political images in other media

Thus far, this thesis has focussed on the range of images on paper which I have chosen to term 'political prints', which term comprehends non-satirical political prints, graphic political satires and political caricature.\(^1\) To date, what little discussion there has been respecting the use - or abuse - of pictorial evidence by the historian has to a considerable extent focussed on this material, and these are, moreover, the genres which have been studied extensively, if in a dilatory and unsatisfactory fashion, in the past; the genres which have merited articles, books and exhibitions.

As far as pictorial evidence goes, the political print has enjoyed a comparatively high profile, albeit one which has perpetuated a narrow conception of the material. This thesis has attempted to demonstrate how inadequate and partial the approach of scholars to these prints has been. Yet if the study of political prints to date leaves much to be desired, the situation regarding political imagery in other media is still less satisfactory.

Prints were not the only pictorial medium in which political statements and political argument appeared. Works on paper other than the political print include playing cards [Plate 11] and hand-painted or printed fans - for example, the fan commemorating Sacheverell's defence of the Church of England [Plates 2 and 3] or the mourning fan of 1751 for Frederick, Prince of Wales reproduced in Nigel Llewellyn's The Art of Death.\(^2\) Medals, coins and tokens are perhaps the best-documented of alternative media for political imagery, while Jacobite symbolism is only the best-known example of the polemical potential of engraved glass [Plates 4 and 5]; still closer to the spirit of the satirical engraving is
the striking glass of 1757 with its inaccurate depiction of the execution of Admiral Byng and the legend 'JUSTICE' (Plate 61). Less familiar is the application of related images to ceramics, cotton, linen or silk.

The range of material available to the scholar interested in what might be described as the politicisation of material artefacts is amply demonstrated in the Mccubbin/Hamilton-Phillips catalogue, *The Age of William III and Mary II*, the historical context in this case being the invasion and subsequent events of 1688.

Such material exists in abundance in both private and public collections, although, as will be argued in Part II, Chapter IV, the documentation of such holdings is not always adequate.

This is not to say that there is not a considerable body of specialist literature devoted to glass, ceramics, numismatics, et cetera, in which it is possible to find essays of relevance. In general, however, this specialist literature has paid little attention to the specifically political nature of such artefacts.

Unfortunately, this neglect is compounded by the failure of political prints scholarship to address such material. Artefacts other than prints have not figured largely in the monographs, more general surveys and exhibitions devoted to political prints. One exception was the British Museum's *The Shadow of the Guillotine: Britain and the French Revolution* (1989), an exhibition the organisers of which might have elected to restrict themselves to political prints, but in which these were merely one genre among many. Reviewing this exhibition and the accompanying catalogue, Marcus Wood celebrated the heterogeneity of the assembled images:

> the materials brought together include plates, jugs, ceramic medallions, figures and plaques,
trade tokens, medals, etchings, engravings, woodcuts, watercolours, oil paintings, pattern books, advertisements, death masks and wax corpses. [David] Bindman's egalitarian approach to subject-matter makes it possible to compare the reproduction of images in different media. [...] The reproduction of certain images in multiple forms is also emphasized.

More recently, Lester C. Olson's *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: a Study in Rhetorical Iconology* also takes a more comprehensive approach to the study of pictorial political images than has been conventional. A study of continuity and change in the iconography of American identity during the 18th century, on both sides of the Atlantic, Olson's study combines an interdisciplinary approach, drawing upon the disciplines of iconography, rhetoric and history, with a similarly comprehensive range of material evidence, addressing, in addition to a familiar body of political prints, newspaper mastheads, almanac illustrations, paper money, illuminated displays, coins and medals, flags, paintings, statuary, pottery and porcelain. Olson's approach to this range of material is primarily iconographical, focussing on several key motifs, with a further, valuable, chapter on the less common.9

Non-graphic material has conventionally merited only the most cursory mention in studies of the political print. In this, as in so much else, *EPC* is paradigmatic: George acknowledges the existence of political imagery in non-graphic form, but restricts her comment on this to the occasional, tantalising, reference to 'similar imagery' in political playing cards and medals, and fails to address the adaptation of images which originally appeared as political prints to other media, other than in passing.10 In *EPC*, one finds an emphasis on the significance of the printing press which is as conventional as it is proscriptive. On the first page, it is asserted that 'only the inventions of paper,
printing and engraving made pictorial propaganda possible'; two pages later, one reads that political prints are 'important', and of especial value to the historian, 'as virtually the only pictorial rendering of passing events' - a very narrow conception of pictorial propaganda. George believes the peculiar value of political prints to the historian to reside in the fact that 'they are history, concrete, personal and tendentious, seen through contemporary eyes', ignoring thereby innumerable non-graphic artefacts of which the same might be said. Only the unproven, and in many cases unfounded, association of printed pictorial media with a 'mass' or 'popular' audience can render the glass celebrating the execution of Admiral Byng less 'significant' than the prints which the same event occasioned.

Cuno acknowledges that the political print and political caricature were part of 'a rich and prolific visual culture', but French Caricature lacks any detailed discussion of the application of political imagery to other artefacts. Similarly, Patten proffers a breathless enumeration of the artefacts which might be thus decorated:

And the images of [the] caricaturists were reproduced everywhere: on broadsides and song sheets, lottery puffs and tickets; in children's alphabets, toys and puzzles; as posters for exhibitions and theatrical performances; in woodcuts for cheap books, pamphlets, jest books and tracts; in panoramas; on cloth, pottery and porcelain; and on fans, valentines, watch dials, tobacco wrappers, snuff boxes, pipe bowls, and walking sticks, but fails to cite or illustrate any one contemporary instance of such application.

The failure of EPC and its successors to address non-graphic material is the less surprising when it is considered how narrow the definition of 'printed images'
has been, George's celebration of the printing-press notwithstanding. It has been seen how, after the first page of EPC1, the scope of this study contracts from 'pictorial propaganda in England' to 'the political or controversial print' and thereafter to the 'political caricature' or 'cartoon'.

The universal antipathy to allegorical and emblematic imagery which has characterised political prints scholarship has meant that scholars have had little time for allegorical prints of the type exemplified by Hollar's Carolo Secundo Dei Gratia Magnae Britanniae, Franciae, Et Hiberniae Regis [Plate 7] and his Redivivo Phoenici Lucifero Nebulas Fuganti, Soli Tenebras Penitus Abolenti Carolo II. D.G. Magnae Britanniae, Franciae Et Hiberniae Regi [Plate 8], and the later print, William III as Hercules [Plate 9].

Conversely, for all that the political print has been celebrated as a 'popular' idiom, prints scholars have had equally little time for 'crude' woodcut images such as The Subjects Satisfaction [Plate 10] or the mixed media mourning-piece for George Washington by Enoch Gridley (1810) [Plate 11]. The image of Charles II which prefaces James Whynnell's England's Sorrows turned into Joy (1661) [Plate 12] and others like it have been marginalised both by the notion of 'artistic merit' and by a linear model which has viewed them as irrelevant to the 'development' of the political print.

The 'political print' has, moreover, conventionally been interpreted as the separately-issued print: the allegorical frontispiece or title-page figures in the Stephens volumes of the Catalogue, but Stephens's inclusions and exclusions are fairly arbitrary. The images which are in this way obscured frequently differ little from published prints: indeed, the same image may be encountered in both contexts owing to the practice of adapting frontispieces to prints and vice versa. Thus, in BM 1202, under the unpromising-sounding title, A New
Description of the World. Or a Compendious Treatise of the Empires, Kingdoms, States, Provinces, Countries, Islands, Cities and Towns of Europe, Asia, Africa and America: In their Situation [sic], Product, Manufactures and Commodities, Geographical and Historical, &c. Faithfully Collected from the best Authors (1689), one finds an allegorical engraving which is nothing less than a Providential interpretation of the events of 1688 and, as such, fit to be compared with England's Memorial [Plate 13]: it was, in fact, also issued separately (BM 1203).

If images within books have enjoyed an uncertain status within political prints scholarship, the broadsheet ballad format, exemplified by The Virtue of a Protestant Orange [Plate 14] has also merited little attention: still more than the frontispiece, the broadsheet format has proved the victim of the seemingly ineradicable antipathy of prints scholars to images in association with text.

As a consequence of this narrow conception of 'printed images', the 18th-century political print in particular is more likely to be catalogued, studied and exhibited alongside non-political caricature, 'drolls' and other comic art, and images such as Rowlandson's Cries of London [Plate 15], than it is to be placed alongside printed images with which it is not only contemporaneous but with which it shares its iconography, political context and rhetorical purpose.

This is absurd and unhelpful. A satire on the trial of Henry Sacheverell, for example Aliquid Pro Nihil O Ducant [Plate 16] has more in common with a commemorative portrait print of the Doctor [Plate 17], with the fan represented by Plates 2 and 3, and with relevant playing cards [Plate 18], than it has with, for example, a
Townshend caricature of 1756. For this reason, Gombrich errs when, as an instance of the general scholarly failure to accommodate the political print, he points to the promiscuous selections of 'popular illustrated histories' in which political prints 'jostle uneasily with portraits, maps, and pictures of pageantries and assassinations'.

The problem here, as in so many other instances, is one of nomenclature: Gombrich is concerned with the 'political cartoon' and with 'caricature', the use of which as inclusive, generic terms has, paradoxically encouraged a selective approach to the material whereby those prints which are deemed 'proto-caricature' or which approximate most closely to the 'modern newspaper cartoon' are plucked out of their contemporary graphic context and placed within an artificially-constructed context of 'the development of political caricature' or 'the cartoon'.

In order to place political prints within their contemporary graphic context - by which is meant not only the full range of images on paper but related images in other media - scholars must be made aware of the profusion of relevant material. With respect to images on paper alone, the range of extant material is insufficiently documented.

The inadequacies of prints documentation and the failure of those who have addressed the political print to acknowledge the existence of, still less to engage with, related images both on paper and in other media should be seen as part of a larger problem, however. It was to the credit of the architects of The Shadow of the Guillotine that

conventional academic divisions between art and popular culture and between various art-historical disciplines (ceramics, glass, sculpture, painting, printing) were rigorously questioned or even discarded.
Outwith the occasional collaborative effort, however, these divisions remain in force.

Perhaps the most pernicious of these is the division of material into 'fine art' and 'the rest' which still prevails. Thus, while the two striking oil on panel works, The Power of Great Britain by Land and The Power of Great Britain by Sea, have been attributed to Sir James Thornhill and hang as 'art' in the Yale Center for British Art, the anonymous engraving which employs the same iconography to a similar end is liable to languish in a 'misc.' solander box, uncatalogued and unregarded. 17 Significantly, the section of the V&A's Anglo-Dutch exhibition of 1974 which was devoted to 'engravings and etchings', while it included a 1641 broadsheet designed by Hollar celebrating the first Stuart-Orange marriage, failed to include a single broadsheet engraving relating to the events of 1688-1702. 18 The Age of William III and Mary II was more comprehensive, but David Alexander's account of print production in England in this period was, nonetheless, informed by hierarchies of aesthetic worth and graphic significance which were, as far as political prints were concerned, unhelpful.

Iconographers have delighted in the decoding and contextualising of large decorative schemes such as Thornhill's ceiling of the Painted Hall at Greenwich Hospital - for example Edgar Wind's excellent account of Verrio's scheme for the decoration of the King's Staircase at Hampton Court, 'Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court', 19 - but have shown little inclination to study political iconography outwith the boundaries of accredited 'fine art', so that while Christiaan Schuckman could remark the extent to which

Dutch printmaking at the end of the 17th century focussed on William [...] an almost categorical personality cult surrounded the
stadtholder-king; both he and the incisively
derided Louis XIV increasingly dominate the
official portrait, the allegorical portrait,
the satire, the allegorical history print
and the journalistic print rendering current
events,
such images have yet to be studied in their entirety
from an iconographical or iconological perspective; still
less alongside similar representations in other media.

Art historical research continues to be delimited by
medium as much as by period or country, so that if an
aesthetic hierarchy of graphic images has contrived to
separate such prints as Gerard de Lairesse's William of
Orange Freeing England and BM 1204 In Memory of Ye
Deliverance from Popery and Slavery by King William III
MDCXXXVIII [Plates 19 and 20] or England's Memorial
[Plate 13], the medium-based nature of traditional art
historical research has militated against the
iconographical study which would comprehend the tapestry
which celebrates William and Mary as King and Queen of
England exhibited at the V&A in 1964, the polemical medal
[Plate 21] and, for example, Caius Gabriel Cibber's
representation of Hercules triumphing over Tyranny and
Superstition, which is to be seen on a pediment on the
east facade of Hampton Court Palace.

While specialist research has resulted in valuable
studies of, for example, 18th-century glass, such studies
have conventionally addressed relevant items as examples
of that medium and/or of a particular stage in that
medium's 'development', or as vehicles of artistic
expression: only rarely have such studies been concerned
with an item as the vehicle of political meaning. In
such accounts, the political context in which an artefact
was produced, its subject-matter and iconography, may be
regarded as incidental. Failure to comment on these
aspects of an artefact reduces the usefulness of an
article or book to those pursuing this line of enquiry. To the scholar seeking to establish the ways in which, for example, the apologists of William and Mary employed iconography and used the visual image to assert the new regime's legitimacy, the distinctions of media and the criteria of artistic quality which have conventionally separated these images are irrelevant, and, insofar as they have militated against the concerted study of this or of similar themes, invidious.

Arguably, the problem is as much curatorial as it is academic, or, to put it another way, the academic division and subdivision of the material evidence of art historical research both reflects and is encouraged by the existing categorisation of images and artefacts by museums and galleries. Outwith the rare thematic exhibition, curatorial policy has dictated that artefacts be stored and catalogued by medium. Thus images which if placed together form a coherent and instructive picture of the graphic response - in the widest sense - to a particular individual or event may be divided between different collections within an institution, and not infrequently divided between more than one institution, to a considerable extent frustrating - certainly not facilitating - comparative studies of the kind I believe to be necessary and desirable.

Together, the emphases of prints scholarship, of traditional art historical scholarship and of curatorial policy have, if only by default, resulted in an incomplete picture of the pictorial argument and propaganda of a given period. George's silence regarding media other than satirical prints and caricatures renders her account of the use of pictorial imagery as a polemical tool in EPC insubstantial.

The evidence suggests that, for example, the iconographic war waged on the religious and dynastic
issue between 1679 and c.1760 was waged as much with numismatic as it was with graphic weapons: George's failure to accommodate this and related material results in a misleading impression of a paucity of material on this issue prior to 1754-46, when EPC remarks a handful of satirical prints. In this way, our understanding of the use of pictorial images to political ends in the 17th and 18th centuries is impoverished.

In 1974, Atherton could describe political prints as 'a corpus of source material for the study of eighteenth-century politics': it is a corpus which could more profitably be studied within the context of related images in other media.

The advantages of a more inclusive and at same time more specific focus - for example, the study of the iconography of William of Orange in all media - are several.

The study of a wider range of works on paper than has been conventional has the potential to correct the focus of political prints study. Where hitherto this has focussed on caricature, scrutiny of the complete range of works on paper of the post-1750 period may call into question the orthodoxy that 'caricature had become the dominant form' or idiom of 18th-century political satire and argument.

The study of a wider range of political images in media other than works on paper has the potential to focus the attention of scholars on iconography. It is particularly ironic that on the first page of EPC, George should remark the historian's tendency 'to neglect iconography' when the iconographical and rhetorical relationship between pictorial political argument in different media within a given period has by and large been ignored by those who have addressed these prints, and when it is possible to treat of a print such as BM 1188 De Gequetste
Franche Beer ('The Wounded French Bear') in isolation from BM 1191, only one of several medallic counterparts to, or sources of, this print (Plates 22 and 23). The iconography of the Orange tree which informs the satire of England's Memorial and The Virtue of a Protestant Orange is to be found also in a medal celebrating the overthrow of James II (BM 1190).

By analysing the iconography employed in contemporaneous material across several media, moreover, scholars may come to recognise and address the iconographical continuities of pictorial political comment and satire over the course of three centuries, as motifs and allusions which may temporarily disappear from the prints prove to have survived in other media. The glass dated c.1751 engraved with a portrait of Charles II in the Boscobel Oak, the branches containing three crowns, possibly a centenary commemoration, is a case in point, as is a glass dating from c.1740 thought to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne (Plates 24 and 25).24

Until such artefacts as these are seen and studied as manifestations of a larger political and historical discourse prosecuted by visual means, a 'material culture' of allegiance and political interest, of which engravings, woodcuts and etchings are merely one manifestation among many, our understanding of the latter will remain partial and insecure.

1. See Part II, Chapter III.
2. Playing-cards: EPC1 pp.48,52,60,62,64,68,74 and n,75; Hodnett, p.26; Atherton, Political Prints p.53; Kunzle, Early Comic Strip pp.5,136-145; Harris, London Crowds pp.102,108,110-12,119,133; McCubbin and Hamilton-Phillips, p.85. See also S.A. Hankey 'Remarks upon a Series of Forty-Nine Historical Cards, with Engravings, Representing the Conspiracy of Titus Oates' Archaeological Journal 30 (1873) 187; J.R.S. Whiting, A Handful of History (Dursley:1978); W.H. Willshire, A Descriptive

Fans: Llewellyn, The Art of Death: Visual Culture in the English Death Ritual c.1500 - c.1800 (London: 1991) p.94. See also Lionel Cust, Catalogue of the Collection of Fans and Fan-leaves presented to the Trustees of the British Museum by Lady Charlotte Schreiber (London:1893). There is, as far as I am aware, no study devoted to fans as carriers of broadly 'political' and related commemorative representations; such a study would be very welcome. There is no lack of material; Monod, Jacobitism p.76, describes a painted fan in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum dated 1720:

'James III in an oak tree, his head circled by three crowns; next to him, Queen Anne ascends to heaven amid dark clouds [...] and winged cherubs. Beneath her, Britannia mourns, leaning on a table on which the orb, crown and sceptre are placed. To relieve her distress, a cherub lifts a curtain to reveal the arms of the house of Stuart, surmounting a large white rose. The popular imagery of the 1650s has been revived here in a Jacobite context, with Queen Anne playing the role of Charles I, and her half-brother representing Charles II. Significantly, James III is depicted not as a figure of authority and power, but as the successor to his sister, whose sovereignty he had never acknowledged [...]. [The] picture is a gentle fantasy, in which the real problems of a restoration are forgotten. The return of the rightful king will be as simple as it was in 1660'.

Readers of Korshin's Typologies in England will recognise the typological nature of such pictorial representation.

The Sacheverell fan-leaf, BM 1525 [Plates 2 and 3], has, recto, a miniature portrait of Queen Anne supported by two angels, one of which also holds a mitre over the head of Sacheverell. With Sacheverell are depicted the six bishops who voted for his acquittal. Stephens notes also the persons of the Duke of Ormond and William Bromley, on horseback. In the background is St Paul's cathedral; in the middle distance a group of martyrs of the Church, including Charles I. A hydra, the mouth of hell, a house built on sand collapsing, a French boat steered by the Pope, and the figure of King David playing the harp. Verso, seven sunbeams penetrate seven clouds to illuminate seven palm trees. The Speck/Madan bibliography quotes, p.269 [M973] a contemporary advertisement of this fan, The Supplement 13-15 September 1710, which includes a warning against
inferior copies.

Atherton, Political Prints pp.17,64; 64 n. quotes an advertisement from Old Common Sense; or, The Englishman's Journal 12 May 1739 'This Day is Publish'd, Most accurately delineated on a Fan-mount.

The Convention or Spanish Cruelty expos'd and censur'd [...] the whole embellish'd in a beautiful Manner'; figure 13, unfortunately printed very small, is a fan comparing Walpole to Wolsey in the Pierpont Morgan Library collection (see also EPC1, p.83 on BM 1925). Significantly, one searches Atherton's index in vain for 'fans'; the problems occasioned by such 'indexing' in the prosecution of searches for relevant materials in non-print media are considerable.

3. For medals, E. Hawkins, Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland 2 vols (London:1885 and 1969; J.R.S. Whiting, Commemorative Medals (London:1972); Laurence Brown, British Historical Medals. I: 1760-1837 (London:1980); Noel Woolf, The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement (London:1988) give some idea of the scope for research in this very large field. Significantly, Atherton, Political Prints pp.31-32 alludes only to Dutch medals as an 'influence' on the iconography of English prints (in this he follows EPC). Such medals cannot be seen in isolation; Woolf, pp.15,27,28,30,32,37,39,56,73,75,87,95,96-98,100, 103-105,106,110, 116-118,123,127,137-38 reproduces and discusses medals produced in Britain (for obvious reasons, most Stuart medallic propaganda was struck in France or Rome). For the period covered by Atherton's study, those struck by the (Hanoverian) Loyal Associations in 1745 (Woolf, p.95); by the Cumberland Society (ibid, p.103); by the Oak society (ibid, pp.116-118); and the Royal Oak Club (ibid, p.127) might have been mentioned; Woolf reproduces several relevant print satires. Woolf does not mention the large silver badge engraved with the white horse of Hanover (legend: 'Liberty') which is awarded in the annual Thames Watermen's race, instituted in 1715.


4. For the quality possible in printing on cloth, see Antony Griffiths, 'Three Theses' PtQtly IX (1992)
Shorter Notices, pp. 193-97. Handkerchiefs would seem to have been employed as the vehicle for such images at least from the beginning of the 18th century. Madan [M971] records an advertisement (The Supplement 31 July-2 August 1710) of a printed silk handkerchief depicting Sacheverell and the six bishops who supported him 'which will not be prejudiced by washing' and available from the shops in Westminster hall, Smithfield, the Poultry and most haberdashers and linen drapers in London' but of which no instance appears to have survived.

For a later period, Patten, GCLTA p. 308 writes that Robert Cruikshank's 'large silk handkerchief emblazoned with a design heralding The Glorious Reform in Parliament was praised by The Times and much copied'. For printing on cotton, see Olson, Emblems pp. 11, 230 and figure 49.

5. For example, the English Delftware dish (c. 1689) p. xxvii, also pp. 75, 297, 304-306; the medals reproduced pp. 9, 23, 30, 42, 129, 218, 220, 223. The Age of William III does not reproduce any political or commemorative glass.

6. For example, G. B. Hughes, 'Jacobite Drinking Glasses and their Relation to Jacobite Medals' British Numismatic Journal n.s. VI (1921-22) p. 270.

7. Wardroper, Cruikshank 200 p. 19 has as exhibits 12a and 13, two Cruikshank designs on Staffordshire jugs, 12a being an adaptation of a print, Murat Reviewing the Grand Army!!! (1813), but Godfrey, English Caricature does not refer to the non-paper career of the satirists's images. As an important means of disseminating the images of the London printshops to a broader market, the use of such designs on pottery merits study in its own right. Care must be taken, however, to avoid assuming 'mass production' even of cheaper artefacts; see John Styles's excellent appraisal of this pitfall, 'Manufacturing, consumption and design in eighteenth-century England' in eds Porter and Brewer, Consumption and the World of Goods 527-54, pp. 529-41.


10. For example, EPC1 pp. 17, 36 for adaptations of the frontispiece to Eikon Basilike, 154 for the adaptation of designs to Staffordshire pottery, p. 90 to fans. EPC2 p. 66 for loyalist invasion scare ephemera (1803), p. 194 for ephemera produced during the trial of Queen Caroline, p. 242 for that produced
in 1831-32 including (p.244) silk handkerchiefs.

11. p.3, my emphasis.
12. ibid.
13. Cuno, Introduction, p.14; see James Leith, 'Ephemera: Civic Education Through Images' in eds Darnton and Roche, Revolution in Print 270-89. For the very public genre of commemorative propaganda, the illuminated transparency, see Trevor Fawcett, 'Patriotic Transparencies in Norwich, 1798-1814' Norfolk Archaeology xxxiv (1968) cited Colley 'Apocalypse' p.114; Olson, Emblems p.11. Such displays might be seen as a slightly debased version of the triumphal arches, with their elaborate emblematic schemes, common to the 17th- and early 18th-centuries, for example that commemorated in mezzotint reproduced p.39, Mccubbin and Hamilton-Phillips. For a related form, see Ann Massing, 'From Print to Painting: the Techniques of Glass Transfer Painting' PtQilty VI (1989) 383-93.
14. GCLTA, p.78.
18. The Orange and the Rose: Holland and Britain in the Age of Observation 1650-1750 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum:1964) For the Hollar print, see pp.53, and Plate XXII.
20. Shuckman, in Mccubbin and Hamilton-Phillips, p.282. It would seem that such prints have to some extent fallen victim to an all-too-familiar linear perspective on Dutch printmaking; 'preconceived [art] historiographical categories, with a "golden" 17th century said already to show symptoms of decline in the 1680s' (p.290). Mccubbin and Hamilton-Phillips are keen to stress 'the rich visual legacy in printed Williamite propaganda' (p.8).
21. Reproduced in Mccubbin and Hamilton-Phillips, p.9. Such a breadth of material will also reveal the extent to which different iconographies were employed at - using these terms very broadly - an 'elite' and a 'popular' level, something on which Monod touches in Jacobitism with respect to the Stuart image post-1688 (pp.72-73).
22. Medals are mentioned in EPC1 p.62, but to cite one striking omission, George ignores the medals produced commemorating the Seven Bishops. On p.63 'the sparsity and conventionality of English prints on the wars with France' is stressed; 'eighteen years of meagre pictorial output in the face of great events'; similarly, p.73 'the lack of political prints in the
first six years of George I's reign'. So much for the numismatic war documented by Woolf. Michael Sharp, *The Collection of Jacobite and Anti-Jacobite Medals and Stuart Touchpieces formed by Noel Woolf* (London, Glendinnings, Sale Catalogue: 4 November 1992) refers (foreword) to 'a medallic war fought for more than a century between the [exiled] Stuarts and their supplanters'; 'many of the medals were the product of the leading artists and engravers of their times'. Sharp disputes the conventional term 'commemorative' in respect of this material; these were 'weapons of an intellectual war'.

23. Political Prints, p. vi.
the image is ultimately, of its very nature, not reducible to words - however much words may be necessary adjuncts to the image to project the full complexity of its meaning.

Ronald Paulson, Emblem and Expression p. 8
Chapter I: Suggestions for Future Research

This thesis began with an examination of the extent to which scholars have recognised the inadequacies of scholarship respecting 17th- and 18th-century political prints. The chapters which followed were an attempt to identify precisely those perceptions of the nature and function of this material which are unhelpful, inadequate, anachronistic or erroneous.

Returning to those texts critical of prints scholarship with which this thesis began, it may be observed that, while these identify several of the problems which have dogged political prints scholarship, they offer little in way of solutions or alternative approaches.

Celina Fox, for example, made several justifiable criticisms in the context of the Chadwyck-Healey series and the exhibition *English Caricature 1620 to the Present*, but other than advocating the study of a broader range of primary evidence than that represented by the B.M. collection (or, more narrowly still, the *Catalogue*) - a point which is taken up in Chapter IV below - and a greater sensitivity to the artistic qualifications of the better prints (for which see Chapter II, below), these reviews are critical rather than constructive.\(^1\)

The 'debate' between Coupe and Streicher is, ultimately, inconclusive because, as far as I have been able to ascertain, Streicher did not respond to Coupe's criticisms.\(^2\) Coupe's essay proves to be, in the author's own words, 'a modification of certain assertions' made by Streicher, rather than the delineation of an alternative approach to this material.\(^3\)

Streicher's analysis is accompanied by specific directions for future research, about which several observations are in order.\(^4\) In the first place, Streicher's suggestions are informed by author's belief in the possibility of, and thus tend to the construction
of, a comprehensive theory of 'political caricature'. It is to this 'theory' that the studies of specific aspects of the material and its history which Streicher suggests would contribute.

In the second place, most of Streicher's suggestions refer to the 'political cartoon' of the 19th and 20th centuries, and are neither relevant nor practical with respect to the 17th- and 18th-century political print.

That said, there has yet to appear a study devoted to the 'relations between publishers and caricaturists' in the 18th century, while Lois Potter's account of royalist publishing between 1641 and 1660 shows what may be achieved by a closer attention to the publishers of political prints in the 17th century.5

Similarly, while it is not clear precisely what Streicher intends by 'comparative studies of publishers, caricaturists and propaganda campaigns', there is ample scope for studies of the production of prints in the context of a particular crisis: my own researches have established the Sacheverell Crisis as particularly suited to such a study; others which offer sufficient material include the Exclusion Crisis, the Jewish Naturalisation Act of 1753, and Catholic Emancipation. The risk with such studies, of course, is that they will tend towards or lapse into the familiar 'illustrative' approach to the material.6 An approach which placed prints in the context of a wider journalism, both with respect to publishers, chronology and the extent to which they reflect - in phraseology or iconography - an awareness of other published contributions would counter this tendency and redress one of the more conspicuous imbalances of prints scholarship to date.

Again, when Streicher suggests the study of 'the caricaturist and his sponsors', he has a 19th- or 20th-century context in mind, but it is the case that scant attention has been given to the instigation and
invention, as opposed to the execution, of political prints. While it may never be possible to construct a complete picture of what might be termed the original, i.e., non-commercial, patronage of political prints, in the absence of the attempt we are left with surmise, and our understanding of contemporary perceptions of the rhetorical capacities of printed images is impoverished as a consequence.

More problematically, Streicher's 'theory of political caricature' requires information on the psychological and political motivation, as well as on the working environment, of the professional caricaturist or graphic political satirist, his suggestion that future studies concern themselves with the 'self-image' of the professional caricaturist as a self-appointed 'manipulator of data and as a possible force in public opinion', information about whose 'social origins, generation and recruitment' together with a consideration of his 'social and psychological motivation', would make possible 'a prediction as to [his] ultimate political commitment' or at the very least 'the comprehension of his present loyalties'. This presupposes the existence of background information which is unlikely to be available even with respect to the better-documented professionals of the so-called 'Golden Age': Streicher's advocacy of autobiographies as a source of such information (he cites those of Low and Grosz) underlines the 20th-century bias of his suggestion.

Furthermore, while, for example, the Jacobite sympathies of the younger George Bickham merit attention, Streicher's presupposition of political commitment on the part of the graphic satirist is essentially anachronistic for the 1640-1832 period, in which the committed professional was atypical (George Townshend, significantly, was an amateur); a period which belongs to the hired needle, the 'visual Grubean'. Streicher
advocates tabulation and analysis of an individual caricaturist's output, either over his entire career or over the course of a particular crisis, as a means of gauging his sympathies and commitment. When it is considered that the satirical output of, for example, Gillray or George Cruikshank includes the virtually simultaneous design and publication of prints supporting diametrically opposed perceptions of an issue, the usefulness of such an exercise must be thrown into doubt.

More importantly, this, together with several of Streicher's other suggestions, has the potential to perpetuate the emphases and omissions identified in Part I. That studies should address 'caricature in general', for example, is nothing less than a mandate for further over-general, geographically and historically promiscuous surveys, thereby ensuring that prints scholarship continues to address the material in a naively schematic fashion.

Similarly, Streicher's preoccupation with the figure of the caricaturist would perpetuate the imbalance in favour of the biographical or quasi-biographical study which is evident from the bibliography of the political print, not least insofar as the subjects of such biographies have been the predictable ones of the 'senior caricaturists' - Gillray, Rowlandson, Isaac and George Cruikshank.

The existence of numerous biographical and quasi-biographical studies of varying sophistication for these and other artists has not brought us any closer to the political print or graphic political satire as genres. Indeed, disregarding their individual merits or demerits, they may be said to be part of the problem, both in terms of their chronological bias, and their bias toward caricature.

This is not to say that the biographical mode is incapable of producing fresh insights. The most recent essay in this vein, however, R.L. Patten's 'definitive' biography of George Cruikshank (1992), the first to use
the mass of largely uncatalogued archival material which exists for the artist's life and work, was, to say the least, disappointing with regard to Cruikshank's political prints. Patten proffers a more coherent account of Cruikshank's work in this genre than is afforded by the chronological, event-oriented structure of, for example, EPC and John Wardroper's Kings, Lords and Wicked Libellers, but there is little in the way of new information, certainly not the 'wealth of new information' promised by the publishers: indeed, Patten's account draws extensively - to the point of replication - on his 1983 essay 'Conventions of Georgian Caricature'.

Challenged by recent developments in art historical study (see Chapter II), the reification of the 'man-and/as-his-work' is in any case inappropriate to those prints the authorship of which is inconclusive and to the still greater number of prints which must remain resolutely anonymous. As the 17th century has the greater share of the latter, a biographical approach to the study of graphic political satire and/or argument can only perpetuate a chronological imbalance which I have argued to have been deleterious to our understanding of the 18th-century print as well as regrettable in its own right.

Biographies of the few 17th-century draughtsmen whose identity is known are unlikely to redress this imbalance; the several accounts of the life and work of Romeyn de Hooghe which have appeared have yet to prompt a reappraisal of the 17th-century political print in England, accounts of which continue to derive from that given in EPC, while Edward Hodnett's biography of Francis Barlow fixes that figure firmly within the linear model of the development of the 'cartoon' and while recognising Barlow's talents in this genre, parrots the conventional account of 17th-century dullness.

Streicher also suggests that it might be helpful to
study political caricature through the study of the representation of a given individual; Streicher cites A.M. Broadley's *Napoleon in Caricature*.

In that this would shift the focus of attention from the artist and the 'development' of the idiom to the prints themselves, there is something to be said for this as an approach. As a caveat, it might be observed that it has the potential to reinforce the chronological bias of prints scholarship, if only because, print for print, the post-1760 period offers more in the way of material. 11 It could also reinforce the bias towards caricature, notwithstanding that, as noted in Chapter V, the post-1760 period saw the survival of all pre-caricatural devices for the representation of individuals.

A study in the earlier period of the representation of, for example, the Duke of Newcastle, would be interesting provided the author avoided the determinist pitfall of 'proto-caricature'. For the post-1760 period, too, the study of the representation of an individual in graphic satire and caricature risks affirming the primacy of facial caricature over other aspects of such representation. For this reason, the most interesting and valuable studies are likely to be those which treat satirical prints, and, where appropriate, caricatures, in a broader context of pictorial representation: to take one example, printed images of James II.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Streicher's analysis is his recognition of the need for iconographical analysis, for a study of political prints which would chart both the survival of, and changes in, motifs over time. In Part I, I observed that, for several reasons, prints scholarship over many decades has emphasised change rather than continuity in these genres. Chapter V will examine the scope for such an analysis of this material.
Other approaches to the material suggested by Streicher are unhelpfully vague. It is far from clear, for example, what is intended by the study of the 'relations between caricature and nations': as a type of such a study, Streicher cites EPC; yet, as noted in Chapter VIII above, George fails to address the claims of the 17th- and 18th-century political print to be regarded as a national genre. Similarly, it is difficult to know what Streicher has in mind when he advocates 'comparative studies' in 'caricature and social structure', unless by this he means the context in which the political print first appeared or in which it flourished, which to date has meant celebration of 'print(s), Protestantism and Liberty' or moral censure of an ideologically-bankrupt or somnolent 'spoils system' of politics: caricatures of the early 18th century which future studies of this period would do well to eschew (and of which a corollary is the neglect of the 17th century). The suggested theme, 'comparative studies of caricaturists and social structures', is still more opaque.

Roy Porter identifies as the main problems of prints scholarship the failure of scholars to address these images as 'art' as opposed to 'evidence' (in this, the art historian is held to be culpable; this is considered in Chapter II below) and the tendency on the part of the historian to see political prints as secondary primary evidence. The print's status as dustjacket illustration might be a foible of the publishing-house, but it to a great extent reflects its status in the mind of the average historian. Even those historians who have directly addressed this material have tended to study prints for confirmation or amplification of known facts.

Porter advocates a closer scrutiny of individual prints with reference not to their ostensible subject-matter but to seemingly incidental detail. The approach Porter advocates is at once closer and more oblique than that
which has been conventional; as an example of this redirection of focus, he cites David Dabydeen's *Hogarth's Blacks*, a study of the incidence of negroes in Hogarth's paintings and prints. With effort, Porter claims, we can 'deconstruct' cartoons; we can refuse to take their explicit subjects at face value, and rather explore the silent sign-systems they represent.

As Porter sees it the great problem (which is at same time the potential and the delight) with regard to political prints is that they are commonly not unequivocal but polysemic; they may be saying more than meets the eye; there are different layers of meaning, and not all may be congruent with each other.

Five years' scrutiny of this material bears this out; indeed, with respect to certain prints, this is an understatement.

Herein lies a problem. While Porter is right to advocate the analysis of political prints with a view to uncovering the 'subliminal' social and cultural, as well as the political, messages of these prints; but in so doing he is asking prints scholarship to run when, as yet it can barely walk. Before such a sophisticated analysis of these images can be possible, certain fundamental aspects of this material must be addressed. These are the subject of the following chapters, with the Appendix which follows being an outline of a specific project which would put these suggestions into practice.

Several of the omissions identified in Part I. are not expanded upon here; for example, the absence of basic documentation and research with regard to genuinely popular prints: it is less that I have considered a reappraisal of the nomenclature of prints scholarship to be of greater importance and urgency than the documentation and study of genuinely popular political prints and satires; rather, it will be seen that the
semantic revision advocated in Chapter III will both facilitate and underpin this very necessary research.

1. 'The English Satirical Print' pp.464-65; idem, 'Satire and Censorship' p.331 suggests that more might be made of extant documentation of the known provenance of certain major 18th-century collections, such as that amassed by George IV and now in the Library of Congress; as Fox notes, the disposal (in 1921) of this material from the royal collection is itself of interest from the perspective of the political caricature's changing status as a genre of printmaking and as a historical document.

2. Press's 'Georgian Political Print' published in the same journal a decade later refers to neither.

3. Coupe, pp.94-95.


5. Streicher, 'Appendix: IIIC' p.445; Potter, Secret Rites pp.1-19; David Alexander, reviewing Rix, Our Old Friend Rolly (PtQtly VI (1989) p.184) wrote that a study of Rowlandson's involvement in the print market is still needed, and expressed the hope that Mrs Rix would undertake this. Tim Clayton's forthcoming study of the 18th-century English print trade will, it is to be hoped, fill not only this but the larger gap in the literature.


7. Streicher, pp.440-41.

8. ibid, pp.444-45; Appendix IIB. Wood, '1789' p.340, complains of Cuno, French Caricature, that insufficient attention is given to the working life of graphic artists and argues for a case-study of a figure such as Louis Debucourt, a 'tremendous survivor' of the political vicissitudes of post-1789 Paris; 'we are told nothing of Debucourt's professional relationships, his politics or his working methods'.
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Chapter II: 'Art', not 'evidence'?

The principal function of the printed picture in Western Europe and America has been obscured by the persistent habit of regarding prints as of interest and value only in so far as they can be regarded as works of art.

William Ivins, *Prints and Visual Communication*¹

we must analyse these prints not just as 'evidence' but as 'art'.


When, in 1957, Hofmann complained of an 'historical' view of 'caricature' 'that is in many respects in need of revision', he had in mind an 'objective, cultural-historical' approach which 'rarely questioned' the 'artistic qualities' of a print.³ Malbert, in his preface to Wood's *Folly and Vice*, observes that the political print has been studied 'for what it reveals about its subject' rather than 'for its intrinsic aesthetic qualities; a complaint which recurs throughout the literature.⁴ Central to Celina Fox's criticisms of the Chadwyck-Healey series was the 'distinct unease with the notion of artistic style and technique, let alone individual creative expression' shown by the (historian) compilers; an inept handling of the prints as pictorial material which was most evident in a failure to discriminate between prints of very varied technical and aesthetic sophistication. To compare

a depiction of the Robin Hood Society by an unknown amateur and a Robert Dighton mezzotint of the Court of Equity with hardly any reference being made to the levels of skill involved, let alone the twenty-five year difference in dates [...] to fail to appreciate the difference in artistic power is to fail to come to terms with at least part of the appeal of these prints for their [original] audience.⁵
The reluctance of the average historian to attempt a qualitative aesthetic evaluation of the pictorial 'evidence' before him, an aspect of the prints upon which he is unlikely to feel qualified to comment, is understandable. In so far as his account of the material may convey an inadequate impression of the visual power and impact of the images discussed, this reluctance is to be regretted. I would argue, however, that it has been the failure of the art historian to engage with this material on its own terms which has had the more deleterious consequences for prints scholarship.

It is less that art historians have neglected the political print, although, as Porter observes, they have, in the main, 'cold-shouldered' this and related material. Rather it is that the concerns of conventional art history have informed several of the emphases of prints scholarship identified in Part I as inappropriate or otherwise unhelpful. I would suggest that so far from being the route to a better understanding of political graphics, an approach to political prints which treats them as 'art' has served the material no better than the much-criticised 'historical' or 'contextual' approach, and may, indeed, be deemed responsible for several of the ideas which have to date handicapped scholarship in this field.

That political prints scholarship should be founded on the premise that 'the aggressive imagery of propagandist art [...] does not aim at the achievement of aesthetic effect' is to no small degree the result of approaching this material as 'art'. Baudelaire's decision to study only that category [of 'caricatures'] in which there is something permanent and eternal at work which commends itself to the artist [...] and to the art historian, is applauded by Hofmann; ironically, given Malbert's observation respecting the priorities of prints
scholarship, Baudelaire's exact words are uncritically reproduced in the text of Folly and Vice: many graphic satires 'have value only by reason of the fact which they represent. No doubt [these] have a right to the attention of the historian'. 8 That early 18th-century English political prints and graphic satires 'have been studied almost exclusively for their historical interest shows a proper sense of priorities', declares Godfrey, who concludes an indictment of all but a few of the products of the 17th-century presses with a lame 'this [...] said, there remains much that is of great historical interest'. 9

At the same time, much prints scholarship has been informed by an aesthetic which has encouraged scholars to view political prints, or, to be more precise, political caricature, as a valid form of visual art; this is reflected in, for example, the celebration of caricature as an idiom for aesthetic subversion. Implicit in many accounts is the idea that in the wake of recent 'developments' in artistic perception, what was regarded by its original audience as a vehicle for political comment can become 'art':

the passage of time often helps a particular print to surpass the limitations imposed at its conception. Readers once laughed or winced at Gillray's or Daumier's satirical thrusts; today their artistic relevance is more important.[my emphasis] 10

The key word here is 'relevance'; reappraisal of the aesthetic qualities of political graphics has formerly entailed the exercise of 20th-century criteria of 'artistic relevance'. The aesthetic rehabilitation of these images is in reality the imposition of new and often anachronistic 'limitations' on the material.

The linear model of development which has informed most if not all accounts of 17th- and 18th-century
political prints may be said to reflect a long-standing perception of 'the history of art' as a sequence of discrete periods.

The same is true of the emphasis on individual artists which is another characteristic of prints literature. Art historical study, at least in its traditional form, has been described as 'intimately bound to the concept of attribution': the art historian is concerned with 'the artist's oeuvre, the definition of artistic personality through the identification and analysis of the works, and the writing of catalogues raisonnées'. With regard to post-Renaissance art, at least, attribution is all, and that victim of Time, 'Anon', has had few champions. Fox might deplore the failure of the Chadwyck-Healey authors to engage with 'the definition of artistic personality', but it is precisely this emphasis which has been responsible for the neglect of lesser-known artists and of those many prints whose authorship is unlikely ever to be established. Unwittingly perhaps, Fox's own criticism underlines this:

It does not take too much by way of historical imagination to recognise that the great names of English caricature - Gillray, Rowlandson, Cruikshank [which Cruikshank is not specified] were remembered for a reason: for their brilliance of invention and facility of execution. [...] What is revealed, albeit unintentionally, by these collections is that they were by no means the only stars in the field.[my emphasis]

Because more 17th- than 18th- or early 19th-century prints are anonymous, the value placed on attribution and the emphasis on the artist can only perpetuate neglect of the earlier period, and will ensure that attention remains fixed on the century c.1720-1820. (Thus, while James Sayers is a figure for whom attention and rehabilitation are long overdue, and on whom a scholarly monograph cannot be other than welcome in its own right, in the broader context of prints scholarship, such a study can only affirm the chronological bias identified
This is not to say that there is not a pressing need for further research on early artists such as Faithorne, Barlow and Colledge, or on de Hooghe with specific relation to his role as William of Orange's propagandist both before and after the invasion of 1688. The evidence of scholarship to date suggests, however, that for political prints to be treated 'as art' threatens to reinforce the concentration on the 'great caricaturists' by which the secondary literature is already imbalanced.

In defense of her own eschewal of the terms 'art' and 'artist' in *Rebellion and Reconciliation*, Dolmestch observes that 'only a few satires can be attributed to artists of any note', while in his introductory essay to the Bindman catalogue, Brewer makes the important point that, during the period of the Revolutionary Wars, at least, 'the majority' of those who designed prints 'were amateurs who might occasionally hire a professional to produce their design in printed form'. While Brewer is here in danger of understimating or obscuring the degree to which the practice of graphic satire and political caricature became 'professionalised' during the 18th century, - something which Press has argued convincingly - his observation is, nonetheless, salutory. Dolmestch, too, observes that

throughout the eighteenth century most [American] satires were crudely conceived by anonymous makers, many of whom were barely more than inexpert craftsmen hired by a publisher to translate his political ideas onto a plate for printing.

The inadequacies of an artist-oriented, aesthetic approach to the study of political images such as these are such as to make it extraordinary that this approach still prevails: until an anonymous print is regarded as of potentially equivalent or superior importance to a Gillray, until anonymous prints are subjected to the same
iconographic analysis and deconstruction as the endlessly picked-over plates of Hogarth, our understanding of the material will remain partial and limited.

A further methodological foible of conventional art historical scholarship which has left its mark on political prints literature is a predilection for the critical comparison of images. Thus Wood can write that, 'when set against the fluent draughtsmanship, swirling compositions and instinctive fantasy of Gillray', those satirical prints attributed to Jacques-Louis David 'appear still-born'. Wood applauds Bindman for making this 'point in the best possible way, by allowing direct comparison between the French prints and the English school which stylistically inspired them'.

Disregarding for the moment the question of whether this is a 'point' worth making in the first place, that this is 'the best possible way' to make it, or to assess contemporaneous French and English prints, is certainly open to doubt. Aside from the fact that a comparison of Gillray and his English contemporaries would prompt the same observation, there is a case to be made that this comparative approach not only, necessarily, sets up antitheses which may be artificial or anachronistic, but that it to a greater or a lesser degree predetermines the response to the images in question. Particularly where it is restricted to style as opposed to pictorial structure, this approach limits response and encourages banal pronouncements of the 'this picture is fluent, this one stilted' kind. One art historian has, indeed, written of his profession as 'trapped in a dualistic way of thinking [...] and looking'.
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It is also fair to say that the tendency towards subjective value-judgements, and towards a descriptive as opposed to an analytical method by which much 'art-historical' writing on the prints is characterised, must strike those who come to it from the very different discipline of political history as frustratingly superficial.

Over the course of the last twenty years, however, the 'art historical' approach as it has been defined here has come in for increasing criticism from within the discipline itself. What had often appeared an unreflective discipline with a long-standing tendency to 'theoretical quietism', is now riven by methodological debate, a debate which centres on the so-called 'new' art history. What has been described as 'an anxious liberal stratagem to market a faded product in a new package', encouraging fragmentation in the name of diversity, is seen by its exponents 'as revisionist, as a reaction to [the] formalism, connoisseurship, and iconography', the dominant methodologies in the discipline 'until well into the [...] 1960s'.

An otherwise hostile review of these developments conceded that:

these 'new' art historians had themselves been driven to understandable fury by sterile 'connoisseurship' of a kind that was self-indulgent, arrogant and blinkered in its refusal to pay any attention to political or literary evidence, other than the crudest, that might inform our understanding of works of art. [my emphasis]

Whether the 'new' art history will prove any more sympathetic towards, or better able to deal with, political graphics than the old remains to be seen, and a verdict at this stage would be premature.
Insofar as the 'new' art history has been defined, not only might political graphics at last become a legitimate field for study, but a more sympathetic evaluation of this material might reasonably be expected. We are informed, for instance, that 'the definition of the subject[-matter] of art historical study is changing'; there is 'more of a tendency not to privilege the hierarchical, fine-art object quite as much'.

Previously, the subject-matter of art-historical enquiry has been 'defined by reference to aesthetic criteria, and in particular to hierarchical judgements of worth', which resulted in 'absolute distinctions between those images which are "art" and those which are not, so that not all paintings, and very few printed images, for example, qualify'.

If, moreover, the political nature of these images formerly encouraged the art historian to view them as the preserve of the historian, the shibboleth of the 'new' art history that, 'from a certain perspective, all art is "political"', in that 'it cannot avoid reflecting the ideology and prejudices both of the artist and (of) the society that produced it', threatens to render this distinction irrelevant. What one art historian has described as

a greater [...] appreciation that art is not simply another visual document, is not simply a passive reflection of history, but rather an active shaper of it, as much as other components of society

augurs well for greater insights into the rhetorical power of visual images - most obviously, but not exclusively, those of a propagandist kind - within their contemporary context; insights of which the study of political graphics has for too long stood in want.

The essence of the 'new' art history appears to be to see 'art' as part of a larger material culture. Yet
while a shift away from purely aesthetic criteria can only be to the good as far as political graphics is concerned, enthusiasm must be guarded.

For one thing, the novelty of the 'new' art history does not always stand scrutiny; indeed, this is a recurrent criticism. Certainly the 'new' art history is not so 'new' that it has abandoned the canonically-secure artist. In the wake of what might have seemed the exhaustive attentions of Ronald Paulson, the appearance of, among other post-Paulson studies, David Dabydeen's *Hogarth's Blacks* and *Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain*, indicated that, as far as the 18th-century English print was concerned, the ground covered by the 'new' art history would not differ fundamentally from that covered by the old.

This is not the only aspect of the 'new' art history about which I have reservations. Aside from the question of whether a discipline in the throes of change and redefinition - and some art historians speak not so much of a debate within the subject but of an as-yet unresolved cold war between the 'old' art historians and the 'new' socio-cultural art historians (sometimes referred to, confusingly, as 'the historians') - is capable of addressing long-standing methodological problems in the study of political prints, it is possible to identify, from the writings of both its advocates and its critics, tendencies in the 'new' art history which threaten to exacerbate those problems.

In an incisive *Apollo* editorial, entitled 'Reconstructing art history: Disappearing facts and the growth of factionalism' (1991), Robin Simon wrote that despite the best efforts of recent theorists, works of art have refused to disappear, and persist in [providing pleasure, instruction and inspiration]. It has become apparent [...] in
the last few years that they may also provide an excuse for the comfortable employment of a large number of academics who indulge in acting out a fantasy of political engagement in the most inappropriate theatre imaginable. 27

Certainly the unassailable ascendancy currently enjoyed by 'feminist' art history, theory, and criticism might be taken as depressing confirmation of Simon's analysis (in the wake of Dabydeen's Hogarth's Blacks, can 'Hogarth's Women' be far behind?) 28 Is it impermissible to speculate whether the plaudits with which so slight a volume as Dabydeen's Hogarth's Blacks was greeted had as much to do with the subject-matter and the unexceptionable nature of the author's conclusions as with the quality or freshness of its insights and the rigour of its scholarship?

