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ABSTRACT

Two features that were viewed by Britons as distinguishing their nation from other Western countries in late-eighteenth century were its Constitutional Monarchy and the comparative freedoms enjoyed by the press. Graphic political satire lies at the juncture of these two features. This thesis examines the dual role that graphic caricatures of King George III played as satirical commentary and as political critique on the unique political stage of "out-of-doors" politics in the 1780s.

James Gillray's caricatured portrait of George III in Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast (1787) provides investigative entry into the marriage between political caricature and the quasi-sacred institution of kingship. The union of individualized portrait caricature and topical political content in Monstrous Craws leads to two key questions which are investigated in this thesis. First, to what extent did the lampooning of the identifiable face of George III provoke a critique of his political position as the hereditary head of the state? Second, how did the pictorially "subversive" content of graphic satires of George III extend or engage with other popular forms of extra-parliamentary political opinion-shaping with regards to the power of the king? To answer these questions, shifts in notions of kingship and the breakdown of the law of hereditary succession are examined. Aspects specific to the trade of political prints, as well as the narrative and pictorial conventions used by Gillray and other graphic satirists in the 1780s, furthermore, help explore the manner in which regal satire conveyed views of George III at that time.

In a word, political