It may or may not be the case that art 'cannot avoid reflecting the ideology and prejudices both of the artist and [of] the society that produced it', but where this proves to be truer of the art historians than of his material, our understanding of the latter can only suffer, and it will go hard with 17th- and 18th-century political graphics should 'historically-aware' translate as 'politically-correct'. 29

Certainly, if such articles as Marcia Pointon's 'Portrait-painting as a Business Enterprise in London in the 1780s' and David Solkin's 'The Battle of the Ciceros: Richard Wilson and the Politics of Landscape in the Age of John Wilkes', together with such larger studies as Dabydeen's Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain, are representative of the new 'historically-aware' art history, reservations as to the value of such a perspective on the political print would appear to be valid. 30 In Pointon's study, for instance, valuable insights into the practical and commercial aspects of portraiture in late 18th-century England are offset by the author's evident antipathy towards the patrons of the works in question, and by the author's preoccupation with
'class' - Pointon is exercised by 'the ambiguous nature of the class relationship between artist and subject' and with 'the reaffirmation or redefinition of class boundaries which is fundamental to the act of portraiture' -, while her 'the portrait-as-utilitarian-object' approach takes the 'tendency not to privilege the hierarchical, fine-art object' to its logical conclusion.  

The 'new' art historian's emphasis on 'the politics of art' does not augur well for our understanding of 'the art of politics', for all that Porter hopes that future studies of the political will embrace both.  

As far as the future study of political graphics is concerned, a view of 18th-century art and society which is rooted in the notion of conflict, aesthetic or social, can only perpetuate the 'high art/low art', 'portrait/caricature' antitheses which have done so much to obscure the shared pictorial and iconographic inheritance between satiric and non-satiric images and still more the correspondences between political imagery in disparate media.

The emphases of scholarship in this field to date have to no small degree been determined by authorial hostility to many significant aspects of 18th-century English society, and a concomitant emphasis on the anti-social nature of graphic political satire. The 'new' art history threatens to give the 'caricaturist-as-social critic' line a fresh lease of life; conversely, and notwithstanding that anachronism and indignation do not necessarily make for illumination, the 'sexism', 'racism', 'xenophobia', 'corruption' or 'hypocrisy' which finds expression in many of the prints themselves will continue to be deplored. In this way, both the ground covered and the perspective from which political prints are viewed will continue to be both partial and anachronistic.

It also remains to be established whether the
emphasis on the historical context of images will be sufficiently rigorous as to avoid the pitfalls of triteness and determinism. One critic of the 'new' art history has deprecated 'its employment of contextual evidence' as 'clumsy, inept and selective'.

While it may or may not be true that 'from the work of art, from the picture, from the sculpture, from the architecture', the scholar 'can arrive at the society' which produced it, it is certainly true that if the scholar begins with the society, he is 'in danger of taking what [he] find[s] in the society and putting it in the work of art'.

The historical 'context' which has 'explained' the post-Bubble 'take-off point' of graphic political satire - the 'preconditions of peace, Protestantism and (limited) liberty of the press - is a case in point. In the same way, an enduring perception of 17th-century Holland as a secular, 'middle-class' or 'bourgeois' society coloured perceptions of Dutch art; preoccupation with its alleged 'verismilitude' obscuring, until recently, the role of allegory and typology in, and the didactic- emblematic qualities of, Dutch pictures.

Whether historians will continue to cite Dutch art as the versimilitudinous 'mirror' of Dutch society is another matter. J.C.D. Clark has described as 'among the most effective barriers to historical research' 'those unwritten rules which have grown up to inhibit scholars from questioning the received orthodoxy in adjacent areas';

Even the best scholars sometimes seem up to a quarter of a century in arrears in their understanding of the course of scholarship in adjoining periods which have been designated 'somebody else's'.

Still more than adjoining periods, adjacent disciplines are vulnerable to precisely this scholarly discontinuity; if art historians are not sufficiently conversant with
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recent debates within 17th- and 18th-century history, the historical 'context' in which their analyses are rooted is likely to prove as shallow as the token paragraph on the art-historical background which is still to be encountered in the more general histories of the period. Studies as diverse as Alan Young's 'The English Civil War Flags: Emblematic Devices and Propaganda', M.M. Goldsmith's 'Hobbes's Ambiguous Politics', Lois Potter's Secret Rites and Secret Writings and Tessa Watt's Cheap Print and Popular Piety show what is possible when the artificial boundaries which separate the study of written documents and the study of visual evidence, are ignored. Only by work of this calibre is the 'iconophobia' of the conventional historian likely to be overcome: it is to be feared that the often crude historical 'contextualising' of the 'new' art historians will entrench as many prejudices in the adjacent disciplines as it wins converts.

The second characteristic of the 'new' art history which can only be deleterious to the study of political graphics is the degree to which the 'new' methodologies are grounded in and oriented towards, theory. Art history has been described as 'a discipline that lags behind rather than leads others', so that long after the various bandwagons of marxism, structuralism and deconstruction have rolled past the history and English departments of our universities, leaving memories of damaging rows behind, art historians can be seen clinging to the tailgates, still struggling to clamber aboard.

Are these the 'certain current precocities' of which Hogarth would have made 'mincemeat', according to Porter? Certainly it would seem that the demands of pertinence and even, if the critical pot-pourri assembled by Wood in the pages of Folly and Vice is anything to go
by, of intelligibility, are too often overridden by
tendentious theorising expressed in obscurantist
prose. 46

Notwithstanding that many see in these methodologies
only a potential for 'philosophical and critical
solipsism, ambiguity, indeterminacy, and [...] cynicism',
it has been claimed that 'the structuralist
methodologies' offer the scholar the possibility of
finding unity and coherence in material that is otherwise
disparate'. 47 This is one of the more significant
challenges facing the scholar in the study of political
graphics; whether 'the structuralist methodologies' will
assist the political prints scholar to this end is less
certain.

In a significant criticism, the adoption of
structuralist or semiotic approaches has been condemned
as the creation of 'a theoretical superstructure which
has no necessary reflex in the art itself [...] , which
is utterly divorced from the artistic object'. 48 As far
as political graphics are concerned, this is perhaps the
most significant drawback to the 'new' art historical
methodologies: that they threaten to distance the scholar
from the image itself, when what is required is closer
analysis of individual images and of the image-systems
and pictorial structures of genres of prints. 49 One art
historian who welcomed the incursion of theory observed
that he 'knew a lot about the material as material, but
[...] really didn't know how to think about it'; before
political prints scholarship attempts to 'think about'
the material in this way, it must address the material
'as material'. 50

In that its classification of legitimate source
material is more catholic than that of traditional art
history, the 'new' art history promises to accommodate
political graphics. Whether the concerns and the
methodologies of the 'new' art history will prove
appropriate or adequate to the study of this material is open to question. In the absence of any 'new' art historical account of the material, a final verdict is neither possible nor appropriate. I would maintain, however, that the theoretical soil in which the 'new' methodologies are rooted is potentially prejudicial to the better understanding of this material. At the same time, while it allows for a shift in emphasis from the aesthetic evaluation of political prints to consideration of their production and consumption which can only be to the good, the other dominant strain of the 'new' art history - the socio-historical - threatens to affirm the emphasis on the political-historical context of political prints which has been recognised to be inadequate, and thereby to compound the failure of most studies to date to look at political graphics in pictorial terms, and, more broadly, at the rhetorical capacities of these images.

'Art' or 'evidence'? To date, neither the historian's emphasis on context nor the art historian's preoccupation with aesthetic evaluation has brought us any closer to these prints. Many, particularly emblematic prints, remain pictorial enigmas, their appeal to their original audience insufficiently comprehended. The question of 'artistic merit' should play no further part in the analysis of political prints. They were not created as 'art' but as visual argument; it is the ideas and the arguments expressed in these prints, and in particular the ways in which those ideas and arguments are constructed, that demand attention.

To treat these prints as though their pictorial nature were irrelevant or incidental, is, however, to replace one distortion with another. If our understanding of political prints is to progress, scholars must engage with such prints not as 'art', but as images and image-systems and replace qualitative aesthetic
evaluation with analysis of the rhetorical capacities of an image.

Thus, while recognition of its political-historical context is often a prerequisite for grasping the point of a given print, and while a more secure knowledge of the context in which prints were produced, that is, knowledge of their instigation, manufacture and consumption, is necessary if we are to evaluate prints as historical documents, future scholarship must address the political print as a rhetorical image. Anything which diverts attention from this aspect of the material while it has yet to be addressed in any depth will leave us at best blinkered in 'seeing the past'.

There are, I would suggest, two approaches by which the pictorial nature of these prints might be addressed. Both draw upon the 'old' rather than the 'new' art-historical methodologies. The first is a more or less iconographical approach. The second, related to the first, is the study of the ways in which individual prints are constructed. The potential of an iconographic analysis of political prints and related pictorial propaganda will be examined in Chapter V and in the Appendix; the different pictorial structures which might profitably be studied are identified in Chapter VI.

Both approaches address political prints as images, and it is this which Porter would really seem to intend when he calls for this material to be treated as 'art'.
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28. The biographical information offered in *Word and Image* states that Cindy McCreery is currently completing a D.Phil. on the subject of 'the depiction of women in satiric prints in England and their reception within English society [it is not clear if this refers to prints or to women] between 1763 and 1793'. The 'new art history' is explicitly grounded in feminist studies: see Overy, p. 136; Iversen, p. 496; Jon Bird, 'On Newness, Art and History' in Rees and Borzello, pp. 35-36; Tagg, *ibid*, pp. 161-62; Lynda Nead, 'Feminism, Art History and Cultural Politics', *ibid*, pp. 120-24; Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, pp. 9159-75, 177-226.

Mary F. Gormally and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, 'Teaching and Learning' in Rees and Borzello, pp. 55-62, offers an unpalatable mixture of self-pity and self-justification which, if encountered in a different context, might be mistaken for a mischievous parody. It includes the breathtakingly arrogant statement (p. 56) 'A new art historian who is female will be a feminist' ('and this will bring her trying times in the workplace'. The persecution of the feminist new art historian involves the imposition of irrelevant ('peripheral') criteria of academic performance: 'punctuality, the quality of the slides [...] ability to rattle off titles, sizes and dates with enthusiasm, a convincing presentation of valuable knowledge or insights as natural possessions'. These the authors appear to view not as characteristics of professionalism but as the fruits of (male) 'privilege'. Perhaps those who cannot take the heat should stay in the kitchen."


Moxey, *Peasants* p. 3 sets out to 'avoid invoking anachronistic aesthetic criteria'; in its place, are invoked the equally anachronistic criteria of 'class' and 'gender', cf. Stephen Goddard, *PtQntly IX* (1992) 208-209. The result is anachronistic readings of images, such as that proffered by Llewellyn, *Art of Death* p. 31 on Joseph Wright's *The Dead Soldier* (1789): 'its message is of the injustice and folly of a system and a state which exploits its soldiers without offering any means of repairing the damage to the social fabric caused by their deaths'; this would have been less exceptional had Llewellyn phrased it 'this painting speaks to us of...' instead, Llewellyn
places a wholly 20th-century construction, rooted in a 20th-century sensibility, on an 18th-century painting, in the absence of any valid contemporary supporting evidence.

31. pp.187,192-93,195-96,198,200-203. Cf. Object, Image, Inquiry p.79 'In these glamorous court portraits the values evoking material, office, [and] splendor [were] things which I was absolutely uninterested in [sic] and thought were a kind of negative part of art, which I really didn't want to know about, because my interest in art had to do with much more important cultural and aesthetic values. Modern art, which set the tone, was rebelling against society and setting society examples rather than glorifying the head of [some] ridiculous, pompous state' (verdict on Hyacinthe Rigaud's portrait of Louis XIV).

32. For the overtly political nature of the new art history, see McWilliam and Potts, p.107 'Solkin's contribution belongs to a new wave of left or radical study of the visual arts that got under way in the 1960s [...] His study of Wilson is clearly motivated by the desire to make a concrete political intervention'. McWilliam's and Potts's essay might have been titled 'The Landscape of Reaction: David Solkin and his Critics'; these critics are (The Daily Telegraph) 'the thrusting new right (p.107) and (Apollo) 'the extreme Right' (p.113). See also Overy, pp.134ff (the post-war sufferings of Marxist art historians); Harrison, p.78 ('those versed in the intellectual traditions of the European left or alerted for one reason or another to the resources which these traditions provide, have been chipping away at the edifice of polite history for over half a century'); Iversen, p.496 ('the dissenting parties can be described as politically on the left. They, or to declare my allegiance, we, may be Marxists studying the social history of art, popular culture or the machinations of the art market'); Bird, pp.32-33 (the new art history acknowledges and is subversive of the hegemonic role played by dominant forms of art history in the culture as a whole. Its 'seminal' text in this is Perry Anderson, 'Components of the National Culture' in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn eds, Student Power (London:1969)); Tagg, pp.167,169. For Kunzle's Marxism, see Patten, 'Tendentious Fun' pp.213,214; for Solkin's politics, see Linda Colley, review of Solkin, Painting for Money: the Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in England (New Haven:1993) Guardian 27 July 1993, p.10.

The New Art History is well-sprinkled with allusions to the 'Thatcherite and Reaganite era' in which it was written, (Overy, p.140; Tagg, p.168; Pointon, pp.149,155,156; McWilliam and Potts, pp.109,115; see also Preziosi, p.3).
For a critical response to this 'left-wing trend', see Somers Cocks, Editorial, *Apollo* CXXVII (June 1988) 380-81.

33. For example, Solkin, 'Battle of the Ciceros' pp.416-17; Shesgreen, *Four Times of Day* pp.107,150 identifies such a 'conflict' in Hogarth 'between, on the one hand, his professional ambitions and his desire for aristocratic recognition as a historical painter in the grand style, and, on the other, his democratic sympathies and deep sense of class antagonism'. The one 'led him to assert Christian and neoclassic values, while his egalitarian instincts led him to express revolutionary bourgeois norms and iconoclastic values. The two contradictory impulses coexisted and battled [with] each other, both in his career and in his art', a conflict which 'explains the radical, almost schizophrenic' shifts in his ouvre. Pointon, reviewing *The Martial Face* (PtQtly IX (1992) 97) refers to Gillray's *The Death of the Great Wolf* (1795) a satire which parodies West's painting; 'in this print, Gillray sets up a dialogue between print and painting. The [...] unspoken context of this image is, therefore, the competitive role of prints in relation to the politics of the Royal Academy'. It must, however be said that Pointon's account of the market for and nature of political caricature in *Hanging the Head* accepts Diana Donald's less conflictful model (p.96).

34. Most noticeably with reference to the graphic depiction of the Church of England; see Kunzle, *Early Comic Strip* p.197; Dabydeen, *Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain* p.52.

35. Wood, *Folly* p.13. Other instances include Patten, GCLTA p.196 on Cruikshank's *New Union Club* 'to a modern sensibility utterly racist' and John Carey on the same print; 'changes in our political [note: not moral...] sensibility also make appreciation difficult. One of Cruikshank's most brilliant [prints] *The New Union Club* mocks Wilberforce and his anti-slavery campaign [...] a more disgusting expression of racism could hardly be conceived. Yet it perfectly exhibits the vitality and the teeming detail for which Cruikshank is celebrated'. The xenophobia of the prints is deprecated by Lionel Lambourne in an otherwise bland review of *Shadow of the Guillotine* (*Apollo* CXXX (July 1989) p.51; 'while deeply impressed by both show and book, one cannot but be a little saddened by this exhibition and its account of our attitudes to our nearest neighbours [sic; not for those of us in Scotland] and traditional enemies; after 1993 they are to be linked to us by land as well as [by] water [sic] and it is to be hoped that the Chunnel may at last diminish the shadow of the guillotine'. Lambourne then proceeds to deprecate the long career of that
machine in France - last used in 1977 'on a one-legged Tunisian murderer'.

36. Simon, op.cit..
38. For which see Chapter IX above; also Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.298. For the historical 'context' conventional to political prints scholarship, as following 'the main trend of popular and semi-scholarly writing on eighteenth-century England', see Clark, English Society pp.42-43
39. For example, Object, Image, Inquiry p.147; Schama, 'Perishable Commodities' pp.478-80. Schama notes that the limitations of the 'Dutch - art-as-uncomplicated-still-life' interpretation were identified as early as 1860. For the dangers in an over-emblematic reading of Dutch paintings, see Bann, p.29.
40. Revolution and Rebellion, p.6.
41. For the token 'cultural background' paragraph and the need for future scholarship to advance beyond it, see Black and Gregory, pp.2-3.
42. For example: Kunzle, Early Comic Strip pp.114,116-117 ('the Earl of Monmouth', who becomes a Duke on p.144),149,428; Solkin, 'Battle of the Ciceros' p.412; idem, 'Great Pictures or Great Men?' p.42; Press, 'Georgian Political Print' pp.217,222,225; Dabydeen, Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain p.52; Barrell, 'Sir Joshua Reynolds and the Political Theory of Painting' p.36. In an otherwise interesting essay, Jill Campbell, 'Politics and Sexuality in the portraits of John, Lord Hervey' Word and Image 6 (1990) takes as her context 'the development of an English government centred on groups of men. Walpole's leadership accelerated England's movement, begun in 1688, from a government focussed upon the theatrical image of a royal family to a government dominated by a prime minister [sic] and his network of faithful male agents and place-holders'. Frequently cited as an exemplar of 'the social history of art' (e.g. by Harrison, p.78) is F.G. Klingender; the limitations of Klingender's contextualisation of Hogarth, and of the political print in general were noted in Chapter VIII and IX above.

Bann, pp.27-28 suggests that 'the destiny of the "new art history is integrally bound up with what has been called the New History [as an example of which he cites Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic]. There can be no "new art history", revolutionary or not, except to the extent that it participates in a "new history"'. Quite what that "new history" entails is not clear; certainly, the new art history has shown a dependence upon historical texts which are very far from being 'new'. Favourites remain E.P. Thompson, The Making

McWilliam and Potts, writing (p.108) of Solkin's indebtedness to E.P. Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class, observe that 'It is this sort of view of eighteenth-century British society presented in these texts, one that clearly gives the lie to any cozy notions about some harmonious golden age of the benevolent and cultivated Georgian gentleman, that Solkin takes as the historical basis of Richard Wilson'. Disproving a caricature of one's own delineation is hardly a sound 'historical basis'; cf. Clark, English Society p.78 n. 'Some historians create absurd parodies of "deference", then present us with a great discovery in showing that they do not fit'.

For the extent to which the new art history is grounded in theory, see Object, Image, Inquiry pp.140-45; Moxey, Peasants pp.6-8; idem, 'Semiotics and the History of Art' New Literary History 22 (1991) 985-1001; Margaret Iversen, 'Models for a Semiotics of Visual Art' in Rees and Borzello; Iversen, Art History op.cit. p.496 ('influenced by trends in the sciences humaines across the Channel, and making use of semiotics, psychoanalysis and discourse analysis'); Overy, p.136; Tagg, p.167; Llewellyn, Art of Death pp.49-51. See also Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Alligators and Marshmallows or the Search for Deconstruction', a highly critical view of a Tate Gallery symposium on 'Deconstruction': the new modernism' Apollo CXXVII (June 1988) 432.

rather than a tidy description of one trend, the new art history is a capacious and convenient title that sums up the impact of feminist, marxist, structuralist, psychoanalytical and socio-political ideas on a discipline notorious for its conservative taste in art and its orthodoxy in research. The influence of these new [sic] ideas has led to some of the most interesting and controversial recent writing about art'.

LRB, p.19.

Folly, pp.17,22,23. Rees and Borzello identify 'clear signs of change in the discourse of art history'; certainly the vocabulary of the new art
history reveals its debt to the social sciences and to recent fashions in literary criticism. As an instance of impenetrability, Paulson, Emblem and Expression p.49:

'In effect, the noun phrase carried sword (Harlot, Plate 2) has to be reverbalised as sword stabs in the back, and (in Plate 3) curtain knot as face screams. The conventional name becomes inadequate, and an apparent nominalization reveals a verbal action: noun changes to verb as a static object is revivified to an act of screaming or stabbing' or Boime, p.73 n.36:

'Analogously the equation devil=shit is the negation of classicism; by exposing the disguised (sublimated) anality behind Neoclassicism (rational state, organised religion, hierarchical authority), David reaffirmed the connections between political caricature and his high art [...] The repeated use of foutre ("to fuck") or foutu ("to be fucked") throughout Père Duchesne is both an index of working-class identification and a metaphorical device to frame the messages the author transmits. [...] In the French and in English equivalents the positive sexual signifier relates as well to a negative signified. Hebert's obsessional foutre (which is eventually neutralized through repetition) broadly caricatures the revolutionary txt in the way that [sic] David's metonymic devices and scatological metaphors caricature political life'.

47. Object, Image, Inquiry, pp.143,140.
48. ibid, p.143. Theoretically, at least, semiology, the identification and study of the underlying patterns of meaning expressed by the signs and symbols used in all aspects of communication, is a legitimate angle from which to approach the visual-verbal hybrid of the political print; in the absence of convincing studies, however, judgement must be suspended as to its real usefulness or validity.

49. This is recognised by Pointon (Rees and Borzello, p.154); while egalitarian - 'the recent attention to theory has shifted the power centre from the unique image to the text which anyone can get out of the library [...] from there on the battle is an intellectual one' - 'theory can at the same time be an escape [...] a way of avoiding analysing visual images and artefacts'. Dabydeen, Hogarth, Walpole and Commercial Britain p.13, touches, albeit obliquely, on the problems entailed in such an approach: 'given such limitlessness of signification and interpretation, today's scholars can legitimately (indeed they are bound to) take risks in their deconstruction of graphic satire in the age of Walpole'.

Chapter III: Winning 'the semantic battle'

[...] nomenclature like a weathercock: you never meet with the same terms twice together in the same place.

Jeremy Bentham A Fragment on Government, 1776

[...] being perpetually plagued from the mistakes made among the illiterate, by the similitude in the sounds of the words character and caricatura

William Hogarth, MS note, John Ireland, Hogarth Illustrated

Popular usage has not differentiated between 'cartoon' and 'caricature', but has applied both indiscriminately [...] to almost any drawing which refers to the social or political situation.

W.A. Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature'

I have used 'caricature', 'cartoon' and 'graphic satire' interchangeably, with only the justification that everyone knows a cartoon when they see one.

Michael Wynn-Jones, A Cartoon History of Britain

While the illustrative choices of authors and compilers - the failure to reproduce prints from particular periods or particular kinds of images, and the ubiquity of other images - are symptomatic of the omissions and the emphases both of an individual study and, when viewed collectively, of the limitations and biases of print studies to date, it was the marked consistency of the vocabulary used to write about the material which directed my attention to, and facilitated my analysis of, the several specific problems associated with the study of the subject to date which are discussed in Part I: the language of 'progress' and 'development'; the vocabulary of age, difficulty and obsolescence by which the emblematical in prints was so consistently marginalised; the loaded vocabulary of qualitative aesthetic judgement,
and the contradictions which an injudicious use of the epithet 'popular' in connection with political prints brought upon its users. Just as certain prints were reproduced in one study after another, so it was possible to find certain stock phrases reappearing over decades in the literature.

What I have not touched on before now, but which, I will argue, has had even more profound implications for the nature of research to date, is the conspicuous absence of a precise and satisfactory descriptive terminology for the material.

This is evident in the very titles of those works which make up the historiography of the subject. Here, the terms 'cartoon', 'caricature', 'graphic satire', 'satirical prints', and more rarely, 'political prints', have a quite arbitrary usage. George, for example, employs 'caricature', 'graphic satire', 'cartoon' and 'political print' by turns. A combination of terms within a single title is not uncommon. The Chadwyck-Healey series adopts the inclusive title 'The English Satirical Print 1600-1832', but the individual volumes employ a variety of descriptive terms, with Sharpe opting for 'satirical prints', Dickinson for 'caricatures' and Miller for 'popular prints'.

Semantic confusion persists beyond the title-page. With rare exceptions, 'caricature', cartoon', 'satirical print', 'graphic satire', 'political satire', 'political print' and 'popular print' have been used interchangeably, to a degree inconsistent with either accuracy or clarity. It is possible for one reviewer, for example, to refer, in the course of a dozen pages, to 'the English satirical print' and 'popular print' (p.189), 'printed pictures', 'graphic satire', 'political prints' and 'the eighteenth-century print' (p.190), 'cartoon' (p.191), 'political print' and 'eighteenth-century print' (p192), 'cartoon' and
'cartoons' (p. 195), 'printed pictures' and 'ballad woodcuts' (p. 196), 'graphic satire' and 'cartoons' again (pp. 201 and 205 respectively). It is only fair to say that such eclecticism mirrors that of the works reviewed.

Conversely, a single term may be used to refer to prints of disparate kinds; a tendency sanctioned by long usage:

since the 19th century the B.M. has used the term ['satires'] for its large collection of hieroglyphical and allegorical prints, caricatures, and comic art generally, calling them 'Political and Personal Satires'.

The terms used in this fashion are almost invariably 'cartoon' and 'caricature'. That the blanket term of choice may be anachronistic is accepted. The anachronism of the term 'cartoon', when applied to 17th- and 18th-century political graphics, is acknowledged by several of the many who employ the term, most of whom refer to its specific appearance in Leech's 1843 designs for *Punch*:

I am [...] aware that the application of the word 'cartoon' to the works of, for instance, Hogarth, is anachronistic. The word was, in fact, coined by John Leech and therefore should not strictly be used to describe the great diversity of visual satire in the 18th century. [my emphasis]

In *EPC1*, George claims that, while anachronistic when applied to 17th- and 18th-century prints, 'cartoon' is 'almost indispensable'. With this precedent, its continued currency is not to be wondered at.

Use of the term 'caricature' to describe graphic political satire prior to the former idiom's becoming a conventional component of the latter is also, although less often, acknowledged to be anachronistic. The precise date at which the incorporation of caricature
into political satires occurred is, as we have seen, a matter on which scholars are divided, but, the work of Townshend excepted, cannot be put much earlier than 1780. As Wood notes in the context of the Cuno French Caricature volume, 'one has to stretch conventional definitions of 'caricature' quite a long way in order to incorporate [...] satiric prints that are in fact emblematic'. Use of the term in discussion of earlier political graphics, including those of a non-satirical kind, is, however, if anything more conventional than the more obviously anachronistic 'cartoon'.

The anachronism and confusion which is evident from even a cursory study of the literature suggests that the unsatisfactory nature of the terminology in use is not seen as cause for concern; indeed, one is more likely to encounter the notion that we should not be over-rigid or nice in our definitions. Were the case to be debated, there would doubtless be many for whom concern at the elastic nature of the terminology would seem mere pedantry. Wood, for example, refers to 'the difficulties that must be overcome in establishing a set of terms and a critical method for dealing with the bewildering variety of prints produced during the revolutionary period' but accepts Paulson's unhelpfully inclusive definition of 'caricature' (see below).

I am convinced, however, that in the failure to establish an accurate nomenclature - the failure to discriminate, semantically, between different kinds of political graphics - may be seen the origins of the failure to establish a sensitive and viable methodology for dealing with the material itself of which Porter and others have complained; that many of the problems and contradictions evident in the study of political graphics to date are directly connected with a failure of discrimination which manifests itself in semantic
imprecision; and that without a reappraisal of the 'set of terms' conventionally employed in political prints scholarship it will be difficult for scholarship to advance.

Insufficient precision and historical accuracy in the choice and use of descriptive terms arguably permits or encourages eclecticism and imprecision in the choice and historical range of material selected, and encourages the assembling of this material in formats not necessarily coherent or instructive. Thus, semantic imprecision may be held at least in part responsible for the fact that the secondary literature of the subject is dominated by the over-comprehensive 'survey'.

Then there is the failure, noted in several of the chapters in Part I., to accommodate the heterogeneity of the material, something which the over-comprehensive scope of many studies has, paradoxically, only exacerbated. One of Fox's most pertinent criticisms of the Chadwyck-Healey series was directed against the spurious and misleading impression of an homogeneous genre given by the collective title, 'The English Satirical Print', an impression belied by the material selected:

the [...] editor has made no attempt to confine his authors to visual satires. [...] Consequently, the selection includes crude woodcuts from 'last dying speeches', allegorical frontispieces and literary illustrations, straight portrait mezzotints and prints simply descriptive of topical events.

As a consequence, argues Fox, the series no more gives a clear picture of the 'satirical print' than does the chronological arrangement of the B.M. Catalogue.

A similar criticism was made in the context of the scholarly neglect of French counter-revolutionary
imagery; for too long, claims Claude Langlois, the selection of material for exhibitions and books has conspired in the creation of 'a homogeneous, and what is more, a consistently patriotic corpus', thereby sustaining 'a tenacious and dangerous' misapprehension of both the scope and the nature of the material available for study. The 'false' picture of the political graphics of this period that has prevailed has been 'partly fostered by publications that, until very recently, have presented to the general public - for aesthetic as well as pedagogical reasons - a confusion of the most heterogeneous works.'\textsuperscript{14} In the work in which Langlois's remarks appear, French Caricature, James Cuno notes that in spite of the fact that the caricatures produced by the Revolution were but one product

of a rich and prolific visual culture, and were read side by side with propagandistic, historical and allegorical prints, as well as calendars and representations of the constitution or the droits de l'homme,

two of the most recent studies of French revolutionary 'caricature' - L'art de l'Estampe et la Revolution francaise, and, more importantly, Michel Vovelle's multiple volume work, La Revolution francaise: Images et recit, 1789-1799 - 'treat caricature as indistinct from other kinds of prints produced during the Revolution.'\textsuperscript{15}

Most works attempt, at some point, to define the term 'caricature' - aesthetically, historically and etymologically. More often than not, however, such definitions appear in the context of the author's own broader and more elastic application of the term:

caricature will not be used solely in the limited sense of a changed likeness (Italian caricatura) but will refer as well to political prints, or graphic commentaries on political events [...] The term French revolutionary caricature will be used to include both form and content, that is, the events or symbols
represented by particular graphic artists, independent of the caricature tradition itself. 16

So it is that works ostensibly devoted to 'caricature' will be found to incorporate, with little or no attempt at differentiation, under the umbrella 'caricature', prints in which caricature in the initial and specific definition of the authors, has no part.

Typical in this respect is Feaver's Masters of Caricature. Like so many others, this study begins with a narrow definition of 'caricature', founded on etymology and historical practice. The editors then proceed to define their own boundaries; for the purposes of the book, they have

taken caricature to mean the art of the distorted representation of particular people rather than of general types [i.e.,] the art of portrait caricature, or portrait-charge. 17

Yet shortly after another definition - 'true caricature is not the formulation of [...] symbolic, synthetic beings, it is concerned with the comic or monstrous potential of real people', - the reader is informed that Swift's Kingdom of Tribnia, where 'a Close-stool' would signify a Privy Council; a Flock of Geese a Senate; a tame Dog, an invader; the Plague a Standing Army; a Buzzard a Minister; the Gout a High Priest; a Gibbet a Secretary of State; a Chamber Pot a Committee of Grandees; a Sieve a Court Lady; a Broom a Revolution [...] is 'evidently a land of caricature'; when what Swift describes is nothing less than the symbolic mode of satire and comment which caricature is alleged to have replaced. 18 Nor can the vividness of the author's own word-painting -

From the pulpit come[s] [...] the very stuff of polemical caricature, thundering down the centuries. Instead of elaborate figures of speech - 'the Whore of Babylon' and suchlike - spelt out in sermons, in printed caricature from the 16th century onwards there is violent graphic abuse: [...] the bundling of
Pope and Cardinals in full regalia, idols, encycyclics, mistresses and all, into Hell's mouth. Or, from the Counter-Reformation propaganda press visions of the many-headed monster of heresy being broken on wheels [or] [...] put to the sword [...] The body politic is represented as a whale, disgorging putrescent Jonahs. Kingdoms become middens whereon fox bishops preach to geese - conceal the fact that imagery of this kind falls outside his own earlier definition of caricature. Feaver's account of the operative power of what he inaccurately calls 'broadsheet or frontispiece caricatures' further conflates and confuses 17th- and 18th-century idioms.

Writing of this degree of imprecision is indefensible; it is only fair to say that it is representative rather than exceptional. Within pages of Langlois's criticisms, for instance, we have Paulson's dogged determination to apply the term 'caricature' to 'both the form and content' of French Revolutionary prints, notwithstanding that, in the absence of political caricature and 'humour' of the contemporary English variety, 'the great majority of the works collected in the present exhibition are [...] emblematic and sometimes merely [!] reportorial representations of current events'. Paulson's is one of several essays the semantic and analytical imprecision of which belies Cuno's laudable hope that the Los Angeles exhibition and catalogue will do justice to the diversity of the material available.

There is a further point to be made in this context. To employ the term 'caricature' in an inclusive fashion can only reinforce the focus upon caricature to the exclusion of other idioms which this thesis has argued to be the most pernicious characteristic of the study of political graphics to date. There could be no better example of this than the Cuno French Caricature volume, in which, notwithstanding Cuno's acknowledgement of the diversity of political graphics and of the importance of
extending the range of material studied to include non-caricatural material, the result is yet another caricature-oriented study.

Cuno himself appears to value non-caricatural prints only in so far as they 'inform' the caricatures:

for, it is only against this background, and in relationship to contemporary allegories, emblems, and propaganda and current event prints, that the mechanics of revolutionary caricature can be fully understood and their importance truly appreciated. 21

For as long as 'caricature' dominates the nomenclature of print studies, caricature will remain the preoccupation of scholars, and the 'contemporary allegories, emblems, [...]' propaganda and current events prints' will be regarded as, at best, a 'background' to the images thus favoured.

There is a further sense in which both the tendency to use a variety of descriptive terms as if they were interchangeable, and its opposite, the blanket application of 'caricature' or 'cartoon', may be argued to have had a pernicious effect on the way in which 17th- and 18th-century prints have been perceived and treated. This is in fostering a specious relativism, which obscures the historical specificity of these prints.

The notion that 'cartoon' is nothing more than a 19th- and 20th-century provision of a name for something that had existed all along ('political satires - or as modern parlance has it, political cartoons', or 'political prints - cartoons in twentieth-century terminology - '), that

the age [i.e., the 1760s] had no single term that conveniently expressed what we today would generally understand by cartoon [...]. It none the less now seems the appropriate term to designate the kind of visual political comment or propaganda here considered,

is particularly insidious in that it conspires to blur
the differences of style, approach to subject-matter and often the subject-matter itself, which exist between 20th-century and 17th- and 18th-century political prints. If Mahood is to be believed, the adoption of the term 'cartoon' after 1843 was a merely nominal change from the earlier 'caricature'; this, of course, carries the further inference that graphic political satire had always been 'caricature'. It is conceded that

the constraints or freedoms of one day cannot be transferred to another. The constraints that technology has placed on today's cartoonist are [...] not those that faced Gillray in Georgian England.

Yet each time that Gillray is referred to as a 'cartoonist', real differences between 18th- and 20th-century experience and practice of graphic political satire and comment are obscured.

The comprehensive survey of the 'Hogarth to Scarfe' type in particular encourages us to view the 'cartoon' (or 'caricature', or 'graphic satire') as a single, ahistorical, phenomenon. Where the approach of such surveys is thematic, as in the 'social issues in graphic satire from the 16th to the 20th century' type of study (e.g. the studies of Shikes, Philippe and Wood), it is common to find a relativist treatment of both the 'issues' and the graphic 'responses' to those issues, in which historical, rhetorical, and even geographical, specificity have no part.

Such blanket usage, of course, both reflects and fosters a 20th-century perspective on these prints, in which they become less historical than prototypical; precursors of the 'modern cartoon'. The leaflet accompanying the most recent exhibition of graphic satires in this country, the B.M.'s Europeans in Caricature employs this perspective; the 'direct descendant' of these prints 'is the modern cartoon'.
Wynn-Jones informs us that 'for more than 250 years, cartoonists have been a familiar, almost indispensable feature of British political life.' Press writes of 18th-century 'developments' which 'gave rise to the modern political cartoon';

from the 1770s on, political caricature was alive and squalling, with no letup since. It blossomed in England in the eighteenth-century print, the nineteenth-century magazine cartoon and in the twentieth-century editorial cartoon of the newspapers.

When it is possible to write, as does George in EPC1, that prints of Exclusion Crisis (1679) have 'more claim than those so far produced to be considered cartoons in the modern sense', and when Caricature 1620 to the Present advertises itself as the most comprehensive exhibition to date of 'English caricatures and satires from the grim anti-Catholic prints of the 17th century to the irreverent cartoons of today', the linear model of 'the development of political caricature' is affirmed and the historical and rhetorical specificity of early prints trivialised.

Blanket usage of 'satire' and 'satirical' with reference to political prints is similarly meaningless and has allowed scholars to evade the question of precisely in what ways individual prints may be said to be satiric; an omission which will be considered in Chapter VII below. Like 'cartoon', moreover, 'satire' has acquired connotations of humour; blanket usage may raise expectations of a humorous element where none exists and where it would be inappropriate.

The contradictions and evasions entailed in the use of the term 'popular' with reference to prints of the type commonly studied, were set out in Part I., Chapter VIII; a paradigmatic instance of sloppiness in terminology reflecting sloppy thinking. Hence it was
particularly disappointing to find it given a further lease of life by the Chadwyck Healey series (Miller's Religion in the Popular Prints).

These are some of the ways in which semantic imprecision may be said to underlie or to have reinforced tendencies in the study of political prints which Part I has identified as injurious. The remainder of this chapter will consider the potential for progress which revision of the prevalent terminology, or greater precision in using established terms, offers.

********

The confusing and intractable nature of political caricature as a subject [for academic study] is perhaps best demonstrated by the uncertainty amongst professional students of the phenomenon as to what caricature really is.

Coupe, 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature',

Political caricature tenaciously resists classification.

Hill, Mr Gillray the Caricaturist

A man must catch at words or catch at nothigg.

Jeremy Bentham, A Fragment on Government

If by 'caricature' we take Coupe to mean 'political prints', his observation, made in 1969, remains valid. It remains valid because the confusion which has prevailed with regard to the nomenclature of the material has yet to be recognised as a problem, and because the need to define the field for study more precisely than has been the case has yet to be recognised. Yet if terminological confusion and a willingness to employ terms acknowledged to be anachronistic have hitherto distorted the picture we have of the political print and
have tended to limit the boundaries of its study, so a finer discrimination in usage is potentially the key to a more sensitive and less narrow study of political graphics in future.

As one scholar has observed, 'semantic shifts are easier to bring about than scholarly reinterpretations', and because in many cases the form taken by works of the kind criticised above owes as much to entrenched perceptions - aesthetic and moral - concerning the nature and function of graphic satire, as it does to the language which these accounts have employed, a more rigorous application of descriptive terminology will not by itself effect the change of emphasis and of perspective which are needed if the study of political prints is to progress beyond the stage at which it has been for over fifty years. 33

Nevertheless, it has been argued in the context of 17th- and 18th-century political and social history that it was the longevity - and in some cases the unquestioning use - of anachronistic or otherwise loaded terms which contributed to the longevity of questionable perceptions and arguments; if, for instance, 'the unchallenged use of the term 'revolution' to cover many very different phenomena was one reason why old prejudices died hard', how much more might this not apply to the continued currency of certain descriptive and defining terms in a field of study that has seen none of the debate which has characterised the study of history? 34

The example of historical studies, where advances in scholarship appear to have come from uncovering 'the very different phenomena which have been obscured by the retrospective application [of label[s]] - phenomena each with its appropriate and 17th- or 18th -century name', would suggest that the way forward lies in a return to contemporary terminology. 35
The problem with this is that, as more than one study has observed in the context of the author's choice of terms, 17th- and in particular 18th-century definitions were themselves broad and confused, and usage arbitrary. Samuel Johnson, for example, defined 'caricature' as 'to hold to ridicule' and as 'a drawing [...] intended as humour, satire and comment'; just as 'caricature', applicable to a person rather than to a situation, is often used of prints of which 'satire' would be more appropriate, so Johnson complains that 'satire', defined as a work 'in which wickedness or folly is censured', was 'too frequently confounded' with the 'lampoon, which is aimed against a particular person'.

In 1742, Thomas Gray wrote that:

> the Wit of the times consists in Satyrical Prints [...] there have been some Hundreds within this Month; if you have any hopeful young Designer of Caricaturas, that has a Political Turn, he may pick up a pretty Subsistence.

Contemporary advertisements show a similar disregard for precision; Britannias Assassination or the Republican's Amusement (Gillray, May 1782) was described in the Morning Chronicle as a 'satire in the Caricatura style'. Dolmetsch reproduces an advertisement from the Virginia Gazette of 1766 which refers to 'a collection of Prints and Pamphlets [...] containing about 200 prints, or pictures [...] in the hieroglyphick or caricatura manner.'

'Emblematic picture', 'hieroglyphic prints', 'curious engravings', 'effigies', 'cuts' and 'print' are the terms most commonly used of early prints. Significantly, the terms 'hieroglyphic' and 'emblematic' persist throughout the 18th century; the term 'caricature' or 'caricatura' was simply added to those already in existence. Hill observes that by the 1790s the term 'caricature' 'had [...] acquired a breadth of meaning [...] as a description of any sort of satirical, humorous or
grotesque representation', George that from the 1750s 'the printshops applied it indiscriminately to any print with a comic or satirical intention'.

In the face of contemporary inconsistency, insistence on a stricter usage might itself seem anachronistic as well as pedantic. I would argue that for the nomenclature of political prints to remain open and arbitrary can only perpetuate the inconsistencies and imbalance which this thesis has identified in the study of these prints to date, and that revision of the terminology available to the scholar of 17th- and 18th-century political prints can only be to the benefit of research, and, as such, is justifiable.

As I see it, research in this field has been handicapped by the fact that the field itself remains so ill-defined. The focus of study has been at one and the same time too broad and too narrow; too broad in that so many studies have been over-general in scope, too narrow in having focussed on 'caricature' and the anachronistic concept of 'the political cartoon'. If the breadth of the descriptive terminology in use has contrived to keep the field for study unhelpfully broad, the tendency to use 'caricature' and 'cartoon' as blanket terms has kept the focus of most studies unhelpfully narrow, and has contributed to the neglect of other types of political graphics.

For Fox, the thematic approach of the Chadwyck-Healey series represented a helpful alternative to the chronological boundaries of the B.M. collection,

but if [the prints] have been pigeonholed into neater categories than the massive chronological format in which they were first catalogued, there is still some way to go to realise their unique potential.

Further 'pigeonholing' would seem to be the answer. It is not enough, however, to demand greater specialisation;
that specialisation must be reflected in the descriptive terminology of the subject. The material needs to be looked at [...] in [an] abstract and clarifying way [...] definitions have to be worked out which may serve as the basis for [...] later, detailed [...] study.

This means discriminating between different types of print by means of a more precise nomenclature. Is it really too much to demand that, in future, studies of 'caricature' will address the idiom of caricature, and will not extend to 'prints of political comment', allegorical prints, or any other kind of print?

The idea that 'caricature' 'resists' or 'defies' attempts to classify it has long provided a convenient excuse for shirking the challenge of addressing the heterogeneity of this material; the truth is that no one to date has seriously attempted such classification. The theoretical studies of Coupe and Streicher are fundamentally flawed by their determination to treat their subject-matter as a single phenomenon, something called 'caricature'. Coupe is right to doubt 'whether it will ever be possible' to establish 'a meaningful theoretical framework', the 'theory of caricature' which Streicher demanded, given 'the peculiarly self-willed, protean nature of what material is available'; if scholars persist in treating as a single phenomenon what are in fact several different and distinct idioms, advances in our understanding and our appreciation of the significance of 17th- and 18th-century political images will be frustrated.

How simple it will be to establish absolute and watertight categories for these prints is another matter. Post-caricature political satire in particular is frequently a 'hybrid' form, and categorisation must
address the degree of overlap present in such prints. Some prints will fit more than one category. What matters is that some attempt is made to discriminate between prints of different idioms. This chapter will conclude with some suggestions for categories, not all of which, perhaps none of which, will be acceptable to others working in this field.

Revising the nomenclature of print studies requires, first and foremost, the jettisoning of 'cartoon'. This is a term which can have no place in studies of 17th- or 18th-century prints and must be eschewed in future. Pointing to the currency of this anachronism even in publications, such as the Chadwyck-Healey series, which are aimed at a scholarly rather than a popular audience, Fox refers to this as a 'linguistic battle' which has long since been lost. While its currency at the popular level is probably unassailable, there can be no argument for its retention at the scholarly level. Its appearance in works with any pretensions to seriousness, even if it is acknowledged to be an anachronism and used only as such, - even if it is placed within inverted commas - must be challenged and criticised, as subtly perpetuating the relativism discussed above. 44

The epithet 'popular' is similarly inadmissible with respect to the greater number of prints in the Catalogue, especially after 1700. Forcing scholars to justify its use is one way of ensuring the reappraisal of the political print for which Part I., Chapter VIII argued. Where its general application has rendered it all but meaningless, it is to be hoped that by being restricted to genuinely popular images it may yet become a meaningful term.

Then there is 'caricature'. This must no longer be used as a blanket term for all 18th-century political
prints; still less should it be used of those of the previous century. Where it is appropriate is with reference to the portrait charge, that is to say, the caricaturing of named individuals by exaggeration and distortion of characteristic features, and to the caricaturing of 'types' by a broader exaggeration, as in A Fat and Lean Antiquarian [Plate 1].

The term 'political caricature' should refer specifically to the application of the techniques of personal caricature to the depiction of politicians. The term would be most appropriate for those prints and drawings depicting a single individual, and with little or no elaboration of background or narrative context, for example Gillray's depiction of Lord Thurlow [Plate 2] and John Cawse's An EverGreen [Plate 3], but it would also be appropriate for Gillray's The Twin Stars, Castor and Pollux [Plate 4]; Doublures of Characters; or, striking Resemblances in Physiognomy [Plate 5] and Bubbles of Opposition [Plate 6].

There is a case to be made that 'political caricature' would be admissible also for those prints in which, notwithstanding the presence of other elements, it is the caricaturing of the figures which dominates the composition; for example, Gillray's Monstrous Craws [Plate 7], or Wierd Sisters [Plate 8].

To warrant the use of the term, facial caricature must have been attempted. This, I would argue restricts its application to post-c.1780 prints. (It is notable how few of Townshend's 'caricatures' in fact involve facial caricature to any marked extent.)

It is important that caricature be distinguished from satirical attacks on individuals and from prints in which some attempt has been made to make the individuals portrayed recognisable, either by an attempt to
approximate the individual's likeness in the manner of engraved portraits, for example Benjamin Hoadly in The Whig's Idol [Plate 9] or by some identifying 'tag', for example Hoadly's crutch in the satires Guess att my Meaning and The Apparition or Low-Church Ghost [Plates 10 and 11]. (That the determinism of 'proto-caricature' renders this term, used by Atherton with reference to prints of this kind, unsound should go without saying). As noted above, many of Townshend's celebrated 'caricatures' in fact prove to rely largely on expressive line in combination with such 'tags of identity' as Cumberland's Garter sash. [Plate 12]

'Print satires', 'satirical prints', 'graphic satire'. Like 'caricature', the terms 'satirical prints' or 'satires' have too often been used as blanket terms for all political prints; P.D.G. Thomas might prefer the terms 'caricature' or 'cartoon' to 'political print' because they 'denote the aim of satire', but while political prints are frequently termed 'satires', not all political prints are satirical in intent. The term 'satire' should be restricted to prints whose satirical intent can be convincingly argued. It would, in fact, be possible to refer to the greater number of political prints in the B.M. Catalogue, especially after c.1720 by the term, 'graphic political satires'; the predominance of this genre reflects the bias of the Catalogue and does not mean that numerous non-satirical political prints did not appear throughout the 18th century; these will be considered below.

With regard to prints of the later 18th and early 19th centuries, a degree of overlap with the type of print which I have designated 'political caricature' will be unavoidable; a print like The Hopes of the Party, prior to July 14th [Plate 13] is capable of being presented as either.
The distinction between caricature and satire with reference to these prints is, none the less, an important one. Although it contains an abundance of grotesques, Gillray's extraordinary image of The Apotheosis of Hoche [Plate 14] cannot with any accuracy be called a caricature; it is a satire, as is, notwithstanding the presence of facial caricature, his Patriotic Regeneration, viz, Parliament Reformed, a la Francoise [Plate 15]. I would suggest that while 'graphic political satire' represents an acceptable alternative to 'political caricature', and may be used in its stead where, as in this last print, the protagonists are caricatured, the term 'political caricature' is inappropriate when used of prints in which caricature is either altogether absent, for example Gillray's The Lord of the Vineyard (1783) [Plate 16], and The Church Militant (1779) [Plate 17] or Argus (1780) [Plate 18], or in which it takes a subordinate part, as in The Fall of Icarus (1808) [Plate 19] - all of which, it is worth observing, date from the period in which caricature is alleged to have superseded earlier forms.

A similar distinction between satire and caricature could also usefully prevail with regard to prints the subject-matter of which is 'social' as opposed to 'political'. George excluded 'genre' from her category, 'Personal and Social Satires', 'except where it is humorous or cautionary, and therefore a satire on manners and morals'. I would suggest that where 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 caricature' is appropriate; the term 'social satires' should be reserved for those prints which register more bite, and in which humorous observation is subordinate to implicit criticism. This is the difference between Gillray's 1796 print Two-penny
whist [Plate 20] and his print of the same year Charite bien ordonnee commence par soimême: Het Committè van Noodlydende, [Plate 21], a print designed for distribution in the French puppet republic established in Holland the previous year (and as such also susceptible of the label 'propaganda').

This thesis may have conveyed the impression that I am hostile to caricature as an idiom. This is not so. My hostility is reserved for the misuse of the term - when it is used of political prints of all periods and all idioms - and in particular the critical evaluation of prints which this blanket usage encourages, in which the presence or absence of caricature is the benchmark of a print's success or excellence.

It is not merely those prints which have hitherto suffered from being lumped together with 'caricature' that will benefit from a more precise use of that term; such precision might encourage reappraisal of caricature as an idiom in its own right, which in turn might facilitate a specific, and more importantly a non-determinist, study of its adoption and its application within the existing genre of graphic political satire.

Similarly, although this thesis has taken exception to the tendency of many previous studies to use 'humour' as a yardstick with which to measure 17th- and 18th-century political prints, and while I would argue that greater accuracy in applying the epithets 'comic' and 'humorous' to political prints is vital if research is not to perpetuate the errors and value-judgements discussed in Part I, Chapter X, 'comic graphic art' has claims to scholarly attention in its own right. Robert Wark and Richard Vogler, among others, have argued that too little is known about 'comic graphic art' of this period; as with 'popular', so a more rigorous and sensitive use of
'comic' can only facilitate our understanding of this material. \textsuperscript{47}

I would define, for instance, the frequently-reproduced Gillray image of The Gout [Plate 22] as a 'humorous print'; commonly it appears as a 'caricature', although of whom is far from clear, or else as a 'satire', although it is difficult to determine against whom or what the satire is directed, and the expected reaction of a viewer to the image is more likely to be sympathy mingled with amusement than it is to be censure.

The rejection of 'cartoon' aside, what I have advocated is nothing more than greater scrupulousness and accuracy in the application of existing terms. It is, however, non-satirical prints which have been particularly ill-served by the over-broad and imprecise usage which has prevailed to date and which would profit by the adoption of a new 'set of terms'. The terms suggested below may not have the sanction of contemporary usage, but they do have the advantages of accuracy and clarity.

'Political print' is the most basic and unexceptionable of these. I would prefer to see it refer only to 'straight', i.e., non-satirical, prints, in order that these come to be recognised as a distinct genre, but there is no reason why it could not also be used as a secondary descriptive term for prints which would otherwise be defined as 'graphic political satires' or as 'political caricatures'.

This is an important point. A viable descriptive terminology must take into account the matter of literary variety. Where this demands that more than one term is used over several pages, it is important that the terms of choice be consistent; 'satirical prints' and 'graphic political satires' and 'political satires' could be used interchangeably in the same context. To introduce
'caricature' or 'political caricature', except with specific reference to a particular print, would be inappropriate.

Charles Press has defined the 'political' print (or as he terms it, 'cartoon') as something necessarily partisan - the political 'cartoon' champions 'a specific political faction or point of view' - and necessarily activist and exhortatory, advocating a particular course of action; prints which are characterised by 'an implicit appeal to do something political'. Were Press's criteria to be applied to 17th- and 18th-century prints, the number for which the term in this sense would be appropriate would be relatively small; excluded would be the many prints which comment rather than exhort. How would a print such as the extraordinary and disturbing design The Powerful Arm of Providence. An Allegorical Print, applicable to the Year 1831. Dedicated to his most Gracious Majesty WILLIAM IV, His present Ministers & every Real Reformer in the United Kingdom (Plate 23) be categorised by Press? It is neither overtly partisan nor does it advocate a particular course of action; wholly abstract, it is indisputably political.

For such prints of the kind defined by Press as 'political' as do exist for our period, I prefer the term 'polemical print', used by Williams of the graphic propaganda of the Great Rebellion. It is a particularly useful term because it focusses attention on the rhetorical strategies and on the argumentative qualities of such prints. Sheila O'Connell's term for Simon Gribelin's Seven Bishops prints (Plate 24) - 'topical propagandist prints' - also has much to recommend it. Press does, in fact, acknowledge that to warrant the description 'political' a print 'need not have a specific event tied to its tail like a tin can', citing Hogarth's Four Prints of an Election. Press's somewhat infelicitous term for such prints is 'political cartoons
[sic] of the non-specific mode'. Press is, none the less, making a valid point; a suitable term is needed for a print like Queen Anne receiving the Act of Union from the Duke of Queensbury and Dover [Plate 25]. This print is typical of the sort of political print for which there has been no room in in the study of the subject to date.

The term one sometimes encounters in connection with images of this kind, 'historical prints' is more bland than meaningful. I would define prints of this kind as 'pictorial propaganda'. Both terms are suited to commemorative prints, 'non-topical' propaganda prints, the illustration of historical events - Queen Anne, for instance, dates from 1792, not 1707, portrait prints, for example the images of William of Orange and George III, both part of a late 18th-century series, [Plates 26 and 27] allegorical portraits, and so forth.

Revising the nomenclature of prints study will not by itself effect a revolution in the way in which scholars see or treat political prints and related genres, but it will lay the foundations for such a revolution.

In the first place, winning the semantic battle is one way, and that not the least significant, by which the prevailing linear model and the relativism which it reflects might be undermined. Once 'cartoon' is abandoned altogether, and the use of 'caricature' restricted, the sweeping narratives of 'Caricature 1620 to the Present' favoured by scholars in the past will come to seem increasingly less secure. Political graphics of the 17th and early 18th centuries might yet come to be seen in their own terms rather than as 'precursors' of caricature and prototypes of the modern newspaper cartoon.
Restricting the term 'caricature' to genuine caricatures is unlikely to effect a shift in favour of non-caricatural prints. It may, however, allow more rigorous evaluation of caricature's place in and contribution to 18th- and 19th-century graphic political satire. This much is suggested by Coupe:

Once we see caricature as but one element, albeit in modern times a very important element in the equipment of the graphic satirist, we shall be nearer to its true significance.

Distinguishing between ad hominem graphic satire and caricature will make it clear that caricature is not essential for effectual personal satire.

The adoption of new terms which better define the non-satirical material hitherto subsumed in the categories 'cartoon' and 'caricature' will direct attention to these largely neglected images and alert scholars to the variety of political imagery available for study. If greater precision in the use of the terms 'caricature', 'satire' et cetera can only contract a hitherto amorphous field of study, it is also the case that the adoption of the terms 'political graphics' or 'pictorial propaganda' will mean, paradoxically, that a far broader spectrum of prints can be studied together: prints which the prevalent terminology has tended to separate.

This chapter has argued for greater discrimination between different genres of print; at same time, progress could be greatly facilitated by the erasure of artificial boundaries between genres of print which may be proven to have a common iconography and rhetorical purpose. 'Political graphics' is an inclusive term which comprehends frontispieces, portrait engravings, engravings after paintings, fans and playing cards; it would allow the straight and satirical to be studied side by side. As much as the eschewal of the blanket usage of
the word itself, shifting the focus of study from idiom to iconography must challenge the hegemony of caricature; caricature will at last be seen as but one idiom, and that not the most significant, of graphic political imagery in the 18th century.

Finally, whereas the terms 'cartoon', 'caricature', 'graphic satire' and 'political print' are restricted to works on paper, the terms 'pictorial propaganda' and 'political graphics' are applicable to media other than prints and may be used to define a whole range of commemorative and propagandist imagery; paintings, portraits, decorative schemes, engraved glasses, images printed on cotton and silk, commemorative pottery and porcelain, coins and medals. The adoption of either term has the potential to facilitate the kind of inclusive study for which I argued in Part I, Chapter XII. This comprehensiveness holds especial advantages for the hitherto-neglected 17th century, which saw quantitatively fewer prints than the succeeding century but which provides ample material for the study of political imagery in other media.

These are suggestions merely. The idea that the words scholars have used to write about prints have been inaccurate or inadequate is likely to be resisted. The most that can be done by one individual is to open a debate on the matter. There has been little discussion and even less debate in political prints scholarship. If calling into question the usefulness or validity of the descriptive terminology of prints scholarship means that scholars will in future look at the prints, rather than merely assume things about them, this brief attempt to classify the material will not have been in vain.

To paraphrase one historian, to advance, research must advance beyond those frames of reference which normally
Unless scholars are willing to reconsider the terminology hitherto conventional, future study in the field is liable to perpetuate the emphases and omissions identified in Part I.
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33. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion, p.41. Nor should the difficulties of effecting semantic shifts be underestimated; cf. the use of 'class' by John Dunkley, 'Berquin's L'Ami des enfants and the hidden curriculum of class relations' BJECS 16 (1993) 185-96.
34. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion p.42.
35. ibid, p.100.
36. Donald, '"Calumny"' p.55. Elkin, Augustan Defence of Satire pp.11-25, considers the extent to which the fluid nature of the terminology of satire in this period reflected the polemical positions of those employing it.
38. Hill, Mr Gillray p.23.
39. Dolmetsch, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg' p.177; idem, Rebellion and Reconciliation p.5.
40. For example, BM 7328 Exhibition of the Times, Consisting of Emblems & Caricatures Original, Political, Humourous and Satirical (1788).
41. Hill, Mr Gillray p.1; George, Hogarth to Cruikshank p.13. Cf. Kahrl, p.169; Dolmetsch, Rebellion and Reconciliation p.1 'in the eighteenth century such [prints] were known as satires or caricatures, terms whose meanings encompassed grotesque or ludicrous representations of persons or situations achieved through exaggeration, ridicule
or denunciation.'

42. Fox, 'English Satirical Print' p.466.
43. Hofmann, p.5. But see n.11 above.
44. Olson, Emblems of American Community (1991) passim, is the most recent prints scholar to fail this test.

The word must also be eradicated from the historian's vocabulary, into which it would appear to have crept: for example, Clark, The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World (Cambridge:1994) p.261.

45. Thomas, American Revolution p.11. George, Hogarth to Cruikshank p.13, observes that "Satire", like "caricature", is used loosely; it covers Hogarth's moralizing, Gillray's irony, Rowlandson's comedy, Newton's burlesque. To find that the word derives from "satura", "a medley", gives it appropriateness'. For this derivation of 'satire', see Elkin, Augustan Defence of Satire pp.29-31. For the conflation of satire and caricature as a further consequence of our historical distance from the material, see Kahrl, pp.171-72, 173-75.

46. George; idem Hogarth to Cruikshank, p.13 'No clear line divides political satires and social'.

47. Wark, Isaac Cruikshank's 'Drawings for Drolle' p.18; Vogler, p.viii; 'To this day very little is understood about the nature of comic art in general, and in particular about the manifestations [note the use of the plural] of that art during the first quarter of the last century in England'. Vogler considers 'humorous art' 'a very complex and, in its own way, serious art form'.

For contemporary distinctions between caricature, graphic political satire, and comic art, see Wark, pp.12-18.

For the distinction between laughing' and 'punitive' satire see Coupe, p.89.
Press, Political Cartoon, p.11 claims that 'all forms of the graphic art of comment are alike in that they muse upon the ridiculous and the incongruous in life [...] the repeated theme in all such art is the contrast between reality and the ideal, between aspiration and practice'; this may be a 'repeated theme' of graphic political satire as well as of less biting humorous prints, but to suggest that the presence of this theme puts George Cruikshank's Monstrosities of 1822 [BM 144381], a satire on fashionable dress, on a par with his reworking of Gillray's A Voluptuary ['Qualification' in Hone's The Queen's Matrimonial Ladder], or that Rowlandson's comic erotica should be considered in the same breath as his The Two Kings of Terror (1813) [fig. 11 in Patten, GCLTA p.82] is to fail the prints. Carretta, George III p.266 claims that by the 1780s, attacks on George III were more 'comic' than 'satiric'.
51. Olson, *Emblems of American Community* p. xvi is 'less willing than former generations of scholars' to use the term 'propaganda' of prints and related materials 'because "propaganda" may suggest an element of calculated detachment'; similarly, Paul Chapman, 'Jacobite Political Argument in England 1714-66' op. cit. Preface, p. iv, eschews the term 'propaganda' for 'argument', the former implying 'a greater degree of organisation and direction than was [...] the case' with the material in question, a point which should be considered. George, *EPC1* p. 1, uses the term 'pictorial propaganda', although as noted in Part I, Chapter V, her concern is, as indicated in the book's title, with caricature.

52. Coupe, p. 89.

53. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion* pp. 2-4, 39, 111.
Chapter IV: The Documentation of Primary Sources: The B.M. Catalogue and Beyond

In his essay in the London Review of Books, Porter claimed that 'thanks to the pioneering researches of a handful of historians [...] the basic documentation [...] of the political print is fairly secure'. By 'the basic documentation', Porter meant the studies undertaken by George and Atherton, but, above all, the BM Catalogue. With only a few exceptions - for instance the studies of Atherton and Carretta which make extensive use of the Lewis Walpole Library's collection of prints - what has been written to date on 17th- and 18th-century political graphics has relied virtually exclusively on the British Museum's collection as catalogued by Stephens and George, not only directly but indirectly, through the the acknowledged dependence of most accounts on George's EPC and to a lesser extent on Hogarth to Cruikshank, both of which rely on the B.M. collection, not least for illustrations. 'This great work [i.e., the Catalogue] has formed the basis for all later studies of British caricature' declared the most recent B.M. contribution to the field. The Chadwyck-Healey series, which appeared in the wake of the same publisher's reproduction of the greater number of catalogued prints onto microfilm, was intended to be as much an 'introduction' to the collection as a set of thematic studies based on material of this kind.

The dependence on the Catalogue of most studies, particularly those of the 'general survey' type, is understandable; the Catalogue presents the material in a more or less immediately usable form. Indeed, the ease with which it is possible to paraphrase entries - even unintentionally - suggests that, if anything, the Catalogue is almost too usable. Perhaps the harshest of Pat Rogers's criticisms of Atherton's Political Prints
was that

most of the text could have been assembled by a writer going cannily through Stephens, without reference to the prints themselves. To take a single example, [...] Atherton analyses The Evil Genius of England (1740) [...] everything he mentions could be extracted from Stephens's long description of the print. 4

That this should be the case is as much a reflection of the general tendency of studies of this material towards description, as opposed to analysis, as it is of overdependence on the Catalogue, but Rogers's observation identifies the extent to which dependence upon the original documentation of the material has determined the focus of, and the form taken by, subsequent studies.

The Catalogue has performed a useful function as a reference source in its own right as well as providing a means of access to the collection. Continued dependence upon the Catalogue can, however, only be detrimental to research. 5

In the first place, the Catalogue is restricted in focus. After c.1700, few political prints of a non-satirical kind are included, thereby encouraging the bias towards satire and caricature which this thesis has remarked. The discrepancy between assertion and evidence identified in Part I, Chapter VIII with respect to so-called 'popular' prints is at least in part attributable to the dependence of scholars on the B.M. collection, especially as catalogued, the bias of the collection being towards relatively expensive, 'quality' political prints, particularly with regard to the later 18th and early 19th centuries. The greater number of prints in the Catalogue are thus representative of the middle to higher end of the price-range, with the 'penny prints' cited by the likes of Paulson and Solkin conspicuous by their absence. 6 A similar, indeed
related, problem exists with respect to so-called 'radical' imagery: as with 'popular' prints, it has proved impossible to reconcile the picture of a 'radical' idiom which has been promoted by the literature with more than a handful of the prints in the Catalogue.

Similarly, the chronological bias of prints study to date, while largely attributable to a long-standing preoccupation with caricature, is also encouraged by dependence on a Catalogue in which, as observed in Part I, Chapter III, pre-1720 prints make up barely 10% of the entries.

In this way, continued dependence upon the Catalogue threatens to perpetuate the emphases and omissions of the study of political prints identified in Part I and will keep the focus of research in the field unduly narrow.

In the second place, and perhaps more importantly, the Catalogue is out of date. This is particularly obvious in the case of the Stephens volumes, which we have already seen described as 'chronologically capricious and far from complete', but is equally applicable to those compiled by George. 7

It is not merely that the historical 'background' provided for each print, the construction put on the events depicted and so forth, inevitably takes no account of historical research beyond 1883 and 1954 respectively. No reference volume can ever be 'neutral' and wholly timeless, and the fact that the Catalogue sometimes shows its age in this respect need not be a problem, provided, of course, that those who use it make allowance for this.

The real problem is not that that the Catalogue, although reprinted in 1978, remains frozen at 1954 in terms of interpretation, but that it remains frozen at 1954 in terms of documentation. Information on the subsequent additions to the collection is lacking. Nicholas Robinson writes of 'hundreds' of prints having
been added to the collection after completion of the Catalogue; the true figure is more likely to run into thousands. In the course of preliminary enquiries with regard to providing volumes I - III with an iconographic index that would function as a supplementary reference volume, (see Appendix, below), I touched on the possibility of extending my content-analysis to such pre-1760 prints as had been omitted by Stephens or had been added to the collection this century; I was given to understand that the number of prints in this category to be so substantial as to require a Catalogue in its own right. Given the indisputable increase in the number of prints produced in the latter third of the 18th century, the number of prints outwith the George volumes of the Catalogue is likely to be greater than those outwith the Stephens volumes. It is also worth noting in this context that while Stephens apparently scrutinised over 35,000 printed works in the B.L. for pictorial material, no such systematic policy informed the compilation of the George volumes. George restricted her documentation to the holdings of the Print Room with occasional reference to prints held by other institutions such as the Guildhall Library and to such works as she encountered in the B.L.

While the inadequacies of the Catalogue may not be overly important with regard to the compilation of books and exhibitions of the more general and popular kind, the implications of continued dependence on the Catalogue for academic study in the field are serious. The study which relies solely on prints as documented in the B.M. Catalogue, risks constructing a partial and potentially inadequate picture of the graphic comment relating to a given period or issue.

If few scholars have looked beyond the Catalogue, fewer still have looked beyond the B.M. collection. The excuse which one frequently encounters in this context is
that the B.M. collection is not only the largest but the most comprehensive in existence. George, for example, writes that the collection is not, 'of course [...] complete', but contains 'most of the more important, and the prints are sufficiently representative to be a guide to trends of opinion'. 11 What is meant by 'the more important' or 'sufficiently representative' (representative of what?) is unclear, but it has satisfied George's successors: the B.M.'s is 'the most extensive collection of such prints in existence, one which most critics assume is as complete as any such human effort can be';

the British Museum collection of English prints is the largest in existence and, because of its comprehensiveness can for practical purposes be treated as the total universe of the prints produced from the mid-eighteenth century on. 12

George acknowledged that 'almost any collection of satirical prints will have some that are not in the Museum'. 13 With large collections such as those of the Library of Congress and the Lewis Walpole Library in America in which c.2,000 and c.3,000 prints respectively do not duplicate prints catalogued in the B.M. (although of course an updated Catalogue might reduce these figures), the picture given by the B.M. collection cannot be assumed to be representative. This much is acknowledged by P.D.G. Thomas in his Chadwyck-Healey volume; 'any statement that no cartoons appeared to celebrate an event [...] may be refuted by the discovery of new prints. 14

At present, however, the potential for such discoveries is limited, having been frustrated by what is to all intents and purposes a moratorium on 'the basic documentation'.

What is urgently required is, first and foremost, for
the B.M. to publish an up-to-date catalogue of its holdings of political prints outwith and post-dating the existing Catalogue. This is of particular importance for the period covered by the Stephens volumes, as it is our picture of pre-c.1720 print production that remains particularly indistinct. While inadequate documentation is better viewed as a symptom and not as the cause of the continued neglect of this period which this thesis has deprecated, if the Stephens volumes are allowed to represent the sum of our knowledge, then the prospects for a reappraisal of this period are poor.

Up-to-date documentation of the B.M. collection must be complemented by adequate documentation respecting British holdings of political prints outwith the B.M.. In London alone, the B.M. collection is complemented by the holdings of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Guildhall Library and the Maritime Museum at Greenwich, the Museum of London, the National Portrait Gallery and the Wellcome Institute. In Scotland, the National Library and the Scottish National Portrait Gallery both possess items not listed in the Catalogue.

Then there are the provincial collections; to date a largely unknown quantity. My own researches proved the Ashmolean Museum to be particularly rich in 17th- and early 18th-century material. In the Bodleian Library, the same period is served by the Fairfax, Douce and John Johnson collections, while T.M. Williams made use of the collection at Worcester College, Oxford, for the important but neglected 1640-1660 period; how many other college and university libraries contain political prints remains to be established. Celina Fox, perhaps a little unfairly given the nature of the undertaking, criticised the Chadwyck-Healey authors for their failure to look beyond the B.M. Collection; hers remains the sole reference I have encountered to the existence of 'fine collections' of political prints at 'Birmingham, Bristol,
Newcastle and Manchester'. 18

Unfortunately, and significantly, Fox failed to elaborate on this. There is as yet no reference source for provincial holdings of political graphics. In 1985 the V&A Department of Prints and Drawings produced A Guide to the Print Rooms in the United Kingdom and Eire. A slim typewritten booklet covering the major collections from a fine art perspective, it is wholly redundant for the purpose of locating political prints. 19 Exemplary in format, providing a full postal address, telephone number, opening hours and the title of the relevant curator, detailed information regarding the scope of a collection is restricted to a brief entry focussing on 'particular strengths'; the fact that the entry for the B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings contains no reference to its 'unrivalled' collection of political prints and satires casts doubt on the reliability of entries for other collections. 20 The Guide is further limited in usefulness as a consequence of its being restricted to 'print rooms'; political prints are as likely to be preserved in libraries.

There is, therefore, a strong case for the provision of a checklist of provincial holdings. In many cases the holdings would not be large, but might, nonetheless, include non-B.M. prints. While this by itself would justify such a venture, a further benefit of such a catalogue would be to alert scholars to the existence of B.M. Catalogue material in their own locality. Moreover, were it possible to establish the provenance of provincial collections, even of individual items, this could prove of considerable assistance in the work which has still to be done on the questions of the circulation and distribution of such prints.

Whether it would be possible to extend such a work of documentation to private, as opposed to public, collections in Britain is uncertain; the benefits, in
particular with regard to establishing a picture of the circulation of the material, through the documentation of provenance, would be considerable.

For the same reason, better use might be made of the sales catalogues of the major auction houses, and of the commercial print dealers through whose hands political prints pass; even if it were not possible to locate specific prints, the fact of their existence would be established (particularly important in the case of prints not held by the B. M.) and, in some cases, information on their provenance. 21

Ideally, the scope of such documentation would comprehend the broader category of 'political graphics' discussed in Part I, Chapter XII; portrait engravings, playing cards and printed ephemera of the kind represented by the mourning fan produced on the death of Frederick, Prince of Wales 22 If anything, such material is in still more urgent need of sympathetic documentation, in that it not infrequently suffers from being difficult to categorise and catalogue in the first place. The political inspiration of such artefacts is likely to be subsumed in generic description based on medium or maker ('a collection of 18th-century printed fans'). A comprehensive catalogue of specifically political material would have the beneficial effect of reintegrating material with a common subject-matter and iconography which the largely media-based categories of museums and galleries have conspired to separate. As noted in Chapter XII, medium-based categories may make for ease of curatorship, but they do not facilitate the study of political images.

The documentation of prints and related material outwith the B. M. need not be unduly detailed. What is required is a catalogue which does not aspire to the detail of the B. M. Catalogue, but rather the means
whereby scholars may locate, or at least establish the existence of, non-B.M. material.

While it is extremely unlikely that any British collection will ever rival that of the B.M., the strength of collections in the United States has perhaps been underestimated by British scholars. That of Yale University alone encompasses a substantial collection at the Yale Center for British Art, the Auchincloss Bequest of Gillray and Rowlandson prints in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library and the superb resource of the print collection of the Lewis Walpole Library.23 In Washington, the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress acquired the greater part of the Royal Collection in 1920; some 10,000 prints amassed by George IV.24 The New York Public Library, which purchased much of Horace Walpole's collection of caricatures and satires, holds a good collection of Gillray prints and an 'unrivalled' collection of his preparatory drawings; the Pierpont Morgan Library, twelve volumes of the Peel Collection, which has been described as 'an exceptionally comprehensive assemblage of prints'.25 The status of political prints as historical documents is reflected in the holdings at both the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Massachusetts.26 This is not to forget the holdings of the principal universities; particularly important with regard to 17th- and early-18th-century material and text-based material such as frontispieces.27

The range of sources cited for the images reproduced in the Mccubbin/Hamilton-Phillips The Age of William III - rightly described as 'a reference encyclopaedia' - is instructive: several of the printed images are described as 'possibly unique' to American collections, while O Rare Show: or, The Fumblers Club and The Virtue of a Protestant Orange [Plates 1 and 2] are reproduced by
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permission of the British Library: neither are catalogued by Stephens, on whose documentation George would seem to be relying for her account of the paucity of English-produced prints. 28 It may be true that 'very few English prints on the Revolution survive': documentation of those which do is the more necessary. Similarly, it may yet be possible to disprove George's claim that no political prints exist for the first six years of the reign of George I. 29

No up-to-date and comprehensive catalogue of the major American holdings exists, although F. Weitenkampf's union list of 1,150 satiric prints in his Political Caricature un the United States in Separately Published Cartoons (1953) went some way towards this. 30 The Library of Congress is now served by Bernard F. Reilly Jr.'s American Political Prints, 1766-1876: A Catalogue of the Collections in the Library of Congress (1991) and a catalogue of non-B.M. prints in the Lewis Walpole Library is in the process of being compiled; it is to be hoped that it will be made available to the B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings on completion, even if only as an unpublished typescript, although a computerised catalogue which had the capacity to be updated as new material was acquired would be preferable. 31 It is imperative that such documentation should be readily available to British and European scholars, in particular to those whose research falls within the period covered by American collections.

A further point: the Lewis Walpole Library possesses many prints which ostensibly duplicate those in the B.M., but which in fact represent different states or versions of that print. As well as being, in many instances, of interest in their own right, such variants and piracies are arguably of considerable importance for a study of the production and circulation of political prints and it is to be hoped that the L.W.L's catalogue will record
their existence. At present, prints in the Library's possession duplicated in other American collections or in the B.M. are catalogued as such, and the Library's own holdings are in many instances supplemented by photographic reproductions from the other major American collections, a practice which other collections would do well to emulate.

In the absence of a comprehensive catalogue of American holdings individual initiatives such as this at Farmington point the way forward: indeed, an alternative to the ideal of a single comprehensive catalogue of British holdings would be a series of catalogues, each focussing on an individual collection or on a particular region - for example, North-West England, - and published either in their own right, under the aegis of the institutions concerned, or else as a series in a journal such as Print Quarterly. The compilation of such a catalogue would require the cooperation of the institutions consulted, but there is no reason to imagine that this would be withheld.

So far, this chapter has been concerned with the documentation of extant prints. Any study of this material must consider those prints which have not survived. With regard to the 18th century at least, it may be possible to augment the picture of print prooduction derived from survivals. Prints were frequently advertised in the London press; a source consistently underexploited by prints scholars but increasingly valued by others working in the 18th century. While such advertisements are seldom as descriptive as the iconographer could wish - it is not always possible to gain any sense of what the image looked like - it is, nonetheless possible to ascertain the subject-matter and the nature of the satire.
The scholar must be careful to distinguish genuine advertisements from mock; invariably more detailed, the latter, accurately speaking, should be classed as written satire which makes use of the format and conventions of the print-advertisement. Such fictitious prints are not without interest, however, not only for the way in which they demonstrate the contemporary blurring of the boundaries between visual and verbal, but for the extent to which they employ the same motifs and satirical and rhetorical tactics as genuine prints.

*****

If 'the basic documentation' of English political prints, graphic political satire and political caricature is more secure than that of French prints, there is little room for complacency. Thomas might believe that our picture of the graphic response to a given incident may be revised by the discovery of new prints; for as long as scholars persist in refusal to tread beyond the documented paths of the B.M. Catalogue, and for as long as institutions lag behind in documentation of their collections, such discoveries are unlikely.

The work of cataloguing and documentation is often tedious and always unglamorous, not least when contrasted with the ease with which it is possible to stage an exhibition or compile a largely pictorial guide to 'the art of graphic satire'. Yet it is fair to say that even the most meretricious compilation owes its existence to the basic documentation represented by the Catalogue.

It might, of course, be argued that, until more adequate methodologies with which to study those prints already catalogued are established, to call for further documentation is to evade the challenge of closer analysis of prints as images identified by Porter.
Certainly, by itself, additional documentation can have only limited impact upon the partial and limited approach to the material outlined in Part I. I would argue, however, that not only is inadequate documentation of the primary source material an indictment of scholarship in any field but that conclusions and assumptions which have to date been based almost entirely on the B.M. Catalogue could profitably be tested against a wider range of evidence.

Unfortunately, the prospects for documentary research on the scale that is necessary are poor. The monolithic, initiative-inhibiting structure of modern curatorial practice and modern librarianship has ensured that what Stephens and George achieved with manuscript notes and card-files should be impracticable or impermissible with the technology which facilitates precisely this sort of work. The Catalogue has frequently been described as a 'monumental' work of scholarship; in the absence of further documentation, it will be the gravestone and not the foundation stone of scholarship in the field.

1. p.19.
2. For example, Thomas, American Revolution p.11; Robinson, 'Caricature and the Regency Crisis', p.157 n.; Dolmetsch, Rebellion and Reconciliation pp.6,10 n.1,11 n.8; Olson, Emblems of American Community pp.xv,261 n.8; Wolf, pp.viii,92 n.21; Press, Political Cartoon p.224; Cuno, French Caricature, introduction p.22 n.10. The extent to which 'the B.M. Catalogue' has meant the post-1770 George volumes is made clear by Goldman, Rumbustious World p.16 ;'any work on English satire is invariably indebted to the Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires by M.D. George (1935-49 (sic)); the University of Kent's Centre for the Study of Cartoons and Caricature, inaugurated 1975, also hails the work of George as 'both inspiration and example' (20th-Century Studies 13/14 (1975) p.3).
5. The same may be said of continued dependence upon EPC; indeed, it can be said that dependence upon the
latter is more to be deprecated, George's essays prefacing volumes V - XI of the Catalogue being far more detailed and useful. EPC is to a considerable extent a condensation of these essays.

6. Fox, 'English Satirical Print' p.465. 'Anonymous popular prints have never been deliberately collected in this country, and as a result those that are in this collection are here by accident more than design. In very recent years a portfolio of popular prints has been started and items will gradually be transferred to it. But as yet it contains little. British [...] popular prints are most likely to be found among the anonymous British woodcuts and mezzotints' - BM User's Guide p.151; see also Griffiths, 'French Popular Prints' PtQtly VII 449; Gretton, Murders and Moralties: British Catchpenny Prints (although this focusses on post-1800 material); Anderson, Printed Image lists relevant collections.

8. 'Caricature and the Regency Crisis', p.157, n.3.
9. For the placing of supplementary prints, see B.M. User's Guide p.51; for the quantitative increase, see Hill, Satirical Etchings p.xvi.
11. EPC1, p.1 n.2.
12. Press, 'Georgian Political Print' p.227
13. EPC1 p.1, n.
16. Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection: Grangerised Burnet and Clarendon Histories. This very large collection is provided with a subject-catalogue. The collection is weighted toward portrait prints, but includes much else of particular value for the period c.1640-1740.

The B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings also has two sets of Clarendon's History of the Rebellion in eight bound folio volumes (1796) bequeathed by the Duke of Gloucester in 1834, and containing c.1,700 images, with an inventory and mss. index; see User's Guide pp.54-55 (the B.M. also has a Grangerised Bulstrode Whitelock, Historical Memorials of the English Affairs [...] from the beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second his happy Restauration (1732).

hold a copy of BM The High-Church Hieroglyphick (1706) (reproduction credits, Holmes, Trial of Dr Sacheverell).


19. As befits the material's uncertain status; what were originally placed low in an aesthetic, remain low in curatorial hierarchies. The guide is also difficult to find; the National Library of Scotland held no copy of this nor the infinitely more useful B.M. User's Guide, notwithstanding that both are official, British, publications. I was able to consult both in the library of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery.


21. The well-illustrated catalogue produced by Sotheby's for their sale (14 December 1993) of the Fairfax Library and archive and that produced the previous November by Glendinning's for their sale of the Woolf collection of Jacobite and anti-Jacobite medals are good instances of the sales catalogue as research tool. The knowledge of those commercial dealers who have dealt in this material has been insufficiently tapped. To take one instance, a particularly informative catalogue was produced by the dealer Robert Douwma (173 New Bond Street) 34 English Caricature to 1800 (December 1993); the introduction, p.3, notes that the prints on sale 'have been brought together over the last thirty years, during which time some have become available only once and might never come on the market again'. Similarly, the principal dealer in this material, Andrew Edmunds, is on record as stating that many of the prints on show at his 1989 French Revolution exhibition 'have passed through [his] hands many times during his 20-year career' (Sarah Jane Checkland, The Times 29 June 1989). For the importance of documenting the provenance of prints in cataloguing them, see Alexander, review of the National Gallery of Dublin's print catalogue (1988), PtQtly VI (1989) 431-33, p.432.

The study of 18th-century catalogues might also be recommended; the B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings holds such material from c.1716 onwards (User's Guide, p.65); see also Griffiths, 'A Checklist of Catalogues of British Print Publishers c.1650-1830' PtQtly I (1984) 4-22.

22. Reproduced p.94, Llewellyn, Art of Death; the fan is the property of the Hon. Christopher Lennox-Boyd; the importance of studying private collections cannot be overemphasised.

23. English Caricature, p.7; Riely, YULG remains the
best introduction to the Lewis Walpole Library collection; see also Riely/Roylance, *The Age of Horace Walpole in Caricature*.


25. *English Caricature*, p.8; see also Dolmetsch, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg' pp.177-78. Other sources include: the Swann Foundation for Caricature and Cartoon and the Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, UCLA...


27. In particular, the Huntington Library, the John Carter Brown Library, the Houghton and Kress Libraries, Harvard. Dolmetsch, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg' notes, p.179, that R.T.H. Halsey's collection was bequeathed to the John Carter Brown Library in 1952. The Speck/Madan Sacheverell bibliography helpfully lists locations of material, many items existing solely in American libraries.


29. ibid, p.73.


31. Described by Mellini as 'an American resource to rival the BM's Catalogue'. For the Lewis Walpole Library, see Reilly, *YULG* pp.374-75; I am grateful to Joan Sussler, Curator, LWL Print Room, for information concerning the computerisation of the catalogue.

32. I intend to compile one such catalogue, documenting the holdings of Edinburgh, covering the National Galleries, National Library, University Library, which will furnish a model for further undertakings of this kind.

33. A representative example is that cited by Scudi, p.15: *The Post Boy* 2302, 11-14 February 1709/10 p.2 column 2, 'Just Published: The True Effigies of Dr Henry Sacheverel, curiously performed in Metzotinto,
from off a Copper-Plate done after the Original Painting of Mr Gibson. Price 1 shilling 6d, in a Frame and Glass 30 shillings 6d. Sold by Philip Overton, Map and Printseller, at the Golden Buck, against St Dunstan's Church, Fleetstreet. NB. There will nor can be no other Print done after the Original Painting than this: All Gray'd Prints being False and Spurious'. The Speck/Madan Sacheverell bibliography provides advertising information in many instances.

See also Francis Buckley/A.W. Aspital, notices of engraver's advertisements extracted from periodicals and newspapers, of prints published in England c.1680-c.1800; B.M. Department of Prints and Drawings, Dd.8.7.;1939-11-27-1; User's Guide, p.67.

Sometimes, the publication line of a print may itself offer useful information concerning related prints or related material. Kunzle, Early Comic Strip p.136 cites BM 1078 Titus Oates, D.D. Wisdom Instructing him to Discover this Hellish Popish Plot, which as Stephens's transcription (I, 621) shows, bears an extensive letterpress advertising related prints, also playing cards together with related literature, to be had from its publisher, Thomas Dawks.

Problems of survival and documentation are touched on by Kunzle, pp.7-8.

35. See Griffiths, 'Bicentenaire' p.455. Extant documentation includes the Bibliothèque Nationale's catalogue of the Collection de Vinck (of an equivalent vintage to the BM Catalogue; 5 vols (1909,1914,1921,1929,1938)); Inventaire analytique de la Collection de Vinck; also Inventaire de la Collection d'estampes relatives à l'histoire de France leguée en 1853 à la Bibliothèque Nationale par le Chevalier Hennin 4 vols (Paris 1877-84).
36. One art historian observes, Object, Image, Inquiry pp.66-67 'cataloguing projects [...] in the thought of our discipline, [are] less sexy. Everyone wants idea pieces'; the emphasis placed on frequency of publication by academic institutions is also cited.
Chapter V: Iconography; iconographic analysis of political prints

In studying cartoons [sic] we study the use of symbols in a circumscribed context.
E.H. Gombrich, 'The Cartoonist's Armoury'.

In Chapter II above, I concluded that, in calling for political prints to be studied 'as art', Porter intended the study of these prints as images. Together with Chapter VI, this chapter considers approaches to the material which would do precisely this.

One such approach, with which this chapter is concerned, is the study of the iconography of the prints; the study of the symbols and motifs of which they are composed; motifs such as the Eye of God, the hand emerging from the clouds, the urinating dog, personifications (Time, Truth, Britannia, Liberty, et cetera).

All but the very simplest prints offer a conjunction of numerous component images or motifs; the analysis of this iconography, of both individual motifs and combinations of motifs, is one of the main keys by which the prints may be unlocked.

This iconography might helpfully be seen as the vocabulary of the print; the 'grammar' of the print is to be found in the formal, pictorial structure and in the rhetorical - or in some cases satirical - structures; this 'grammar' is the subject of Chapters VI and VII.

Iconography is one of the ways in which the prints are most conspicuously polysemic, not only in the sense in which Wardroper describes Gillray's 'finest prints' - 'complex structures in which dozens of details convey messages that often question each other' - but in terms of the way in which the same motif may be employed to
very different ends, depending on its broader iconographical context and the intention of the designer.²

Yet remarkably little attention has been paid to this aspect of the prints by those who have addressed this material. It has been conventional to acknowledge the iconographical richness of 18th-century political prints and graphic political satire, but while the literature is prolific of terms such as 'conventional symbolism', analysis of this iconography has been wanting.

Historians might be, in George's words, 'apt to neglect iconography' but the historical-contextual approach of EPC dictated that after a brief review of the 'international' iconography inherited by the English political print of the 17th-century, by way of a preface to the subsequent chronological narrative, the iconography of the prints is dealt with only briefly and in passing. Never ignored, - George is keen to identify and celebrate 'developments in imagery' - it is never the subject of analysis in its own right.³

Subsequent accounts have by and large followed suit. Atherton's Political Prints was subtitled 'a study of the ideographic representation of politics'. In it one could read that 'symbols, with emotive connotations, fill the prints, serving as shibboleths'.⁴ One such 'emotive' symbol is the wooden shoe - symbol of (French) 'slavery'. It is one of many symbols the graphic political career of which Atherton might profitably have traced. Ultimately, Political Prints was concerned less with 'the ideographic representation of politics' and its constituent iconography than with the political print as a genre and as an organ of organised 'Opposition'.

Arguably, it is only by the study of the incidence or career of such 'emotive symbols' that it will be possible to determine the rhetorical capacity of political prints, but, to date, only a handful of studies of individual
motifs has appeared. These have proved predictable in both range and subject-matter, focussing in the main upon national personifications and the genesis of a handful of stereotypes.  

An honorable exception, although dealing with national personification, is Lester Olson's *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era*, which attempts to establish the iconography of both the American self-image and British perceptions of the colonies, as articulated and disseminated by a range of graphic media. In the place of a conventional chronological or medium-based structure, the structure of *Emblems of American Community* reflects its iconographic basis - 'The Colonies are a Snake', '...an Indian', '...a Child', et cetera. That Olson's book should be the first book-length iconographical study of even a small corpus of prints is eloquent of the indifference to iconographical analysis which has prevailed in political prints scholarship. With the predictable exception of the works of Hogarth, prints scholarship has eschewed the iconographic analysis of individual prints. The deconstruction of individual prints to their iconographical components should have been a part of the format for the Chadwyck-Healey series - the point of which was, after all, to advertise the research potential of this material; the absence of such an exercise - which might most easily have been undertaken in the form of an introductory analysis of one important print per volume - was rightly seen as a serious failing on the part of the series.

Before examining the scope for iconographic analysis of the prints and the advantages of such an approach to the material, it is pertinent to ask why genres which should have been an iconographer's playground have so seldom been studied from this perspective. The paucity of iconographic studies of the political
print both reflects and informs its illustrative status; identification of subject-matter ('a satire on Thomas Paine') and explanation of context ('the East India Bill of 1783', 'the Regency Crisis of 1788-89') having taken precedence over the analysis of the prints as configurations of visual images. Similarly, a preoccupation with aesthetic competence has kept the analysis of prints at a literally superficial level, so that the presence or absence of colour, or the particular printmaking technique employed, have been considered of greater significance than the symbolisation for which the medium is merely the vehicle and to which artistic sophistication is in most cases incidental. The preoccupation with a single idiom - caricature - has also militated against the analysis of prints from an iconographical perspective.

The paucity of iconographic analyses of the prints also reflects a paucity of specialist scholars; there is a tendency for accounts of the material to be written by non-specialists (reflecting its uncertain academic status). The exigencies of compiling a jolly exhibition and accompanying catalogue are not conducive to a more analytical approach to the material; the closest one gets to an iconographically-grounded study in this context is the broadly thematic, e.g., 'Medicine in caricature'.

As always, however, the more telling answers are to be found in the idées reçues concerning the nature, function and audience of the prints. First there is the idea that political prints, political caricature and graphic political satire are at bottom undemanding genres.

For various reasons, many prints 'scholars' have been concerned to present these genres as, with one or two exceptions, 'contentedly free from intellectual content'. Thus Atherton;

they are simple artefacts. They pretend to no great genius of invention or depth of meaning.
Pat Rogers, reviewing *Political Prints*, obediently followed suit; there may be a profusion of motifs in the prints, but graphic symbolisation at this period was un challengingly one-dimensional:

Such motifs as the screen used as a way of indicating Walpole have a static, allegorical function: they mean one thing and one thing only, and they seldom come into significant confrontation with other parts of the print.

On these grounds, Rogers questioned Atherton's use of the word 'symbol':

Atherton sometimes talks of 'symbols', but that is rather too dressed-up a word; it belongs to the iconography of the Renaissance, with those numerological riddles and cabbalistic jokes which an immensely secretive and mystery-loving society draped on the simplest ideas. But for the Georgians, one level of metaphor was quite enough. This means that Atherton has few opportunities for exploring hidden meanings in the manner of Frances Yates. 12

These verdicts assert the ideographic inarticulacy of the pictorial - its capacity to visualise abstract ideas - which continues to inform a basic absence of curiosity on the part of scholars not only with respect to the rhetorical capacities of these prints (conveniently assumed to have been limited) but with respect to the individual components from which such pictorial arguments (or non-arguments if you are, for example, Miller, Langford, or Dickinson) were constructed.

Lucie-Smith might consider the 'caricaturist' [sic] to be, 'far more than any other kind of visual artist', 'the servant of an idea', but scholars have not merely asserted the ideographic inadequacies of the prints; their prejudices have led them to ignore or deprecate attempts at more complex visual symbolisation. 13 We read that the post-1760 'caricature' dealt in personalities, not abstracts; the combinations of motifs by means of which the pre-1760 graphic satirist and polemicist
attempted to deal in abstracts are for the most part rejected as the emblematic detritus from recourse to which the genre needed to be emancipated.

The insistence of many scholars on both the ideographic inadequacies of the material and the undesirability of 'complicated' emblematic symbolisation is itself informed by prevailing orthodoxies concerning the contemporary function of the prints, not least the idea that political prints and graphic political satire 'simplified' ideas and arguments; thus Wardroper 'the essence of a good political caricature was and is that it can make complex matters clear in an instant'. This itself derives from the enduring idea that these prints could communicate 'even' or 'especially' to the uneducated or illiterate. Indeed, there is a school which insists on the diminishing iconographic and formal complexity and difficulties of the prints as the corollary of the print's increasing importance as a vehicle of 'popular politicisation' - wherein, or so the argument goes, lies its historical significance. Thus Press could refer to the emblematic idiom, conventionally associated with iconographic complexity, as a 'handicap' to the print's earlier assumption of this role. Carretta, similarly, could describe the post-1760 'development' of graphic political satire in terms of an iconographic 'break with the past' dictated by the need to appeal to 'new audiences' composed 'mainly of the unenfranchised'. It is a thesis which entails a judicious downplaying of iconography in general but above all of iconographic continuity.

In many accounts, this alleged shift to greater simplicity of representation is associated with the adoption of caricature; Carretta refers to 'developments in iconography' which secured the triumph of caricature. It is significant that Atherton should
have distinguished not between the 'emblematic' but between the 'iconographic print' and the caricature; there is a sense in which scholars have viewed the two as antithetical, so that in narrating the adoption of caricature, the impression created is of a process whereby the new idiom replaces iconography.\textsuperscript{18}

It is less that, in describing prints, there is no mention of iconography, rather that, in such descriptions, iconography so often comes across as of minor importance; the selective nature of such descriptions, in which perhaps one out of a potential dozen motifs merits mention, not only gives - in the absence of the print itself - a false impression of the print in question, but downplays the part played by iconography in the composition of satirical images. The fact that, aside from describing the central action and the main protagonists, the emphasis of such 'descriptions' remains historical-contextual compounds this.

Not least when harnessed to the socio-political thesis, the conventional account of the 'triumph of caricature' posits a difference in iconographic terms between the pre- and post-1760 print which is not borne out by the evidence. It is hardly surprising that such accounts have tended to downplay iconography; in studying iconography, the scholar would have to face the fact that the change in the prints allegedly effected by the introduction of caricature was in reality limited and superficial.

If the accounts of Press and Carretta place the increasing iconographic simplification of the prints in the context of post-1760 socio-political 'developments', political prints scholarship's insistence on simplicity of meaning - the simplicity or monodimensionality of visual symbolisation - in the prints is also informed by the idea that there is necessarily a discontinuity
between the 17th- and 18th-centuries; a shift in mentalitites from a 'metaphysical' 17th-century in which allegory and emblem are idioms expressive of the 'spirit of the age' to a 'rational' 18th-century in which these idioms could have no place. The seminal articulation of this idea remains Paulson's Emblem and Expression and its thesis of a transition from difficultas to claritas in visual representation and the gradual obsolescence of emblematic modes of representation:

Once the old iconography was understood to be just that, the question of how to use it, what to put in its place, and where to go from there occupied Hogarth into his last years and the artists who followed him into the 1760s and 1770s. Paulson was not here referring to graphic satirists and polemicists, but these and similar passages in Emblem and Expression, together with Paulson's thesis of Hogarth's 'iconoclasm' and 'subversion' of traditional iconography, have encouraged prints scholars to downplay the iconographic continuity between 17th- and 18th-century, and even between pre- and post-1760, prints. The idea that such iconographic transformations were - like the triumph of caricature which they inform - , because rooted in the zeitgeist, necessary and inevitable has coloured the appraisal of pre-caricatural iconography in the prints; recourse to 'complicated traditional symbolism' and the use of established motifs such as the British Lion are cited as proof of the 'poverty of invention' of the pre-caricatural print.

It has not helped that the anachronistic aesthetic values identified in Part I, Chapter VII, have also pronounced iconographical complexity an undesirable characteristic, the elimination of which over time is the 'story' of the print's 18th-century ameliorative 'development'. Little in the way of iconographic content-analysis can be expected from those to whom the
20th-century ideal of the print with a single arresting image which encapsulates the satirist's point is an acceptable yardstick for the appraisal of 17th- and 18th-century images; from those who subscribe to the idea that 'caricature [sic] more than any other art, must cultivate elimination', those to whom motifs are so much visual detritus; those for whom the rhetorical power of a print is limited by iconographical complexity.  

The neglect of iconography may also be said to reflect the political print's low status in the hierarchy even of graphic genres. Godfrey might draw an analogy between the imagery of Gillray and Blake, but the former's iconography has yet to become the subject of dictionaries. Nor, perhaps more tellingly, has the Hogarth industry yet produced a definitive and comprehensive 'Hogarth iconography', innumerable analyses of individual prints and the oeuvre notwithstanding. Discernible in these omissions is the lingering sense, certainly outwith the oeuvre of Hogarth (a 'real' artist), that these prints are not proper subjects for iconographical analysis as conventionally understood. In this respect, graphic political satire, political prints, and political caricature are genres in which the 'history' continues to take precedence over the 'art'.

The failure of those who have addressed the political print to engage with iconography and the processes of visual symbolisation (other than the most simple) is, then, explicable in terms of the prejudices and limitations of political prints scholarship. The consequences of this neglect of iconography are several, and in their turn may be seen to have informed the emphases and omissions of scholarship to date.
In an earlier chapter, I considered whether the unchallenged currency of the thesis of the transformation of the political print by caricature might be explained in terms of a general unfamiliarity with the full range of surviving prints, both pre- and post-caricature, on the part of those who have reiterated this thesis and on the part of their general readership. A similar apparent ignorance informs the literature with regard to iconography. Although the phrases 'long-established topos', 'conventional iconography', 'A recurrent motif', 'conventional symbol for...' are conventional to the literature, from EPC onwards, accounts have been silent or evasive when it comes to delineating the genesis and subsequent graphic career of a given motif. Those who register the existence in an 18th-century print of a motif almost invariably fail to specify, if only in a documentary footnote, earlier examples in the same genre. Conversely, in the context of the anti-sectarian satires of 1641, George registers the image of the tub-preacher - of which more below - and writes that 'the tub-preacher was to become (in word and picture) the symbol of the ranting nonconformist'; the latest instance offered in EPC1 dates from c.1690 - significant 18th-century applications of the image are omitted.

George may acknowledge that 'many of the perennial devices of the political caricaturist [sic] made a seemingly first appearance' in 'the graphic satire of the Great Rebellion', but as far as the literature in general is concerned, in keeping, perhaps, with the idea that there was no native tradition of graphic satire and graphic polemic pre c.1720, such iconographical sources for images and motifs as are cited are likely to refer to images - not necessarily in prints - dating from the Reformation or earlier, and often of foreign origin; this lip-service to iconographical continuity must be set against the virtual silence which prevails with regard to 17th-century or pre-1720 English prints.
To take one example, the much-reproduced image *A Free Born Englishman* (1819). Referring to the motif of the padlocked mouth, Patten writes; 'the padlocked mouth is an ancient demotic emblem', citing a 16th-century German woodcut. 25 A more appropriate example, in that it comes from an English print, is the Sacheverell print [M979] Mobbs idol or ye pad lockt trumpeter (1710), which depicts the Doctor with padlocked lips, a comment on the three-year preaching ban imposed in 1710. 26 This omission is not particularly surprising; Patten's account of the 'development' of the genre including the significant phrase 'from Hogarth forward...'. 27 Yet the post-1720, pre-c.1780 print figures no more prominently as the source for motifs deployed by Cruikshank. Thus with reference to the 1811 print *The Return to Office* [BM 11728] [Plate 1], we are informed that 'Fame sounding a trumpet by a blast from the nether cheeks is a commonplace of demotic prints'. Patten cites two French examples catalogued by Cuno 28; a more appropriate example is BM 2859 *The Humours of the Westminster Election or the scald miserable Independant Electors in ye Suds* (1747) [Plate 2] in which Fame blows two trumpets, one orally ('Faithful to King and Country') the other anally ('A F--t for the Jacobites'). 29 Langford rightly observes the prevalence of what might be loosely termed 'theatrical' imagery in anti-Walpole satires - Walpole is depicted as a charlatan showman, a conjurer, a quack; what Langford fails to mention is that Walpole was not the first figure to be satirised by this conceit - Charles II was depicted as a Ra-ree showman in 1681, while the print BM 1258 *The High German Doctor and the English Fool* (c.1690) may refer to William of Orange. 30

Does this general failure to acknowledge pre-existing manifestations of a given motif, or combination of motifs, matter? It matters, arguably, when it occurs in the context of works which assert the non- or very
limited existence of graphic satire and polemic in 17th-century or pre-1720 England; at what stage does suppressio veri become suggestio falsi?

This question recurred on reading Carretta's George III. Those with an extensive knowledge of the extant relevant material for the period 1640-1820 cannot but find Carretta's discussion of the iconography of prints 1760-1820 partial and arbitrary. In the case of the motif of the Liberty Tree, Carretta celebrates the choice of an organic rather than architectural trope as a focus for colonial disaffection, an 'emblem of natural rights' which could take the place of or vie with the (for the colonies increasingly obsolescent) royal oak. As Carretta sees it, the Tree of Liberty represents the 'transference of the spiritual type of the tree figure [e.g., the Cross, the Tree of Life, the Jesse Tree] to a secular context' an example of what Paul Korshin calls abstracted typology'; 'the tree of liberty as a secular antitype of the tree of life'. This idea, of the 'secularisation' of traditional iconography, is one which recurs in Carretta's writings. What Carretta omits to mention, however, is the continued vitality of the spiritual type of tree in this period, in the 1770 Methodist print The Tree of Life [Plate 3] and in the 1771 print Hieroglyphicks of the Natural Man [Plate 4].

Nor is this the only sense in which Carretta's account of arboreal political iconography is selective. Asking 'how had the Liberty Tree come to be available to the Stamp Act satirists in 1765?', Carretta places it in the predictable context of the Albion's-Fatal-Tree/tree-of-corruption images, citing the 1763 image Scotch Paradice in which Bute distributes fruit labelled 'Customs', 'Excise', 'Stamps' and the verse of which describes Bute as the 'Laird of the Golden Pippins'. In this context it might have been appropriate to have considered Gillray's later (1798) image of The Tree of Liberty with the Devil tempting John Bull [Plate 5] in
which the royal oak survives in the background, and in which it is the tree of liberty which is the tree of corruption, its fruits 'rotten medlars' ('Democracy', 'Reform', 'Deism', 'Atheism', 'Blasphemy', et cetera).

Again, does Carretta's omission really matter? It matters when it is considered that the print Hieroglyphicks of the Natural Man [Plate 4] would conventionally be dismissed as a non-satirical, emblematic image - an anachronism in the non-emblematic post-1760 period; Miller could consider The Tree of Life [Plate 3] 'rather old-fashioned'. It begins to matter still more on closer comparison of the obscure Hieroglyphicks and the reasonably familiar Gillray print.

The resemblances are striking; the general composition, including the shape of the tree and its labelled trunk and roots; the bare branches with the labelled fruit and the coiled serpent. The reasonable supposition must be that Gillray was familiar with the earlier image (which may, indeed, have still been available in 1798, dealers such as Carrington Bowles, by whom the 1771 image is published, tending to retain and reissue their stock).

As noted above, the sources of Gillray's iconography have yet to be considered a legitimate field for research. Indifference to the sources which may have shaped the personal iconography of the acknowledged genius of the genre says much about the nature of political prints scholarship; it is eloquent of an indifference to iconography in general and symptomatic of a failure to engage with the material on other than a superficial level.

Indifference to iconography, together with the failure to recognise the pre-1720 English political print, has meant that iconographic and rhetorical continuities in the prints over time remain unexplored. The Tree of Liberty and Hieroglyphicks are merely two instances of an established visual trope. The labelled trunk by which both trees are distinguished may be found in, among
others, the 1645 image of Charles I defending the tree of religion [Plate 6], the 1656 print Parallelum Olivae [Plate 7], the 1675 image The Chvrch Catholick [Plate 8], the 1686 print, 'Rebellion, Scism, Sed[ition]' [Plate 9] and the 1688 print England's Memorial [Plate 10]. The latter is also an example of the tree which is distinguished by its fruits - earlier examples include Plate 6, The Royall Oake of Brittayne [Plate 11], Plate 10 - and the iconography of the Orange tree in related Williamite propaganda, [Plate 12]. The withered trunk to the right of the tree in Hieroglyphicks recalls the withered oak and saplings in the frontispiece to Anthony Sadler's The Loyall Mourner, Shewing the Murdering of King Charles the First (1660) [Plate 13] and in the 1750 Oak Society medal [Plate 14] as well as the fallen oak and sapling orange tree in Williamite medals [Plate 12].

In these images, the iconography - and in many instances the typological associations - of the tree are employed to several polemical ends, but the extent to which this iconography is both common and persistent is readily apparent. The image of the tub-preacher, referred to earlier, is an example of iconographic continuity over this period which entails - or would appear to entail - a rhetorical consistency.

As noted before, George remarks in EPC1 the long career of the image of the tub-preacher which first appears in satire and polemic of the 1640s as one of what Williams terms, somewhat dismissively, the 'limited range of identity-tags' by which pamphlet coverage of the proliferation of sects was supported; it appears in Plate 6. In the post-Restoration print, the image of the tub-preacher persists as a shorthand means of associating contemporary dissent and its ambitions with earlier rebellion and regicide - a graphic shorthand character for what Charles Leslie termed 'the principles of forty-one'. Prints employing this motif include BM 1109 The Ballad of the Cloak (c.1680) [Plate 15]; BM 1231
and 1232 A Trimmer (c.1689); BM 1233 A Trimmer Practicall (c.1689); BM 1386, 'a satire on the hypocrisy and vices of the quakers' (c.1700); BM 1418 (c.1700) [Plate 16]; BM 1505 A British Janus Anglice a Timeserver (c.1709) [Plate 17]; BM 1299 The Tub Preacher and the Mountebank (illustrating the 1724 edition of A Tale of a Tub); BM 2835 The Orator (1746), a satire on 'Orator' Henley; BM 7637 A Dissenting Congregation (c.1790).

Possibly the most striking instances of recourse to this motif in 18th-century graphic political satire - mention of which is conspicuously absent from EPC1 - are the prints published in connexion with the 1790 proposal to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts; Dent's A Word of Comfort (1790) and BM 7822 Tale of a Tub (1791), satires on, respectively, Joseph Priestley and Richard Price [Plates 18 and 19]. As part of a larger recourse to analogies, visual and verbal, with 17th-century rebellion, regicide and usurpation in the post-French Revolutionary period, these last two images should be seen within this context; they nonetheless draw on an extant convention for the depiction of dissent which may be traced back to 1641.

In the prints, iconographical continuity was assured by the common practice whereby old stock was reissued and plates altered; thus Plate 3, The Tree of Life proves to be a slightly different version of a print dated 1740 [Plate 20]. Plate 6 was reissued in 1690 as the second frontispiece to the third edition of Thomas May's Epitome of English History; in this later version, the figure of Charles I is replaced by that of Charles II. Similarly, Faithorne's emblematic image of Oliver Cromwell, The Embleme of England's Distractions [Plate 21] reappears exactly thirty years later, with the figure of William of Orange substituted for that of Cromwell [Plate 22]. Within the genres of political satire and caricature, the reissue of prints - in most instances slightly modified
the better to increase their topicality - was more common than the literature has perhaps made clear. Piracy exacerbated this ideographic incest.

The fundamentally conservative nature of the iconography of graphic political satire and polemic has been obscured; the literature, not least as a result of the narration of the post-1720 'development' of 'caricature', has emphasised change rather than continuity. Significantly, 18th-century issues of 17th-century images such as The Double Deliverance or the frontispiece to Eikon Basilike are referred to in EPC1 not in their chronological context, but in the context of their first appearance; their 18th-century career is thereby obscured, not least for those who consult the book on a chronological basis. George was always more ready to identify the first appearance of a new motif than she was to acknowledge - other than in the most general terms - the survival within the post-1720 or post-1760 print of older motifs.

An anachronistic admiration for 'originality' continues to colour perceptions of the 18th-century political print; the more 'original' and individualistic the visual vocabulary deployed, the 'better' the print. This was not the yardstick employed by contemporaries. As Vogler observes, by George Cruikshank's day,

...caricature [sic] had already become a complex genre that had accumulated a corpus of traditional motifs and subjects. The artist was expected not to create an entirely new idea but rather to give a new interpretation to previously established visual motifs.

The exigencies of responding to events faster than one's graphic rivals also ensured the continued currency of this corpus as a source to be plundered. Patten describes Cruikshank's brother Robert as continuing 'to work within a referential visual context' throughout the 1820s and 1830s; 'his images constantly renovate graphic traditions', his work is 'conventional in the sense of
overtly playing with an inherited syntax of forms and signs'. Unsurprisingly, it has been the more exploratory work of George Cruikshank which has attracted scholarly attention.

The emphasis on change entailed in the linear model of 'the development of political caricature' is in many cases compounded by ignorance of earlier prints; too many of those who have written on the 18th-century political print, graphic political satire and political caricature would appear - from the omissions of their accounts - to be inadequately grounded in the whole range of the evidence. This has meant that important continuities between the 17th- and 18th-century political print have gone undetected. At the same time, unquestioning acceptance of the conventional narrative of the 18th-century 'development' of political caricature has led scholars to underestimate - or downplay - the tenacity of emblematic iconography even when it is apparent in a later print.

********

Political prints scholarship remains reluctant to acknowledge, still less to engage with, the complexities and tenacity of the visual vocabulary of the material.

The first stage in remedying this neglect of iconography must be the comprehensive documentation of that iconography. If the iconography of the prints is viewed as the vocabulary of the prints, then scholarship must take a lexicographical turn, and establish the constituent parts of this vocabulary, prior to undertaking more sophisticated and specialised studies of the incidence of given motifs, et cetera.

Streicher went some way towards identifying this need when he wrote that political prints scholarship requires
some kind of construct of the 'language of caricature' which would point to the various types and particular kinds of items which are employed in graphic imagery and used for particular purposes of persuasion.

Once identified and documented,

changes in detail in this 'language' could then fairly easily be traced over time by content-analysis and related to other changing and dependent events. Caricatural imagery would then be a dependent variable.

This is important; in documenting the visual vocabulary of the prints, be it within a limited or - which would be more useful - a more extended chronology, the scholar must be sensitive to variations in usage and application, variations which may or may not be determined by the context of a print, and he must also be alert to changes in application and meaning over time.

A relevant criticism encountered with reference to iconographic analysis of images as conventionally practised was the ease with which such analysis became a mechanistic approach, so that 'if Saint Anne raises her right hand that related to chastity or avarice, and there are twenty-five other examples'. Iconographical content-analysis of the prints must avoid the structuralist simplicity of deploying iconographic content-analysis as the 'standard key' by which all occurrences within the genre may be unlocked. The risk is that the process of documenting the incidence of a given motif in the prints over time will encourage the scholar to view the motif as static, discrete or ahistorical. Thus, it will not be enough to document the incidence of the personification, Time, in the prints over this period and conclude 'Time appears in x number of prints between 16-- and 18--', although a basic quantitative approach will be necessary to establish Time as a recurrent motif. Having established Time as a recurrent motif, it will be necessary to consider whether
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this motif is used to the same rhetorical purpose in each instance, and to explore variants in usage. In this instance, it will be discovered that Time is almost invariably deployed in a revelatory capacity (especially when accompanied by the personification Truth); Time draws back a curtain to reveal some iniquity, and so forth. As an iconographical motif, Time operates within a revelatory satirical structure - satire as exposure - (for which see Chapter VII), and a full 'reading' of a print would comprehend both, just as conventional literacy comprehends vocabulary within the context of grammar.

Time is perhaps a bad example, in that its application remains consistent in the prints. Other, still more common, motifs have a more varied application in the prints and it is to the nuances of application and context that any documentation must be sensitive.

What such iconographical content analysis ought, ideally, to establish, is the degree to which the iconography of the political print is 'fixed' or closed, that is, has the static, monodimensionality of meaning claimed by Rogers, and how far it is unstable, fluid and open to appropriation for the articulation of very different political arguments. Such research should establish whether there is any justification for speaking of rival iconographies - an iconography and a counter-iconography - and whether at any stage it is possible to identify, to use Carretta's phrase, a 'war of icons'. The scope for such research and its reintegration into a 'straight' political-historical context is, I would suggest, considerable.

The question of the stability of iconography in the prints over any given period is central to an understanding of, first, the role of iconography in the prints, and second, the potential rhetorical capacity of symbolisation. From this it should be possible to
advance more legitimate speculations with regard to the reception and rhetorical capacity of the material than have hitherto been proferred.

Study of the evidence suggests that it will be possible to identify a corpus of motifs that are basically 'fixed' in their associations - the 'Scales of Justice' is one such - but not 'fixed' in terms of their application within the prints; the scales of justice could be used in a number of contexts and was certainly not the preserve of any one 'side' in terms of political argument. It is likely that only with regard to a handful of motifs will it be possible to speak of rival iconographies; in most instances, the corpus is a common one. This is hardly surprising when the nature of graphic satire and propaganda, and the working-practices of the, in most cases, apolitical professional graphic satirist are considered. Such practices required an iconography that was stable, in which meaning was neither arbitrary nor so fixed as to limit its application; a common corpus for the construction of wildly different political messages.

Arguably, the stability of this iconography - the existence of an agreed, common iconography - was the corollary of an iconography that was far from being 'static' in the sense argued by Rogers. According to Rogers, in the political print motifs 'mean one thing and one thing only and they seldom come into significant confrontation with other parts of the print'; prints offer a combination of discrete symbols. The evidence of the prints suggests otherwise. If nothing else, Rogers ignores the quasi-emblematic interaction of word and image which remains central to the carriage of meaning within the print. There are many motifs in which iconographic meaning is not inherent but determined by the immediate graphic context and in particular by pictorial and rhetorical structures. Were this otherwise, then the deconstruction by iconographic content-analysis of a given print would be simply a case
of identifying the static components of that image; an iconographic train-spotting exercise of limited value. In the following two chapters, I attempt to delineate the larger structures within which the iconographic vocabulary of the prints operates.

If iconographic meaning is in many instances not 'fixed' but dictated by the immediate graphic context, it would also seem that the significance of individual motifs is fixed - and the use of such motifs within the prints informed - by iconographic association. Thus the motif of the dark-lantern, which is employed as a shorthand for 'conspiracy' throughout the 18th century, would seem to presuppose familiarity with one of the many versions and editions of The Double Deliverance [Plate 23]; certainly the 1756 satire Guy Vaux the 2d [Plate 24] would seem to depend on the recollection of the earlier image (in other prints, the use of 'Faux' or 'Vaux' for 'Fox' may be interpreted as a verbal equivalent of this iconographical association). Similarly, the depiction of Charles II as Augustus Anglicus [Plate 25] would seem a deliberate attempt to invoke the resonant image of Eikon Basilike [Plate 26] and its derivations [Plate 27].

The extent to which the 18th-century political print relied upon familiarity with other images - whether those of an earlier period or images contemporary with the print - is something which any iconographic study of the material must consider if iconographic study of the print is to illuminate the questions of visual literacy and the accessibility or otherwise of the 'visual codes' of the prints. In order to do so, it will be necessary to address the question of the availability in the 18th century of older images, where previous studies have tended to ignore such survivals. If iconography matters, then the corpus of images which coloured both the iconography used in the prints and the reception of the prints is worth establishing (the inspecificity of the literature when it comes to identifying the sources for
the imagery employed in the prints - 'emblem books', 'popular imagery' - suggests that iconography does not matter). 54

Such survivals and reissues may themselves tell us something about the nature of symbolisation - was it static and ahistorical or subject to contextual nuances? What, for example, was the meaning of the reappearance, in the context of a larger landscape print, of the 1660 emblematic engraving on the subject of the murder of Charles I, [Plate 131], discovered in the fourth volume of Joseph Smith's Nouveau Theatre de 1 a Grande Bretagne (1729) in which it is described as 'Estampe emblematique sur la mort de Charles I, decapite le 30 Janvier 1648/9 & sur les trois Princesses [sic] fils, qui etoient fugatifs'? After the death of Charles II, that is, after 1685, the iconography of this print would have been redundant; a Jacobite reworking would, one might have thought, ensured that the second branch supported the crown, although the quotation from Job - retained in the 1729 print - would have been receptive to a Jacobite construction. 55

To turn to a very different image, what was the intention behind the 1689 reworking of Faithorne's The Embleme of England's Distractions - especially when it is possible to claim, as Bruce Lawson has done, that this image was more ambivalent and loaded than its reputation as a commemorative tribute to Cromwell would lead one to expect. If, as Lawson argues, the image subverts as much as it commemorates Cromwell, what is to be made of its adaptation - in which the details cited by Lawson are unchanged - forty years later? 56 We are ill-equipped to penetrate such visual enigmas; progress will come only when it is recognised that iconography is central to an understanding of the political print and that central to the understanding of iconography is the recognition of iconographic continuity - which will entail the study of the 17th-century and emblematic prints hitherto
marginalised by political prints scholarship.

Thus far, I have touched on two 'iconographical' approaches to the prints; iconographical content-analysis of prints which would allow the documentation of the visual vocabulary employed - the lexicographical approach, and the investigation of the sources by which this iconography acquired its currency at any given moment.

If, as I suggested, we are dealing with a visual vocabulary that is predominantly 'neutral' - that is to say, open to appropriation for the simultaneous articulation of arguments by different 'sides' in a debate, we must consider the extent to which the meaning of an image - as construed from its iconography - was open to misappropriation, that is, to polemical misinterpretation or, to use a more pertinent word, misrepresentation. This entails shifting our focus from the images themselves to what contemporaries said about them; from iconography to iconology, literally, 'the stories about images'. 57 This 'discourse of images' is something upon which Williams touched in her study of the prints of the 1640-60 period, and something to which Lois Potter's Secret Rites gives some consideration, focussing upon the discourse prompted by the Eikon Basilike frontispiece. 58 As Williams puts it, 'by presenting their own explanations of prints, writers tried to shape the way in which illustrations [sic] were regarded'. 59

18th-century instances of a polemical 'discourse of images' include the interpretations and counter-interpretations of the allegedly Jacobite images of the 1710—1712 Oxford Almanacs and of the Saint Clement Dane's altarpiece - a debate to which Hogarth made (1726) a graphic contribution, and which recalled a similar controversy of 1714 concerning another altarpiece, in which Christ was said to have been painted as a likeness of Henry Sacheverell. 60 It was not only
the 'deliberately cryptic' emblematic political images of the 17th and early 18th centuries which attracted polemical 'interpretations' in the form of commentaries, 'Explanations'; printed (and occasionally manuscript) commentaries on political prints survived, like so much else, into the 19th century. 61

If the documentation of the visual vocabulary of the prints has the potential to alert scholars to - or establish incontrovertably - significant continuities in ideographic representation over the period 1640-1840, to be of value it must also document changes in that vocabulary or its application over the same period. 62 For this reason, apparent continuities must themselves be scrutinised. A case in point is the tub-preacher; was the depiction of Price and Priestley in this manner ironic, or the best way in which graphic satirists could visualise contemporary suspicions as to the ambitions of 'radical dissent'? As noted earlier, these 1790s tub-preacher images must be seen within the context of other references to the upheavals of 1640-60 in prints of this period; references which are made verbally as well as visually. Such references merit attention within the specific context of graphic responses to the French Revolution. At the same time, they are merely the latest instances of such references; the same iconography articulating the same historical references, may be found in the prints in previous decades of the 18th century. The significance of such references within the 18th-century context merits further study.

The light which such iconographical continuities may shed on the mentalites of the past is something upon which Atherton touched in Political Prints, suggesting that in such rhetorical and iconographical continuities - the use of Armada and Gunpowder Plot images in graphic propaganda supporting the Duke of Monmouth 63, the
continued appearance in the prints of Lord Bute 'behind
the curtain' for more than a decade after his
resignation,
64 - we see 'the glacier-like protractedness
and languid movement in popular beliefs' which
characterised the 18th century.
65 If, as I have
suggested, the 'popular' nature of the market for the
greater number of these prints needs to be reconsidered,
then the survival of so-called 'popular' political
mythologies in the prints must be reconsidered also.
Atherton continues:

In the main, however, the political prints of
the eighteenth century show how closely its basic
preconceptions were related to the seventeenth
century [...]. In some instances, the rudiments
are even earlier. 'Ages of history [...]. overlap,
and curious throwbacks occur, or it will happen
that, as the world changes, men are slow in making
their mental adjustments'.

The tendency of prints scholars to downplay those
iconographical and rhetorical continuities has much to do
with their inability - or reluctance - to free themselves
from the linear model within which most prints
scholarship and commentary have operated. It may also be
accounted for in terms of a reluctance to abandon the
historical contexts conventionally proffered. Thus
George can ignore the depiction of Price and Priestley as
tub-preachers and can discuss other images of the 1789-92
period which deploy a 17th-century iconography of
'radical dissent' as 'curious throwbacks' 'to the days of
Sacheverell at least'; 'in the prints the dissenters are
compared with the Republican sectaries'.
67 Yet such
comparisons - comparisons which, as in the case of the
tub-preacher, were made by recourse to an iconography
first used in the 1640s, and which were explicit
throughout (thus George Whitefield becomes the 'new Hugh
Peters' in the 1730s) - have a history which may be
traced in the prints of previous decades. The fact that
George had earlier declared the Sacheverell prints of
1710 'the end of an age [...] the excitements tend to be religious - politics and religion being still interwoven, and dominated by memories of '41 and '49. From the Stuarts to the Hanoverians the shift is from prints mainly ecclesiastical or sectarian to prints mainly secular' - a thesis of 'secularisation' taken up by Carretta and Miller - may have something to do with George's failure to remark such continuities ('Methodism', 'Wesley' make no appearance in the Index of EPC1, for example). Pace Carretta, there can be no 'reclamation' of visual and verbal rhetoric that was never abandoned in the first place.

In Political Prints, Atherton saw himself as modifying - by a closer attention to iconography - the tendency which he identified in EPC to view political prints as 'disconnected incidentals'; unfortunately, this became subsumed in, and to a large extent took second place to, Atherton's thesis of the development of the political print as a weapon of an emergent Opposition. There is, however, a case to be made that the study of the iconography of the prints - and ideally, of related contemporary images in other media - has the potential to discover unity and coherence in material which is in format, technical sophistication and aesthetic effect, disparate. Iconographical study of the material will entail the shedding of what Gombrich identified as a 'protective attitude' in looking at political prints whereby we look but do not see - a genuine 'image-blindness' to which not even scholars such as George have been immune. It will also, one must hope, entail the rehabilitation of the 17th-century print, not only as the source for so much of the iconography and rhetorical and satirical devices of the later, 18th-century print, but as scholars come to see the
18th-century print itself not as a lead-in to later phenomena - whether 'the golden age of caricature' or Spitting Image - , but as a development of a vital 17th-century tradition.
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Chapter VI: Pictorial Structures

If the study of iconography is one approach to this material which would address its pictorial nature, there is a similar case to be made for an approach which would address the pictorial framework within which this iconography is deployed. Like iconographical analysis, the study of the 'formal' or structural qualities of political prints, graphic political satires and political caricatures promises to discover layers of meaning in the prints which the predominantly contextual approach by which the study of these prints has been characterised has failed to reveal.

By 'pictorial structure' is meant the very skeleton of a print, independent of both its subject-matter and its iconography. A scientific analogy that suggests itself is that of the x-ray, a means of revealing the otherwise invisible underlying structure of the body and facilitating the identification of characteristics that would otherwise have gone undetected. Alternatively, if iconography is the 'visual vocabulary' of the political print and graphic political satire, the framework within which that iconography is deployed might helpfully be seen as the 'grammar' of a print.

I would suggest that this 'grammar' is discernible in the prints in two forms, one verbal, the other visual; the verbal - what I have termed the 'rhetorical tactics' and constants - being the subject of Chapter VII.

As with the study of these images for the purpose of identifying iconographical constants and variants, identifying and characterising the structure or visual 'grammar' of the prints will require a closer scrutiny of individual prints than has been conventional; for this reason alone, it is an approach which must further our understanding of the mechanism of the political print.

The first task of such a study will be to establish the
basic structure of a given image. Is the 'action' contained within a single frame, or is the print compartmental in design, as is, for example, the 1784 print The Loves of the Fox and the Badger [Plate 1]? If a print is not subdivided in this fashion, that is to say, if the action is contained within a single frame, does it present a single incident - as does, for example, A Transfer of East India Stock [Plate 2] - or does it eschew a naturalistic or at least quasi-naturalistic mode of representation in order to contain within one frame incidents which ordinary spatial and temporal considerations would not permit, as does, for example The Double Deliverance [Plate 3], in which the events of 1588 and 1605 occur simultaneously?

Even prints which are at first sight single-incident 'naturalistic' representations repay further analysis; in such a print, meaning may be augmented or, as in some cases, subverted, by secondary images, for example by portraits or paintings on a background wall.

If political prints, graphic political satires and political caricatures are to be understood - and evaluated - as pictorial statements or arguments, then the compositional choices of the designer in the construction of such statements or arguments are fit matter for analysis, while by establishing the structure and the number of of 'layers' in an image we may better understand how that image was intended to be 'read'. In a compartmental framework such as that of The Loves of the Fox and the Badger, the sequence in which image and text are designed to be read is clear. The same is true of 'linear' designs such as The Funeral Procession of Miss Regency (1789)\(^1\); other images are more complex.

Like iconographical analysis, the study of the pictorial structure of these prints will pay due respect to the complexity of political prints as images.
Hitherto, as noted in Part I, the emphasis of political prints scholarship has been upon the simplicity and accessibility of the genre; economy of design has been promoted as a virtue, complexity condemned as a vice.

To date, the only research in the field which has been concerned with visual structure has, predictably, been in the context of Hogarth, most notably in the work of Ronald Paulson but also in David Kunzle's account of Hogarth's 'narrative' pictorial structures in *The Early Comic Strip* and in the Paulson-influenced studies of R.L.S. Cowley, Lance Bertelson and Peter Wagner. Paulson has also essayed to identify the 'reading structures' of the oeuvre of Rowlandson, while Patricia Crown has provided a useful summary of the compositional techniques of 18th-century English 'comic art' (proof, if proof were needed, of the tendency of 'new' art historical approaches to keep within the safe perimeters of an established canon). As with so many other aspects of the material, the basic compositional tactics, let alone the more-subtle 'reading structures' of the ordinary political print, await their scholar.

This chapter represents an attempt to identify those structural and compositional conventions in the prints which would repay closer study and to give some indication of the potential scope of such a structural study.

i) Images which depict, without subdivision into compartments or framed vignettes, either a sequence of events or a number of simultaneous events.

Kunzle describes as 'narrative' 'any engraving in which are depicted, within a single setting, three (exceptionally, two,) or more episodes from the same story'. Thus *England's Memorial* [Plate 4] presents a loosely sequential interpretation of the events leading up to the expulsion of James II and his family from
England in 1688, and The Double Deliverance [Plate 3] a simultaneously conspiratorial and Providential interpretation of the repulsion of the Spanish invasion of 1588 and the miscarriage of the Gunpowder Plot. These prints have a 'narrative' element; the combination of images is designed to convey a message of causation.5

The Prospect of a Popish Successor [Plate 5], which at first sight resembles these prints, is in every sense more 'abstract'; the print presents, in a sequence of images, not an interpretation of past events but an argument for the exclusion from the succession of the Duke of York.

England's Memorial, The Double Deliverance and The Prospect of a Popish Successor exemplify the tendency towards the 'irrational juxtaposition' of disparate images, the depiction within a single frame of 'events which have no logical connection but [rather] a [...] symbolic one' which has exercised and to a great extent alienated scholars.6 Indeed, it is interesting to find valued in the work of Hogarth the very characteristics which prints scholars have deprecated in earlier English political prints and graphic political satires; we read that Hogarth discovered

afresh the simultaneity of different, various and disparate elements; he broke through unity of action and filled his stage with events that had no logical connection - and these events [...] because they had no logical connection attain a symbolic value that cannot be overlooked.7

Yet the retention by the designers of the pre-Hogarth political print of what are in many instances pre-Renaissance pictorial conventions has been taken as evidence of the 'backwardness' of the genre prior to c.1720:

to express the complex meaning of his message the satirical artist must often resort the methods of the rebus and of primitive ideographic script. He must crowd on to his page a number of incongruous images which stand for the ideas or forces he wants
to symbolise. In periods such as the Middle Ages, when artistic conventions were entirely based on the symbolic use of images, no special problems arose from this need. The configuration of images was understood and read as purely symbolic. With the victory of a realistic conception of art, however, a dilemma makes itself felt. To a public accustomed to see images as representations of a visual reality, the mere juxtaposition of disconnected symbols produces a disquieting paradox in need of resolution. Thus, while the mediaeval idiom and mediaeval motifs lived on in satirical broadsheets with astonishing tenacity, we also witness continuous efforts to rationalise and justify this antiquated language and to reconcile it with realistic conventions.

A process which Gombrich claims to see in the work of Hogarth. The 'development' of the political print has been described in terms of the 'evolution' of these multiple symbolic images into the single, developed incident or 'dramatic scene', in which development the 'observed life' of the Hogarthian scene is held to have played an important part. The quasi-naturalistic, single-scene prints of the so-called 'Golden Age' have long been accepted as the standard by which which more complex representations are measured and found wanting. In fact, the structural idiom of The Prospect of a Popish Successor survives in 18th-century prints such as Without [Plate 6] and into the 19th century in prints such as Apocrypha Combatants No VI [Plate 7], part of a series published in 1822. In these and similar prints may be seen the same disjointed disposition of images without reference to scale and perspective, which the linear model of 'development' ascribes to 'early', i.e., undeveloped, pre-caricatural, prints.

If the study of the deployment of discrete images in combination in order to impart meaning will require the reappraisal of many prints hitherto dismissed as 'over-complicated' or 'emblematic', it will also require the reappraisal of prints hitherto disparaged as 'clumsy' or inept; the comparatively unsophisticated woodcuts found in the broadsheet polemical literature of the 17th
century. The seemingly incongruous combinations of images and the 'errors' of scale and perspective which have appeared risible or contemptible to modern commentators might more profitably be taken as evidence of a recognition on the part of those who constructed these often composite images of the articulative capacity of visual images. T. M. Williams's writings on the predominantly woodcut broadsheet images of the period 1640-1660 are to be commended if only in that the author has elected to examine such images on their own terms, eschewing easy value-judgements, in order to arrive at some understanding of the ways in which polemicists attempted to use visual images.10

One tactic noted by Williams is the inversion of an image; a deliberate manipulation on the part of the compositor, the better to fit the pictorial element to the written element of a broadsheet or pamphlet. This may be seen in a woodcut dating from c. 1700; a church has been set on its side and is surmounted by a depiction of a tub-preacher [Plate 8]; the threat to the Church of England from dissent is thus articulated by visual means; the inversion of the cut of the church is so far from being accidental as to merit the term 'rhetorical'.

An important point to be made in this context is the absence of a descriptive terminology appropriate to such images; a terminology adequate to define and describe the characteristics peculiar to non-representational imagery. Kunzle rejects as 'misleading' the terms sometimes encountered in the context of images such as The Double Deliverance - 'simultaneous' and 'synchronistic' narratives - , preferring 'single-setting narrative'.11 'Narrative', however, implies some sort of sequence, if not necessarily a chronological progression, which, while it may be appropriate to, for example, A Ra-ree Show [Plate 9], in which the duplication of the central figure implies that some progression is intended, cannot be used
of prints such as The Prospect of a Popish Successor in which this temporal dimension is absent. 'Narrative' fails to identify what is peculiar to these and similar images; as a descriptive category, it must be used sparingly if it is to have any value or meaning and it will be necessary to devise a taxonomy adequate to the task of discussing such images as The Prospect of a Popish Successor and Plate 8, the better to establish them as valid forms of pictorial representation.

The extent to which the interpretation of these and similar prints is dependent on the reading of their verbal component, be it in the form of keyed identifications and commentary below the main frame, as in both England's Memorial and Without, or in the form of captions and inscriptions within the frame, including the representation of direct speech (as in England's Memorial), has been left unresolved by the emphasis of scholarship to date upon the tautologous and 'cumbersome' nature of such texts. The place of texts in an analysis of pictorial structures will be considered at a later point in this chapter.

Even when thus amplified, however, images such as The Prospect of a Popish Successor remain iconologically remote, so that while the study of the verbal/visual relationships of political prints is urgently required, only closer analysis of political prints as pictorial compositions will establish the way in which they could have been 'read' on a visual level. 12

ii) Prints divided into two or more distinct scenes.

The subdivision of a print into two or more scenes is common in satirical prints, rather less so in 'straight', i.e. commemorative or reportorial, political prints. While it is possible to interpret such subdivision as an attempt on the part of the draughtsman to resolve
difficulties of composition when the representation of more than one place and more than one period of time is demanded, the extent to which it is encountered in the form of contrasts or comparisons, when it assumes the function of a satirical rather than a narrative tactic, suggests that subdivision should be seen as an attempt to influence the reading of a print.

The predilection of graphic satire for the basic satirical tactic of the contrast or comparison (cf. Chapter VII below) means that the most common division is a binary one, as in Gillray's French Liberty British Slavery [Plate 10]. This is one of many instances in which 'formal' and 'rhetorical' tactics overlap. As a rhetorical tactic ('Before and After' 'Past and Present') the comparison/contrast has an independent existence in the prints, although it usually informs the image itself, as it does in The Contrast 1749 [Plate 11], a print which I would define as having this 'binary' structure notwithstanding the fact that, as in some other prints, the artist has elected to dispense with actual compartments.

Binary division is a favoured format for the exposure of inconsistency or hypocrisy, as in, for example, An Analysis of Modern Patriotism [Plate 12], reissued as VOX POPULI in PRIVATE...and IN PUBLIC, and an example of what the next chapter will term 'revelatory satire'. The same binary division may be seen in non-political prints of the 18th century; for example the memento mori images Death and Life Contrasted or an Essay on Man [Plate 13] and Life and Death Contrasted, or an Essay on Woman.

While this is the most common and also the most tenacious pictorial division, many prints exist which, while not 'compartmental' in the manner of The Loves of the Fox and the Badger, contain three or more distinct scenes, as does, for example, The Funeral of the Low-Church or the Whig's last Will and Testament (1710)
Here, we have an instance of the use of subsidiary images in order to amplify the message or satirical point of a primary image; in this print there is a loosely narrative sequence, but it is inverted, in that the viewer must read back from the larger image depicting the funeral procession via two subsidiary images in which are depicted the events preceding the funeral; the image at the lower left shows the first collapse of the Whig; the lower right-hand compartment shows him on his death-bed. In that the accompanying text takes the form of a dying speech, the larger, ostensibly primary, image of the funeral functions as a coda to the whole; future scholars who undertake the structural analysis of this material would do well to remember that size is not always everything. Indeed, this print serves to illustrate the pitfalls of an over-rigid classification of prints by structure; only by objective analysis of individual prints will it be possible to establish the several ways in which an apparently similar format might be employed.

iii) Wholly compartmental designs.

Until the appearance of The Early Comic Strip, such sequential designs as Popish Plots and Treasons and A Representation of the Popish Plott [Plates 15 and 16] had been neglected, largely, one feels, because they contained too much information and too many images for convenient description. They have been too readily dismissed as dull or unduly complex; in fact, while the overall impression may be one of complexity, for the most part the actual images in these prints are simple and representational.

The association of the 'development' of graphic political satire with the single-scene 'dramatisation' has encouraged scholars to view the compartmental format as a phenomenon of graphic satire's 17th-century
'apprenticeship'. Hence it was possible for George to describe the large thirty-one-scene compartmental design Political Electricity; or, an Historical & Prophetic Print, in the Year 1770 [BM 4422] as 'a last flare-up [...] of an obsolescent manner'.

As with so many of the pronouncements encountered with reference to the 'development' of the political print, this belies the extent to which the compartmental format survives unmodified after c.1720. It was not spurned by the accepted giants of the so-called 'golden age': Rowlandson (The Loves of the Fox and Badger), Gillray (Democracy - or a Sketch of the Life of Buonaparte (1800)), and George Cruikshank (Buonaparte! Ambition and Death (1814)).

Yet while they share a format, the satirical compartmental designs of the later 18th and early 19th centuries differ in their treatment of subject-matter from those of the later 17th century. Looking at Plates 15 and 16, it is difficult to disagree with Kunzle when he states that

> the narrative strip acts progressively, and seeks to convince by force of argument. The narrative structure seems to invite a documentary approach and even the most fiercely partisan propaganda when reduced to strip form and realistically drawn, takes on an impartial appearance.

It is this dispassionate quality which is likely to disconcert those who come to such prints in expectation of a 17th-century equivalent or precursor of Steve Bell's If...

The extent to which it is possible to view political playing cards [Plate 17] as a variant on such compartmental designs is debatable; they are treated as such by Kunzle not only on internal evidence but on the grounds that it was possible to purchase such packs in the form of uncut sheets in which the sequence of images was 'fixed'. As with compartmental designs of the type
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represented by Plates 15 and 16, Kunzle's analysis of these cards is the more valuable in that they have by and large been accorded no more than a footnote in the study of political prints and graphic political satire.

The extent to which the familiar sequence of cards in suits could be exploited to polemical or narrative effect merits further study, as does the influence of the playing-card format on the appearance of graphic political satires (for example, Court Cards of 1759, or Hearts is Trump & has Won the Game [BM 3699], itself a compartmental print). 19

Compartmental division is not the only way in which a print may be subdivided. In many of Romeyn de Hooghe's large propagandist images, a large central image, frequently allegorical, is framed by numerous smaller vignettes. 20 Such prints have fallen foul of the antipathy of scholars towards large and complex prints; once again, it is Kunzle who provides a more objective analysis. Kunzle observes that such subdivision allows for the combination within one print of satirical comment (the allegorical centrepiece) and factual reportage; the allegorical centrepiece

may be regarded as a [...] visually arresting introduction or conclusion, while the narrative border provides a sober, phase-by-phase analysis; Kunzle notes that at 'key moments' of the propaganda war of 1688-1702, Romeyn de Hooghe eschews the single-subject satirical image for this format. 21

While this format allows for amplification, it also allows for a degree of condensation; whereas Hogarth required twelve plates for his didactic Industry and Idleness, the same message is efficiently conveyed by a single (and more genuinely 'popular') print, Keep Within Compass (1786) [Plate 18], in which the consequences of vice are depicted in the four corners of the image, while at the same time permitting the viewer to focus on a
striking central image of prosperous virtue, made the more striking by the compasses conceit.

iv) 'Strip' or linear designs.

As Kunzle's study of the work of Bunbury, F. G. Byron, Newton and their contemporaries indicates, this was one form which so far from becoming obsolete during the so-called 'Golden Age', became a notable addition to the stock of the print shops. Such strips favoured social over political satire, but several political examples exist, of which a good example is The Sour Prospect Before Us or the Ins Throwing Up (Plate 19). While their sequential form and absence of background detail conveys an impression of simplicity, it should be remembered that so far from being a quasi-'popular' form, strip designs were the most expensive format for graphic satire at this date.

In the category of linear designs might also be placed processional designs such as The Solemn Mock Procession of the POPE Cardinalle Jesuits Fryers &c through the City of London, November the 17th 1680 [Plate 20] or Gillray's Funeral Procession of Miss Regency. Printed representations of processions had existed in England since the 16th century, and constitute a genre of pictorial reportage which persisted throughout the 18th century, for example the French print, The Order of Procession for the Transfer of Voltaire's Departed Spirit on Monday, 11 July 1791. The procession was thus an established quasi-naturalistic convention of representation which was open to satirical adaptation. With or without an accompanying letterpress, it was a format which allowed for the making of many points within one print and was thus well-suited to the needs of graphic satire. It also
informed written satire of this period; Gillray's Funeral Procession of Miss Regency is paralleled by a pamphlet by John Walter, The Death, Dissection, Will and Funeral Procession of Mrs Regency in which Fox, Sheridan et al process in mourning to Brooks's, the cortège including such followers as 'Twenty Paragraph Writers Two and two, dressed in paper caps, and armed each with a silver pen and a little bottle of gall', who 'carried four flags on which were displayed the words Morning Herald Morning Post Gazetteer General Advertiser'.

v) Internal Reading Structures: Pictures within pictures.

The use of secondary images - most commonly in the form of paintings, portraits - which may amplify, but in some instances offer an ironic counterpoint to, the larger image is another aspect of graphic political satires which, while it has not gone unnoticed, has yet to be the subject of systematic analysis.

That the relation of secondary to primary images in political prints should have gone uninvestigated is testimony to the narrow focus of study to date, still more to the anachronistic ideal of the 'immediately graspable image' which may be 'taken in at a glance', and the idea that political caricature or graphic political satire represent the condensation of ideas. In The Early Comic Strip, for example, Kunzle associates the 'development' of the narrative strip and related forms at least in part with the elimination of background elaboration:

at first considered inessential, [background detail] became gradually more important during the seventeenth century [...] reached a peak of elaboration in Hogarth, then toward the end of the century [was] eliminated once more.

This may be true of the English strip designs of the
later 18th century which Kunzle examines, most notably those of Bunbury and Newton, but there is no evidence of a similar 'development' in the political print; indeed, Kunzle himself reproduces Gillray's A Voluptuary [Plate 21], which Hibbert cites as an example of the way in which the scrutiny of incidental detail - in this instance, amongst other items, the portrait of the longevous Cornaro - is indispensible to a full appreciation of a print's meaning and satire. 29

The shift from difficultas to claritas which Paulson claims to discern in art in general over the course of the 18th century is not evident in graphic political satire; the degree of complexity varies from print to print, but there are few prints which do not comprise several layers of representation, of which one of the more consistent is the use of pictures, portraits and to a lesser extent, statuary, as well as clearly-titled books and papers. 30

There can be few better indications of the prevailing ignorance of 17th-century prints than that the use of portraits and paintings should be associated with the prints of Hogarth (Iannone, for example, can state that 'by placing suggestive pictures and objects throughout the room' in his Germans Eating Sour-Krout (1803) Gillray 'recalls emblematic Hogarthian satire'); the idea that the creation of polysemic images with multiple 'reading structures' was a Hogarthian innovation does not survive scrutiny of the pre-Hogarth print. 31

The 1710 prints Made and Written by a Youth of 15 Years of Age on the sight of 3 Pictures which hung in his Closet [Plate 22] and BM 1510 [Plate 23] exploit the partisan associations of the portrait - the possession of portraits as an expression of political, religious and dynastic allegiance - and reflect the proliferation of portrait engravings from the late 17th century. 33 As a pro-Sacheverell print, Plate 22 was almost certainly
designed to appeal to those who might have had such portrait engravings as Plate 23 in their own houses. Indeed, the extent to which portraits and portrait-conceits are employed in both the visual and the written polemic of the Sacheverell crisis suggests that what Pointon has termed the 'discourse of portraits' in the context of such later examples as Gillray's Two Pair of Portraits [Plate 24], was established by the beginning of the 18th century; Two Pair of Portraits is in the same satiric tradition as the anti-Sacheverell pamphlet, Chuse which you please: or, Dr. Sacheverell, and Mr. Hoadley, I drawn to the life. 34

If the 'discourse of portraits' allowed the portrait to be used as an eloquent shorthand indicator of allegiance, this was capable of more than one application. The presence of a portrait was a means by which the satirist could indicate allegiances and sympathies of which the print as a whole is critical; BM 1548 The Picture of a True Fanatick closely resembles Plate 23, but in this print the portrait of 'B - H---y' on his wall beside the arms of the Commonwealth associates William Bisset with Benjamin Hoadly and with republican principles. Hogarth's choice of Sacheverell to hang next to a print of 'capt. Macheath' in the Harlot's chamber in the third print of the Harlot's Progress is not intended to reflect well on the protagonist, and the same may be said of the portrait of Oliver Cromwell which is discernible in the 'sanctum sanctorum' in Sayers's The Repeal of the Test Act [Plate 25]. 35

The abuse of portraits is a rhetorical tactic which exploits the partisan associations of the portrait. 36 The abuse of a portrait was a stock means of signifying apostacy; hence, in The Temple of Purity, or Master Billy Pit-i-ful's Introduction (1783) [Plate 26] a torn portrait of Chatham is employed to suggest that the son has departed from the political principles of the father;
the torn portrait of Luther in *A Great Man at his Private Devotions* [Plate 27] (a print in which the related tactic of the abuse of deliberately-identified papers - in this case Protestant petitions - may be seen, as, indeed, is the case in *The Temple of Purity* where the King is employing Commons' Resolutions and Addresses as lavatory paper) underpins the accusation of religious apostacy made by the larger image of an idolatrous, Papist George III.

The portrait may be used as a means of making an ironic comment upon an individual or with respect to the larger scene depicted. In *A Voluptuary* [Plate 21], the portrait of Cornaro, whose longevity was ascribed to his asceticism, points up the dissipation of the Prince. Portraits can be active; in BM 10374 *The Address of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers* (c.1805), a whole-length portrait of Charles I issues from its frame, one hand held up in horror.

Paintings or non-portrait prints are used in the same way, and offer equal scope for satire and/or amplification of the main message of a print. The republican sympathies of Richard Price are indicated by the painting on his wall 'Death of Charles Ist or, the Glory of Great Britain' in *Smelling out a Rat* [Plate 28]; it was interesting to see in the *Guardian* (1 November 1993) visible among a collection of 18th- and early 19th-century graphic political satires on the wall of the Working Class Movement Library, Salford, those hardy perennials *The Rights of Man* and *A Free Born Englishman*.

The otherwise sparse background of *Edward the Black Prince Receiving Homage* (1789) [Plate 29], allows the eye to focus on a painting depicting the theft of the Crown Jewels in the previous century by Colonel Blood; a comment on the general suspicions of the Lord Chancellor's capacity to play a double game during the
Regency Crisis. The hostility of 'radical dissent' to the established Church and the fate of the Church should this interest triumph are suggested by the picture of St Paul's Cathedral as 'A Pig's Stye' which appears in A Birmingham Toast [Plate 30]. Similarly, the pictures 'Justice' and 'Moderation' in Design for the New Gallery of Busts and Pictures [Plate 31] satirise the territorial aggrandisement and pretensions to 'Enlightened' rule of Catherine the Great, while the print itself satirises Charles James Fox via that same monarch's admiration for him which prompted a request for his portrait bust.

As this last print indicates, statues may be deployed to the same effect as portraits or paintings - witness the use of busts of Jack Cade and Wat Tyler in order to suggest republican sympathies on the part of Fox in Loose Principles [Plate 32], but pictures feature more consistently in the prints, if for no other reason than that less skill in draughtsmanship is required; indeed, a legible title being all that is strictly necessary in order to carry the point or allusion, as Rowlandson's pictorial reference to 'The Prodigal Son' in Filial Piety [Plate 33]; the painting itself being suggested by a mere scribble.

Pictures in the background of prints are almost never irrelevant; so far from 'cluttering' an image, they are frequently central to its satire. In that busts, portraits and paintings also qualify as part of the iconographical baggage of a print, one begins to grasp the extent to which political prints and graphic political satires are truly polysemic. The analysis of such prints must take this into account, but the isolation of particular strands or layers by selective analysis is necessary if we are to fully grasp the richness of the visual language of graphic political satire.
vi) Reading Structures: image-text relationships

Perhaps no aspect of the material has been so consistently condemned by those who have elected to study it than the words which appear in and surround most prints. So far from being recognised and studied as an integral part of the print, the textual components of 17th- and 18th-century political prints, graphic political satires and political caricatures have been dismissed out of hand as intrusive or unnecessary; witness Coupe's dismissal of captions and speech-balloons as 'tautologous' burdens on the image. Prints scholars have not hesitated to give an impression of a superfluity of words; witness Patten's predictable reference to 'caricature etchings where balloons crammed with dialogue festoon the design and prolix captions frame them'. The pejorative term 'verbiage' is used by both Godfrey and Press; 'the verbiage to which it was the cartoon's [sic] fate to be eternally attached'.

This hostile attitude persists at all levels; in an otherwise valuable introductory study of the 'visual codes' of French prints of the Revolutionary period, Klaus Herding can suggest that the incursion of the verbal into these prints is evidence of a failure to construct visual codes which could articulate ideas independent of words. In 1993, as in 1928, words are a Bad Thing: 'the ideal caricature [sic] would give us statement without text'. 'Because cartoons [sic] are visual, it is especially important that this element be exploited to the fullest' and words kept in due subordination if they cannot be dispensed with altogether.

The eradication of words, in particular the keyed explanatory texts beneath the image, accompanying verses, long titles or sub-titles, has been presented as at once the corollary of, and as evidence of the 'development' of the genres of graphic political satire and political
caricature. It has become a shibboleth of prints scholarship that 'the story of the developing relations between text and imagery in print satire is primarily one of increasingly fewer words'; hence the insistence on the obsolescence of the emblematic idiom, to which the interdependence of word and image is central, after c.1750. Verse accompaniment is swiftly characterised in EPC1 as an 'old-fashioned' format with which 18th-century graphic political satire learned to dispense; George also claims that the 'pictorial broadside in which the text was at least as important as the print continued to appear' after c.1740 'but less often'.

For George, as for her successors, the absence of text is an indicator of 'modernity'; William Austin's A Peep in the Garden at Hayes (1773) is described as 'a cartoon [sic] in the newer manner, without explanation'; a characteristic of the 'new look' is the elimination of identifying labels for the protagonists - the adoption of facial caricature has rendered such accessories redundant. The fact that late 18th-century French prints 'depend heavily on written explanations and on framing annotations' is taken as 'evidence' of their backwardness; they are 'narrowly dependent on the written form'.

The prevailing antipathy towards text has ensured that scant attention has been paid to the print published in pamphlet or periodical format. The chronology of studies of the English political print as analysed in Part I, Chapter III reflects the chronology of the single-sheet engraving or etching; indeed, the decline and/or demise of political caricature c.1830 is conventionally presented in terms of a shift from the single-sheet print to the print published in the context of a magazine or newspaper, a shift which, ignoring the pamphlet prints of the 17th century and the inclusion of satirical political images in the magazines of the 1770s, is presented as
It is also pertinent to observe that it is common for the text of a print to be omitted on the reproduction of that print, in the secondary literature; in EPC1, for example, A Ra-Ree Show [Plate 9], Design for the new Gallery of Busts and Pictures [Plate 31] and The Committee, or Popery in Masquerade [Plate 34] are severed from their texts. This is doubtless done in the interests of clarity of reproduction, but it is misleading, nonetheless, and, arguably, symptomatic of the dismissive attitude towards the text; it is the text which is treated as secondary, auxiliary and dispensible.

As with the reluctance of prints scholars to engage with the complex nature of political prints which has left unexplored not only the iconographical but the structural richness of these prints, so the enduring scholarly hostility to the verbal aspects of the political print and to the use of printed images within a text reflects an entrenched association of the pictorial with the simple and accessible and a determination to regard the political print as a medium to which the illiterate and semi-literate might enjoy, if not unlimited access, then something approaching this. The presence of verse or prose explanations, extended captions and copious speech scrolls or balloons in the majority of prints argues against this view of the material; the conventional response has been to celebrate the communicative power of the image independent of the text (which can then be presented as tautologous, certainly not necessary to a full understanding of the image). That so conspicuous a component of these prints has for so long gone unstudied becomes more explicable once it is recognised that its reappraisal threatens the easy association of this material with a popular appeal and, in some accounts, a popular mandate.

The 20th-century aesthetic of sprezzatura sketchiness -
of 'caricature' as 'the art of elimination' - which has militated against acceptance of the visual complexity of political prints, has also coloured the response of scholars to the verbal component of these prints, but perhaps the greatest impediment to an understanding of the role of words in these prints has been the relativism which has allowed the modern newspaper cartoon to be presented as at one and the same time the product of the evolution or development of the political print and the yardstick by which earlier political prints are evaluated. Wood states that

in the most important political prints of the twentieth century language plays a relatively small role. Although some prints have been provided with sparse titles, many carry no accompanying words at all.

So far from playing 'a relatively small role', the role of language in 17th- and 18th-century graphic political satire and political caricature is a central one, both within the 'frame' of an image and in the relation of an image to an accompanying text.

The several interactions of verbal and visual are one of the more conspicuous ways in which the prints may be said to be 'polysemic'. It is peculiarly ironic that the historian's neglect of the political print should have been interpreted in terms of an ingrained 'logocentrism' when the anachronistic perspective and the consequent antipathies of prints scholars have precluded a considered analysis of the role of words in the political print itself.

In the first place, it cannot be emphasised too strongly that in this, as in so many other respects, the linear model which has informed most accounts of prints of this period - and in which the 'development' of graphic political satire is associated with a diminishing dependence upon words - cannot be reconciled with the
evidence of the prints themselves. This is not to say that there do not exist many images from the second half of the 18th century in which the verbal is restricted to a title (for example, Billy Lackbeard and Charley Blackbeard and French Telegraph [Plates 35 and 36]), but such prints are not representative. A collective, as opposed to a selective, survey of the British Museum Catalogue furnishes conclusive evidence that the verbal element of these prints does not decline or diminish over the course of the 18th century, as is invariably claimed, but survives as an integral part of graphic political satire into the 19th century. In this context it is pertinent to remark that so far from the elimination of words being an inevitable corollary of 'development', the textual component of French prints increases rather than diminishes during the Revolutionary period.

The use of identifying labels is a practice which is supposed to have been rendered redundant by the adoption of facial caricature. Yet a glance at the work of the more skilled political caricaturists reveals no such elimination of words. The keyed inscriptions in Gillray's Doublures of Caricatures [Plate 37] point up the satirical transformations, at the same time as they reinforce the impression of the print as a page out of a physiognomical textbook. The undisputed master of facial caricature, Gillray was also the author of some of the most prolix speech balloons of the 18th century, for example John Bull bother'd [Plate 38] (1792), in which the point of the print and its humour reside wholly in the dense balloons, or, later still, Political Candour (1805) [Plate 39] in which the speech balloon occupies an appropriately central position in the print.

It is also pertinent to observe that the verbal apparatus shunned by critics of the 17th- and 18th-century print has been modified rather than discarded by contemporary political cartoonists, speech
bubbles in particular having been retained, confirming what is evident from a study of the political caricature of the so-called 'Golden Age'; that what is said is as important as what is done and as important as accurate and clever caricature. Those who would claim otherwise must ask themselves whether the satirical puppet-show Spitting Image, notwithstanding that it might be taken to represent the apotheosis of the facial caricaturist's art, would have worked had the puppets not been given voices. What the success of Spitting Image demonstrated was the enduring appeal of putting words in other people's mouths for satirical effect; a basic satirical tactic to which the accuracy of the vocal mimicry was merely a refinement of a post-wireless age.

Even were the elimination of words a phenomenon of the 20th-century journalistic cartoon or caricature, this would be of little relevance to the evaluation of the role of words in the 17th- and 18th-century political print.

The scope for the study of the place and function of words in 17th- and 18th-century graphic political satire and political caricature is considerable: the use of words outwith the main 'frame' of the image; titles, sub-titles and captions; explanatory texts and/or keys; and verses; and the use of words within the image, most notably the representation of speech.

a) Words outwith the image:

Titles, sub-titles and captions.

These are far from being incidental. An apparently 'straight' image may be politicised by the title or inscription. The use of the titles James III and Charles
III on portrait images as opposed to 'the Pretender' or 'ye Pretended Prince of Wales' is a case in point. Similarly, while the market in the late 17th and 18th centuries for a portrait of Charles I might be determined by partisan considerations, the inscription on a mezzotint by John Faber after Edward Bower which depicts Charles I 'as he sat before ye Pretended Court of Judicature' lifts the print from historical neutrality to the status of a partisan icon. 57

Titles, sub-titles and other inscriptions assume a peculiar importance in graphic political satires and political caricatures. Here, they serve to define the nature and subject-matter of the satire; in some instances the title, and in particular the sub-title, may explicate the image; the composition of appropriate titles and sub-titles is something in which Gillray is known to have invested much effort. 58

The title or sub-title may function as a précis, an encapsulation of the satiric point of a print. This much has been conceded: 'sometimes a caption is worth 1,000 pictures, since it helps by quickly unravelling the picture puzzle'. 59 To see this as the only valid function of the title or caption is to miss the point with respect to the 17th- and 18th-century graphic political satire, to which the teasing out of layers of meaning and satire appears to have been integral; the title which acts solely as a précis of the image is rare and the most succinct will often be found to amplify as well as summarise. Ah! sure such a pair was never seen so justly form'd to meet by nature, (1820), a quotation from Sheridan's The Duenna, is an ironical comment on the separation of George IV and Queen Caroline, but it also underlines the inference, which is made pictorially by the placing of both into the 'green bags' in which the evidence against the Queen was placed, that for personal morality there is little to choose between them. 60

Conversely, an innocuous title may accompany a
particularly satirical or violent image. While Williams has suggested, with reference to mid-17th-century prints, that it was possible to evade or frustrate censorship by leaving an image untitled, or with an obscure or equivocal title, many of the titles of, in particular, 18th-century prints, appear to have been devised in order to increase the satirical effect of the print by their very incongruity. 61 The bland and laconic titles devised by Goya for his disturbing images have been the subject of much comment. 62 A title innocuous in itself acquires a new edge in connexion with the image; for example, the title From the Originals at Windsor [Plate 40].

It has been observed that while, in French prints, the words of the title or captions are often direct and exhortatory, addressing protagonists who may or may not be depicted - for example, Louis le traitre lis sa sentence - , the titles and captions of English graphic satires incline to oblique or ironic comment; it has been suggested that this reflects the greater detachment of the professional graphic satirist. 63 Only a comprehensive survey of the Catalogue will establish the extent to which this perception of the titles of English prints is correct, but it may safely be said that, so far from being a tautologous 'abomination', the title or caption will commonly be found to add to rather than detract from the satiric effect of a print. 64

From the Originals at Windsor is an example of the deliberate excision of letters, a common practice which, like blanks and dashes, while it undoubtedly originated in a desire to escape prosecution, increasingly came to be employed for satirical effect. In more than one print, the words or letters are so lightly excised as to be immediately readable. In the case of blanks, one sees the complicity between satirist and reader which is one of the accepted features of satire; the spectator can be relied upon to supply the deficit. In a print such as
Without [Plate 6], the satire is wholly dependent on the reader substituting the word 'without' for the blank in a series of satiric inversions of accepted ideals.

In this context it was instructive to read P.K. Elkin's comments on Augustan satire. Elkin suspects that to some extent their paraphernalia of asterisks, dashes, blanks and nicknames, was employed for publicity purposes, rather than to safeguard reputations and persons. Certainly it had the result of increasing interest in the personal element of the satire and, also sometimes, of widening its applications.

'Misapplication was a favourite pastime', one to which 'the use of dashes and asterisks' pandered. Langlois, referring to the extended commentaries which followed the publication of certain prints in Revolutionary France, accounts for them in terms of 'the pure pleasure of fabricating stories based upon the engraving'.

The title or caption is not the only way in which words outwith the frame of a print might amplify the pictorial satire. Inscriptions such as 'drawn from the life' underline the delight taken by this most eristic of idioms in professions of veracity. Then there is the satirical or subversive dedication, or, still more common, the satirical publication line (for example, in BM 7630 Meeting of Dissenters Religious and Political, 1790, 'The New Coalition, designed by Hope and Executed by Mutual Convenience') - another instance of what may have begun as an evasion of censorship having become a satirical tactic in its own right.

In that as much care appears to have been taken with the composition of titles and related inscriptions as with the image itself, there can be no justification for regarding them as incidental or insignificant. Still less should they be regarded as tautologous or as an unnecessary burden on the image.
There is, I would suggest, ample scope for an investigation of print titles in their own right. Such a study might consider the career of particular epithets and catchphrases; the variants of capitalization and italicization and the prevalence of alternative and sub-titles. Wood goes some way towards this when he notes Gillray's predilection for 'fragmented language when devising the titles for finished prints'; his titles include linguistic devices such as group compounding and excision of parts of speech, which are typical of [the] headlinese which was not to become a part of journalism until the mid-19th century. Wood cites as instances of Gillray's 'daring experimentation at a time when the headline as such did not really exist':


The possibilities of a purely linguistic approach to graphic political satire are considerable. Such an approach undeniably short-circuits the visual aspect of the material, but might yet bring us closer to a better understanding of an idiom which is, after all, often as much verbal as visual in emphasis.

Explanatory texts.

Conventionally dismissed as 'cumbersome' and not infrequently omitted when a print is illustrated. The gradual independence of graphic political satire of such texts has been taken as evidence of the 'development' of the genre over the course of the 18th century; this does not reflect the realities of the material, but rather the proscriptive notion of what a 'political cartoon' should look like, a notion which is itself informed by an
erroneous perception of the contemporary function of these prints. It also reflects the idea that there is necessarily a tension between text and image. The 'good' or 'effective' image will be self-sufficient; a text will either be tautologous and dispensible or exist to 'prop up' an inarticulate image.\textsuperscript{70} The idea that text and image might be interdependent - as they are in Without - is not entertained.

It is interesting that the elimination of 'dependence' upon such texts should be as measure of the 'development' of graphic political satire when the reverse development can be seen in French prints after 1789.\textsuperscript{71} A survey of English prints of the same period suggests that to state, as does Wood, that over this period 'the English caricaturists developed prints that were increasingly independent of accompanying texts' is to exaggerate the extent to which the text was dropped from prints themselves and also to ignore the tradition of interpretative commentaries.\textsuperscript{72} The absence of words in most of Hogarth's prints - exceptions include the didactic Industry and Idleness and Four Stages of Cruelty - has been remarked by at least one scholar, but it would seem that Hogarth's omission only served to provide a market for interpretative commentaries.\textsuperscript{73}

In an excellent discussion of the hermeneutics of Royalist 'secret' writing and the use of pictorial imagery, Lois Potter argues that the cryptic image remained dependent upon the interpretative text, whether hostile or sympathetic.\textsuperscript{74} The currency of commentaries published separately from the print is discussed in the context of French royalist prints by Langlois; explanations of the royalist prints published in the Actes des apôtres could run to over ten pages; Wolf notes that by the late 18th century, 'the English had [...] established a tradition of writing interpretations of
satirical prints', but the independent text commentary on prints is one more aspect of the material which has not attracted attention.  

Langlois observes that such texts went beyond their ostensible function of aiding the reader in identification and understanding and should rather be viewed as a visually-oriented or visually-grounded form of written satire; such texts are numerous in England in our period, most notably the several interpretations of the iconography and allegory intended in several of the Oxford Almanacs in the early years of the 18th century. One of Hogarth's most verbal prints is in this vein, and participates in the debate - itself conducted in the form of written 'explanations' - surrounding William Kent's allegedly crypto-Jacobite St Clement Danes altarpiece.

Verses.

Again, it is conventional to state that these disappeared during the course of the 18th century. The evidence of the prints is that verse accompaniment, whether doggerel couplets or more extensive efforts, survived into the 19th century. The ratio of text to image in a Regency Crisis print, The Donkey-O. (1788) [Plate 41] is somewhat different from that which the secondary literature would lead one to expect. Satirical verses and songs without any visual component similarly persisted into the 19th century, existing alongside the newspapers which are alleged to have eclipsed them.

The use of verse is an aspect of these prints which is of potential interest to scholars of literary satire, representing as it does the point at which the political print merges with the political ballad. Many accompaniments to 17th- and 18th-century images were evidently intended to be sung, with at least one, and occasionally more than one, stock tune such as Packington's Pound being indicated. The tendency to
dismiss or deprecate the presence of accompanying texts has obscured the extent to which 17th- and 18th-century graphic political satire and the political caricature were hybrid forms. The failure of political prints scholars to accommodate this is the more conspicuous when it is set against the emphasis, in other contexts, upon 'orality' and the concept of 'bridging'. Whatever the precise significance of the text accompaniment in these prints, it is something with which any future discussion of these images and their place in contemporary political culture must engage.

ii) Words within the print:

The hostility of prints scholars to any form of text accompaniment extends to anything more than a minimal use of words within an image. Labels and tags, and in particular prolix speech balloons are held to 'clutter' an image and interfere with its satirical impact.

Inserted labels, identifying protagonists, places, et cetera:

The use of tags or labels to identify the actors or the setting of a satire - for example the tags identifying the different sects in The Committee [Plate 34] has conventionally been viewed as a 'primitive' tactic. Yet although the identification of protagonists by verbal means is held to have been rendered unnecessary following the adoption of the techniques of facial caricature in the second half of the 18th century, the extent to which labels were dropped from the prints has, in the absence of any specific study, yet to be established.

The idea that labels were made redundant by the use of facial caricature is particularly interesting with respect to political caricature's claims to the status of a 'popular' genre; it can be argued that the adoption of
caricature by the graphic political satirists limited the reception of such prints even as the production of political caricatures increased. The fact that the British Museum's own caricatures are in most cases annotated and the protagonists identified may have encouraged scholars to overestimate the accessibility of the unlabelled political caricature to an audience in the 'world beyond Westminster' to which the political caricature is held to appealed.

Labelled books, papers, et cetera.

Carefully-titled volumes abound in satirical prints and political caricatures, in which their main function is equivalent to that of the portrait, namely a shorthand reference to political or other sympathies. In Loose Principles [Plate 33] the busts of Wat Tyler and Jack Cade flank a bookshelf which holds, among other works, 'The Life of Oliver Cromwell' and 'Catiline'; verbal allusions which elsewhere, in particular the analogy between Fox and Cromwell, are made by visual means, most notably in The Mirror of Patriotism.

Like the greater number of motifs and conventions, this is one which may be found in many pre-c.1720 polemical and satirical images, although George, who suggests that elaborate 'political libraries' were an innovation of the Sacheverell crisis prints, might be said to underplay the use of identified texts in prints before 1710. In BM 967 and 968, for example, works depicted alongside the regicide Hugh Peters include the unpopular 'Directory' and 'Geneua Notes'. The elaboration of this conceit saw the creation of entire bookshelves. The library of Benjamin Hoadly in Guess at my Meaning (1710) [Plate 42] exemplifies this conceit; Lock [sic] ('of Governm.') and Sydney ('of Govt') are complemented by 'Hobbs Leviathan', 'Milton', 'Rights of ye Chr[istian] Ch[urch]'.
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'Christ[ianitly not Myster[ious]', 'Har[ringto]n Oceana' and 'Burn[et's] Past[oral] Letter'; BM 1504 Quod risum movet, et quod consilium monet offers a very different body of literature: 'Ch. Catechism', 'L(ife) of K Ch(arles), 'Try(al) of K Ch(arles)', 'Holy Bible', 'Pract(ice) of Piety', 'S(acheverell's) S(ermon) Pr(eached) at Darby', 'S(acheverell's) S(ermon) Pr(eached) at St Pauls', 'Artic(les) of Ch of E', 'Wh(ole) Duty of Man', 'Bk of Martyrs', 'Com Prayer'. On the sounding-board above the pulpit in The Repeal of the Test Act [Plate 25] are 'Priestley on civil Government' and 'Price on civil Liberty', his propaganda for American independence in 1776.

Named texts were also a means whereby the personal morality of a protagonist might be suggested; perennial favourites include the works of Rochester and 'Aretine's Postures', while the probably apocryphal 'Baxter's Shove to ye Heavy-Arsed Christian' has a career in the prints spanning more than a century. Although such deliberately-labelled volumes are commonly an incidental although far from insignificant component of a print, in the form of the conceit of the auction of personal libraries, the 'instructive library' could itself be the central satire - as it is in BM 1415, and M952 Jack Ketch's new and fashionable auction of choice and valuable books; begun on Saturday last, and so to continue till the said collection of sale are sold and burnt, according to the order of both H----s. Unsurprisingly, it is also to be found in written satire; M680 The instructive library (1710) is a mock catalogue of books including, 'An essay on falsehood and cowardice' purportedly by Sir Samuel Garrard, the Lord Mayor of London who had attempted to distance himself from the decision to publish Sacheverell's 5 November sermon; another instance of a convention common to both verbal and visual satire.
Like the mutilation of a portrait, the sale or disposal of carefully chosen and identified books functions as a shorthand for apostacy; this may be seen in An Analysis of Modern Patriotism [Plate 12] in which, conspicuous in the foreground of the left-hand compartment, volumes labelled 'Macauley', 'Locke' and 'Sydney' are bound ready 'To be sold'. In a satire on the dissolution of Parliament after the defeat of the Fox-North coalition on their India Bill, BM 6469 The State Auction (1784), Pitt is the auctioneer, Dundas his porter; raising the hammer of 'Prerogative', he auctions 'Lot 1', a pile of books entitled 'Rights of the People in 558 Volumes' (a reference to the 558 M.P.s); 'Lot 2' is 'Magna Charta'.

In other prints, pages of books are used for lavatory paper or dogs urinate on them. The books thus abused are predominantly emotive texts such as the Prayer Book, Bible, or Foxe's Book of Martyrs; among volumes lying discarded on the ground in The Committee are 'Magna Charta' and 'Biblia Sacra'.

Labelled papers perform an equivalent function. For over two hundred years, the prints are literally littered with Acts of Parliament, Magna Carta, petitions, letters, sermons, and 'the constitution' itself. The fate of these papers is almost invariably destruction or abuse (as in Plates 27, 28 and 33); a useful encapsulation of the threat to whatever is signified by the document, as well as a means of identifying the destroyer with that threat. By this means, the oecumenicism of the Dukes of Kent and Sussex is condemned in BM 12624 Royal Methodists in Kent and Sussex - or the Dissenters too Powerful for the Established Church (1815); the Duke of Sussex tramples on 'The 39 Articles of Religion', his brother the Duke of Kent on the Act of Settlement; in The Repeal of the Test Act [Plate 25] the Thirty Nine Articles are torn up by Theophilus Lindsey.

Inscribed papers may perform the additional function of
identifying characters and contexts; in Royal Methodists, the Duke of Bedford may be identified by the paper which hangs out of his pocket inscribed 'Bedfordshire'. In *Guess att my Meaning*, Hoadly is depicted in the act of writing 'An Answer to a Sermon published by her Ma-
Com-'; on the table lies 'A Sermon pr. - Majesty - Exon'. This refers to Hoadly's *Some considerations humbly offered to the Lord Bishop of Exeter* (1709), a response to the sermon preached before Queen Anne by Bishop Blackall in March 1708.

The presence of accurately-titled papers may also have been a means of establishing the veracity of the satirist's version of events by giving an impression of up-to-date and/or inside knowledge. The gradual incursion of parliamentary reporting over the 18th century is reflected in those prints which attempt to reproduce verbatim the words of protagonists; in 1784, Sheridan could complain of a speech by Dundas which 'might fairly be deemed hints for paragraphs and sketches for prints', while Dent's *Coalition Dissected*, first published in August 1783, was subsequently reissued with 'improvements' derived from the anti-Coalition speech of Lord Abingdon. 87 It has been conventional to present the 18th-century political caricature and the 18th-century newspaper as unrelated media; this aspect of the verbal component of 18th-century graphic political satire and political caricature underlines the extent to which these genres should not be seen as sui generis, but rather as one facet of contemporary political journalism.

Certainly, prints such as *The Common Stage Wagging from Brooke's Inn St James Street* (papers moved on ye shortest Notice (1786) [Plate 43] challenge the conventional opinion that the elimination of words was a distinctive feature of political caricature and graphic political satire of the so-called 'golden age'.
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Thus far I have considered the inscription of objects as a secondary component of a print. Yet there are numerous prints in which, so far from being incidental, the labelling dominates the composition. In this category must be placed those prints in which figures and objects are 'anatomised', for example Dent's Coalition Dissected, The Free-Born Briton or a Perspective of Taxation and A Right Hon Democrat Dissected [Plates 44 and 45]. Again, this is a convention with its roots in the 17th century; The Dissembling Scot Set forth in his true Coulours (1653) [Plate 46]. Such prints point up the fallacy of supposing the relation of word and image in these prints to be an antithetical one; few prints could be more 'verbal' at the same time as being strikingly visual, than The Free-Born Briton or The Right Hon Democrat.

Represented speech.

Perhaps the most conspicuous verbal component of these prints, most commonly in the form of a balloon or bubble issuing from the mouth of the speaker. While it has not provoked the universal hostility shown to other verbal forms, the representation of direct speech has been paid scant attention by prints scholars. Yet the evidence of the prints suggests that, even more than to the devising of appropriately ironic or facetious titles, considerable thought went into the content, and to a lesser extent the shape, of represented speech.

Coupe too readily rejects Streicher's perceptive interpretation of the speech of the actors in graphic political satire as 'animation', in the literal sense; an attempt on the part of the graphic satirist to breathe life into his subjects, to convey 'not only the words of the speaker, but, as it were, his very "breath" or "air", in short, his reality'.

Williams suggests that the
wavy lines which enclose speech in many pre-1660 prints should be interpreted as an attempt on the part of the designer to reproduce sound. 89

As such, represented speech could function as a means of identification, through the mimicry of characteristic phrases and patterns of speech, of which probably the best-known example is the disjointed and repetitive speech of George III. This could be extensively parodied, much as it was in the verse of Peter Pindar 90, or could be no more than the short-hand 'What! what!', used to such ambivalent effect in The Hopes of the Party (Part II, Chapter II, Plate 13) and to the point of being tasteless in George Cruikshank's State Miners, in which the familiar 'what! what!' issuing from the mouth of the grotesquely horrified king in the painting 'King Lear and his Daughter' which appears in the background cruelly affirms the analogy between Lear and George III, with reference to the grief of the latter at the recent death of his youngest daughter, Princess Amelia. 91

As noted above, the reporting of Parliamentary and other speeches allowed for increasing versimilitude in the representation of speech; great play is made in prints of the Regency Crisis with the speeches of Pitt, Fox and Burke, so much so that several prints turned this focus on words to satirical account: The Veil being Removed: in his True Colours, appears The Pretended Man of the People: Alias the Word-Eating Monster from Bologna! [Plate 47] in which Fox complains 'Oh! These D----d WORDS!'. 92 Although it was not unusual for satirists to characterise whole groups by their speech - the parody of the idiom of dissenters, in particular the extempore invocation of God, being an example which springs to mind (e.g., Plate 30) - the extent to which prints of the later 18th century attempt to echo the rhetorical styles of individual politicians, not least when coupled with facial caricature, dependent, for full effect, on familiarity with the original, is suggestive
of a more limited primary audience than has conventionally been claimed for this material. 93

The representation of direct speech is an efficient means whereby the person satirised may be made to damn himself, as in The Veil Being Removed. Such prints must be viewed in the context of the popularity of satirical anthologies such as The Beauties and Deformities of Fox, North and Burke, one of several publications which use the subject's own words to chart his 'apostacies'. 94

Wood notes that Gillray's characters are frequently 'provided with monologues which are running commentaries on the speaker's state of mind', citing Thomas Paine in The Rights of Man [Plate 48]:

Fathom & a half! Fathom & a half! Poor Tom! ah! mercy upon me! that's more by half than my poor Measure will ever be able to reach! - Lord! Lord! I wish I had a bit of the Stay-tape or Buckram which I you'st to Cabbage when I was prentice, to lengthen it out; - well, well, who could ever have thought it, that I, who have served Seven Years as an Apprentice, & afterwards Exciseman as much longer, aught not not be able to take the dimensions of this Bauble? for what is a Crown but a Bauble? which we may see in the Tower for Six-pence apiece? - well, altho' it may be too large for a Taylor to take Measure of, there's one Comfort, he may make mouths at it, & call it as many names as he pleases! - and yet, Lord, Lord, I should like to make it a Yankee doodle Night Cap & Breeches, if it was not so damn'd large or I had stuff enough Ah! if I could once do that, I would soon stitch up the mouth of that Barnacled Edmund from making of any more Reflections upon the Flints - & so Flints & Liberty for ever & damn the Dungs...[trails off into illegible scribble] 95

The 'confession', drawing on the convention of the 'Last Dying Speech', is another convention which is well-served in the prints by the representation of direct speech; the severed head of Archbishop Laud is allowed to speak in The Full View of Canterburies Fall [Plate 49] in traditional exemplary and monitory style. 96
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Mieczyslaw Wallis has associated the disappearance from paintings in the 16th century of inscriptions 'conceived as statements by the persons depicted' with the attempt by painters 'to render the emotions of the persons they painted exclusively by showing their gestures and facial expressions', and it might be expected that the advent of facial caricature might have had similar results in graphic political satire; speech balloons have, indeed, on occasion been included in the verbal impedimenta which were eliminated over the course of the 18th century. Yet so far from being made redundant by the adoption of facial caricature, one sees, above all in work of Gillray, an awareness of the potential of the representation of direct speech.

As I noted in Part I, Chapter V, the invention of 'dramatic scenes' in graphic political satire was not a phenomenon of caricature or the 'golden age'. Such scenes had always been dependent on represented speech, first as an additional means of identifying the speaker, ultimately because of the satiric and dramatic possibilities of the convention.

This is not to say that speech balloons do not, on occasion, threaten the balance of a composition; in the case of prints such as The Political Mirror (Plate 50), the eye is caught and held by the series of large white bubbles issuing from the mouths of the protagonists at the expense of the print as a whole; in The Commissioners (Plate 51), the speech bubbles, in this instance characterised by the long lines by which they are appended to the speakers, dominate an otherwise sketchy and static composition. Similarly, there is a case to be made that the speech bubble in The King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver (1803) (Plate 52) is tautologous; the title is sufficient basis for the analogy which informs the satire. At the same time, however, it cannot be said to detract from the satire.

Ultimately, represented direct speech is an integral
part of graphic political satire and political caricature from the earliest satires of the 17th century. Those who would deprecate its use must reject the intentionally shocking use of the speech bubble in Massacre at St Peter's or "Britons Strike Home"! ! ! ! [Plate 53], which gives the print a critical bite which the image minus the speech balloon would lack.

Such has been the hostility and/or indifference to this component of the prints that the literature has to date failed to discriminate between the different forms of represented speech which it is possible to identify. The chaste scrolls of The Committee [Plate 34], the unwieldy balloons of The Political Mirror, the words which spill out of their inadequate frame in The Rights of Man and the extraordinary spiky freehand ejaculations of The Fox Chace [Plate 54] are subsumed in the blanket (and usually pejorative) references to 'speech balloons'.

The scroll may coexist with the balloon; there is no formal or stylistic 'development' in the representation of speech. Sawney's Defence against the Beast, Whore, Pope and Devil [Plate 55] is contemporary with The Political Mirror; Apocrypha Combatants [Plate 7] shares its iconography with the latter, its patterns of represented speech with The Fox Chace of forty years' earlier. George Cruikshank's Our Gutter Children of 1869 [Plate 56] is no less 'dominated' by speech balloons than the pre-'Golden Age' print; and the balloons of 1869 are far less legible than the despised scrolls of the 17th-century. 99

******

To date, the emphases and, reflecting these, the illustrative choices, of prints literature have promoted as normative the political print, still more the political caricature, as a unified dramatic composition,
presenting a quasi-naturalistic disposition of figures within a quasi-realistic setting. It is true that, by the end of the 18th century, this type of pictorial composition had become standard; this is not to say that it dominated to the exclusion of other forms of representation. The extent to which alternative compositional structures and tactics survived into the 19th century has been concealed by a prescriptive approach to the material which has, in this as in so many other instances, failed to accommodate its heterogeneity. Preoccupation with caricature has obscured the extent to which the structural basis of graphic political satire and polemic remains unchanged.

Until the structure as opposed to the subject-matter or the aesthetic value of this material is regarded as a suitable subject for analysis, continuities in format and structure between the 17th-century print and the Gillray print of c.1800 will go unrecognised, as will the changes and modifications in structure which may be identified over time.

As with the greater semantic precision for which I argued in Chapter III, rigid codification of structures is not possible; but as with the descriptive terminology of prints study, the task of identifying and characterising the different compositional options open to the designers of these prints can only encourage a more rigorous appraisal of the material than has been conventional.

Like iconographical analysis, structural analysis of this material is one way of refusing to take these prints 'at face value' and a means whereby it may be possible to establish precisely to what extent the material may be said to be 'polysemic'.

As a combination of word and image, graphic political satire, political caricature and many political prints
exemplify the 'mixed objects' or 'mixed subjects' to which the 'new art history' is supposed to be more sensitive than the old. The journal *Word and Image* has been hailed as exemplifying this shift in interests; *Word and Image*

balances itself strategically at the dividing-line between images and words [...] Without predetermining [...] important issues of method, it stakes its future on the assumption that [...] new areas for research will continue to burgeon precisely at those points where the study of the image converges with the study of language [my emphasis];

thereby distancing itself from the academic tradition which has tended 'to keep the two areas of investigation separate'. 100

It was particularly disappointing, therefore, to find that the first essay in *Word and Image* to address graphic political satire should singularly fail to address the question of word/image relationships in this material. Instead of an analysis of the different ways in which the verbal is incorporated and exploited in the prints, we are offered a contextual study of prints in the M.D. George vein, focussing on a specific event - in this case the India Bill of 1783. The sole nod to the context in which it is published is this generalisation: 'In terms of verbal and visual compositions, they combine relatively bold designs and spare compositions with sometimes elaborate captions and verses' [my emphasis]. 101 A counterpart to Nicholas Robinson's 1985 essay on satirical prints and the Regency Crisis, it cannot be viewed as anything other than (another) wasted opportunity, particularly in the context in which it appears. That such a piece should have appeared as recently as June 1993 is eloquent of the reluctance of prints scholars to abandon conventional methodologies and conceptual frameworks.
1. The length of this print prevented its being used as a plate.

2. For example, Paulson, Emblem and Expression pp.44-47; Cowley, Marriage à la Mode: a Review of Hogarth's Narrative Art; Bertelson, 'The Interior Structures of Hogarth's Marriage à la Mode'.


5. Cf. Atherton, Political Prints pp.65-66 'symbols in visual proximation with one another can cause a connection to be inferred between the ideas and qualities they represent which may or may not, by logic or reality, have any association'. Atherton cites those anti-Jacobite prints which depict Prince Charles Edward in the company of the Pope, the Devil and the King of France [e.g., BM 2636 The Invasion, or Perkins Triumph and BM 2658 The Procession, or the Pope's Nurturing riding in Triumph], articulating 'an all-too-simple causation and relationship'. Philippe, p.8, considers the technique a more strictly synthetic than a narrative one; 'their methodology is accumulation and synthesis - and hence events and people acquire an extraordinary intensity and power'. The Double Deliverance is a good example of the image which Philippe describes as 'liberated from the grammar of space and time'.

6. Lucie-Smith, p.57. Atherton, Political Prints p.66 'the conjunction of diverse images, with their innumerable connotations is a short-cut to, and often a perversion of, logic'. Atherton cites BM 3202 Vox Populi, Vox Dei - or the Jew Act Repealed [Plate 13 in Part I, Chapter VII; 'A cluster of expressions [sic] and symbols jumbled together, few of which have anything to do with the issue'. This is far from being the case. As noted by Korshin, Typologies p.271, the iconography of this print is fitted to its subject.


9. For example, Patten, GCLTA p.54: 'The aim of most caricature was to tell some kind of story, however abbreviated the narrative. British graphic satire was given its narrative direction by Hogarth, who said that he treated his subjects in the manner of a dramatist and considered his picture a stage, his figures as players'. For George Cruikshank's fondness for 'narrative paradigms' ibid, p.67; also Wardroper, Cruikshank 200 p.8.

10. Williams, 'Polemical Prints' pp.205ff; idem, "Magnetic Figures".

11. Kunzle, pp.4-5. Rosemary Freeman used the term.
'diagrammatic emblems' of images 'in which miscellaneous objects are brought together in new and often surprisingly unnatural associations'; see Bath, Speaking Pictures p.256.

12. In the meantime, scholars continue to assume the accessibility of such images. Thus W.A. Speck, Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688 (Oxford:1988, paperback edn 1989) p.206 refers to The Prospect of a Popish Successor: 'even if they could not read the captions', 'tradesmen and craftsmen' 'could see the symbolism of martyrs burning at the stake, the city on fire, and the figures of the pope, a cardinal, a devil, and other Catholic stereotypes presiding over the scene'.

13. BM 6207 and 6207a.

14. BM 3792 and 3793; Life and Death Contrasted, or an Essay on Woman is reproduced as plate XI of English Caricature. 'Since this is a morality, the basic pattern is simply this vs that'; for Hogarth's alleged 'subversion' of this in Industry and Idleness, see Paulson, Emblem and Expression pp.64ff, especially pp.73,75.

15. EPC1, p.142.

16. Gillray's print is reproduced in Hill, Satirical Etchings plate 69; Cruikshank's (BM 12171) is no.131 in English Caricature. See also BM 6287 Two New Sliders for the State Magick Lantern (Rowlandson, 1783) and, for an earlier period, BM 1938 R-b-n's Progress in Eight Scenes. Patten, GCLTA p.67, writes that:

By breaking down a plate into successive scenes, [Cruikshank] could make each image speak a part of the story in its own right. He did not have to invent an incident that would cover many different events [...] nor did he have to devise a quasi-allegorical representation of complex events [...] A narrative sequence exactly suited [Cruikshank's] style of exposition and he used it again and again, from the pamphlets for [...] Hone to his Temperance tracts'. See also ibid, p.105 for Cruikshank's compartmental plates for The Scourge (1815).
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obsolescence of this particular idiom, although the production of a pack on Admiral Byng in 1756 is noted; see also pp.108-109. Kunzle, p.145, argues for the survival of cards beyond their original context, and cites an advertisement in the Post Man (30 December 1703) for 'Orange' and 'Horrid Popish Plot' cards; it was still possible to obtain a Spanish Armada pack in 1714.

20. Again, not suited to reproduction on a small scale; The Early Comic Strip is distinguished by its large-scale format which allowed for excellent reproductions of these prints.

21. ibid, pp.110,426.

22. ibid, 'Bunbury and the Bunburian Strip' pp.360-63
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33. For the partisan associations of the portrait see Williams, 'Polemical Prints' p.217; Pointon, Hanging the Head, Chapter II: 'James Granger and the Politics of Collecting', pp.53-83; Dolmetsch, 'Prints in Colonial America: Supply and Demand' p.70; Frank H. Sommer III, 'Thomas Hollis and the Arts of Dissent' pp.132-38,143-55; Monod, Jacobitism pp.70-92. For the proliferation of portrait engravings, see Shawe-Taylor, pp.9-20
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McCreery, 'Satiric Images' p.184.
Chapter VII: Rhetorical and Satirical Tactics

If prints scholars have as yet failed to explore the formal, generic, qualities of the material in terms of the study of iconography and of the pictorial 'reading structures' which it is possible to identify in the prints, they have been no more eager to explore what one scholar has termed the 'underlying rhetorical structures' of the material. 1 This is most evident in their failure to question the satiric qualifications of 'satirical' prints. As noted in Chapter III above, the terms 'satires', 'graphic satire', 'graphic political satire' have been used interchangeably with 'political print', 'caricature' and 'cartoon' as generic terms for this material; promiscuous usage which underpins a failure to distinguish between satirical and non-satirical forms of graphic political imagery. 2 The existence in the literature of subtitles such as 'The Art of Satire' has, perhaps, obscured the extent to which prints scholarship continues to ignore the 'satire' in favour of the 'art'. 3

The paucity of studies addressing the satirical print as satire, that is to say of studies which address the generic satirical forms and tactics employed in the prints, the metaphors favoured, et cetera; the total absence of studies which address, for example, Gillray as a satirist with a satiric language which is peculiar to him, in the way in which the existence is recognised of the satiric language or devices peculiar to individual literary satirists, such as Pope or Swift, is striking.

The failure of prints scholarship to address this aspect of the prints is the more remarkable in that the material has, on occasion, attracted the attention of literary scholars. 4 The resulting studies have not been unproblematic, however. It is fair to say that while a
number of literary approaches to satire - from those which address satire as a genre, focussing on tactics and forms, to studies dealing with specific aspects of 17th- and 18th-century English satire - have proved extremely helpful in suggesting starting-points for similar exercises in the analysis of the satiric print, the handful of comparative studies which exist have in each instance evaded what to me seems the primary task, which is one of identifying the formal satiric structures and tactics of the prints.\(^5\) Too often, the prints are addressed as complementary and auxiliary to the written form; addressed not in their own right but as additional evidence for an interpretation of the satirical preoccupations of a given period which is derived from the literary evidence. Too often, such studies promote - by omission as much as by emphasis - a perception of the graphic form as essentially derivative of, or parasitic upon, the written form.

Carretta's *The Snarling Muse* and George III and the Satirists from Hogarth to Byron exemplify this approach and the literary scholar's failure to engage with the prints as satires. At first sight, this is surprising. The *Snarling Muse* opens with an assertion the essential validity of which will be upheld by this chapter:

> To study the verbal in the light of the visual illumines both forms because, though one uses words and the other pictures [sic], verbal and visual satirists from Pope to Charles Churchill communicated with a shared iconographic vocabulary. Carretta is keen to demonstrate 'why the verbal and visual satirist had so much in common' in terms of tactics and iconography.\(^6\) This laudable project founders on a series of rocks, of which not the least is, as H.T. Dickinson remarked in his review of *George III*, Carretta's failure to penetrate the codes of the graphic material.\(^7\)

This failure has its roots in the author's perceptions...
of both the status and the rhetorical capacity of the print; it does not help that Carretta sees political engravings as a 'low, or popular, art form'. Such an art form cannot rival the depth and complexity of literary satire as penned by some of England's greatest satirists; the rhetorical limitations of the pictorial are in this way subtly affirmed.

Perhaps because of this, Carretta approaches the material with a view to establishing less the congruences and cross-fertilizations between the two genres than the 'extraliterary contexts' of his primary texts; the influences which might have shaped the (literary) satiric achievements of the period. Political prints are one of 'the external resources' the study of which may augment our understanding of why 'Pope, Gay, Swift, Johnson and others' wrote 'some of their best verse on political subjects'. Prints are pressed into service as additional evidence to support the author's theories concerning developments in political satire - as expressed by Pope, Churchill et al, - and, in George III especially, the author's thesis concerning perceptions of the monarch.

Carretta quotes at great length from written texts, but an equivalent attention to detail and nuance is conspicuously lacking in his account of the pictorial texts; indeed, Carretta seems hardly to see the pictorial evidence as 'textual'. The reader is left with the impression, particularly in the case of George III, of a literary study illustrated with satirical prints. Carretta's phraseology leaves no doubt as to the hierarchy of evidence; 'to study the verbal in the light of the visual' but not, it will be noted vice versa; 'we can better understand one medium of satire, political verse, by comparing and contrasting it with another, political engravings'. 'Only incidentally' is George III 'a study of the relationship between verbal and visual political satire in Britain and colonial America during the late Georgian period'.
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Carretta's studies are not only the only instances of the study of graphic satire within a literary context which, while paying closer attention to the imagery of the prints, no more addresses the material in its own right and on its own terms than the crudely historical-contextual approach. 11

What needs to be established is, in the case of satirical prints, the devices, conventions and tactics common to the genre; the form or pattern in which the satirist chooses to cast his attack and which, singly or in combination, produce the satiric effect of a print, and for non-satirical prints, the polemical and rhetorical devices used to articulate the print's argument. 12 These satirical - or in the case of non-satirical prints, rhetorical - tactics are, as much as the pictorial structures identified in the previous chapter (which, in many cases they inform), the 'grammar' of the prints, the framework within which both the iconographical 'vocabulary' and the polemics of the prints operate.

In this chapter, I will focus on satirical tactics, but there is similar scope for analyses of the rhetorical structures; indeed, these may co-exist within a given print, not least because satire is a quintessentially parasitic genre; thus one finds a satirical application of a 'straight' rhetorical tactic, such as the contrast.

Contrary to Carretta's simplistic division of visual (prints) and verbal (written satire), satirical and rhetorical tactics in the prints offer a fusion of verbal and visual, in that while these tactics frequently have counterparts in satirical or polemical literature (of which more later) in the prints they are as likely to find pictorial as verbal expression, notwithstanding the important part played by the verbal - captions,
represented speech, et cetera - in the prints. Thus, to take an example on which I touched in the previous chapter, the basic satiric and rhetorical tactic of the contrast, one finds this given visual expression in the composition of a plate, the balancing or contrasting of opposites, and in the iconography (Plate 1).

As with the pictorial 'reading' structures identifiable in the prints, it is not possible to do more than sketch out the potential for research. As with the pictorial 'reading' structures, it is less that we should determine absolute categories and definitions, rather that the process of analysing the material to this end cannot but bring us closer to an understanding of its nature and its rhetorical capacity.

Satire is a parasitic and protean genre; one to which parody is conventional. The result is a bewildering variety of forms which may be termed 'satiric' and it is easy to see why the genre continues to engage literary scholars at both a general and theoretical, and a period- or author-specific level. Regardless of this multiplicity of forms, however, it may be said that two impulses inform and underpin satire; the exposure, and the punishment, of vice. The basic tactics of satire, which will inform the different forms chosen for its expression, are revelation, 'unmasking', and chastisement; one or both may be present in any given satire.

It is, then, possible to categorise graphic satire by the presence of one or both of these tactics; I will refer, therefore, in this chapter, to revelatory and to punitive satires.
Of the two, the revelatory would seem the more consistent in graphic satire. Arguably, in understanding it, we come closer to an understanding of what prompted the creation of, as well as sustained the market for, satirical prints in 17th- and 18th-century England.

In the context of political satire, revelatory satire satisfies the conspiratorial mentalité; the conviction that there must be hidden springs and causes, the desire to discover the 'real' 'truth' about men, measures and events; it feeds also upon that cynicism and suspicion that holds appearances to be deceptive. In the words of one historian, it 'presume[s] the prevalence of deception. It posit[es] a discrepancy between appearance and reality'. It is both exclusive (the satirist may present himself as the only one whose perceptions of men and motives are unclouded; the rest of mankind are dupes) and complicit; the satirist's audience is privy to the unmasking and is undeceived.

The conspiratorial mentalité which informs revelatory satire is perennial, but its expression in 17th- and 18th-century England has been identified in both psychological and theological terms, not least in the context of Anglo-American political discourse. As far as the political print relates to this phenomenon, in the absence of further research the most that can be said is that the post-c.1640 development of graphic political satire as a genre in England offered unprecedented opportunities for the expression of this mentalité and also its iconographical codification (frequently and consistently theological). It might also be observed that the result was a genre which, running parallel to, as well as on occasion engaging with, pamphlet polemic, was in the 18th-century if not before, similarly self-sustaining; print was met with counter-print as pamphlet with counter-pamphlet. In this sense, at least, it is not unhelpful to see the prints as a 'running interpretative commentary' on events.
Revelatory satire is something to which pictorial representation is well-suited, although the conceits favoured are seldom exclusive to the prints. A quintessentially revelatory mode of graphic satirical representation which flourished in the 1760s was the transparency;

a device ascribed to Townshend, a print so folded that one design was superimposed on another, which became visible, as part of the whole, when held to the light. Thus, what is behind a curtain [BM 3824] or a screen [3825] or inside a tent is revealed. In The Scotch Tent, or True Contrast [3912] not only Bute and the Princess [of Wales] but George III are discovered [...] engaged upon a 'Scotch, and French Scheme [...] to hurt King and Country'.

When it is not established by the title, the revelatory premise of a satirical print is in most cases identifiable in iconographic terms. Certain motifs are reliable indicators of revelatory satire. The personifications Time and Truth, singly or together, are two such indicators; for example, BM 837 Dr Dorislaws Ghost [Plate 2], BM 5135 Time and Truth Bring Stranger things to Pass (c.1773) [Plate 3] BM 5982 The Political Mirror (1782) [Plate 4].

The drawing back of a curtain, often by Time or Truth, is one of the more consistent visual articulations of the act of revelatory satire, and one which is found in the earliest prints, for example, BM , a plate from Foxe's Actes and Monuments [Plate 5], the frontispiece to Eikon Alethine: The Portraiture of Truths most sacred Majesty...Wherein the false coulours are wash'd off, wherewith the Painter-stainer had Bedawbed Truth, the late King, and the Parliament in his late piece (1649) [Plate 6] and BM Oliver Crumwells Cabinet Counsell Discovered [Plate 7]; as well as later 18th-century prints, for example, The Veil Being Removed; in his True Colours appears The Pretended Man of the People: Alias the Word-Eating Monster from Bologna (1789) [Plate
There also exists a large body of the minister-behind-the-curtain prints, the best-known of which concern Bute after his resignation in 1763. In one of these, in which Bute is made to say 'Tho I am out it's known for Certain/I prompt'em still behind the Curtain', the conceit of a puppet show is employed, with Bute and the Devil the puppet-masters; the same conceit was employed on the fall of Walpole in 1742, with 'the Screen' taking the place of the Curtain.

Equally popular is the act of unmasking, as in BM 4146 The Hypocrite unmask'd or the Double Pensioner (1766) and, possibly its most graphic expression, BM 2558 The Anti-Craftsman Unmask'd [Plate 10]. The full title of Dr Dorislaws Ghost is ... Presented by Time to unmask the Vizards of the Hollanders; note the masks on the arm of the third figure; the same may be seen on the belt of Pitt in The Sacrifice to Slavery. This latter print, indeed, combines several of the stock motifs of revelatory satire; Time draws back curtain to reveal the murdered Britannia.

In Dr Dorislaws Ghost, Time unveils Truth, and uncloaking is another visual and verbal conceit of revelatory satire; see, for example, BM 375 The Kingdomes Monster Uncloaked from Heaven [Plate 11] and BM 852 The Dissembling Scot Set forth in his true Coulours (1652) [Plate 12].

The conventional attribute of Truth which appears in both The Political Mirror and Time and Truth is the mirror, and the mirror is frequently used to revelatory ends in the prints. In BM 3487 The Mirrour: Or, the British Lion's Back Friends Detected (1756) [Plate 13] the newly-liberated British Lion, in this print standing for George II, is confronted by a glass, by means of which he is able to see behind him to where the Duke of Newcastle, Henry Fox and Lords Hardwicke and Anson are preparing to fetter him once more. In BM 1710 A True
Picture of the Famous SKREEN (1721) [Plate 14] the action takes place behind the eponymous screen which was to become the leitmotif of Walpolian corruption, but is reflected, and therefore exposed, in the tall pier glass.

The graphic satirist need not depict an act of revelation in order to exploit the rhetorical capacity of revelatory satire; he can presuppose a familiarity with the verbal and iconographic conventions identified above which will ensure that the revelatory potential of a static image such as the screen in Plate 14 will suggest the truth which the screen - and what it stands for - obscures. As far as graphic satire is concerned, it may be observed that revelatory satire feeds the conspiratorial mentalité not least of all in that revelation is seldom total; the curtain is never fully drawn back - the viewer is encouraged to supplement the satirist's vision from his own suspicions and convictions.

At the same time, revelatory satire in both its verbal and visual forms is essentially complicit; the spectator is party to the revelation and enjoys this advantage over his still-deluded fellows, but more especially over the protagonists of the satire, who are invariably depicted as convinced of the success of their deceit. In graphic form particularly, however, it privileges the viewer; perhaps the best example is The Mirror of Patriotism [Plate 15]; is it only the viewer, whom Sayers places behind Fox's shoulder who sees Cromwell's face in the glass? 23

There is a sense in which the idiom of caricature as it is deployed in the prints is a further manifestation of this revelatory impulse; an 'unmasking' equivalent to that in Plate 10, but achieved by different means; indeed, the sub-title of that print asserts that A Man May Be Known By His Looks. Caricature can, with reference to the physiognomic theory in which its
practice was at least in part grounded, effect the satirical unmasking of an individual, who is made to reflect in his outward appearance the inner corruption discerned by the satirist; while remaining recognisable, his 'true' nature is revealed in physiognomic terms, as it is in Gillray's Doublures of Caricatures [Plate 16].

ii) Punitive Satire.

If it lacks a characteristic iconography, punitive satire is responsible for some of the more enduring images of graphic satire. The newcomer to the genre, should he be offered a sufficiently large corpus of evidence, will be struck by the frequency with which acts of violence and bodily punishment occur in the prints. Ministers are flogged [Plate 17] or hanged [Plate 18]; Britannia is dismembered or is ridden by spurred ministers; the British Lion has his eyes put out; protagonists spray one another with ordure or are forced to submit to the anal rape of enemas.

Punishment, pain and humiliation inform the descriptive, self-defining vocabulary of satire. Satire 'cuts', 'bites', 'stings', 'flays', and 'lashes'; significantly for graphic satire, the 'bite' of satire had long been associated with the bite of acid; thus John Oldham in his Satires Upon the Jesuits (1679):

Each drop of ink like aquafortis gnaw
Red hot with vengeance thus I'll brand disgrage
So deep, no time shall e'er the marks deface.

The same impulse is implicit in the inscription to BM 4050 John Wilkes Esq; 'Drawn from the Life & Etch'd in Aqua Fortis by Wm Hogarth'. In this inscription, Hogarth insists upon the ad vivam veracity of his interpretation of Wilkes and also identifies himself with the punitive satirist; his print is acid in the face of Wilkes.
Many scholars of both satire and caricature have subscribed to the idea that the satiric impulse is rooted in primitive, sympathetic magic; 'the belief that by a pre-enactment of his wishes' the satirist' could coerce the gods to effect a similar outcome in reality. The primitive man will, in his curse, enumerate the stripes he wishes to see descend upon the enemy's back; the verbal satirist describes such a punishment in detail and the graphic satirist 'realises' the desired punishment by visualising it. The image of the victim of the satire undergoing punishment is at one and the same time a prophecy and a substitute for the real enactment. In both senses it offers the satirist and, in the case of the prints, the viewer who shares the satirist's view of the victim, a potentially cathartic satisfaction.

Satiric punishment is almost invariably consequential; the consequence of vice and corruption, the abuse of reason, et cetera. This is emphasised in many of the numerous prints in which the execution or other physical punishment of ministers is depicted. In BM 6399 The Coalition Balloon (1784), which depicts the hanging of Fox and North, the crowd observe: 'How richly they deserve their fate - it is a pity they were not Hanged 7 Years ago - Never did Rope fit better - and never was exaltation more proper'. In BM 1134 The Doctor Degraded, the flogging and pillorying of Titus Oates is 'The Just Reward of bloody Perjury'. In BM 172 Mercuries Message Defended (1641), the hangman places a rope around the neck of Laud saying 'Here's your reward'. These examples could be multiplied.

The exemplary and monitory convention of the last dying speech is often employed to this end; the punished allude to the 'crime' which brought the punishment upon them. Thus in BM 1939 The Downfall of Sejanus (1733) the severed head of Walpole manages to stammer out 'Ex- Ex - Ex - Excise', just as in BM 418 The Full View of Canterburies Fall (1645), the severed head of Laud had
observed: 'My head that wrought all misery/Is smitten off as you may see,/you Prelats be warned by me/The fate of evill just you see'.

In the context of satire, punishment also offers the satirist a means of defining his victim; his 'end' is at one and the same time the consequence of his vice and folly and its quintessence. As an instance of this, Ronald Paulson cites the death of Peregrine in the satire of Lucian; Peregrine's self-immolation affirms his self-consuming folly. 29

The minster-as-common-criminal conceit, which finds its finest expression in Fielding's Jonathan Wild, is one running metaphor which entails this aspect of satiric punishment. The prints furnish numerous examples; the anti-Pitt Regency Crisis print, BM 7481 Billy the Bamboozler Robbing the Cobler (1789) adopts the language of the Newgate Calendar: 'Some account of the Life and Behaviour of William Pett, alias Billy the Bamboozler'; he

... was born of honest parents who gave him a good education & got him young into place, but being early prone to lying and other vicious habits (although unlike most other rogues he was not addicted to bad women) he inveighed a number of idle boys away from their Books & encouraged them to live like himself upon the Public. After supporting himself and one Duke [the Duke of Richmond] [...] by robbing the Shopkeepers [a reference to Pitt's Shop Tax] and chiefly the poorer sort, he was at last convicted of stealing Half a Crown from George Prince [i.e., the Regency restrictions] for which he suffer'd. This Notorious Culprit was one of the daring Gang concern'd in the Affair of the Great Seal.

In such satires, the language of reward and punishment is inverted, so that execution becomes 'exaltation' or 'promotion' (as in The Coalition Balloon and BM 6916 A Great Man Filling the Highest Post in the Kingdom (1786)). As with many of the characteristic satiric forms, tactics and conventions of the prints, so numerous
and rich are the examples that this metaphor and the larger punitive tactic of which it is a part merit a study in their own right.

A fact which might be observed in this context is that such graphic and criminal punishments of ministers increase over the course of the 18th century; in part reflecting the quantitative increase in print production, this may also reflect the diminishing likelihood of such punishment. It has been observed that the fate of disgraced or displaced ministers was one way in which the 18th-century differed from the 17th. In the 17th-century print the punishment depicted was likely to be the punishment experienced, be it the execution of Laud, the flogging of Titus Oates or the punishment and public humiliation of regicides and rebels in 1660, celebrated by a rash of prints; in the 18th-century the likelihood of such punishment diminished. The more precise distinction, however, would seem to be between not the 17th- and 18th-centuries but between the pre- and post-c. 1750 world, although, as the execution of, among others, Dr Archibald Cameron in 1753 shows, judicial murder on political grounds had yet to become a 17th-century anachronism. For the same reasons, those prints depicting, threatening or prophesying the impeachment and execution of Walpole have a greater edge than similar representations in later prints attacking Bute or Pitt, notwithstanding their pictorial and satirical similarities - although, arguably, such representations regain this edge in the 1790s as may be felt from Gillray's disturbingly naturalistic Patriotic Regeneration, - viz. - Parliament Reform'd; a la Françoise, - that is, - Honest Men (i.e. - Opposition) in the Seat of Justice (1795) [Plate 19].

The violence in satire has been interpreted as symbolic action that conveys the central meaning of the satire. In this context, it should be observed that another of
the punitive verbs with which the definitive vocabulary of satire is furnished is that to 'pillory'; the graphic pillorying of ministers (and others) may be literal. Yet the pillory offers an instance of punishment which entails not merely physical humiliation but public exposure; it can be argued that recourse to this in graphic satire is a tactic not of punitive but of revelatory satire. It should also be observed that not all of the violence of the prints is punitive in the sense of punishing vice. What Paulson, in his The Fictions of Satire, refers to as 'the central symbol of violence' is one means whereby the graphic satirist can visualise the threats to the national interest et cetera which prompted the satire and, most importantly, identify the villains of the piece.

Satires of this kind are more 'revelatory' than punitive in that they reveal the guilty and visualise the covert intentions and ambitions of the hypocritical and corrupt.

There can be no better example of the need in this as in other analyses of the prints to eschew anything approaching a rigidly prescriptive methodology than the way in which satirical conventions common to the prints, such as those of medicine and surgery, may be either revelatory or punitive in application. Indeed, to take the *summ*ical conceit, the anatomy or dissection, while predominantly used to revelatory effect is also informed by the associations of punitive satire; similarly, the vomit or purge may be either revelatory or punitive, and in some prints the two satiric impulses may be seen to coexist.

i) Anatomies and Dissections

The anatomy or dissection is one of several satirical tactics which may be discerned in the prints from the
17th to the 19th-century. It exists in both verbal and visual form; in verbal form it is to be found in the titles of prints which do not themselves employ this tactic; for example BM 222 The Wrens nest Defil'd or Bishop Wren Anatomiz'd, His Life and Actions Dissected and Laid Open and BM 223 Wrens Anatomy, Discovering His Notorious Pranks, And Shamefull Wickednesse (1641) [Plate 20]; BM 1028 The Dutch Boare Dissected or a Description of Hogg-Land (1672) and so on; in visual form it reached a peak of elaboration in two prints by Dent, BM 6257 The Coalition Dissected (1783) and A Rt Hon Democrat Dissected [Plate 21], prints which recall Horace's praise for Lucilius for 'peeling the skins off hypocrites'.

A glance at satirical literature reveals such anatomies and dissections to be an established revelatory satirical tactic, so that one finds works with such suggestive and characteristically revelatory titles as Time's Curtaine drawne or the Anatomie of Vanitie (1621). The association of satire with revelation and the conceit of the anatomy are present in Thomas Randolph's The Muses' Looking Glass (1638); in the presence of Satire

Every guilty breast
Stood fearful of dissection, as if afraid
To be anatomic'd by that skilful hand,
And have each artery, nerve and vein of sin,
By it laid open to the public scorn.

Swift employed similar language in A Vindication of His Excellency John Lord Carteret (1730):

I'm afraid lest such a Practitioner, with a Body so open, so foul, and so full of Sores, may fall under the Resentment of an incensed Political Surgeon, who is not in much renown for his Mercy upon great Provocation: Who without waiting for his Death, will flay and dissect him alive; and to the View of Mankind, lay open all the disordered Cells of his Brain, the venom of his Tongue, the Corruption of his Heart, and Spots and Flatulences of his Spleen - And all this for Three-Pence!
In graphic terms, this impulse finds expression in the anatomised or otherwise annotated body. Plate 12, *The Dissembling Scot Set Forth in his Couleurs* (1652), is one such example, but Dent's prints exploit this tactic to the full with their profusion of labelled organs and limbs. (Here it might perhaps be mentioned that while, iconographically, the anatomising of figures has much in common with the labelling of amputated limbs, with which the prints are littered, this latter convention of the prints is seldom used to revelatory effect and will not be discussed here, although it is interesting enough in its own right. 37)

In *The Coalition Dissected*, a whole-length figure is bisected vertically, one half representing Charles James Fox, the other Lord North, the head apparently copied from Sayers's *The Mask*, BM 6234 [Part I, Chapter V, Plate 53]. Excepting a pair of short breeches, the figure is naked, and the organs of the body from neck to waist exposed. North's arm is tattooed with guineas and inscribed 'Finance', Fox's with dice, dice-box and 'Industry'. Fox's hand is inscribed 'Goodwill' and grasps a cord marked 'Anodyne Necklace', which is attached to the 'Oratorical' (left) 'Lungs' (right); North's a bag of 'Whip-Cord', a reference to bureaucratic corruption. 39 North's ribs are inscribed 'Place, Pension, Sinecure, Contract, Loan, Title &c.', Fox's 'Thirteen Stripes', an allusion to his highly-public support of the American rebels in the recent conflict. 40

This horrible hybrid has not one but two hearts, both labelled 'Union'; other organs are 'Touch-Wood', 'Love' and 'Honesty'. The central, common, artery is 'Self-Interest', from which proceed arteries inscribed, respectively, 'E(ast) I(ndia) Bill', and 'P---- of W-----'s Establishment' which enter the breeches pockets, both overflowing with coin and marked 'Pickings'. The creature's stomach is a globe, 'Indostan', and, in reversed lettering, 'Great Britain'. 42 The sides, drawn
back to reveal all this, are composed of 'Green Fat'. North's leg is inscribed 'Hypocrisy'; his foot, labelled 'Affection', tramples on a fox which excretes. Fox's leg is inscribed 'Prostitution'. The face has a common tongue, inscribed in reversed letters, 'Truth'; the inscription 'Pro privato lucro' is also common to both sides of the figure.

A Right Hon Democrat Dissected [Plate 21] is similarly bisected. Fox's left shoulder is inscribed 'Attachment', the left sleeve decorated with dice and dice-box as in 6527 and inscribed 'British Industry', followed by 'Interest of Levellers, Jews, Gamesters, Adventurers, &c.', the left hand 'Argument'; the right shoulder is 'Apprehension', the sleeve decorated with an axe and halter, and inscribed 'French Industry' and 'Advocate for Atheists, Jews, Papists, Dissenters &c.', the hand, clutching a dagger, is inscribed 'Penetration'. The chest organs are exposed with, on the left side 'Fat of Pidgeons' and on the right 'Fat of Friends' rolled back to reveal ribs inscribed (left): 'Duplicity, Drunkenness, Whoredom, Gambling, Envy, Inconsistency and Prophaneness' and (right): 'Enmity, Cruelty, Madness, Distress, Treachery, Ingratitude, Despair'. His heart is inscribed 'Common Wealth', his liver 'Intemperance', his Kidneys 'Aristocratic' (1) and 'Democratic'; other organs are 'Gallic' and 'Fraternity'. His 'Oratorical Lungs' are 'Variably Verbose'. A large windy space on the right is inscribed 'French Principles'. Below the waist, Fox's generous 'Private Virtues' are evenly distributed; the pocket (1) 'Equality' is empty, that on the right ('Assignats'), full. Fox's left leg is 'Hypocrisy', a Knave of Clubs 'Spirit' is affixed; the right is 'Fornication' and decorated with two medallion portraits (for 'Valor') of Mary 'Perdita' Robinson and Elizabeth Armitstead, his mistresses. His booted left foot tramples on 'Religious Duties' and 'Moral Duties', and is inscribed 'Post-Haste to Old Scratch', his right,
inscribed 'Step to French Measures' tramples on 'Religion, Order, Liberty, Law and Property'. His forehead is inscribed 'Self-Interest' and in his mouth he carries a windmill ('Genius'), the sails of which are 'Monarchy', 'For the People', 'Republic' and 'For the King'.

Both these satires are the work of William Dent, and the fact that another copiously-annotated figure, The Free-Born Briton (Chapter VI above, Plate 441, is also his work suggests a personal predilection for this tactic. But Dent was working within an established graphic satiric tradition, although it is surprising that so few graphic satirists exploited the anatomised figure to the full as does Dent. Both prints are related, both iconographically and satirically to the bisected body, graphic shorthand for hypocrisy [Plate 22]. In the Wilkesite print, BM 4315 The Times [Plate 23], so extensive is the satirical dissection (although in this instance the figure is fully-clothed) that it extends to the figure's unseen back.

Such annotations figure in prints in which the anatomy is far from being the central or primary conceit. In 1757, Fox's father, Henry Fox was depicted with his breast opened, exposing a rotten heart, engraved with fleurs-de-lis (BM 3633 and 3634, The Lying Hydra) an indication of sympathies contrary to British interests which was to appear in the body of Bute in BM 3963 The Blasted Cocoa Tree (1762). BM 3378 A Scene in Hell, or the Infernall Jubilee (1756) (an example of the punitive satirical tactic of consigning ministers to Hell), has demons feast, and pass satiric comment upon the hearts of Fox, Newcastle and Byng, inscribed respectively 'Subtlety', 'Luxury' and 'Cowardice'.

The heart remains the index to the inner man; hence, in Dent's BM 7139 The Battle of Hastings (1787), the non-appearance, in the course of a satiric dissection, of
'a Nabob's heart'. A print from the Regency Crisis, BM 7474 State Butchers (1788) [Plate 24], depicts the evisceration of the Prince of Wales; Pitt says 'the good Qualities of his Heart will certainly ruin our plan, therefore cut that out first'.

As with so many other tactics and conventions, that of the anatomy exists - and frequently coexists - in the prints in both pictorial and verbal forms. The 'Explanation' of BM 3396 The Ostrich, in which a figure intended for the Duke of Newcastle bares his buttocks, as given in the compilation A Political and Satyrical History states; 'it is plain enough he made the worst and basest part of himself conspicuous, Except he had shown his Heart'. The anatomy or dissection permits an extended metaphor (the post mortem, for example) as exemplified by BM 3271 The Dissection of a Dead Member (of Parliament) 1754. Five surgeons are gathered round the corpse of an M.P.. The first claims to find the brain 'very foul & Muddy it has a Contusion or as it may be Call'd a Soft place in it'. The second concurs; 'Ay Ay, He knock'd his Head to [sic] hard against Politics & Brusify'd his Pericranium, He was bred a Fox hunter'.

The third asserts:

'The Vena Cava of the Thorax makes a Noise & sounds as if one should say - My Country be dam'd & his Intestines have got, I think 'tis Bribery wrote on them - not a drop of good blood in his heart',

to which the fourth replies:

'Bribery, the Auri Sacra fames of the Antients. Ay 'twas a Dyet he was fond of 'twas his Breakfast, Dinner, & Supper, & infected all the Corpuscles of his Corporeal System it was his Insanibile Membrum'.

The fifth observes, 'There's a most potent Foetor exhales as if the whole Body was corrupted'.

Quintessentially revelatory, the anatomy or dissection
may nonetheless entail an element of the punitive in that the exposure thus effected must necessarily be unwelcome to its victim. Hence Swift's threat to Traulus; he will dissect him alive (physical cruelty equals punishment equals punitive satire) 'to the View of Mankind', i.e., he will effect a public exposure of his victim's corruption, equals revelatory satire. The detail in The Coalition Dissected and A Rt Hon Democrat Dissected is insistent, almost obsessive, and violent on the eye; the optical result is of some bizarre physical affliction. It is also notable that this tactic is almost never used to humorous effect. 44

ii) The Compleat Purge and Vomit: Punishment and Exposure

The medical metaphors of graphic satire are in many cases informed by another metaphor; that of the body politic - exemplified by Gillray's Britannia between Death and the Doctors (1804) [Plate 25]. Such satires tend to be revelatory, in depicting the ill-intentioned administration of physic, or malicious, debilitating surgery; the satirist depicts the concealed intentions of his protagonists, disabusing the viewer of any naive faith in their intentions. The body politic and the medical metaphors merit consideration in their own right; this necessarily superficial introduction to the different satirical tactics of the print will focus on the punitive and revelatory aspects of those perennials of the prints, the purges and emetics which are inflicted upon the subjects of the satire.

In innumerable prints, purgative medicines are administered as punishment; the emphasis is upon the sufferings of the guilty thereby punished, both before and after punishment. Ministers grimace and clutch their sides, complaining of surfeit, stomach-ache and griping
pains, as in BM 5632 Ministerial Purgations or State Gripings 1780. Their 'cure' is conventionally presented as equally painful and unwelcome.

The punitive aspect of such applications was stressed by Swift in an episode which found graphic expression in BM 1797 The Punishment Inflicted on Lemuel Gulliver by applying a Lilliputian fire Engine to his Posteriors for his Urinal Profanation of the Royal Palace at Mildendo; a print which was later made more explicitly political (BM 3557 The Political Clyster). Such prints are informed by the punitive nature of scatological satire - the process degrades and abuses - but in many prints the resulting vomiting or defecation is revelatory, as is suggested by the title of one such print, BM 3629 The Truth or you see its coming out (1757).

Thus, in the highly scatological satire, Loose Principles (Plate 26), after an application of 'R[egent]'s Clyster', Fox farts 'Vox Populi'; this, together with the labelled paper ('Magna Charta Non Posteris sed Posterioribus') with which he will wipe himself, allows the satirist to cast doubt upon Fox's patriotic and populist pretensions. Frequently, ministers vomit or excrete gold (as in Administering to an Old Friend!!! Or the rapid effects of Whitbreads Intire! [Plate 27]), items such as the Great Seal (as in The Sour Prospect Before Us or the Ins Throwing Up [Plate 28]), or labelled papers (as in BM 2531 The Political Vomit for the Ease of Britain [Plate 29]). In this print (inscription: 'He hath Swallowed down Riches and he shall Vomit them up again; God shall cast them out of his Belly - Job xx 15th') Walpole vomits 'West-----r' and 'Chipenham' and excretes into 'The Gulph of Secret Iniquity' 'T-tles & R-b-nds', 'Promises', 'Ex--se Scheme', 'Reversions', 'S-nk-ng F-nd' and 'Private P-na-ns'.

The emetic or purge is frequently identified; it may be
something which, by being found - because so unpalatable and indigestible - highly efficacious, serves not only to identify the remedy appropriate to the political malaise but to impugn those who are shown as unable to stomach it. In The Sour Prospect Before Us, for example, it is the prospect of being turned out as result of a Regency which has acted as an emetic on the ministers.

Yet because what is excreted or vomited up may define the vice or 'crime' that occasioned the satire, such representation conforms to the idea, which was mentioned with reference to punitive satire, of the definitive punishment; it is less that the punishment must 'fit' the crime, rather that the guilty are defined by their punishment. As the inscription reads in BM 4797 Compleat Purge and Vomit (c.1770) 'Behold, I will bring out of his mouth that which he has swallowed up, and the people shall behold the evil he hath done'. Thus, in BM 412 Great was surnam'd Gregorie of Rome [Plate 30], Laud vomits 'Canons and Constitutions', 'Sundai no Sabath', 'An Order of Star Chamber', and so on. Still more revealing are the words of Henry Burton, seen in the print and, with Bastwick and Prynne one of the so-called 'Protestant Martyrs', in the accompanying text. Laud's sickness comes from his unChristian diet:

'Raw-meats, o Bishop bredd sharp Cruditties
Eares from the Pillory? other Cruelties
As Prisonments, by your high Inquisistion
That makes your Vomits have no intermission'.

In BM 1296 The Triumphs of Providence over Hell, France, & Rome (1696), Louis XIV is made to disgorge towns (French conquests). Here the metaphor of the King's two bodies allows a satire on the territorial aggrandisement of the French state to be articulated as a satire on the physical greed and suffering of the monarch in his personal capacity.
As with the medical and body politic metaphors with which it in some instances overlaps, an entire thesis might profitably be devoted to the several uses of scatology in 17th- and 18th-century prints, not least as a satirical tactic. As well as offering several metaphors for political practices, scatological imagery offered a shorthand for the indication of contempt and derision, for example, the urinating dog in BM 3696 The Vanity of Human Glory - A Design for the Monument of General Wolfe (1760) [Plate 31]; iconographically, the urinating dog was an established motif of disorder. The urination could be an act of derision, as in BM 6611 The Covent Garden Deluge (1784) in which the Duchess of Devonshire urinates on the face of Fox's rival candidate Sir Cecil Wray, or of violence, as in BM 4132 Thro the Wood Laddie, or the Gentle Shepherd (1765) in which Bute is depicted straddled over the prone Chatham, relieving himself into his mouth.

This brings us back to where this chapter began. Whereas literary scholars have studied scatological satire as an important element of 18th-century satire, its graphic manifestations have been almost completely ignored by prints scholars other than by coy references in which it is cited as evidence of the 'robustness' of 18th-century humour. Nor has the medical metaphor, extensive as is its incidence and varied as are its applications in the prints, attracted more than cursory attention.

An important point, to which, in deprecating what I see as the abuse - certainly the tendency of literary scholars who have extended their studies to prints to treat this material as secondary, auxiliary evidence - of such prints by logocentric literary scholars, I have not
given sufficient emphasis, is that few, if any, of the satirical and rhetorical tactics which I have identified in the prints are unique to the graphic form.

A print such as The Anti-Craftsman Unmask'd must be assessed in the context of innumerable written satires; for example, from the Sacheverell crisis, M898 Moderation Unmask'd and M722 The High-church Mask Pull'd Off; or, Modern Addressers Anatomized (1710).53

Those prints which depict (or their texts describe) the continued interest in current affairs of historical notorieties draw not only upon the classical tradition of 'Dialogues with the Dead' but contemporary ballads in which partisan bêtes noires are mentioned the better to damn by association their modern 'counterparts', emissaries or heirs; thus M405 Advice from the Shades Below. Or a Letter from Thomas Hobbs of Malmsbury to his brother B-n H--dly. In imitation of Mr Brown's Letters from the Dead to the Living (1710) a letter from 'Brandipolis' dated (emotively) 30 January, signed 'Tho. Hobbes'. Hoadly is informed that his principles have been praised by Hugh Peters and Ignatius Loyola, that the newly-arrived Sir Stephen Lennard, MP for Kent (died 15 December 1709) has been made chairman of the hellish Calves Head Club, that a toast was drunk to Hoadly and to the roasting of Sacheverell. Hobbes forwards a letter to Hoadly from Lennard, Cromwell and Ireton, and urges him to drop 'moderation' with respect to Sacheverell.54 In 1790, a scene in Hell, in which Lord Holland greets his son, Charles James Fox, includes an archetypally lank-haired dissenting minister who asks 'Any News about the Test act' (BM 7642).

For every instance of the conceit of 'the dream' or 'the vision' in graphic form at least three such may be found in written satire or polemic; thus BM 1537 the frontispiece to Aminadab! or the Quaker's Vision (1710) is best studied with reference to M639 The Limehouse Dream; or, the Churches Prop (1710) (which also has a
frontispiece) or M1094 Hell Broke Loose; upon's Doctor S-ch-e-ve---l's Sermons: or, Don Quevedo's Vision of an Infernal Cabal of WHiggish Papists or Popish Whigs in Utopia (another instance of the 'Hellish Parliament' convention, op.cit.) (1713).

The portrait metaphor has been mentioned in previous chapters, as also the auction of pictures or books; all exist in both visual and verbal forms.

Plate 31 The Vanity of Human Glory is not only a good instance of the scatology-as-shorthand-for-contempt but an instance of the 'funerary' convention common to verbal and visual satire in this period; BM 1527 The Living Man's Elegie (1710) (Plate 32) differs from the many satirical epitaphs and elegies of its period by the elaborate pictorial setting of what is a commonplace satirical convention (e.g., M940 An Elegy on Moderation (1710); M640 Dr Henry Sacheverell's Funeral Sermon. Preach'd on the much lamented Death of that Eminent and Great Lady the Low-Church Parliament who unfortunately departed this Life, the 22d. of September, 1710. To the grief of the Whigs, Phanaticks, and Dissenters. Also you have Mrs James's elegy, on the Death of the said Parliament (1710). George notes the 'burlesque' monument To the Mortal Memory of Madam Geneva [Plate 33] and the graphic and actual 'funeral processions' of which this print was a part, but fails to place the print within a literary tradition of mock-elegies, epitaphs, last-wills-and-testaments within which it belongs, although remarking that the funeral monument was 'beloved by cartoonists' [sic].

This is the problem; most scholars of the print have ignored the literary evidence which 'contextualises' the satiric forms taken by the prints. Yet, as noted above, for every one graphic instance of a satirical tactic, at least three literary instances may be found for the relevant date. Where previous literary scholars have
erred is in assuming from this the secondary, parasitic nature of the graphic genre. It is more helpful to view the relationship as a symbiotic one; it is for this reason that the failure of scholars like Carretta to address the prints with the same attention to nuances of satiric expression that is automatically accorded to a literary text, of whatever quality, is to be deprecated as an opportunity lost. Above all for the scholar of political argument, an awareness of the rhetorical and satirical congruences between verbal and visual forms current in any debate or at any given date, cannot be other than instructive.

To date, such evidence has been plundered piecemeal; a print here, a literary quotation there. If it is to tell us anything at all, a study of the political rhetoric and satire available at a given date must address the whole range of material published. As far as a proper understanding of the prints is concerned, too, the prints must be placed within their rhetorical and satirical as well as within their immediate, events-oriented, historical context if their codes are to be penetrated. For too long, political prints have been studied sui generis or else tacked onto an historical narrative; an analysis of the prints as simply another medium for the exercise of the satiric impulse in the period cannot be other than instructive.

A final point. Consider BM 5978 The Minister In The Minister Out (1782). This print offers two scenes. In the first, Charles James Fox squats, three obsequious men behind him, one proffering a chamberpot (decorated with the royal arms); another, behind, carries a similar, smoking receptacle; a third, supporting Fox, licks his befouled finger. In the second, Lord North is shown, arms outstretched in dismay at the same three men, who insult him, one pouring the contents of the chamberpot...
onto his head, the second emptying the second receptacle into his face, the third holding befouled papers to his face. The verse inscription amplifies the political metaphor.

In this one far from elaborate print, we see the multiple layers of representation which make the political print and in particular the graphic political satire so enticing and yet so rebarbative a genre to study in more than limited numbers. The structure is the bipartite structure of that rhetorical tactic, the contrast; this is underlined by the bipartite title. The basic satirical tactic is that of punitive scatology. The verbal component of the print expands this into a political metaphor. The iconography - the royal arms on the chamber-pot - adds another layer of significance to the satire.

Faced with upwards of 17,000 such prints, not all of which are so simple, the prints scholar has the option of addressing a handful of prints and engaging with every layer of meaning or representation, or he can do justice to the genre by addressing one mode of representation over a broad chronological sweep. To more than this is to repeat the mistakes of past scholarship (the compilation/introduction approach to the material need not concern us here). Only by a series of specific studies, which set out to exhaust the possibilities of one mode of analysis - be it iconographic, structural or rhetorical - will the rhetorical terra incognita of the prints begin to be mapped. In so doing, scholars will establish an empirical 'guide' to this terrain that will remain partial, but which, should sufficient studies of this kind, and a sufficient variety of such studies, be undertaken, future scholars may synthesise. In that synthesis, it may be possible to 'see' and 'read' these prints for the first time. In the absence of a sufficient body of empirical scholarship, the landscape
of the 17th- and 18th-century political print will continue to be illuminated only fitfully and partially, as by the lightning of a summer storm.

1. Olson, *Emblems of American Community* pp. xvi-xvii, 14
2. Cf. Fox, 'English Satirical Print' p. 463 on 'Satirical Print' as an inapposite umbrella title to the Chadwyck-Healey series.
3. E.g., *Folly and Vice: The Art of Satire and Social Criticism*. A good example is Iannone, *Comedy and Satire*.
9. ibid, pp.xiii, 249.
11. Other works omit any reference to graphic satire: for example, B.A. Goldgar, Walpole and the Wits; the Relation of Politics to Literature 1722-1742 (Lincoln, Nebraska:1976); Downie, 'Walpole, the "Poet's Foe"' op.cit..


I must admit to finding this genre of 18th-century studies of only limited value as far as graphic satire and political graphics are concerned. Far more useful are reference works such as David Foxon's English Verse 1701-1750 2 vols (Cambridge:1975), from which it is possible to establish the literary existence of many of the tactics, metaphors and tropes employed in contemporary graphic satire.

12. For this, and the parasitical nature of satire, see Paulson, Fictions of Satire pp.4-8,20; Nichols, pp.11-12,49-63.


17. EPC1, p. 123.

18. See BM 58 and 59 Truth Brought to Light and Discovered by Time (1651); BM 199 A Conspiracy Discovered (1641); BM 263 The Complaint of M. Tenter-Hooke the Projector (1641), a classic revelatory satire, with the victim speaking these lines; 'Now Time has pluck'd the Vizard from my face, /I am the onely Image of disgrace. /My ugly shape I hid so cunningly/(Close cover'd with the cloake of honesty)'; BM 1659 De Waereld is Een Speel (1720); BM 2449 European State Jockies (1740). For the iconography of Time and Truth in a fine art context, see P. M. Barber, 'Marlborough, art and diplomacy: the background to Peter Strudel's drawing of Time revealing Truth and confounding Fraudulence' JWCI 47 (1984) 119-35.


21. See BM 2540 The Screen. A Simile (1742); this print also employs a looking-glass as an instrument of revelation.

22. 'The Dutch Visards of the three Treaties with the English in 1613, 1615 and 1619' (key); in BM 656 The Times Displayed (1646), the personification 'Envious Hypocresie' is distinguished by three masks and a cloak. For masks and unmasking, see Wood, 'Causality and Deceit' pp. 422-23, 425 n; Brewer, Party Ideology p. 108.

23. The viewer is placed in a similar position when contemplating Robert Cruikshank's Reflection, To be, or not to be [BM 13661] (1820), in which George IV is seen from behind trying on his crown before a glass, and startled to see Caroline, crowned, smirking back at him. Earlier, BM 7907 The Flattering Glass, or, Nell's Mistake (1791) played with this idea - and once again places the viewer behind the subject - by showing Mrs Jordan, mistress to the Duke of Clarence, similarly smirking at the ducal coronet which appears in her reflection.

24. The same impulse would seem to underlie the visual and verbal 'anatomies' performed on the satirist's victim; the reconciliation of external appearance with the inner corruption identified by the satirist - diseased body with diseased soul.

Insofar as such a dissection performed on a living individual (for which see ns 35 and 36) would be
painful, the conceit is a punitive one, and in this, too, would seem to be informed by the idea that the punishment should 'fit' the crime in the sense of visualising or externalising it. See Paulson, Fictions of Satire p.11.

25. See Randolph, p.142; Paulson, Fictions of Satire p.11; Elkin, pp.156-157. In a passage which draws on a similar thesis as presented by Randolph (pp.125-26,135,145,), Elkin claims to see a dramatic change in the vocabulary of satire from the 17th to the 18th century (for which see also ns 30 and 31 below); the 16th- and 17th-century satirist's metaphorical weapons 'are whips, cats-o'nine-tails, cauterizing irons, bundles of rods, steel flails, knotted ropes, leather thongs, surgeon's scalpels, and strong purgatives and cathartics. His pen may be a knife to cut deep into the patient's body and remove the infected part [...] Altogether he was hardly the type to appeal to men who prided themselves on their refinement. The contrast between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century images of the satirist is startling indeed: a barber-surgeon or torturer-executioner on the one hand, and on the other, the man of virtue and good sense. The one uses the crude language of plagues and poisons, of hideous diseases and racking tortures, [...] the other employs a milder, more philosophical vocabulary, and retains his poise even when his subject is evil and disgusting. [...] The object of his satire is not the body but the mind, the ruling passion instead of the canker in the flesh, and his favourite weapon not a scourge or a scalpel, but ridicule'. Cf. ibid, pp.27-28. Elkin evidently has not looked at 18th-century graphic satire, in which he would have found both scalpel and scourge in frequent use.

27. See R.C. Elliott, The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (Princeton:1960); Paulson, Fictions of Satire pp.75-79. This association is one which has frequently been cited in the context of the late development of true, ad hominem, caricature. For reservations about this, see Coupe, pp.86-87.

28. Cf. Sharpe, op.cit.; see also Daniel Szechi, 'The Jacobite Theatre of Death' in eds. Cruikshank and Black, The Jacobite Challenge (Edinburgh:1988) 57-73. This is only one of many contexts in which self-damning statements are put into the mouths of the protagonists and vice left to speak for itself; cf. Paulson, Fictions of Satire pp.38-39.

29. The Fictions of Satire p.10.
31. See M206 and 207 The Merciful Judgments of High-Church Triumphant on Offending Clergymen, and others, in the Reign of Charles I. Together with Lord Falkland's speech in Parliament 1640 (1710);
Paulson, *Fictions of Satire* pp.12-13, considers many of the 'commonest' punishments encountered in literary satire - unmerciful whipping, roasting in hell-fire, submersion in excrement - to be satirically inadequate, 'more an objectification of the satirist's disgust than of the evil man's sin. [...] too often [...] the punishment is decorative and tells us very little about the person or crime punished'. There is, however, a sense in which depictions of ministers in the pillory, in the hangman's cart, flogged, or on the gallows, effect, by the very banality of these punishments, a satiric diminution of the victim, who is treated as a common criminal.

32. Paulson, *Fictions of Satire* p.11; see BM 4114 The Times Past, Present, and to Come (1765); BM 4114 The Pillory Triumphant (1765); BM 4117 La Croix de St Pillory (1765); BM 6477 The Rising of Pa-l--ment (1784); BM 7284 East India Stocks (1788).

33. p.9.
34. Randolph, p.143.
35. Quoted Randolph, p.150.
36. Quoted Paulson, *Fictions of Satire* pp.187-88. Paulson notes, p.14, that the satirist's surgeon persona had the effect of 'drawing the reader's attention away from both persuasion and presentation to the interesting image of the performer and his operations'. In graphic satire, however, the operation takes place in the absence of the performer (i.e., the draughtsman); those prints which depict one individual performing such an operation upon another are almost invariably aligned against the performer and on the side of the performer's victim, as is the case in BM 3069 The Conduct, of the two B-----rs. An exception might be Hogarth's ambivalent The Reward of Cruelty.

37. See Olson, *Emblems of American Community* pp.219ff 'The Colonies are the Limbs [...] of Britannia'.
38. The 'anodyne necklace' - an infant prophylactic - was also a euphemism for the hangman's noose, as it is here and also in BM 7329 Exhibition of the Times [...]. Plate the 2d (1788).
39. See the entry BM 6257; *Parliamentary History* xxiii 953; Wraxall, *Memoirs* iii, 458.
40. For 'Thirteen' in rebel propaganda, see Olson, pp.65,72.
41. The reference to the India Bill was the result of the print being reissued 15 December 1783 (it was originally published in August).
42. This may be accidental; conversely, the reversed lettering may be intended to convey the false values and inversions deemed to inhere in Fox's political philosophy.
43. See Randolph, p.153,
44. For a possible iconographic source for this sort of visual anatomy, the 'Wound-man' chart of the barber-surgeon, see Randolph, p.136; for comprehensive enumeration of the desired sufferings of the satirist's victim as a formal satirical tactic, see Randolph, p.134.

45. Emetic satire may be seen to carry a political in, among other prints, BM 5990 Evacuation Before Resignation (1782), BM 7320 State Jugglers (1788) and 7366 Casting Up the Poll and Declaring the Majority, by Mr Reynard (1788).

46. See also BM 117 The Bishop's Potion (1641)

47. Still more explicit is the print BM 1267 The Usurpers Habit (1691) in which Louis XIV is depicted seated at a table. His clothes are covered with representations of towns, fortresses, etcetera. His hat is 'Limerick' and is already laid aside; a man with a lantern (revelatory) observes the king loosening his clothing and says 'He begins to unrigg'. The geographical and military specificites enhance the cleverness of this as a satire, but this conceit was never again used with any ingenuity.

48. For example, BM 5990 Evacuation Before Resignation (1782); BM 6050 Retaliation or State of Nations (1782); BM 6164 Secret Reflection or the Stool of Repentance (1782); 6201 A New Administration; or - The State Quacks Administering (1783); BM 6222 A Joint Motion or the Honey-Moon of the Coalition (1783); BM 6248 The Treasury Ladders, or, Political Grapes (1783); a man, probably intended for Shelburne, has a yoke over his shoulders, from which hang bunches of grapes, also two long ladders, from the top of which Fox and North grab at the grapes; below them are ambitious politicians: Fox excretes into Sheridan's mouth ('Gape wide Sherry'); Shridamn does the same to the man below him ('These are Golden Drops'); the man below North exhorts him 'Shite away my Lord, my mouth is open'; the figure below this speaker observes 'I shall have a Belly full'; BM 6260 Duty on Discharges, or a Companion to the Receipt Tax (1784); BM 6417 The Temple of Purity (1784); BM 6617 (Fox) Boring Money out of a Jew (1784); BM 6635 Paul Before Felix or the High Bailiff Disconcerted (1784), a chamber-pot 'scrutiny' satire on the Westminster Election scrutiny, as is BM 6553 The Scrutiny, or Examination of the Filth (1784); BM 6572 A New Way to Secure a Majority (1784); BM 6626 The Political Bog House; BM 6964 A British Minister Worshipping the Meridian Sun, Engraved after the Original painted by Maria Closestool in the possession of his M-j-sty (1786); BM 7655 Advice to the Electors of Westminster, or, the Case as It Is (1790) a divided plate; on the left, Fox ('A little Before and During Election') kneels to kiss the bare buttocks of a butcher, whose verdict is 'Charley is a fine Promising Fellow.
Charley forever Huzza!!!. In the right-hand compartment ('After Election') Fox bares his buttocks to the butcher ('Now you may kiss my A-se'). Beneath the image is etched 'NB the above may be applied with equal force against any of the Party at another place'.

These are a mere fraction of the prints in which scatology is explicitly and consciously harnessed as a political metaphor.

49. The presence of such a dog in the print A Society of Patriotic Ladies, at Edenton, in North Carolina (1775) (reproduced Dolmetsch, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg' p.188), not least when set against the abandoned child and the equivocal central couple, qualifies Dolmestch's reading of this as 'straight' reportage and turns it into a satire on female politicisation.

50. For urination as sex-and/or-violence, see Wagner, Eros Revived p.186 (The Pissing Conflict, Covent Garden Magazine 1773). For the sexual aspects of scatology, see Adams Day, 'Sex, Scatology, Smollett' pp.228,230,231,234,238.


53. For example, the ballad The Western Rebel c.1679-80; first line, 'See, the Vizor's pull'd off, and the Zealots are running'.

54. See also M443 Mr D[olbeln]'s letter, to his brother
Advice from the Shades Below no. 2, or, a letter from John D-lb-n, to his friends the Whiggs, in imitation of Mr Brown's Letters from the dead to the Living [...]. Note, there is lately publish'd, the second edition of Advice from the Shades below, (no.1) or a Letter from Thomas Hobbs of Malmsbury, to his brother B-n H--dly (1710) sent from 'a coffee-house in Brandipolis'; M518 Strange News From the Dead (1710); M540 An Express from Pandemonium to Dr Sach---l, occasion'd by his late tour from Oxford (1710). For the 'Dialogues of the Dead', see Paulson, Fictions of Satire pp.31-42.

55. EPC1, p.85; for example, from an earlier period, BM 200 The Late Will and Testament of the Doctors Commons, shewing how he hath disposed of his Commissioners, Doctors, Proctors, Surrogates, Messengers, Examiners and Promotors, and the rest of his Attendants, With a short deportment of his Legacies and how he hath bequeathed them (1641); BM 760 The Last Will and Testament of Richard Brandon (1649); BM 1527 and BM 1545; BM 1531 The Funeral of the Low-Church or the Whig's Last Will and Testament (1710); M283 An Elegy on the Death of High-Church Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, which departed this life on the 22nd of this instant March 1709/10, much lamented (1710); M526 The Last Will and Testament of the C----h of E-----d. With a Preface Shewing the Reason of its Publication, in spite of all her Enemies (1710); M635/6/7 A True and Faithful Account of the Last Distemper and Death of Tom Whigg, Esq; who departed this life on the 22d day of September last, Anno Domini 1710. Together with a relation of his frequent appearing since that day in town and country, to the great disturbance of Her Majesty's peaceable subjects [ghost conceit; itself a common conceit of political satire] (1710); M640 Dr Henry Sacheverell's Funeral Sermon. Preach'd on the much lamented Death of that Eminent and Great Lady the Low-Church Parliament who unfortunately departed this Life, the 22d September, 1710. To the grief of the Whigs, phanaticks, and Dissenters. Also you have Mrs James's elegy, on the death of the said Parliament (1710); M822 Another Elegy on the Death of John Dolben, Esq; for a pretended death-bed recantation, see M492 A Letter Written by Mr J. Dolben to Dr Henry Sacheverell, and left him with a Friend at Epsom, to deliver to the Doctor (1710); BM 1708 The Bubblers Funeral Ticket for the Directors of the South Sea Company (1721); BM 2499 The Funeral of Independency (1741); BM 6798 The Funeral of Trade, who Died of a Mortal Stab Receiv'd on the 13th of June 1785; BM 6512 The Soliloquy of Reynard (1784); BM 6513 The Last Dying Words of Reynard the Fox (1784); BM 7526 The Funeral Procession of Miss Regency (1789).
Appendix

From iconoclasm to ICONCLASS? Indexing the B.M. Catalogue

Iconographical research poses its own problems for the researcher, for art is seldom catalogued by its subject matter. The lack of helpful resources was a common complaint.

For me the great dream is images indexed by a reasonably efficient subject-index.

I would love to have any and all systems that can index and make accessible [...] textual and iconographic traditions.

If one could theoretically push a button, and get information about all the occurrences of [for example] blue cloaks in eighteenth-century German paintings and then use that as a basis [from which] to work [...].

Anonymous art historians, Object, Image, Inquiry

In the absence of the supplementary documentation for which I called in Chapter IV, the BM Catalogue remains the primary source of documentation for English political prints of the 17th and 18th centuries. Disregarding the question of its comprehensiveness with respect to later additions to the B.M. Collection, I consider the potential of the Catalogue as a research tool has yet to be fully realised.

As it stands, the Catalogue is an extremely unwieldy research tool. Its format has discouraged scholars from regarding it other than as a source of contextual information and of readily-paraphrased description. Its size, eleven stout volumes, is particularly inimical to the sort of extended iconographical analysis of images for which I argued in Chapter V. Those who have paid lip-service to the idea of iconographical continuity have, perhaps understandably, balked at the prospect of a scrutiny of every entry from volumes I to XI, although it is only with such a survey of the material that the
tenacity of motifs will be established.

The limitations of the Catalogue and in particular of
the first four (Stephens) volumes became apparent during
the period in which my study of the material had as its
end a thesis which would have examined the relationship
between political rhetoric as expressed in published
writings and Parliamentary speeches and the iconography
of English political prints between 1688 and 1788. This
necessitated detailed and extensive content-analysis of a
large number of prints, from several perspectives. In
the absence of subject-indices to volumes I - IV, and
with only basic subject-indices to volumes V - XI, a
study of the incidence of particular motifs or specific
themes - for example, the Eye of God, or references to
Divine Providence - necessitated the scrutiny of every
entry in the Catalogue for this period. This was not
only extremely - and I would suggest, unnecessarily -
time-consuming, but far from efficient, it being only too
easy to overlook pertinent examples of the sought-after
theme or motif; examples which revealed themselves at a
later date, in the course of a different search.
Iconographic content-analysis as based on the Catalogue
is far from impossible; it proves, however, a
discouragingly Sisyphean task.

At present, then, the Catalogue, while a fine work of
scholarship in its own right, so far from facilitating
enquiries which would do justice to the wealth of
information contained therein, actually militates against
more than the most limited usage.

An index of sorts to volumes I - IV has been in the
process of compilation for over a decade. As far as it
has been possible to ascertain, this will take the form
of the indices to volumes V - XI. Arguably, however,
George's indices themselves fail to realise the potential
of the Catalogue, in particular for the study of 17th-
and 18th-century political argument.
What is required is an index which would address not only the rich iconography of the prints and the several satirical tactics, as outlined in Chapter VII, which it is possible to identify, but which would also accommodate the political language of the prints, verbal as well as visual. Within its chronological limits (see below), it must be not only reasonably comprehensive but sufficiently innovative in its categorisation and, above all, extensive and flexible in its cross-referencing capacity in order that it might function as a 'middleman' between the scholar and the vast amount information held in the Catalogue and even, perhaps, as a reference work in its own right. By liberating the scholar from laborious scrutiny of the text of the Catalogue, such an index might facilitate more innovative and specialised research.

For the past four years, I have given considerable thought both to the scope and emphases of such an Index and to the practical problems associated with designing a research tool of this kind.

i) The scope of the Index.

In the first place, there can be no question of addressing the Catalogue in its eleven-volume entirety. What can be achieved is a complete, self-contained Index to one part of the Catalogue. One approach would be to provide each of the eleven volumes with such an Index; an alternative would be a chronological division regardless of the physical division of the Catalogue; e.g., to 1715; 1715–60, and so on. In the case of the early volumes, physical division of the Catalogue severs the important period 1679–1702, with 1689 being divided between volumes I and II; adhering to this division would hardly facilitate the study of the iconography of the religious
and dynastic conflict of the period. As far as subsequent volumes are concerned, the physical division of the Catalogue is less unhappy; the quantitative development of graphic satire means that these volumes address shorter, but coherent, periods of time.

As it is the Stephens volumes which are most off-putting to the novice user, and as it makes sense for a project of this type to proceed chronologically, the remainder of this chapter will be concerned with the first three of these, that is with an index which would extend to 1715 and one covering the period 1715-60. Even these divisions encompass a very large number of entries to be combed and prints to be examined; at the same time, I am conscious of the need for chronological breadth in that only by electing to index a relatively large number of prints will it be possible to establish the sort of iconographical and rhetorical continuities and discontinuities with which I am concerned.

On this point, it should be added that to index every image in every print as catalogued in the relevant volumes would produce an Index as large and unwieldy as the Catalogue itself. For this reason, description of prints and motifs will be kept at a minimum; the intention is not to replicate information held in, but to encourage more efficient and more sophisticated use of, the Catalogue.

My own criterion for inclusions and exclusions would be the degree to which individual prints, together with motifs and other elements within a print appear to be of relevance to the historian concerned with political discourse, and with the capacities of printed images as vehicles for such discourse.

This would entail the exclusion of those prints and of imagery within prints otherwise included as 'political', which fall within the (I will be the first to concede, far from absolute) category, 'social'. That is to say,
unlike George, I am not interested in the prints as repositories of information concerning the material culture of the day - dress, vehicles, furniture, et cetera; nor, except they are informed by political considerations, with fashions in entertainment, architecture, et cetera. Also excluded will be personal satire directed against non-political individuals, such as the scandal-mongering 'Tête à Tête' portraits of a later period. Non-political personal satire is in fact comparatively rare in the period to 1715; with the exception of Townshend's prints, caricature scarcely figures in a political context in the 1715-60 period. Were I to address the post-1760 print, however, the same exclusion of non-political personal satire and caricature would apply; also excluded would be the exclusively 'comic' prints - the 'drolls' and 'Macaronis' which proliferate thereafter. The generalised, perennial satires on the professions - law, medicine (satires concerned with the Church and Universities will figure where political nuances are discernible) are also excluded.

There will always be prints which support the idea that no absolute line can be drawn between social and political satires; that said, the very format of the later, George, volumes attempts precisely this distinction. The very fact that these prints are addressed within the same volume as political subjects has informed the unhappy eclecticism of the secondary literature, the tendency to regard the material as an homogenous whole (reflected in those umbrella anachronisms 'cartoon' and 'caricature'; as noted in Chapter III above, the term 'satire' also misrepresents a great number of prints - this is particularly true of the first three volumes of the Catalogue, with which we are concerned).

The Index is not, then, an index to the entire collection, as catalogued, but rather to the political
images of a given period. Those aspects excluded are, moreover, those which promise to figure prominently in the aforementioned project to provide the Stephens volumes with a George-format index (including publishers, artists, an index of titles et cetera), upon which I understand Rosemary Baker to have been working for over a decade; Mrs Baker's article in the Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress on the usefulness of prints as a resource for the social historian underlines the extent to which our interests and our approaches to the material diverge; that said, a George-format index will serve many needs. The degree of overlap with the index outlined here promises to be small.

Iconographical content-analysis.

The Index will comprehend all the individual motifs employed in political prints; those of established iconographical standing, such as personifications (Britannia, Fame, Time, Truth, et al) and their attributions; motifs of identification, such as the French fleur-de-lis, and motifs derived from emblems, from allegorical art of the Classical tradition and from didactic Christian art (e.g., the Eye or Hand of God, the Tetragrammaton, the Mouth of Hell, et cetera). The range of motifs which will be covered by the Index will be catholic to a degree unimagined by, for example, Hall's fine-art oriented Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art, in which one would search in vain for an entry on CHAMBER-POTS or CLYSTERS, or on WOODEN SHOES or DARK LANTERNS - all of which would figure in an index devoted to political prints.4

Each entry (entries will be in alphabetical order) will note what a given motif was most commonly and most consistently employed to signify. This will be followed by a sequence of BM reference numbers identifying those prints in which this motif appears. Each BM number will
be followed by a date in brackets; the inclusion of dates will allow scholars to identify those periods in which a particular motif was used consistently; ultimately, should the Catalogue in its entirety be indexed in this way, it should be possible for scholars to chart the career of particular motifs (the same goes for other elements of the prints, such as Scriptural quotation, of which more below).

The entry for a particular motif will go on to include, where appropriate, references to those instances in which that motif is employed atypically, or its conventional sense inverted for satiric purposes.

Again, with reference to the period c. 1600-1832, indexing prints in this way will allow future scholars to determine the extent to which the iconography of the prints was fixed, and the extent to which it was open to appropriation for different rhetorical purposes. It will probably emerge that a distinct body of iconography is identifiable the meaning and usage of were 'fixed', but that a further body of motifs is identifiable which was open in application; a common iconography, such as the iconography of anti-popery, could, nonetheless, be enlisted for the articulation of very different Protestant positions, from Presbyterian prints of the 1640s to the High Church polemic of 1710. The extent to which it is possible to refer, as does Carretta, to a 'war of icons' at given periods will only become clear through such analysis as an iconographic Index would facilitate.

In this way, the Index may be seen as an attempt to implement the iconographical content-analysis of images advocated in Chapter V. Chapters VI and VII attempted to demonstrate that the iconography of the political print does not function in isolation, but rather within a satiric and rhetorical framework - a 'grammar' of which the iconography is the vocabulary. The Index will
therefore, also address the satiric and rhetorical framework as discussed in these Chapters.

Satiric and rhetorical forms and tactics.

The Index would document the stock conceits, which, as I have attempted to show, may be verbal as well as visual, on which a print is based or which a print may employ to a lesser degree. By this is meant such conceits as the FUNERAL, the CONTRAST, the VISION (or DREAM), the LOTTERY or AUCTION, et cetera. These may figure in the title or sub-title of a print and as such may inform the whole sense of a print even if the iconography associated with the conceit is absent. Not every print entitled THE BALANCE depicts a pair of scales or the act of weighing; conversely, in a print such as Rome Rhym'd To Death [BM 1125 (1683)] the image is informed by this conceit even though this is not expressed verbally. It is, however, usual, with prints with a verbal conceit in the title to find this reflected in the iconography.

The Index will register different applications of a given conceit; for example, in the context of the AUCTION, precisely what is auctioned.

Chapters VI and VII argued that analysis of prints according to 'formal' or tactical, as opposed to purely iconographic, criteria is productive of fresh insights into the material and its rhetorical capacities. More than this, however, it redirects attention away from those aspects of a print which have conventionally held the attention of scholars (political context, the presence or absence of caricature) to important satirical and structural constants within the genre, the tenacity of which is too easily obscured by apparent change in the idiom and style of prints.
Chapter VII argued for the existence of, and for the need for further study of, even broader satiric forms in the prints; REVELATORY SATIRE, PUNITIVE SATIRE, et cetera, of which tactics such as the CONTRAST are examples.

The Index would accommodate this by regarding REVELATORY SATIRE as a primary satirical tactic, in which the CONTRAST, the CURTAIN, the MIRROR, and so on, subsist as secondary satirical tactics. Thus an entry on CURTAIN would cite every print in which this motif appears, but would also direct the scholar to a more general entry, REVELATORY SATIRE, in which the motif of the curtain would be found to be but one of several motifs, the appearance of, or allusions to, which might fairly be taken as signifying the basic tenor of the satire (others include the CLOAK, the MASK, the MIRROR, and the SCREEN). In this way, the scholar would be directed to the connections which often exist between seemingly unrelated motifs and tactics in this genre.

It is in this context that the extensive cross-referencing capacity of Index comes into its own.

The nature and extent of this may best be indicated by a few examples. Thus an entry for a specific motif, e.g., CHAMBER POT, will cite the relevant BM numbers for all the prints in which a chamber-pot appears. The entry will be divided into sub-entries; e.g. 'CROWN used as with the relevant BM number; this would entail a cross-reference to CROWN, but, more importantly, to a larger entry devoted to SCATOLOGY, which would, in its turn, furnish the enquirer with further examples of the lavatorial abuse of significant objects, for example, the use of Magna Carta as lavatory paper; this in turn would entail a cross-reference to MAGNA CARTA and to the entry on the ABUSE of PAPERS. The SCATOLOGY entry would also note that defecation can be both a PUNITIVE gesture and a
tactic of REVELATORY SATIRE as the victim of the satire is relieved of 'the truth'.

The entry on BRITANNIA would include a cross-reference to the larger entry on PERSONIFICATION. The BRITANNIA entry would be further broken down in order to accommodate the several contexts in which this personification appears, for example: murdered; in need of physicians; flogged; stripped; asleep; weeping; triumphant; accusatory; with HIBERNIA and so forth.

The basic intention is to facilitate research at both a simple and at a more elaborate level. Thus the scholar who, on seeing Taking Physick; - or - The News of Shooting the King of Sweden [Plate 2], wanted to establish how usual or unusual it was for graphic satirists to depict the monarch on the privy would be able to do so. He would then be alerted to the broader scatological framework within which such prints belong, and to the satirical potential of scatological representation. We are already a long way from the basic contextualising with which this thesis began, and which, in the absence of more analytical study, the format of the Catalogue encourages.

Words and Images

The Index will pay as much attention to the verbal as to the visual components of the prints. It is intended, for instance, that just as the scholar should be able to trace the first appearance of, for example, Britannia or the White Horse of Hanover in a print, so it should be possible to chart the incidence and application of, for example, Biblical quotations; to which books of the Old and New Testaments - and to which particular passages - there is most frequent recourse. The same goes for literary quotation. In this way, the Index will facilitate access to the mind-set of the original
consumers of propagandist or satirical material; to the literacy, in the broadest sense of that word, presupposed by the prints. Attention to words and phrases will also mean that it will be possible to identify the emergence, and (in the context of a series of indices covering the entire Catalogue) the subsequent career, of catchphrases such as 'The Roast Beef of Old England' or 'in the Suds'. There will be entries for partisan labels such as 'High Church' and 'Tory' just as there will be entries for ROSEs or ANCHORs, on the grounds that such labels are of comparable interest and significance. There can be little justification for excluding the slogans, allusions and labels from an Index which is designed to address the material as the vehicle of political discourse. In this way, the Index would assert the interdependence of verbal and visual which the tenor of previous prints scholarship has set in opposition.

Abstract Concepts

Moving from components of the prints which are readily isolated by content-analysis, the final aspect of the material which must be addressed is the extent to which specific prints, but also specific motifs within prints, invoke or are informed by abstract ideas and concepts: Providence, liberty, justice, Divine Right et cetera. This is potentially the most difficult task. It is one which must, however, be attempted, because the extent to which the prints could articulate abstract ideas has so often been underestimated or even, as most recently in Miller's analysis of 'religion' in the prints, disputed. Iconography provides clues; visual references to divine protection and the hand of Providence are easily identified - in the case of the hand of God or of Providence, literally so.

Those who have questioned the rhetorical capacities of the prints, have, however, focussed wholly upon the
rhetorical capacities of the pictorial. The reference to Providence or to monarchy which informs the sense of the whole may occur only in an inscription or 'Explanation'. To ignore this is to render the image inarticulate. Unfortunately, the incorporation of words, or the presence of an accompanying text has been accepted as evidence of the rhetorical failure of an image. This is in many instances the reality behind the verdicts of rhetorical inarticulacy as pronounced by scholars such as Miller. The Index, by engaging with the hybrid nature of the material, will go further than previous scholarship in anatomising the full rhetorical capacity of the material.

The nature and scope of the content-analysis by which the content and format of the Index will be arrived at is best demonstrated by example. I have selected two very different prints in order to show how much may be extracted from a single print. The first falls within the period to which the first Index would be addressed and is iconographically rich; the second is a political caricature from the so-called 'Golden Age' - but it is not this aspect of the print with which the Index would deal. The relevant components of the print are numbered on the plates and identified below.

I. Britania (1682) BM 1182 [Plate 1]

1. EYE of GOD, with
2. SHAFT of LIGHT directed upon
3. BRITANNIA; female PERSONIFICATION; clothed, seated, weeping; she is menaced by a
4. JANUS-HEADED CLERIC, half
5. PURITAN, half
6. JESUIT. In one hand he holds a
7. CROSS and a
8. ROSARY, with the other points at BRITANNIA. He wears a
9. CLOAK, LINED with figures of
10. IMPS. One of his legs ends in a
11. CLOVEN HOOF, with which he tramples on a
12. BIBLE. He is prompted by the
13. DEVIL. On the ground before BRITANNIA (not, unfortunately, visible in this reproduction) are a
14. CROWN, a
15. CORONET, a
16. SCEPTRE, a
17. MITRE, a
18. CROSIER, an
19. AXE, BLOODY, and
20. 'MAGNA CHARTA'. To BRITANNIA's left are the
21. ROYAL ARMS, INVERTED. Behind her is a large
22. CHURCH or
23. CATHEDRAL, its east end in RUINS. Behind this may be seen another CHURCH, on fire. Behind the priest and devil is a
24. BATTLE; above, the
25. HAND of GOD or of PROVIDENCE, grasping a
26. FLAMING SWORD.

The Janus-headed figure is a common device for signifying DECEIT or HYPOCRISY; as is the CLOAK which he wears. In that, in this instance, the Puritan is shown as a DISGUISED PAPIST, this representation could be termed a REVELATORY SATIRE, not least in that this figure is intended to damn, by analogy, the modern counterparts of the rebellious sects of 1641 and 1649. The trampling on the BIBLE is a conventional instance of the ABUSE OF BOOKS; in the Index it would therefore figure twice, once under 'BIBLE; trampled on', once under ABUSE OF BOOKS. The BLOODY AXE, as is made clear in 'the mind of the Frontispiece', is an allusion to the REGICIDE of 1649. It would therefore appear twice, in its own right under 'AXE, bloody' and under 'REGICIDE (1649), alluded to obliquely: [BM] 1182 (1682)'.

II. Taking Physick; - or -The News of Shooting the King of Sweden
1. GEORGE III and
2. QUEEN CHARLOTTE, on the
3. CLOSE-STOOL, (the Index would use this term; those who looked up 'Privy' or 'Lavatory' would be referred to CLOSE-STOOL: where a different term is used within the print itself, e.g. Sawney in the Bog-House, a separate entry would obtain, with cross-references).
4. PITT, the Younger, holding a
5. PAPER, inscribed 'News from Sweden'. Behind the king on the wall are the
6. ROYAL ARMS; the
7. LION, excretes in apprehension.

3 and 7 would entail cross-references to SCATOLOGY; the title, Taking PHYSICK to MEDICAL SATIRE, PURGES and PURGING.
Proceeding print by print (in contrast to the less efficient motif-oriented iconographic searches which first prompted the idea of an Index), it will be possible to document all relevant motifs and themes. Some prints will furnish more entries than others, but all will contribute to the construction of what might, ultimately, form not only an Index to the Catalogue but a lexicon of the devices and conventions which facilitated the presentation of political ideas, arguments and political satire in print form.

As such, it may offer answers to questions which scholars of the material have yet to ask; indeed, one of the minor constraints of a project of this kind is the extent to which it is possible to anticipate the research interests and future needs of others.

Certain lines of research, I would suggest, might be facilitated by an Index in the form proposed. One is the question of iconographical and rhetorical continuity; more precisely, to what extent any such continuity should be regarded as evidence for a corresponding ideological conservatism - in the broadest sense of that word (something which Atherton appears to believe, but which Political Prints fails to address in any detail)?

Another relates to the status of 17th- and 18th-century graphic political satire and pictorial political argument as genres; often regarded as ephemera, and peripheral (or inferior) to other media for the articulation of political ideas and argument, such as pamphlets, to what extent is it possible to claim for these prints the status of a coherent, even self-sustaining, idiom? Only with a closer analysis of the language of the prints, in the broadest sense of that word, will it be possible to determine the rhetorical limitations of the print as a vehicle for political discourse. An Index of the kind envisaged would greatly facilitate comparative studies, in particular of the rhetoric - the metaphors and the visual tropes - employed in written polemic and those of
the prints. The Index as envisaged here would also assist scholars in the identification of correspondences between the verbal and visual satire of a given period; to date inadequately explored.

Providing the Catalogue to 1715 with an iconographical and rhetorical Index would counter at least two trends in political prints scholarship which this thesis has identified as unhelpful; the chronological bias against pre-1720 material, and the historical-contextual approach to the material in general which has informed its auxiliary, illustrative status as historical evidence.

In its present form, the Index is a personal project, its boundaries, its emphases and omissions a matter of individual choice. In this, or in any other form, the prospects for its being realised are poor.

That said, recent years have seen comparable endeavours in related fields. One is the ICONCLASS iconographical classification system, now computerised (belying its card-index origins), which has codified iconographic classification into a general system which may be applied to specific collections of paintings and prints; a lucid account of one such ICONCLASS-based project is Roelof van Straten's essay, 'Indexing Italian Prints with ICONCLASS' in the journal Visual Resources.

Still more relevant to the problems entailed in the construction of an Index to the B.M. Catalogue the application of new technology to the documentation and content-analysis of emblem books, to the problems entailed in both documenting and deconstructing large numbers of complex and word-dependent images in such a way as to make scholarly access to the emblem corpus easier, and subsequent scholarship more sophisticated. Here at least, there would seem to be a place for personal initiatives.

Nor would the Index be the first attempt to process political prints by content-analysis. The Lewis Walpole
Library's large collection of prints was from the first provided with a subject-index (at present an extensive card-file, although this is in the process of being transferred to computer), in addition to other, more conventional approaches to cataloguing (e.g., by artist). The LWL subject-index was the subject of an article by John Riely in the Yale University Library Gazette; 'here is the eighteenth century at one's fingertips, from "Abolition of the Slave Trade" to "Zebra"'; a file in which a 'system of categories and cross-references has resulted in some of the prints' furnishing 'as many as fifty' references. Riely describes the LWL subject-index as 'a research tool of unlimited potential not to be found anywhere else'; one which 'opens up the collection to many approaches'. While not as iconographically- or rhetorically-oriented as the Index proposed here, the LWL subject-index takes the content-analysis of prints somewhat further than George's Catalogue indices, and computerisation offers the prospect of further refinement.

On this note, it is pertinent to consider the format which the Index outlined in this chapter might take, were the project to be taken further, as this has some bearing on its potential as a research tool. Of three possible formats (computer, microfilm and conventional book) microfilm is readily discounted, as militating against the cross-referencing which is at the heart of the Index.

A computer would undoubtedly be indispensable for the construction of the Index, both for the basic storage of information and for its subsequent rearrangement and cross-referencing. Advantages of retaining a computer format (say CDROM, to which the Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue has been adapted) would include the rapidity with which searches might be prosecuted; we are here approaching something not too far removed from the identification of every German painting in which blue
cloaks appear, at the 'touch of a button', for which one art historian was seen to pine at the beginning of this chapter.

With a computer it would also be possible to call up the relevant print (or, more usefully, the relevant detail from a print). Until August 1993, I was of the opinion that, just as the Index should not replicate information contained in the Catalogue, so there was no need for the replication of the prints themselves, as the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm had made these accessible. In the course of discussing the Index with several informed North American scholars, however, it became clear that the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm is by no means as readily available as I had supposed, particularly in America. Whether this situation will change is uncertain; for the moment, access to the microfilm must not be taken for granted. It should also be recalled that the Chadwyck-Healey microfilm is by no means complete; significantly, the greater number of omissions occur in the first reels - that is, for the very period covered by the first Index, as projected.

The limited illustrative choices of the secondary literature mean that in most cases, the alternative to the microfilm is the BM Print Room. In this way, the usefulness of the Index would be limited. Having to include the image itself promises to complicate an already complicated project; that said, advances in the computerised documentation of visual images mean that the image-banks and electronic slide-libraries envisaged by the frustrated art-historians quoted at the beginning of this chapter, (dismissed by the editors as largely unrealisable) are no longer merely a thing of the future.

As scholarly research becomes increasingly computer-dominated, the likelihood of the Index taking this format is considerable. With reference to the present, however, the incomplete nature of
computerisation in libraries must be borne in mind, and I would argue in favour of producing the Index in conventional format either as complementary, or as an alternative, to electronic format.

The main consideration must be efficiency of use, and efficiency of access to the Index. The Index is designed to be used in conjunction with the relevant volumes of the Catalogue; in most cases this means bound volumes, although some libraries may have the 1978 microfilm format (this is a further argument against microfilm; using the Index in conjunction with the Catalogue would require simultaneous use of two microfilm readers; this is unlikely to endear the Index to those who consult it, nor to the library and to the other users of the library). In such cases, the microfilm Catalogue would have to be serviced by a conventional, book-format Index.

Related problems arise with a computer-based Index. In many libraries, computer terminals are over-subscribed; while it is sometimes possible to get round this by advance reservation, this, while unproblematic for those intending to use Index and Catalogue for protracted searches, must deter the scholar who wishes merely to ascertain that the subjects or persons sought were indexed; restricting the Index to a computer programme threatens to frustrate the very ease of access into the information stored in the Catalogue which it is designed to facilitate.

The structure of the index offers three options for scholars consulting it in the first instance; let us say, the scholar who wished to ascertain whether there was any reference to Oliver Cromwell in the prints between 1700-1760: i) he could simply register the existence, under 'CROMWELL, OLIVER', of numerous potentially useful prints, with, moreover, a sequence of cross-references to other potentially useful entries (for example, 'GOOD OLD CAUSE, THE') - he would then see the Index and the Catalogue as sources to which he could return at a later
stage in his researches; ii) he could record the relevant BM numbers (and any other relevant information), again with a view to consulting the Catalogue entries themselves at a later point; or iii) he could sit down, Index and Catalogue together and undertake one or more full searches. With a computer in an ordinary academic library, ii) and iii) are possible; i) is unlikely to be practicable. Yet the Index has to be open to the rapid consultation envisaged in i). For this reason, it makes sense to supplement the Index on computer with a conventional bound volume, shelved alongside the Catalogue (or available for use with the microfilm edition of the Catalogue).

A conventional format has one advantage over a computer. The scholar who called up 'CROMWELL, OLIVER' would be given that entry, and would be able to call up any other entries listed in the cross-references; but he would be unable to browse through the Index in its entirety. In this way, a computerised Index precludes the sort of serendipitous discovery which the Index otherwise might encourage.

Shelving the Index alongside the Catalogue, or making it available to those consulting the Catalogue on microfilm, would have the further advantage of alerting the novice user to its existence, who might not go to the trouble of consulting, or indeed, even be intimidated by, a computer format (between the computer-literate and the computerphobic is a great gulf fixed; this is frequently underestimated by the former). It was particularly interesting that Roelof van Straten should have eschewed computerisation for a traditional format when it came to publishing his ICONCLASS-based index to Italian prints.13

******
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With prints scholars continuing to rely on the Catalogue as the primary documentation of the material, the need to find some means by which the Catalogue might be opened up to less contextual and more analytical approaches is real and pressing. In this respect, the Index envisaged in this chapter is more than an academic exercise.

It says something of the calibre of the Catalogue as a reference work that an Index of this kind is worth contemplating, one hundred and ten years after Stephens, forty after George; it says as much of political prints scholarship and (as far as Great Britain is concerned) the institutional framework within which it has to a considerable degree operated that the prospects of such an extension of the Catalogue are poor.

The Catalogue stands as the flawed yet monumental achievement of Stephens and George, without which even the limited advances in political prints scholarship documented in this thesis must have been stillborn. There can be few more fitting ways of building upon that achievement than by an Index that would affirm the status of the Catalogue while opening it up to new approaches. As I observed in Chapter IV, without this and related efforts, the work of Stephens and George will be the tombstone, and not the foundation-stone, of political prints scholarship.

1. pp.147,103-104,51.
2. For volumes V and VI, this was for most, although not all, searches simplified by the division of the graphic output of each year between 'Political' and 'Personal' satires.
3. The Index would not have to recognise Stephens's chronology, although users would have to be alerted to this. There is no reason why the prints 'misplaced' by Stephens should not be analysed according to their real date; use of the appropriate BM number would direct the user of the Index to the relevant Catalogue entry should amplification be required. In this way, the Index would be better placed to chart variations in iconography over time, as advocated by Streicher.


For ICONCLASS, and for criticism of van Straten's project, see Jean Michel Massing, 'ICONCLASS', *Notes, PtQtly* 72-73.


10. The LWL subject-file is as much geared to the needs of the furniture scholar as the political historian, as well as being more restricted in chronological terms than the B.M. Catalogue; nonetheless, a month spent consulting the card file for categories appropriate to my more specialised Index filled over forty sides of legal-size paper with potential entry categories, e.g., 'Acts of Parliament', 'Duke of Cumberland', and so on.

11. I am particularly grateful to Dr Alan Young, Acadia University, for his helpful comments.

12. For a useful precis of recent developments see Lindsay MacDonald, 'Europe's Growing Support for Imaging in Art: Supported projects moving beyond image databases' *Computers and the History of Art* (Journal of CHArt) September 1990

13. van Straten, p.4.
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Plate to Part I, Chapter III
Plate 1. The Egg of Dutch Rebellion. Attributed to Francis Barlow. BM 1045, c. 1672. The prints produced and circulated in England in the 17th-century remain too little-known, having been largely ignored by post-George prints scholars.
Plates to Part I, Chapter IV
Plate 1. The Prospect of a Popish Successor, 1681.

EPC1 considers this and related prints to present 'a foretaste of the cartoon' [sic]; that is, they are considered not in their own right but as precursors both of the 18th-century political caricature and the modern political cartoon.
Plate 2. Qualis vir Talis Oratio ('As a man is, so is his speech') Romeyne de Hooghe. BM 1174 (1688). One of many finely-executed satires produced by de Hooghe during the dynastic conflicts of 1688-1702. For 'definitive vomit' as a satirical tactic, see Part II, Chapter VII.
Plate 3. The Double Deliverance. BM 41, 1621. An image the significance of which has been judged to reside in the print's suggesting an embryonic 'public demand for pictorial comment on political events'.
Plate 4. The Happy Instruments of England's Preservation. BM 1114, 1681. An image which calls into question the prevalent perception of 17th-century English prints as 'crude journalistic hack-work', of importance only in that they fostered a market for graphic political satire.
Plate 5. The Sucklington Faction. BM 268, 1641.

George distinguishes this print from 'the allegorical designs of the period'; it 'has an expressive realism, Hogarthian in spirit and competence. The tendency to separate the 'forward-looking' sheep from the emblematical goat is one which this and the following chapters question.
Plate 6. Vox Populi Vox Dei or the Jew Act Repealed. BM 3202, 1753. To be compared with Plate 7; as I will argue in Part II, Chapter V, the emphases of prints scholarship have tended to obscure such iconographic continuities, thereby shoring up the chronology of print 'development' which this chapter considers misleading.
Plate 7. The Loyal Toast. Gillray, 1798. One of many late 18th- and early 19th-century examples of a motif to be found in 17th- and early 18th-century prints.
Plate 9. Sawney's Defence against the Beast, Whore, Pope, and Devil &c. &c...
BM 5334 (1779). To be compared with Plate 9.
Plate 9. Apocrypha Combatants No VI: The Idol Bel and the Dragon's Tour to the North. BM 15579 (1828).

One of a series of eighteen prints occasioned by a dispute within the Church of Scotland.
Plate 10. Fireworks Celebrating the Coronation of the Prince and Princess of Orange as King and Queen of England, 1689. Distinguished by extensive and sophisticated contemporary hand-colouring superior to much of the hand-colouring found on satires of the so-called 'golden age'.
Plate 11. Woodcut to the satirical pamphlet, *Fox against Fox* (1788). BM 7395. Woodcut continued to be used for political images, including satires, throughout the 18th century, particularly in works of a cheaper nature. These, as Chapter VIII below will observe, have scarcely impinged on the Gillray-and-Rowlandson oriented studies of scholars in the field.
A Purge for Pluralities, shewing the unlawfulness of men to have two Livings.

Or

The Downe-fall of Double Benefices.

Being in the Clymactericall and fatal yeare of the proud Prelates.

But the yeare of Imbitter to all poore hunger-pinched Schollers.

London,

Plate 12. A Purge for Pluralities, shewing the unlawfulness of men to have two Livings. BM 323, 1642.
Plate 13. The Pluralist. BM 2617 (1744). As a graphic encapsulation of a phenomenon - pluralism - this print differs little from that of the previous century; that it falls on the right side of 1720 cannot give it greater validity than the older print.
Plates to Part I, Chapter V
Plate 1. The Pillars of the State, Townshend, 1756. BM 3371. One of 'the first political caricatures, Townshend nonetheless employs the pre-caricatural tactic of representing men as animals in the case of Henry Fox. In 1690, Sir Thomas Browne had written 'when men's features are drawn with resemblance to some other animals, the Italians call it to be drawn in caricature'; this is a form of representation which survives the introduction of caricature in the sense of the 'portrait charge'.
Plate 2. Idol Worship or the Way to Preferment, 1740. BM 2447. Atherton considers the difference between this type of *ad hominem* graphic political satire - satire by association (the inscriptions allude to Cardinal Wolsey) - and the true caricature to be 'theoretically fundamental'. In this print, the subject of the satire - Walpole - is identifiable by verbal more than by visual means.
Plate 3. Some of Ye Principal Inhabitants of ye Moon (also known as Royalty Episcopacy Law), Hogarth, 1724/5. BM 1734. An uncompromisingly emblematic or, as George describes it, 'hieroglyphic' print from the hand of 'Hogarth the caricaturist', also known as 'the father of English caricature'.
Plate 4. Characters and Caricaturas. BM 2591, 1743.

One of several works in which Hogarth attempted to articulate a distinction between his own work and caricature; attempts which later commentators have chosen to ignore or to qualify.
Plate 5. The Motion, 1741. BM 2479. A 'forward-looking' print, in Langford's words, which eschews allegory for realism and 'careful character studies of individuals'. It is an example of that praiseworthy phenomenon, the 'proto-caricature'.
Plate 6. The Apparition, 'HB' (John Doyle), 1829.

'HB' is alleged to have eschewed facial caricature in the Gilray mode for 'representational likeness', which accounts in part for the low esteem in which his work has conventionally been held. In fact, the facial characterisation in this and other prints is superior to that of many of the so-called 'caricaturists' of the so-called 'Golden Age'.
Plate 7. America to her mistaken Mother. BM 5475, 1778. The rebus, or pictographic print is a non-caricatural idiom of graphic political satire which has been almost wholly neglected by print scholars.
Plate 8. Frontispiece to The Temple of Imposture.

BM 5495, 1778. An emblematical attack on Methodism.
Plate 9. The Free Regency, 1789. BM 7487. A pro-Prince of Wales print, neither the Prince nor his supporters are caricatured, but the figure of Pitt, being led away (1) suggests that this was less a deliberate partisan gesture than the consequence of the inadequacies as a caricaturist of the artist.
Plate 10. The Triumph of Liberty, 1789. BM 7496. A print in which a greater effort has been made to caricature Pitt and his supporters; in contrast, the Prince and his supporters are so idealised as to be almost unrecognisable. Note also that such 'caricature' as there is in this print is secondary to the larger allegory, which differs little from that of prints of the 1680s.
Plate 11. *The English Regency*, 1789. BM 7485. In this print, dating from the so-called 'Golden Age of English Caricature', Pitt (on the throne) and the Prince of Wales are all but indistinguishable; the satirical distortion of caricature is reserved for the stereotypical foreign ambassadors.
Plate 12. The Captive prince - or - Liberty Run Mad, 1782. BM 5979. An example of the joining of well-characterised but scarcely caricatured heads onto undifferentiated bodies. Note the extremely poor 'caricature' of George III and the characterisation of Charles James Fox by a fox's head, twenty-six years after The Pillars of the State; arguably this fox's head does not even achieve the degree of inverted anthropomorphism of the earlier print.
Plate 13. The Protestant Grind-Stone, 1690. BM 1255. The facial characterisation of William of Orange ('King') is arguably superior to that achieved by the so-called 'caricaturists' of Plates 9, 10 and 11 a century later.
Plate 14. *Bob Ferguson or The Raree Shew*, 1685. BM 1142. George cites the failure of 'caricaturists' to exploit the physical appearance of Titus Oates as evidence of the 'undeveloped' nature of English caricature at this period. On the evidence of this and the following plate, among others, I would disagree.
Plate 15. *A Popish Whigg*, 1685. BM 1141. Note also the use of mezzotint for a satirical image, *pace* David Alexander and others.
Canterbury's Tooles:

Or,

Instruments wherewith he hath effected many rare feats, and egregious exploits, as is very well known, and notoriously manifest to all men.

Discovering his projects and policies, and the ends and purposes of the Prelates in effecting their facino-

rous actions and enterprises.

EZEKIEL 34:6,10.

My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill: yea my flock, was scattered upon all the face of the earth, & none did search or seek after them. Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require my flock, at their hand, and cause them to cast from feeding the flock, neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more: for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them.

Printed in the yeere, when Prelates fall is neere. 1641.

Plate 16. Canterbury's Tooles, 1641. BM . A print which attempts to approximate to the physical resemblance of Archbishop Laud.
THE
FULL VIEW
OF
Canterburies fall,
From POP deliver us all.

Grace, and no grace,
Hash wrought thy disgrace.

Plate 17. The Full View of Canterburies Fall, 1645.
Plate 18. Great was surnam'd Gregorie of Rome. BM 412, 1645. An ad hominem satire on Archbishop Laud in which an effort has been made to characterise the protagonists by their facial features.
Plate 20. A Description of the Calve's Head Club, 1707. BM 1517. The upward-turned eyes, lank, undressed hair and miserable expression of the five figures facing the spectator are stock characterisations of the 'factions' and 'hypocritical' Dissenter in prints throughout the 18th century.
Plate 21. The Vulture of the Constitution, Gillray, 1789. BM 7478. Gillray's ability to translate issues into images - to which his skill as a caricaturist was in some respects incidental - is demonstrated in this visualisation of Pitt and the personal ambitions alleged to underlie his attempts to restrict the powers of the Prince of Wales in the event of a Regency.
Plate 22. An Excrecence; a Fungus; alias a Toadstool upon a Dunghill, Gillray, 1791. BM 7936. Gillray’s ability to translate the facial features of his victims was, arguably, unrivalled; informed by a similar vision of Pitt as that of Plate 21, in this print, the caricature dominates the conceit.
Plate 23. **Camera-Obscura**. BM 7314, 1788. A parodic response to a print by James Sayers, purporting to be by Sayers; the distinctive manner of facial caricature of the king and queen and the Lord Chancellor, bottom right, when set against BM 7313, betrays Gillray’s hand.
Plate 24. Anti-Saccharites, or John Bull and his Family leaving off the use of Sugar. BM 8074, 1792.

While one should be cautious in ascribing to these prints effects which can never be quantified, there is a real sense in which our mental images of George III have been influenced by Gillray's interpretation of that monarch.
Plate 25. Taking Physick: - or - the News of Shooting the King of Sweden. BM 8080, 1792. Another print in which caricature attains the level of super-characterisation.
Plate 26. The Hanoverian Horse and British Lion. Rowlandson. BM 6476, 1784. A print which demonstrates Rowlandson's limitations as a caricaturist, most noticeably in his handling of Pitt.
Plate 27. Suitable Restrictions. Rowlandson. BM 7497 (1789). Note the poor characterisation of Pitt and, especially, the Prince of Wales.
Plate 28. John Bull bother'd: - or - the Geese alarming the Capitol, Gillray, 1792. BM 8141.
Plate 29. The Times, Rowlandson, 1788. BM 7386. Rowlandson the caricaturist. As with Plate 10, the seemingly unironic recourse to the sort of large allegorical composition allegedly outmoded by the adoption of caricature, is worth remarking.
Plate 30. A Voluptuary under the horrors of Digestion. BM 8112, 1792. Arguably the definitive image of the Prince of Wales, visibly beginning to degenerate into the grotesque figure of the later regent. Gillray's use of facial caricature is sparing; the eye is directed to the swelling stomach and the detritus of excess around the Prince before turning to the face.
Plate 31. Britannia Roused or the Coalition Monsters Destroyed. Rowlandson, BM 6403, 1784.
Plate 32. Carlo Khan's Triumphant Entry into Leadenhall Street, Sayers, 1783. BM 6276. Sayers effects the sort of physiognomic translation of the features of Lord North which, like Gillray's essays in caricature, realised the idiom's potential, but which was in fact rare in the so-called 'Golden Age'.
Plate 33. Princely Predilections. 1812. George Cruikshank captures the Prince Regent with as much skill as Gillray captured the younger Prince of Wales; arguably few if any of the contemporaries of either artist attained this level of skill in caricature.
Plate 34. 'Qualification' from The Queen's Matrimonial Ladder 1820. If Gillray's Prinny as Voluptuary left the face almost uncaricatured, George Cruikshank's George IV is a bitter caricature which creates the face of an ageing satyr.
Plate 35. **R---l Hobbies!!!** 1819. Here George Cruikshank shows that he can combine skilled facial caricature with graphic satiric invention, using a current craze, the velocipede, as his starting-point.
Plate 36  A Transfer of East India Stock. Sayers, BM 6271, 1783.

Note the use of labelled papers 'List of Directors' et cetera which identify the subject of the satire.
Plate 37. The Modern Egbert, Rowlandson, 1789. BM 7479. A print in which the satire derives from the words in the speech balloons and the other inscriptions, rather than from the (limited) use of caricature. For the place of the verbal in the 'reading-structures' of graphic satire, see Part II, Chapter VI.
Plate 38. Dun-Shaw, 1788. RM. A potentate in plaid; approximations to tartan were consistently used to denote Scottish antecedents or connexions; in this case to denote that the figure depicted is Henry Dundas, Pitt's Scottish manager.
Plate 39. Guess att my Meaning. 1709. BM 1503. A satire in which Hoadly is identified not by facial caricature but by, among other things, the crutches resting against his desk.
Plate 40. The Loaded Boot or Scotch preferment in Motion, 1762. BM 3911.
Plate 41. The Scotch Broomstick & the Female Besom.

By 1762, an example of identification by costume and by metonymic objects, in this case the jack-boot, a pun on Bute. Described by Bardwell.
Plate 42. The Bed-foot. 1762. A print in which the protagonists scarcely figure, but are identified by symbolic objects.
Plate 43. An EXCISEMAN made out of ye Necessaries of Life now Tax'd in Great Britain except the head which is a Knave's taken from ye Court Cards. BM 4015, 1763. A non-caricatural satirical representation of Bute.
Plate 44. The Free-Born Briton or a Perspective of Taxation, Dent, 1786. BM 6914.
Plate 45. The Patenty. Hollar, 1640. BM 264. The figure constructed out of pertinent items survives the adoption of caricature in the late 18th century.
Plate 46. The Lord of the Vineyard, Gillray, 1783. BM 6204. Like Townshend's depiction of Henry Fox, Gillray's depiction of Fox's son with a fox's head includes the bushy eyebrows by which both men were characterised; in this sense, their interpretations come close to caricature. In other hands, the device was no more than a convenient visual-verbal pun.
Plate 47. The Dog Tax, Gillray, 1796. BM 8794. The reverse of Plate 46; caricatured heads on animal bodies.
Plate 48. To be seen at Mr Sheridan's Menagerie, the Wonderful Learned Han---r Colt, who writes a Letter Blindfolded, Sayers, 1789. BM 7493. In this print and to a lesser extent in Plate 49, the animal transformation of the Prince of Wales as the White Horse of Hanover (note the Prince of Wales feathers in his mane) carries the satire better than a straightforward caricature would have done.
Plate 49. A Mis-fire at the Constitution, Sayers, 1789. BM 7483. The 'Hanover Colt' - i.e., the Prince of Wales - becomes the stalking-horse of opposition politicians.
Plate 50. Parliamentary Personalities. BM 7154, 1787. At no time did graphic political satirists abandon the convention of portraying their subjects in animal form, as this rather ugly and disturbing image shows.
Plate 51. The King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver.
1803.
Plate 52. A Demosthenean Attitude. BM 7644, 1790.

Charles James Fox, scarcely caricatured.
Plate 53. The Mask. BM 6234, 1783. A striking caricature by Sayers, this nonetheless draws on a much older convention of graphic satire; for example the central figure in BM 319, 1642, reproduced as plate 8 in EPC1.
Plate 54. The Claims of the Broad Bottom. BM 3579, 1743. The naturalistic representation of politicians in a dramatised imaginary 'scene', with the protagonists identifiable by their words pre-dates the introduction of facial caricature. The various verbal identifications (labelled papers *et cetera*), on the other hand, survive the adoption of the idiom which is sometimes alleged to have made them redundant.
Plate 55. Britannia's Support or the Conspirators Defeated, Rowlandson, 1789. BM 7503. Allegorical compositions and in particular the use of personifications, survived the adoption of caricature.
Plate 56. Carlo everso missus succurrere seco. BM 1130, 1684. The frontispiece to Edward Pettit's Visions of Government, wherein the Antimonarchical Principles and Practices of all Fanatical Commonwealths men and Jesuitical Politicians are discovered, confuted and exposed.
Plate 57. Needs must when the Devil drives: or An Emblem of what we must expect if High-Church gets the uppermost. BM 1496 (1709). Hailed as a 'proto-caricature', the 1740 print The Motion in fact differs little from this 'emblem' and the high-church riposte BM 1497.
Plate 58. Tale of a Tub - 'Every Man has his PRICE!', 1791. BM 7822. A hybrid of facial caricature and satire by association with inanimate objects, in this case the tub, an attempt to associate Price with the fanatics of the 1640s and 1650s.
Plate 59a. Robin's Flight or ye Ghost of a late S-S-Treasurer ferry'd into Hell; alias conveyed to Antwerp, 1721. The depiction of Walpole's posthumous career was only the latest instance of a conceit common to literary and visual satire; as here. Earlier victims included the Earl of Strafford [BM 197 (1640)] and Archbishop Laud [BM 420 (1645)]. Compare with 59b.
Plate 59b. Charon's-Boat. - or - the Ghosts of "all the Talents" taking their last voyage. Gillray, 1807. The 'arrival in Hell' remained a popular conceit for graphic satirists. Waiting on the shore are Charles James Fox (d.1806), Oliver Cromwell and Robespierre.
Plate 60. The Mirror of Patriotism. BM 6380, 1784.

Acknowledged by its victim to have been a particularly pointed and emotive satire, it is one in which we do not see the victim's face; strictly speaking, this cannot be termed a 'caricature' of Fox.
Plate 61. The Tomb-Stone, Benjamin Wilson, 1766. BM 4124. Just as facial caricature involved the selection and refinement of characteristic features into a physiognomic and satirical 'shorthand' which, by frequent use, ensured recognition of the caricaturist's target, so the repeated use of non-caricatural 'signifiers', in this case a blank face, could serve a similar purpose.
Plate 62. The Stature of a Great Man or the English Colossus. BM 2458, 1740. Were the face to have been completely blank or the figure viewed from behind, contemporaries could reasonably have been expected to identify the 'Great Man', not least by his sash.
Plate 63. Billy Lackbeard and Charley Blackbeard playing at Football. 1784. The title itself is suggestive of how caricature, so far from augmenting the political insight of the graphic satirist, encouraged simplistic contrasts on the grounds of physical appearance; a focus on personalities rather than issues - in this case the autonomy of the East India Company, at which the rather limited 'football' conceit hints.
Plate 64. The New Peerage or Fountain of Honor.
Dent, 1787. The fact that so many of the B.M.'s prints have mss. identifications has perhaps obscured the fact that in the absence of such 'keys', the identification of caricatured figures would have been dependent upon familiarity with the appearance of the original. It will be noted that the figure of Dundas employs a more accessible 'key' in the form of his plaid costume.
Plates to Part I, Chapter VI
Plate 1. Syons Calamitye or Englands Miserye Hieroglyphically Delineated. 1643. An emblematic political print of unusual compartmental design, the unfamiliar ‘reading structures’ of the emblematic, together with the extensive use of Latin mottos have alienated political prints scholars from such prints, leaving this tradition of representation unexplored.
To the Author

upon his

FRONTIS-PIECE.

Eagle, who e'er thou art; is it a prize
Not worth thy wing; shall eagles loop at flies?
True; they have blown thy prey; but, in thy stead,
The vulgar fly, flapping might have stuck them dead.
But they have sported with the flame of Kings!
That very flame would soon have burnt their wings:
If not; Arachne, in her watchful seat,
As sure as Greg's hand, had done the feat.
But 'tis too late: some honour it will be,
Above their merits, to be crush'd by thee.
Plate 4. The Royall Oake of Britayne. BM 737, 1649.
The Explanation of the EMBLEME.

Pondensbus genue exu man, factiup, gravatut, Vexa ternuda cresce. Balsa at Depressa, refugia.

As: velut unidarum Fluscula Ventiis, soleraem Erum. Papuul Rupes immota repoles.

Clanor e tenebris, vestfia Stella, exempla. Videntur aternam-selles esse triumpho.

Tune Fugentiem ruinae gemmis, misantem.

At sunt Gravidae tennundis calco Coronam.

Spinciam, a fers facilem, qua Spes mea. Christo.

Amoris. Nisi non eis tractare molestum.

Quaerint, sine fiduci, timendo-beatam.

In Colos scule Specto. Nobis, paratem.

Quo Venum et Irum quod Christi Gratia producit.

Tus est, id est Christo. Atque Deus et deus.

Plate 5. Frontispiece to Eikon Basilike (1649). One of the few emblematic political images familiar to the layman, this quintessentially emblematic images has nonetheless attracted more attention from literary scholars (Potter, 1989) than it has from prints scholars for whom it represents a tradition abandoned as the political print 'developed'.

Plate 6. A Roman soldier offering the crown of thorns.
Archontas summus inter faelices OLIVE,
Primus OLIVARI nomen et omen habes.

Plate 6. Parallelum Olivae, nec non Olivarii
Serenissimi, Celissimi, Potentissimique Angliae,
Scotiae, Hiberniae. Dei Gratia Protectoris, &c.
Faithorne, 1656.
Plate 7. The Embleme of England's Distractions As also of her attained, and further expected Freedome, & Happines Per H.M. 1658. 1658.
Plate 8. Britània. BM 1122, 1682. Frontispiece to volume I of J. Nalson's Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the year 1639 to the Murther of King Charles I.
An Answer to the Liveing Man's Elegy.

Foul Monster thou who thinkst thou hast improved Thy talent when thy Guilty hand first mov'd To paint with all thy cunning spitefull art The black and gnawing rancour of thy heart And write an Elegy for him whose name Were he now dead thy verse could not defame Alas false brother we know thou canst not hurt us When good men dye vivit post Funeravirtus.

Plate 10. An Answer to the Liveing Man's Elegy.
1710, BM 1545. A good example of the satirical application of emblematic forms and structures.
Plate 11. The Church Catholick. BM 1997, B.L. 480, d. 12, 1733.
Plate 12. Frontispiece to The Life and death of Pierce Gaveston. BM 2462, 1740. For the motif of the disembodied arm, see Scholtz, 'Ownerless arms and legs stretching from the sky: notes on an emblematic motif'.
Plate 13. *Vox Populi Vox Dei* or the Jew Act Repealed. 1753. A print which not only has much in common iconographically with emblems, but which retains the tripartite structure of motto, icon (the image) and subscript (which elaborates on the truth or point established in the motto, and amplified in the icon) of the emblem form.
Plate 14. The Tree of Life. c.1770; a variant of a print of 1760. As well as retaining its currency for political prints and satires, the emblematic remained a viable idiom for non-political prints, such as this Methodist print.
Plates to Part I, Chapter VII
Plate 1. Woodcuts illustrating a procession celebrating the failure of the '15. BM 1607, 1717. Far from being 'crude', these carefully-engraved images are clear and attractive.
Plate 2. The Egg of Dutch Rebellion. Attributed to Francis Barlow. BM 1045, c.1672. This print has been cited by prints scholars as the exception to a dull and ineptly-engraved rule. Arguably the pictorial shortcomings of 17th-century English prints have been exaggerated; certainly their neglect has allowed scholars to underestimate their satirical and iconographic significance.
Plate 3. Burke on the Sublime & Beautiful. BM 6788 (1785). A print by James Sayers, who has a distinctive and far from unattractive style, but who has conventionally been dismissed as a poor draughtsman.
Plate 4. The Great Council of Rome. Romeyn de Hooghe, c.1689. BM 1219. The strong draughtsmanship and imaginative conception are characteristic of this artist.
Plate 5: Dr Dorislaw Ghost. 1652. BM 837.

This image disregards conventional representational temporal and spatial relationships, but this is no reason for marginalising it and others like it; it is certainly far from being crude or inept.
Plate 6. The happy Instruments of Englands Preservation. BM 1114 (1681). A far from crude, inept or amateurish print, in draughtsmanship, conception and execution, but 'crude', 'inept' and 'amateurish' are the terms conventionally employed with reference to English prints of this period.
Plate 7. *Britañia*, 1682. BM 1122. Another 17th-century print which challenges the conventional picture of the period as one of 'poor artistic quality'.
To the unknown AUTHOR of the
HIGH CHURCH CHAMPION.
and his two seconds.

Plate B. To the unknown author of the High Church Champion, 1710. BM 1501. Again, a far from crudely-executed or ineptly-conceived print.
Plate 9. *Perdito and Perdita or the Man & Woman of the People*, 1782. That the political print improved in 'artistic quality' over the 18th century is accepted without question by those who have written about this material. This conveniently ignores the many images which are far from supporting this thesis, such as this crude caricature of Charles James Fox.
Plate 10. The Man of Moderation, 1784. BM 6422. A lively and original print, but hardly distinguished by its draughtsmanship.
Plate 11. Parliamentary Personalities, 1787. BM 7154. Another print from the so-called 'Golden Age of English Caricature' which belies the alleged improvement in artistic quality associated with these decades.
Plate 12. The Opening of St Stephen's Chapel for the Present Season, 1787. BM 7130. If any print merits the epithets 'childish', 'crude' and 'scratchy' it is this design.
Plate 13. *The Competitors*, 1788. BM 7382. It may be more simplistic in theme, but this print is hardly more 'sophisticated' in design than, for instance, Plates 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8.
Plate 14. The Late P-m-r M-n-r, 1743. 'The close-up of the face awaited Gillray and his generation ...'
Plate 16. The Apotheosis of Hoche, 1798. 'Crowded and suffocating' to 'the modern eye', according to David Low. To what extent are 17th- and 18th-century political prints being seen through uncompromisingly 'modern' eyes?
Plate 17. *Phaeton Alarm'd!*, 1808. Gillray. It is not only 'early' prints which have been measured by anachronistic aesthetic criteria and found wanting; Gillray's prints have been judged 'involved' and 'over-complicated' by later commentators.
Plate 18. The Pillars of the State, 1756.

Townshend. BM 3371. Atherton writes of the figures of Newcastle and Fox as 'crowding' this design; in fact, it is as sparse as any modern commentator might wish.
The Farewell Address to the Loaves and Fishes.

Me dear little Loaves, and my sweet little Fishes, You're appear'd to my view, you have come to my wish, I have long been without you, I've long been with you, To lay hold of the tail of a dear little Fish Such a mass of corruption so long did prevail, I could not finger a head nor a tail; So attempting ill did things turn about, I could not get in, so of course I was OUT, My splendid Grations could never once hit, They were lost in a yawning open-mouth'd PIT, No hope of success was likely to be, My Rhetoric was just like snow in the sun, But I'll think of my good stars when no longer oppose'd, For so it fell out that the PIT it was closed, And I found by my sense to be clear on that score, For the PIT being shut, ... could fall in it no more, So from this great EPOCH my Joy did begin, This thing falling out, ... it made me FALL IN, I soon was call'd forth, with honour and grace, And instead of a PIT, I fell into PLACE, Happy in this conclusion however, To be fortunate late, it is better than never, I wanted no Youth to complete all my wishes, I found myself swimming so much among Fishes, Whose sparkling scales did a heaven unfold, All spangled with scarlet, with green, and with gold, So sweet, such enchanting and delicate things, no rarer, they are only treasure'd by Kings, Such pleasure can last but a few fleeting hours, And our bliss not resemble the blossom of flowers, Or like the bright Rainbow that bends in the sky, Mired its own colours that instant will die, Or like the loud Thunder tremendous roar, You view the bright flash ... and you see it no more, No man is so great, but sooner or later, Must yield to the pressing decrees of his fate, No electors are made in the grave, Between the fell Tyrant, the Lord and the Slave, No difference whatever when once a man's gone, 'Tween the Cabinet feaster and those that's had none, Adieu then ye Joys of a Cabinet feast, Where there's sure to be something delicious to eat, Surlousing around the various Tables, and Fishes, I must take my leave of the many ODD FISHES, When warming with zeal I hereby declare it, Fights, and contests, in terms of Claret, Contending this way we've had many hard goes, The Holders and Tailors alone feel the blows, The fishling class goes absolutely round.

We have felt that the Joys of the Nation abound, Those meetings EMBRACE where we had all our wishes, Our final adieu to the LOAVES and the FISHES, Some boldly assert that I am to blame, That for LOAVES and for FISHES I've harbored my waste, That our butteries of late have encrease every hour, GREAT TAKES been doubled since I've been in power, But it known to all men when I am at rest, That what I've projected was done for the best, For much has been done, and more to do yet, To drag our poor Country out of a DEEP PIT, In doing of which all our tacle of late, Has been hung with the opposite pillars of state, With so much in hand, our necessities wax, It was therefore desired to go on with the Tares, 'Tis a very bad time for the butteries to cease, For I've learnt'd to give to all mankind a PEACE, I exerted the utmost in this NOBLE strife, And my order is only extinguish'd with life, The butteries of Tares a glorious vacation, But yet it is all for the good of the Nation, The task is a nice one, I feel if I own, To please both the people, and pamper the Crown, To keep in his Place, a Stademon in office, And forced to yield to the will of his better, It is so at COURT, he is wrong, or he's right, A Courtier will and ... if he said black is white, A different opinion the' only in looks, May lead to a CAUSE to be SCRATCHED OFF THE BOOKS, As this is the case no Courtier will fall, To lay hold of the Head instead of the Tail, I was call'd OPPOSITION, but I find it's a fact, That the name of a man may be change'd by an ACT, In many high cases a silence is best, If we fly direct East, we do not go West, Most to the press in« decrees of his fate, Tho' of senses most aseen andtend, The moment of reves must soon understand, If we sail from the shore, we are not upon Land, Moreover it is very clear to the view, If we're doing of one thing, we cannot do two, Rott to speak the whole out, without any more prose, If we stand high in office, NOW CAN WE OFFER, As I meant not to carry my words to excess, Once more, and then I must end my Address, Also I regret my career is soon run, And my power is ended, as soon as begun, I am sorry without ending the strife, The work is done ... yet seeds from this life, Could I live to enjoy you, my little gold Trout, I am sure with your beauties I'd never fall out.

Plate 19. The Farewell Address to the Loaves and Fishes, 1806. BM 10598. 'Enormous legends covering half the picture'; the modern commentator would prefer to see prints with little or any textual element. This anti-Fox broadside, released on his death in 1806, is of particular interest in that it confirms that the long texts condemned in 'early' prints persisted over the 'Golden Age'.
Plate 20. The Effects of a New Administration or Civil and Religious Liberties in Danger!!!, 1827.
Robert Cruikshank. BM 15398. 'Balloons full of writing coming from the mouths of the figures...'
Recourse to speech balloons, deplored by the modern critics of these prints, does not, as several accounts suggest, diminish over the period of the 'Golden Age'.
Plate 21. The Wonderful Word-Eater, Lately arrived from Abroad &c. BM 7390 (1788). The 'verbiage' of earlier graphic satire shows no sign of diminishing over the second half of the century, as this quintessentially verbal graphic satire shows.
Plate 22. A Solemn League and Covenant, for Reformation, 1643. A print in which the ratio between image and text would encourage modern commentators to dismiss it altogether. In order to establish the significance of such prints, the anachronistic aesthetic criteria which have prevailed to date must be abandoned. Indeed, a print of this kind raises questions about the relevance of the concept of 'artistic merit' in the study of political prints.
Plate 23. The Prospect of a Popish Successor. 1680.

Such enigmatic configurations of separate images are a form of pictorial argument which has fallen foul of modernist aesthetics as deployed in the evaluation of 17th- and 18th-century political prints.
Plates to Part I, Chapter VIII
Plate 1. Subscription ticket for *Four Scenes of an Election*, and a panegyric on Parliament for passing the legislation against print piracy commonly associated with Hogarth's name (1755). The implications of that legislation for graphic political satire sit uneasily with the still-current picture of Hogarth as a graphic populist.
Plate 2: Temperance enjoying a Frugal Meal. Gillray, 1792. A print which typifies the large, expensive, hand-coloured etching of the 'Golden Age' for which the term 'popular' is inappropriate.
Plate 3: One of the Penny Political Prints, woodcuts by Charles Jameson Grant (fl. 1831-46). Prints of this kind may merit the epithet 'popular' but, unlike the Gillray print [Plate 2], they are seldom reproduced and have yet to be studied in their own right.
Plate 4: *Very Slippy Weather*. Gillray, 1808. The window of Mrs Humphrey's print shop, 27 St James's Street. Although the printshop window is cited as the main source of plebeian exposure to prints of the quality of Plate 2, there is little reason to believe that prints of this kind would have been viewed in this fashion other than by a limited number of Londoners.
Plate 6: Good Humour. 1829. The printshop of Thomas McLean, Haymarket. The Duke of Wellington joins the pavement spectators; such images have for too long served to obscure the limits of contemporary exposure to political prints.
Plate 7: Honi Soit Qui Mal Y Pense. 1821. A far from plebeian-looking crowd before the window of what was by that date George Humphrey's printshop.
Plates to Part I, Chapter IX
Plate 1. Royalty, Episcopacy, Law [Some of the Principal Inhabitants of ye Moon]. BM 1734 (1724).
Plate 2. The Bench. Hogarth, 1758. The somnolence, if not total inertia, of Hanoverian England is a recurrent emphasis of the context of the development of graphic political satire preferred by prints scholars.
Plate 3. Great Britain and Ireland's Yawn. George Bickham the Younger. BM 2607 (11 October 1743, reissued on 3 December as The Late P---m---r M-n----r). Described by Langford (Robinocracy, p.252) as 'a retrospective judgement on the nature of Walpole's rule', it is a judgement accepted by prints scholars and which has informed the political context of the post-1720, pre-1760 development of graphic political satire.
Plate 4. **Treason!!!**. Richard Newton. BM 9188 (1798). Rude because repressed? Press has posited an association between incivility and insecurity in criticism as a characteristic of this 'stage' of the political print's 'development' which favoured the use of scatological imagery.
A Petitioning Remonstrating Reforming Republican.

YOUR PETITIONER SHEWETH,
That he Humbly wishes to
Reduce the Church to Gospel Order
By Rape, Sacrilege & Murder
To make Prestige supreme
8 Kings themselves submit to

is not content all this to do
He must have wealth & Honor too
or else with Blood & Resolution
He'll tear it out of the heart of the

Publication May 1790

Plate 5. A Petitioning Remonstrating Reforming Republican. BM 5665 (1780). As this anti-'radical' satire shows, eutological imagery was not restricted to 'radical' satires.
Plate 6. Massacre at St Peter's or Britons Strike Home"!!! George Cruikshank, 1819. A staple of history textbooks as well as of print compilations on 'the art of satire and social criticism'.
Plate 8. Poor Bull and his Burden. George Cruikshank. BM 13288 (1819). Certainly Poor Bull is one of the most overworked images in the corpus.
Plate 9. The Sleeping Congregation. BM 2285 (1736).

More yawns; perhaps the stock image of the 'torpor' of 18th-century Anglicanism. Hogarth’s apparent antipathy towards the Church found expression in this and other prints which have been eagerly seized upon by historians anxious to affirm this conventional and partial view of the Church in this period.
Plate 10. Parsons Drowning Care. Richard Newton. 1796. The popular image of the 18th-century parson as an idle glutton or drunkard is an enduring one, and one fostered by the compilers of print 'histories' of the period. Newton has been hailed as a 'neglected genius' of English caricature; in contrast, the staunchly Anglican Sayers (see Plate 12) remains underrated.
Plate 11. The Pluralist. BM 2618 (also 2617)

(1744). A favourite image for asserting the worldliness of the 18th-century Church.
Plate 12. The Repeal of the Test Act - A Vision.
James Sayers, BM 7628 (1790). Far less familiar than prints such as The Sleeping Congregation, George notes (Catalogue: BM 10374) Sayers's 'fanatical fear of Dissenters'; I have suggested that Sayers's consistent anti-opposition and anti-dissenting position may have coloured the criticism of his prints on aesthetic grounds.
Plate 13. The Test. Rowlandson? BM 7629 (1790). The destruction of the Church of England by descendants of 17th-century sectaries; this print appears 'tongue-in-cheek' where Sayer's satire is 'in deadly earnest', but both satires invoke an association of dissent with the subversion and republicanism of 1640-60 which was common to graphic satire throughout the 18th century (see Plate 17).
Plate 14. Meeting of Dissenters Religious and Political 1790. Dent. BM 7630 (1790). A print which identifies Fox's motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts with earlier republicanism and the destruction of the Church of England. Fox is accused of irreligious pragmatism, his dissenting allies of more sinister ambition; 'if we get a repeal and become equal we'll not rest till we are Superior'.
Plate 15. **Augustus Anglicus. c.1660.** A polemical image, representative of a whole body of political prints which have been marginalised by the narrow concerns of scholarship in this field to date and in particular by the association of the genre with the subversion as opposed to the justification of authority in Church and State.
THE UNFEIGNED RESPECT OF AN ENGLISH TORY, TO THE QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Bright Queen, the I no Robes nor Coronet wear; 
Nor Grandure have, to fit me to appear; 
For so much Brightness, as adorns the place, 
Can none, by Virtues, Queen, are placed to grace.

I boast no Pageantry, nor Gawdy Show; 
Or Glittering Pomp, I no Court exhibitions know; 
Nor can I tell the way, or manner how, 
In Ceremonious form to reach to bow;

When I approach the presence of my Queen, 
Yet Potent Madam, I as well do mean, 
As the Court Stars, whose Light shine from You, 
And are without reserve, entirely true;

Say Goddess mate, and teach me how to raise; 
Some Noble Strain, to sound my Sovereign praise; 
Had matchless Princess, o that I could give; 
A Name to fit the Brightness, as I love;

I would extend thee, higher far than Fame;

Eric Cripplet her Wings, I would applaud the Name
In such a Sound, as Britain Ear never heard;
Thou Great Elizabeth, admired and Feared;
By thy Auspicious Sings, we only live;
The sunshine of thy Favour, blessings give;
Worst not for Thee, how would the unruly root;

Of Oliverian Tyranny, springing up,
And trample all thy Children Under feet;
Bless'd be the happy hour, that heard thee name
Thy Country's Parent as thou wert Proclaim'd;
The well pleased powers of heav'n began to pour;
Their blessings down, and still are heaping more;
O may this late renowned deed you've done;
Meet with Success, may every Time Son;

Of the New Parliament, applaud thy glory;
And boast the being, an honest hearted Tory.

Sold by SuttonNickolls against George Inn in Aldersgate Street, and by Mr. Dring next door to the Lege Tavern in Fleet Street against White Freres gate. LONDON.

Plate 16. The Unfeigned Respect of An English Tory to the Queen of Great Britain. BM 1547, 1710. A far from 'radical' or 'subversive' use of the graphic medium.
Plate 17. London Corresponding Society, alarm'd. BM 9202 (1798). A nightmare vision of sub-human revolutionaries. To what extent these and similar images by Gillray were 'ironic' continues to be disputed. Note, among the criminal and plebeian appellations given the delegates (listed on the open book), 'Dissenting Nick'.
Plate 18. The Tree of Liberty, - with the Devil tempting John Bull. Gillray, 1798. There is no evidence that Gillray's hostility towards the Foxite Whigs in this period was anything other than sincere, although much has been made of his small government pension.
Plate 19. The Hopes of the Party, prior to July 14th.

Gillray’s delineation of the ambitions of the Foxite Whigs and their plebeian allies extends to a criticism of the king, who is depicted as passive and uncomprehending.

BM 7892 (1791).
Plate 21. John Wilkes, Esqr. BM 4050 (1763). An 'error of judgement' on Hogarth's part which prints scholars have conventionally depredated, suggesting on their part an unconscious association of graphic satire with the 'right', i.e. anti-authoritarian or anti-ministerial side in any conflict. It is often forgotten that Wilkes himself is on record as seeking precisely this sort of graphic publicity.
"THE RIGHTS OF MAN" or "Tommy Paine, the little American, Taylor, taking the Measure of the Crown, for a new pair of Revolution Breeches."

Plate 22. The Rights of Man. BM 7867 (1791)
Plate 23. **Taking Physick. BM 8080 (1792).** A good example of the way in which so far from 'dehumanising' its victims, the use of facial caricature can render them more human, and is therefore not without limitations as a 'weapon'.
Plate 24. The King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver.

Gillray, 1803. The ever-shrinking figure of 'little Boney' has been interpreted as a barometer of English invasion fears, and as an instance of satiric belittling as a defensive rather than an aggressive mechanism.
Plate 25. A German Governess. The genuinely 'radical' and republican graphic satire produced c.1790-1850 has attracted only a fraction of the attention from either prints scholars or historians lavished on the costly mainstream criticism of the West End printshops.
Plate 26. Billy Lackbeard and Charley Blackbeard playing at Football. This, like many other graphic political satires and caricatures, makes few concessions in terms of contextual explanation; it supposes a degree of political literacy on the part of the viewer which is more consonant with a genre oriented towards opinion 'within' than with one oriented to opinion 'without doors'.
Plate 27. The Twin Stars, Castor and Pollux. 1799. Gillray's mild satire on the undistinguished joint Members for Bridport is hardly a damning indictment of the system of parliamentary representation, and would seem to have been directed at a market of the M.P.'s peers. The extent to which satirists such as Gillray should be seen as institutionalised 'critics' merits further study.
Plate 28. *The Republican Attack*. Gillray. BM 8681, (1795). 'The Jacobin Mob' as Foxite Whigs. The cost of a print such as this would have been far beyond the means of the original bread rioters, a fact which those who have claimed a 'radical' influence for the work of the London print-shops have generally downplayed.
Plate 29. The Hungry Mob of Scribblers and Etchers. BM 3844, 1762. This print depicts Hogarth (with an engraving tool) and Matthew Darly (who holds his print The Screen [BM 3825]) in the crowd, which includes Samuel Johnson, before Bute who scatters coin. As George notes, the inference of paid propaganda is difficult to reconcile with the consistently anti-Bute line of Darly. The real problem is that neither George nor subsequent prints scholars have addressed the question of the instigation and patronage of graphic political satire and propaganda in any depth.
Plates to Part I, Chapter X
A new Sect of Religion Descryed, called

ADAMITES:

Deriving their Religion from our Father Adam.

Wherein theyhold themselves to be blameless at the last day,
though they sine never so egregiously, for they challenge Salvations, as
their date, from the Incarnation of their Saviour, A.D. & c.

This was first disclosed by a Brother of the same Sect, to the Author, who went
amongst those Brothers, and saw all these Paintings hereunto.

By Samath Turb, Batchelor in Art.

Plate 1: A new Sect of Religion Descryed, called ADAMITES (1641). Did contemporaries guffaw or shudder at this image? A print which indicates the problems involved in determining the humour – or absence of humour in early prints.
Plate 2. Idol Worship or the Way to Preferment. BM 2447 (1740). The serious political criticism of this print and others of a similar nature has frequently been obscured by an emphasis on the humour of the bared bottom.
Plate 3: The Double Deliverance. Samuel Ward, (1621). BM 41. The yardstick of humour finds this, and innumerable images like it, wanting.
Plate 4: Taylor's Physicke has purged the Divel. 1641. BM 250. An early example of the anal humour which persists in graphic political satire throughout the 18th century. The prevalent perception of 17th-century prints as 'humourless' has tended to obscure the fact that many of the tactics employed in later prints originated in this period.
Plate 6: Great was surnam'd Gregorie of Rome. 1645.
BM 412. In an early example of what I have termed 'emetic satire', Archbishop Laud is made to vomit books and orders.
Plate 7: Political Medicine or John Bulls Recipe.

1805. The same tactic, but employed in a print of the later period.

"Mercy, on me, how sick I am! It do work em harry to be sure. I shall disgorge every thing to the last Bunkoo!"

"Oh Billy, Billy, how is it we you Morn. I shall disgorge every thing to the last Bunkoo!"

"I do work em harry to be sure. It do work em harry to be sure.

"Oh Lord! I'm afraid. I shall reach my heart up by and bye. I mean wins on sink on all my life."

POLITICAL MEDICINE or John Bulls Recipe.
Plate 8: French-Telegraph making Signals in the Dark.

1795. A biting political satire, but a print which is unlikely to have been found humorous in the context of the invasion fears of that and subsequent years.
Plate 9: Worthy of Liberty, Mr. Pitt scorns to invade the Liberties of other People. 1768. A political print in which there is no element of humour and to which the concept of humour is wholly irrelevant.
Plates to Part I, Chapter XI
Plate 1. Night (The Four Times of the Day).
Hogarth, 1738. The acceptance by historians of this series and other prints by Hogarth as unproblematic representations of 'Hogarth's London' "as it was" promises to survive the deconstruction of these images by Paulson and his followers, if only because they appear - to use a phrase of Patten's 'psychologically true' to the age.
Plate 2. Light Expelling Darkness. Gillray. BM 8644 (1795). Whatever else it might suggest, this print is far removed from the 'realistic representation' of politics and politicians which some have claimed to have been their contemporary appeal (e.g. Rude, Hanoverian London p.241).
Plate 3. Stealing off; - or - prudent Secession.
Gillray, 1798. A satirical reinterpretation of an actual incident which can hardly have been accepted as a realistic interpretation.
Plate 4. Temperance Enjoying a Frugal Meal.
Gillray. The caricaturist's interpretation of public figures is alleged to have offered contemporaries a more truthful picture than that offered by straight portraiture, and the caricature's historical value is said to derive from this.
Plate 5. **George the III.** 1804 portrait engraving. This print is neither more nor less 'true' than Gillray's *Temperance Enjoying a Frugal Meal*; to privilege the latter as historical evidence says more about 20th-century attitudes towards formal portraiture than it does about either print.
Plate 6. *A View of the Fire-Workes and Illuminations, at his Grace the Duke of Richmond’s at White-Hall [... ] 15 May 1749.* 18th-century graphic satire has, according to Roylance, ‘all the color and easy appeal of fireworks at Vauxhall’. Unfortunately, this has led curators of exhibitions and compilers of anthologies of such prints to leave them to speak for themselves or via unhelpful analogies with modern phenomena. The direct access to the past anticipated is in many instances problematic.
Plates to Part I, Chapter XII
Plate 1. Bubble playing-card with satirical reference to the birth of Prince Charles Edward Stuart in 1720; stock-jobbers plan to spread the rumour of twin sons to manipulate stock prices.
Plate 2. BM 1525 An Historical Emblematical Fan in Honour of the Church of England. 1711 [detail].
Plate 6. Wineglass, c. 1757 purporting to depict the execution of Admiral Byng. Eckstein Bequest (E 108), Ashmolean Museum. As 'political' as any print.
Plate 7. Carolo Secundo Dei Gratia Magnae Brittaniae, Franciae, Et Hiberniae, Regis. Hollar 1650. In the British Museum but not catalogued under 'Satires' by Stephens, although indisputably a 'political print'. 
Plate 10. The Subjects Satisfaction c.1689. Too 'crude' to merit the attention of political prints scholars, notwithstanding its 'popular' nature.
Iconographically and rhetorically, this print has much in common with the medals, frontispieces and 'fine art' images produced at this date on this subject.
The Virtue of a Protestant Orange:
Being the ANTIDOTE again:
ROMAN POYSON.

The Virtue of a Protestant Orange:
Being the ANTIDOTE again:

Plate 14. The Virtue of a Protestant Orange
Broadsheet (1689). The iconography of 'the Protestant orange' may be traced in images in several media, including commemorative medals.
Plate 15. Cries of London No.1. Rowlandson. This and similar prints - while satiric in nature - have little in common with political prints of a non-satirical nature, which might more helpfully be studied with reference to contemporary medals, portraits and other commemoritive artefacts; in practice such prints may be catalogued with works such as this.
ALIQUID PRO NIHILO DUCANT. CIC.
For Speaking Gospel Truths it Shakes my Reason
To think That Man's impeach'd as tho' there were treason.
To preach the Doctrine, which our Saviour taught
Or tho' as he commission bore for nought.
Toomuch Religion. Festus told S. Paul
Did make him mad. A Little madd's us all
Till these Sad times (I Vow) I never knew
The Laws of Men, the Laws of God out do
Sad times, indeed when Truth must not be Said
And Priests must Speak as tho' they were afraid.
Because GREAT men
Being conscious wont be call'd, FALSE BROTHEREN.

(1710) A pro-Sacheverell satire on the Doctor's trial.
Plate 17. A polemical portrait engraving of Dr Henry Sacheverell with a portrait of Charles I. BM 1510 (1710).
Plate 18. BM 1546. Sacheverell playing-cards (1710).
Plate 20. In Memory of Ye Deliverance From Popery and Slavery by King William III in MDCLXXXVIII c.1688-89. English engraving, technically and aesthetically 'inferior' to Plate 19, but with a common theme and related iconography.
Plate 21a. Tapestry showing the arms of William and Mary as King and Queen of England.
Plate 21b  Medal of William III and Hercules: engraved plate from Nicolas Chevalier, Histoire de Guillaume III (Amsterdam:1692). Ample material exists in all media for a study of the iconography of William of Orange as Hercules.
Plate 22. BM 1188 De Gequestste Fransche Beer.
Emblematic broadsheet, (1688) 'foreign' and thus irrelevant to English political prints of the same period. Compare with Plate 23.
Plate 23. Dutch medal, (1689). Obverse: a bear wearing a rosary has overturned two of three hives and is stung by bees, legends **POENA COMES SCELERIS** ('Punishment the companion of crime') and **SIC LIBERTATEM RELIGIONEMQ: BRITANNIA SPOILATIBUS VINDICANT MCCLXXXVIII** ('Thus the British vindicate their liberty and religion from the spoilers 1688'). Reverse: A bear wearing a Jesuit's cap is led by the nose and made to dance by the hand of Heaven, legends **FORTEM VIS FORTIOR URGET** ('The strong a stronger power constrains') and **BRITANNIA A DUPLICI ARBITRAR: PAPALIQ: OPPRESSIONE LIBERATA. 1689** (Britain freed from the double oppression of tyranny and the Papacy, 1689'). See BM 1191
Plate 24. Wineglass, 18th century, possibly centenary glass and therefore c. 1751. Eckstein Bequest (E 66), Ashmolean Museum
Plate 25. Wineglass, 18th century, inscribed TO THE GLORIOUS MEMORY OF KING WILLIAM and LIBERTY AND PROSPERITY. Possibly marking the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne, and therefore c.1740. Eckstein Bequest (E 83), Ashmolean Museum
Plates to Part II, Chapter III
Plate 1. A Fat and Lean Antiquarian, 1807. From The Antiquarian Repertory, compiled by Francis Grose, Thomas Astle and others. An example of the caricature of 'types', as opposed to the caricaturing of specific individuals.
Plate 2. A sketch of Lord Thurlow by Gillray, in imitation of Sayers, 1788. BM 7540. A print which uses facial caricature but is provided with neither background nor narrative context, and for which the term 'political caricature' would be appropriate.
Plate 4. The Twin Stars. A political caricature, but not a political satire.

'Political caricature', in which the physiognomic premise of portrait caricature is made evident.
Plate 6. Bubbles of Opposition. Gillray, 1788. A print which is simultaneously a comment on Charles James Fox's attempts to float Lord John Townshend as candidate in the Westminster election and a vehicle for Gillray to show his skill as a caricaturist.
Plate 7. *Monstrous Craws, at a New Coalition Feast*. Gillray, 1787. More elaborate than the previous prints, but dominated by detailed facial caricature, the term 'political caricature' would be appropriate for this image.
Plate 8. **Wierd Sisters**. Gillray, 1791. A comment on the alleged ascendancy of Queen Charlotte and William Pitt in the context of the Regency Crisis provoked by the illness of George III; again, the degree to which this parody of Fuseli's painting is dominated by detailed facial caricature allows it to be termed a 'political caricature'.
Of all the Factions in the Town
Moved by French Springs or Spanish Wheels,
Now a trump Religion upheaved
Or was Romance cast at heels,
Like Spade-mouth with his Thunder-Clap,
Where Conscience might be sought perhaps
By the Dimensions of his Chaps,
He whom the Siflasses adore.
Counting his Arrows all Divine,
Who when the spirit moves can fain,
And if occasion serves can write:
No he can follow knee or head,
Was ever a mock learned Clerk
That speaks all Logic of the Ark.
To show in Proportions like these,
With playing Twang he tones his voice,
He gives his Handskerchief a shake,
And draws his Letters through his Nose.
Motive on Motive he dubs,
With Oat and Oat-Hustler,
Eight Ukraine and so concludes.
When Monarchy began to fade,
And Britain had its first New name.

Rise for Rebellion he begins
To rouse up the booths in Swarms,
HeBeauty stands, and keep your fires,
But whispers low, rend to your Arms.
Thus has grown suddenly rude,
Thinking his Gods can't be inherited,
Money Loose and Multitude.
Mongrel he regards no more
Than St George or the King of Bohem:
Vowing, shall not comfort before
Men cease to wear Cloaths made of Whollon,
He calls the Bully, grey-beard Chaff
And makes his Powers more a Sniff.
As Dayes, when his Hands were o'er,
Back! how he opens with full Crie !
Hail ye my Heave, bow of ROME,
Conquered that are bound to die
Then makes domestick Buys at home.
How quietly Great ANN might reign,
Would all these Harpies cack for Ham,
And preach down Foreign in Spain.
The bloody Riles of Heaven in last,
There's no quietness in the sky.

BM 1509. A depiction of Benjamin Hoadly in the context of a satirical ballad which attempts to approximate 'likeness' but which does not employ caricature and which should not, therefore be described as such.
There is a man by present Age think'd fit
Amongst our Loyal Bishops rank to sit
A Cripple Prize whose Intellec't are lame
As his Supporters monstrous as his name
Who gives each Topick by treatise touches
As like himself must be upheld by Crutches
A brave Defender of the Established Church
As even left his Doctrine in the House
But I'm persuaded such a Crooked-Stick
As ne'er will gain an English Bishop's
And may they ne'er obtain our Sovereign's Favour
That dare be guilty of such Rude-Behaviour
That Boost in long an Anti-Gospel.

Plate 10. Guess att my Meaning. 1709. BM 1503. A satire in which Hoadly is identified not by facial caricature but by, among other things, the crutches resting against his desk.
THE APPARITION, OR LOW-C——h GHOST
As it lately Appeard, In the Carcase of A Conventicle, In a Reform'd Metropolis,
to the Great Amonishment of all the Civvle, that lately Grac'd the FUNERAL: Particularly,
the Pall-bearers, the Black-Cock carriers, and the Grave-Digger Together with the Irreconcilable
Difference thereby Greated between Ben Crutches and Burges's Hour Glass; In A Poetical Dialogue,
Between a Lay Teacher and the Ghost ....

Plate 11. The Apparition, or Low-C——h Ghost. BM
1569, 1710. Benjamin Hoadly is identified by his stick and crutch.
Plate 12. Ink sketch, after George Townshend, Bodleian Library, Douce Collection no. 214.
Plate 13. The Hopes of the Party. Gillray, 1791. A print which qualifies as a political caricature, although it would be acceptable to term it a graphic political satire.
An elaborate satire that qualifies as a 'political print' but not as a 'caricature'.
Plate 15. *Patriotic Regeneration.* A political satire which includes caricature.
Plate 16. *The Lord of the Vineyard*, 1783. Only the figure of Lord North is caricatured in the strict sense of that term; the print might more accurately be termed a political satire.
Plate 17: The Church Militant. Gillray, 1779. A political satire, which may or may not also be a caricature.
Plate 18. Argus. Gillray, 1780. A political satire, but one in which caricature does not figure; to call this a 'caricature' is misleading.
Plate 19: The Fall of Icarus. 1807. A political satire; insofar as the physiques of the two protagonists would have been recognisable, also a political caricature.
Plate 20. Two-Penny Whist. Gillray (1795) in lighter, non-political vein; a mildly comic social scene, which is not the same thing as a social satire, in which some aspect of manners or morals is held up for criticism.
Plate 21. A print for foreign consumption by Gillray (1796); at one and the same time an anti-republican propaganda print and a satire, in tone far removed from the previous plate.
Plate 22. The Gout. Gillray, 1799. Not a caricature nor exactly a satire, this image falls within the as-yet ill-defined category of 'humorous' prints.
Plate 23. The Powerful Arm of Providence. After Gillray, 1831. This describes itself as an 'Allegorical Print'; it is neither political satire nor political caricature, but either term might conventionally be used of this and similar prints.
Plate 24. A print commemorating the Seven Bishops. O'Connell calls this a 'topical propagandist print', certainly the descriptive vocabulary of prints scholarship could be improved so as to accommodate such non-satirical polemical images.
Plate 25. Queen Anne receiving the Act of Union from the Duke of Queensbury and Dover, 1792. A print depicting a comparatively recent historical event. Such prints have fallen outwith the boundaries of political prints scholarship to date, not least because the conventional umbrella terms 'cartoon', 'caricature' and 'satire' do not fit them.
Plate 26. William of Orange. 1796 portrait engraving with allegorical vignette; a print of the type with which the current descriptive vocabulary of political prints scholarship has failed to engage.
Plates 27. George the III. (1804)
Plates to Part II, Chapter IV
Plate 1. O Rare Show: Or, the Fumblers Club. 1688.

British Library. This broadsheet satire on the paternity of the Prince of Wales is one of many prints of the period which were not catalogued by Stephens.
Plate 2. The Virtue of a Protestant Orange. 1688. British Library. In order to facilitate the comprehensive iconographic analyses of prints and related material advocated in Chapter V below, similarly comprehensive documentation of surviving material is necessary.
Plates to Part II, Chapter V
Plate 1. The Return to Office (1811) BM 11728. The subversion of the traditional personification of Fame is by no means novel.
Plate 2. The Humours of the Westminster Election (1747) BM 2859. An anti-Jacobite satire which employs the same motif as that of Plate 1.
Plate 3. The Tree of Life. c.1770. A Methodist print which must be set against Carretta's thesis of the 'secularization' of the tree motif in this period; the 'broad and narrow way' theme enjoyed a notably consistent career in prints into the present century.
Another far from secular use of the tree motif, in this case with references to the barren fig tree (Matthew 21.18-20; Luke, 13.6-9).
Plate 5. The Tree of Liberty, - with, the Devil tempting John Bull. Gillray, 1798. One 'tree of liberty' which Carretta fails to mention. The similarities to Plate 4 are remarkable and suggest an awareness of the religious print on Gillray's part.
Plate 6. Charles I Defending the Tree of Religion. 1645. One of many arboreal representations of the Church of England. This image was later adapted, with Charles II taking the place of his father.
Archontas summus inter faelices OLIVÆ,
Primus OLIVARI nomen et omen habes.
Plate 8. The Church Catholic, 1733. An image which makes extensive use of the typological associations of the tree.
Plate 9. Rebellion, Scism, Sed[ition] (1686) [BM 1149]. A good instance of the typological 'Tree of Rebellion' in a political context; note the labelled trunk.
Plate 10. England's Memorial, 1688. (Detail)
Plate 11. The Royall Oake of Brittayne (detail).
Compare with Plate 6.
Plate 12. Two medals, both reverse. a) A medal recording the offering of the administration of Great Britain to William of Orange (1688); an oak tree with a broken (but not severed) trunk, by a sturdy orange tree, legend Pro Glandibus Avrea Pona ('For Acorns, Oranges'). b) Medal commemorating the coronation of William and Mary as King and Queen of Great Britain (1689) An oak tree uprooted (see Plate 13), behind it a slender orange tree flourishes, legend Meliorem Lapsa Locavit ('The fallen tree has made room for a better'). Compare this treatment of the oak with the Jacobite response, Plate 14.
Plate 13. The Loyal Mourner Shewing the Murdering of King Charles the First. In this emblem of 1660, the iconography of the oak is explicitly dynastic in association, the same emblem was incorporated into a landscape print in a work dated 1729.

The Author on His Frontispiece.

That each fair Fancy, may the Fancy find,
Of this Emblems meaning, and the Authors mind;
The Moral of the Model is this —— The Tree, Prefers the King: cut down —— His Tragedy.
No Better tree —— the Murder’d in Diglise.
The Dead Tree-Dry —— the Kings supor Oblique.
The Royal Sceptre breaks: and lately Crowned,
By Reekless Fury turned upside down:
Do shew a Change of State. Records are burn’d;
And Monarchy to Anarchy is turn’d.
The Rest not Dead —— doth Emblemize the Strength,
Of happy Hope, to Sprout again, at length.
The lovely Branches —— are the Lillie Royal.
The Angel’s Trumpet —— is the Subject Loyal.
The Muse Triumpha, with a flying Wing; Is England’s joy, our Sovereigns Welcoming.
The Wither Branch, in growing through a Crown,
The King his Birth-right shows the Crown his Own.
The other Two, alike in Leaves, but Lower; Show their Alliance to the Higher Power.
The Hound, above —— is God. The Water-pot, Is Providence. The Stream: that do alls.
Each Branch, his Seat of Water: are God’s Grace. To make it Loyal, to the Royal Race.
Thus, the Emblem in Divine : the Moral, plain:
Divinity-moral, in each Sovereign:
King Charles the First, His Murder: and His Son,
King Charles the Second’s Restitution.
So faith Anthony Sadler.
Plate 14. Medal of the Oak Society, 1750. Reverse (obverse, a bust of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, facing right). A withered oak tree, with a sapling springing from its root; legend Revirescit - 'it flourishes'. This medal suggests the extent to which the period c.1688-1788 saw a 'war of icons'; the construction of rival legitimising iconographies, which nonetheless acknowledged each other.
The Ballad of the CLOAK:
Dr. The Cloaks Knavery:
To the Tune of, From Hunger and Cold: Or, Packington's Pound.

Then let us repair to pull the Cloak down,
That cramp'd up the Kingdom, and crippled the Crown.
It was a Black Cloak,
In good time he spoke,
That kill'd many thousands, but never struck stroak:
With Hatchet and Rope,
The Foison Hope,
Did join with the Devil to pull down the Pope:
It let all the Bees in the City to work,
And rather then fail, 't would have brought in the Twain,
Then let us endeavour, &c.

It seiz'd on the Tower Guns,
Those fierce Demi-Gorgons,
It brought in the Bag-pipes, and pull'd down the C
The Pulpits did sink:
The Churches did Cloak,
And all our Religion was turn'd to a Cloak:
It brought in Lay Elders could not write no Head,
It let publick Faith up, and pull'd down the Creed:
Then let us endeavour, &c.

This Pious Imposter,
Such fury did foster,
It left us no Penny, nor no Pater-Noster;
As them to the ground.
Plate 16. A Tub-Preacher. BM 1418, dated by Stephens c.1700; note the recurrence of the inverted church.
Since Moderation is so much in vogue.
And few can tell a Timeserver from a R—-
I am persuaded such a Print as this,
Thus modelled and contriv'd can't be amiss.
At such a juncture, such a time as this,
When to be loyal is elsemid a fault.
Obedience hut at Scripture set at nought,
And thus reverse for pure sound doctrine taught
I mean by them this picture doth resemble,
Who preach not half so fine as they dissemble.
Of Heterogeneous parts as opposite
Composed as darkness to Meridian light,
Made up of halves that can no more agree
Than Regal pow'r and Independency.
A British Janus with a double face,
A Member of a strange Gigantic Race:
His head half Miter, and half hat doth bear;
His Looks are sanctified, and refined his air.
Not more pernicious in his black and white
Than the true semblance of an Hypocrite.
Always Conformist to the strongest Party,
Always deceitful, ever more unhearty.
The Moderate Man ne'er yet a Martyr dy'd,
But tack'd about, & chose the strongest side.
Always recant'd in the time of trial:
It ever best expmosto at denial.
Some to be moderate then in any thing,
But where to be immoderate is a sin.
In eating, drinking, and such things as these
Be moderate as moderate as you please.
But in Religion there's no Medium, No:
Who is not truly zealous, is not so.
Glory to be esteemed an High—c—h Man:
Let them prove Low—c—h true c—h, if they can.
Zeal for the c—h Cause a Crown will gain;
And Martyrdom for Heaven an easy pain.
Dare to be true, that in a suffering time:
A Base Denial then's a Double Crime.

Plate 17. A British Janus Anglicè a Timeserver. BM
1505 (1709).

Joseph Priestley preaches from a tub inscribed 'Fanaticism'.
Plate 19. A Tale of a Tub (1791) BM 7822. The tub-preacher redivivus; irony, or, as George observes of Sayers's The Repeal of the Test Act, a Vision, 'deadly earnest'? 
Plate 20. The Tree of Life. 1740. An earlier version of Plate 3. Such continuities (not least in non-secular imagery) have been downplayed or obscured by the emphases of scholarship in the field to date.

(1658)
Plate 22. The Embleme of England's Distractions II. (c.1689). The adaptation of Faithorne's ambivalent image of Cromwell to the figure of William of Orange remains a rhetorical enigma.
Plate 23. The Double Deliverance. The seminal visualisation of English Protestant history, with many variants, the status of such images as national 'icons' and the consequences for the development of the iconography of English graphic polemic and graphic satire, have been blurred by a refusal to acknowledge the pre-1720 print as being of other than marginal interest, and by a residual hostility to the emblematic nature of such images.
Plate 24. **Guy Vaux the 2d.** BM 3439 (1756). A 'novel' format, the 'card', but the iconography shows the enduring influence of *The Double Deliverance* and its numerous variants.
Plate 25. **Augustus Anglicus.** c.1660. It is fair to say that this image consciously invokes that of Eikon Basilike. Compare the stout and flourishing oak, background left, with that in Gillray’s image, Plate 5, background right.
Plate 26. Frontispiece to Eikon Basilike. Like The Double Deliverance, one of the seminal images of the 17th century which inspired copies and variants in several media, in the 18th as well as in the 17th century, and which would, it is fair to surmise, have formed part of the pictorial 'subconscious' of 18th-century graphic polemists.
Plates to Part II, Chapter VI
Plate 1. The Loves of the Fox and the Badger, - or the Coalition Wedding. Rowlandson, BM 6369, 1784.

Note the use of labelled papers 'List of Directors' et cetera which identify the subject of the satire.
Plate 3. The Double Deliverance. BM 41. This print shows two incidents - the defeat of the Armada and the Gunpowder Plot as happening simultaneously; conventional spatial and temporal relationships are suspended.
Plate 3a. A 1671 variant, which adopts the different tactic of compartmentalising the (in this case three) separate incidents; the same causality is inferred, but by more 'narrative' means.
Plate 4. *England's Memorial*. BM 1186, 1688. A single frame within which conventions of temporal and spatial representation - the 'unities of time, place and action' are eschewed for a more emblematic 'narrative'. An example of what Rosemary Freeman termed the 'diagrammatic emblem' - i.e., the juxtaposition of seemingly unrelated images, - this print nonetheless employs an ideographic sign-system in order 'to dramatise the action as a single, historically consistent event' (see Bath, *Speaking Pictures* p.256).
Plate 5. A Prospect of a Popish Successor. An example of what Rosemary Freeman in a different context called the 'diagrammatic emblem'; i.e., an image in which the relationship of discrete symbols or clusters of symbols is at first sight arbitrary.
Plate 6. WITHOUT. BM 3605, 1757. A print made up of disparate incidents. The keyed text and the substitution of the word 'without' for the blanks, are the means by which the point of the satire is arrived at. Such visual-verbal interdependence has not found favour with prints scholars to date.
Plate 7. Apocrypha Combatants No. VI.

Plate 7. Apocrypha Combatants No. VI.

The Idol Bel and the Dragon's Tour to the North.

Plate 7. Apocrypha Combatants No. VI.

The Idol Bel and the Dragon's Tour to the North.
Plate 8. A tub-preacher. The inversion of the church is rhetorical.
Plate 9. A Ra-Ree Show. Colledge, 1681. A 'single-incident' print. EPC1 reproduces this image minus the ballad text, which George discusses pp.56-57; the written component to which satirical prints belong is too often omitted both in reproduction and in discussion of the print.
Plate 10. **French Liberty - British Slavery.**

Gillray, BM 8145, 1792. The basic compartmental contrast. Note the figure of Britannia with her bag of 'sterling' and the 'Map of French Conquests'. The satire of the pictorial contrast is amplified by the title, but above all by the contrast of the sentiments expressed by the protagonists when set against their condition; the Englishman complains of excessive taxation and fears starvation, the Frenchman claims to 'swim in de Milk and Honey'. 
Plate 11. The Contrast 1749. BM 3028, 1749. The bi-partite compartmental division is implicit. See also BM 3477 Forty-Six and Fifty-Six and BM 3595 The True Contrast.

A Money, with Fire-works.  |  Money, with Commerce.
Plate 12: An Analysis of Modern Patriotism (1783)

A classic bipartite revelatory satire, the pictorial structure articulating the rhetorical structure (i.e., the contrast) of the print. Note the labelled books and the legible papers in the left compartment, the elaborate speech bubble in the right, and the satirical sub-title; all verbal tactics discussed in this chapter.
Note the place of words in this arresting image, including the identifiable book in the lower right corner.
Plate 14. The Funeral of the Low Church or the Whig's last will and Testament. BM 1531, 1710. A print made up of three scenes; as far as the narrative of the satire is concerned, the order in which the images should be read is bottom left to bottom right, and finally the upper image.

The Funeral of the Low Church or the Whig's last Will and Testament.
Plate 16. A Representation of the Popish Plot in 29 figures. BM 1067, 1680.
Before your Eyes I Good and Ill have plac'd: 
Vb. for your Country's Sake in your last: 
Here Welsh Parishioners attend his Coach, 
And joy to See their Ministers Approach.

In the Church wept into Ruines turn: 
But Truth won't let a Friend that Falsity burn. 
Here find Electors Candidates adore, 
Whom they rejected but a while before.

Plate 17. Pro-Sacheverell playing-cards. BM 1546, 1710. Available in the form of uncut sheets, in which the narrative of the cards was 'fixed' in the manner of compartmental prints.
Plate 18. Keep Within Compass. BM 6903 (1786) The unusual compartmental design allows for the compression of a didactic narrative equivalent to the twelve plates of Industry and Idleness.
Plate 19. The Sour Prospect Before Us, or the Ins Throwing Up BM 7500, Dent, 1789. One of several strip designs of a political nature; the format was favoured for non-political satire.
Plate 20. The Solemn Mock Procession of the POPE Cardinal's Jesuits Fryers &c through the City of London November the 17th 1680 BM 1085, 1680. A representative 'procession' print. All components of the procession are carefully identified both within the image and by the 'Explanation'.
Plate 21. A Voluptuary, detail. The portrait of 'L. Cornaro' offers an oblique comment on the Prince's less than ascetic existence; this is only one of numerous internal iconographic points scored against the central subject of the print.
Made and Written by a Youth of 15 Years of Age on the sight of 3 Pictures which hung in his Closet.

When will the Tyrant Presbyter give o'er Suppressing Virtue Dayly more and more Was not that Pious Prince King Charles's blood Sad weight enough that they themselves must load With more dark Crimes and Horrid deeds of Hell Anc strive to crush the good Sacheverell That Pious Pastor who doth far excell Their ranting Priests as Heav'n surpasses Hell O Sacred Ann were all thy Realm as true As this good man what could the Devill doe May God above send Guards of Angells down And Radiant beams of Glory on your Crown A good old Age to pull your Emnies down And when you dye receive you as his own

Plate 22. Made and Written by a Youth of 15 Years of Age on the sight of 3 Pictures which hung in his Closet. BM 1514, 1710. The portraits are those of Charles I, Queen Anne and Dr Sacheverell. One of several prints concerned with the trial of Sacheverell which draws on the partisan 'discourse of portraiture'.

Amen.
Plate 23. Portrait of Dr Henry Sacheverell holding a portrait miniature of King Charles I. BM 1510, 1710. One of several prints of Sacheverell which use this device. The verse inscription reveals a conscious attempt to harness not only the past, but the rhetorical capacity of the portrait to advantage in present controversy.
Plate 24. Two Pair of Portraits. BM 9270, 1798.

Gillray shows his awareness of portraiture as a genre open to political discourse. The print is also a good example of the use of pictures and statuary within prints to amplify or contradict the larger message.
Sayers, BM 7628, 1790. At the right of the print, in the background, a portrait of Oliver Cromwell hangs in the 'Sanctum Sanctorum'; in the pulpit, the Unitarian Theophilus Lindsey rends the Thirty-Nine Articles.
Plate 26. The Temple of Purity, 1783. The torn portrait of Lord Chatham hints at his son's divergence from his father's 'patriotic' principles. The king employs Commons resolutions for paper.
Plate 27. A Great Man at his Private Devotions
BM 5680, 1780. Note the 'Petitions' to be used as lavatory-paper.
Plate 28. **Smelling out a Rat** (detail). Gillray, 1790. Note the picture on the wall and the legible texts.
Plate 29. Edward the Black Prince Receiving Homage

BM 7516, 1789

Edward the Black Prince receiving Homage.

The fate of St Paul's Cathedral at the hands of Unitarians and their Whig supporters is one of several points scored in this print by means of the internal reading-structures which are the subject of this chapter. Note the invocations of the lank-haired zealots; evidence of the satiric value of represented speech.
Plate 31. Design for the New Gallery of Busts and Pictures. BM 8072. 1792. Gillray plays on the partisan associations of portrait busts, and also with internal reading structures via the paintings satirising Catherine II.
Plate 32. **Loose Principles.** Rowlandson. BM 7492 (1789). In this print, two aspects of 'visual literacy' are entailed; the recognition of portrait busts as statements of political allegiance, and the reading of labelled texts, performing a similar function; both the 'political bookshelf' and the abuse of Magna Charta (see also Chapter VII below).
Plate 33. **Filial Piety.** Rowlandson. BM 7378 (1788)

Rowlandson amplifies the point of this scene via the inscription of the picture 'The Prodigal Son' on the wall.
Plate 34. The Committee; or, Popery in Masquerade. BM 1080, 1680. Words are an integral part of this print; the 'Explanation' is largely in the form of speeches assigned to the protagonists, via a lettered key, ensuring the further interaction of verbal and visual. The 'Explanation' is omitted from the plate in EPC1; evidence of the failure of prints scholars to engage with the material as a hybrid of visual and verbal.
Plate 35. Billy Lackbeard and Charley Blackbeard. 1784. A print in which the text is restricted to a single title-line.
Plate 36: French Telegraph making Signals in the Dark, 1795. A print in which, uncharacteristically for Gillray at this period, the use of words is kept to a minimum.
Plate 37. Doublures of Caricatures. The resemblance of this print to a page from a physiognomic treatise is likely to have been deliberate. The keyed text amplifies the visual satire.
Plate 38. John Bull bother'd. BM 8141 (1792). The importance to Gillray of words, in the titles, sub-titles and quotations of his prints, is particularly evident in his willingness to let large speech ballons carry the satire of a given scene, as here.
Plate 39. Political Candour. Gillray, 1805. A print in which Fox's soliloquy occupies a dominant visual position, although this is by no means the only verbal component of the design.
Plate 40. From the Originals at Windsor. BM 7836, 1791. An instance of deliberate excision of letters (or words); as much a satirical tactic as an attempt to render a print less exceptionable.
Plate 41. The Donkey - 0: a new Song. BM 7502 (1789). The ballad format was never abandoned even at the upper end of the print market.
Plate 42. *Guess att my Meaning*, detail. BM 1503, 1710. An early instance of 'the Instructive Library'; note also the use of legible papers to identify the protagonist.
Plate 42a. *If...* Steve Bell, *The Guardian* 14 February 1994. Suggesting that the bookshelf still has a part to play in contemporary graphic political satire.
Plate 43. The Common Stage. 1786. A print in which words play a dominant part.

The Common Stage Wagg, from Brooke's Inn, St. James's Street (puppets moved on 8 shorted Notice.

NB the Proprietors (never) Accept for PLATE, MONEY, ESWEELS, NOTES or BONDS.

London published as the Act Directs, April 6 1786 by Ast. & T. Bloomsbury Street.
Plate 44. The Free-Born Briton. Dent, BM 6914, 1786. A print which exemplifies the verbal nature of 18th-century graphic political satire.
Plate 45. A Right Hon Democrat Dissected. BM 8291 (1793). A print in which the verbal plays an essential part in 'anatomising' Fox.
Plate 46. The Dissembling Scot Set forth in his Coulours (detail). BM 852 (1652). An earlier 'anatomy'; the incursion of words into the image is important.
The VEIL being Removed; in his TRUE Colours, appears

The PRETENDED MAN of the PEOPLE:

Alias the WORD-EATING MONSTER from BOLOGNA!

LONDON,istle Jan 1739, by a Lover of his King and Country.

Plate 47. The Veil Being Removed BM 7476, 1789.
See also BM 7390 The Wonderful Word-Eater and 7391 The Word Eater and also Stealing off; - or prudent Secession, 1798.
Plate 48. "The Rights of Man". Gillray, BM 7867, 1791. Further evidence of the satiric value of represented speech. So far from a gradual lessening of 'dependence' upon such allegedly 'cumbersome' tactics, many of Gillray's speech-balloons are extensive soliloquies; here the words spill out of their frame. Note also the satirical dedication, at the top of the print.
The Full View of Canterbury's Fall, 1645.

Here the texts address both viewer and Laud directly.
Plate 50. The Political Mirror. A print in which the eye is distracted by both the profusion and the size of the speech bubbles.
Plate 51. The Commissioners. BM 5473 (1778). A sketchy design, dominated by the speech balloons.
Plate 52. The King of Brobdingnag and Gulliver. A print in which the extensive speech balloon might for once be deemed tautologous, the point being made by both the image and the title.
Plate 53. Massacre at St Peter's. In this print, it is the single speech balloon (far left) which carries the full satire of what might at first sight be mistaken for a (melodramatic) reportorial account of an incident.
Plate 54. The Fox Chace. The representation of speech takes an unusual spiky freehand form, and is far from a minor part of the print.
Plate 55. Sawney's Defence. (1779) A print in which the speech scrolls are clear and attractive.
Plate 56. Our "Gutter Children". George Cruikshank, 1896; handcoloured etching on glass. A print characterised by a prolixiy of lettering far denser and less legible than that of many an early or mid-18th-century political satire condemned on these grounds.
Plates to Part II, Chapter VII
Plate 1. French Liberty - British Slavery. Gillray, 1792. The contrast is basic to satire and particularly suited to graphic satire.
Plate 2. Dr Dorislaw's Ghost. Time 'sets forth the Truth'.
Plate 3. Time & Truth bring Stranger things to Pass. c.1771. The pairing of Time and Truth (sometimes with History also) is a standard one in 'revelatory' satires from the early 17th century onwards.
Plate 4. The Political Mirror. 1782. The personification, Truth, with her revelatory attribute, a mirror. The figure of Lord Mansfield (12) complains: 'This Truth is a most cruel Libel on us all'.
Plate 5. BM 10. A very early anti-Catholic satire; note the demon in the act of drawing back the curtain, top right; a stock motif for the revelation of conspiracies, et cetera.
The Curtain's drapery; All may perceive the plot,
And Him who truly the blacke Babe begot:
Whose sable mantle makes me bold to say
A Phaeton Sol's charriot ruler'd that day.
Presumptuous Priest to skip into the throne,
And make his King his Bastard Issue owne.
The Author therefore hath conceiu'd it meet,
The Doctor should doe pennisance in this sheet.

Plate 6. Spectatum admissi risum teneatis;
frontispiece to Eikon Alethine (1649) which disputed
Charles I's authorship of Eikon Basilike, suggesting
Dr. John Gauden as the real author.
Plate 7. Oliver Cromwell's Cabinet Council discovered. c.1660. The council is 'discovered' by the drawing-back of curtains.
Plate 8. The Veil Being Removed. 1789. Pitt draws a curtain in a print which seeks to expose Fox's volte-face on the constitutional rights of the Prince of Wales; Fox is made to show 'his True Colours'.

The VEIL being Removed: in his TRUE Colours, appears
The PRETENDED MAN of the PEOPLE.
Arias the WORD-EATING MONSTER from BOLOGNA!

LONDON, 1st Jan. 1789, by a Lover of his King and Country.
Plate 9. A Sacrifice to Slavery. 1787. Time draws back the 'Curtain of Futurity' to reveal an assassinated Britannia. Note the mask on Pitt's sash.
Plate 11. The Kingdomes Monster Uncloaked from Heaven. BM 375 (1643). Uncloaking remains a revelatory tactic of graphic political satire throughout the 18th century.
Plate 12. The Disembling Scot Set forth in his
Coulours Or a Vindication of Lieu. Col. John Lilburne
and others. BM 852 (1652). A print which combines
several revelatory motifs and tactics; the figure of
Time who removes the cloak of religion, and the
anatomised body. The title is similarly revelatory.
Plate 14. A True Picture of the Famous SKREEN. BM 1710 (1722). The action of the print takes place behind the screen; but the viewer is afforded a glimpse of the 'cover-up' via the reflection in the tall pier-glass to the left.
Plate 15. *The Mirror of Patriotism*. BM 6380 (1784). An example of the mirror as revelatory device. In this print, as in others, the conceit privileges the viewer, affording him an insight into Fox's character and ambitions.
Plate 16. Doublûres of Caricatures. The idea expressed in the quotation from Lavater which appears on the print, 'If you would know Men's Hearts, look in their Faces', is central to the revelatory potential of caricature which 'unmasks' by externalising internal vice, weakness or corruption.
Plate 17. Westminster School. Gillray, 1785. The youthfulness of the younger Pitt is central to this satire, but this and similar scenes derive their force from the vicarious pleasure taken in the corporal chastisement of ministers.
Plate 18. The Dog Tax. Gillray, 1796. Ministers are frequently depicted on the gallows in the prints, much as certain ministers were in reality hanged in effigy.
Plate 19. Patriotic Regeneration - viz - Parliament Reform'd a la Françoise. Gillray, 1795. The scene envisaged by Gillray has a realism deriving from written reports from France (see Paulson in Cuno) and a chillingly prophetic quality which is lacking in many satires showing the criminal ends of statesmen.
WREN'S ANATOMY.

DISCOVERING
His notorious pranks, and shameful wickedness, with some of his most lewd facts, and infamous deeds, both in his government of Pestrige Cathedral, and dominating in these colleges, sick, to the perpetual shame and history.

Printed in the yeare, That Wren ceased to domincere, 1641.

Plate 20. Wren's Anatomy. Discovering His notorious pranks and shameful wickedness, with some of his most lewd facts... BM 223 (1641) The 'anatomising' of individuals and incidents was a stock rhetorical tactic of 17th-century written polemic which may have influenced more graphic anatomies.
Plate 22. A Trimmer. A variant of BM 1231 and 1232. See also 1233 and (later) BM 1505. Note the tub.
Plate 23. The Times. 1770. A literal 'anatomy' of the conflict between Wilkes and the Crown. This print was based on an actual masquerade costume of the period.
Plate 24. State Butchers (detail). Rowlandson. BM 7474 (1789). Here surgery is both an assault which defines the ill intentions of the surgeon, and an anatomy which in this case exposes the good qualities of the victim (the Prince of Wales).
Plate 25. Britannia Between Death and the Doctors.

Gillray, 1804. Rival political quacks leave the body politic (Britannia) vulnerable to attack by Death (Napoleon; inevitably 'behind the curtain'). A representative instance of the medical conceit popular in political satire both visual and verbal.
Plate 26. *Loose Principles*. 1789. 'Vox Populi' is a fart from a 'Patriotic Bum'; Sheridan applies a 'Rights oyster' and Burke delves in, 'Not searching from Precedents but Consequences' in this representative recourse to scatology as a political metaphor.
Plate 27. Administering to an Old Friend. 1805. Lord Melville is shown being forced to give up money to the Naval Reservoir. The satire is 'consequential' ('I am afraid you have brought on your Sickness by your high living!').
Plate 28. The Sour Prospect Before Us, or the Ins Throwing Up. 1789. The offices of ministers, including Pitt and Thurlow, are defined by the items they vomit.
Plate 29. Political Vomit for the Ease of Britain. BM 2531 (1742). Emetic satire, with the vomit as a political metaphor; Walpole's system is defined by what he is forced to give up, as is suggested by the quotation below the print.
Plate 30. **Great was surnam'd Gregorie of Rome.** BM 412 (1645). Archbishop Laud’s ‘crimes’ are defined by what he vomits. Laud’s sickness will only be ‘cured’ by decapitation, according to Henry Burton - a recurrent idea in punitive satire.
Plate 32. The Living Man's Elegie. BM 1527 (1710).

A satire against Sacheverell, employing funerary conventions.
Plate 33. To the Mortal Memory of Madam Geneva, Who died Sepr. 29 1736. BM 2279 (1736). One of many satirical monuments, funeral processions, elegies and 'last wills and testaments' in the prints; a convention shared with written satire.
Plates to Appendix
Plate 1. Britañia. 1682
Plate 2. Taking Physick. 1792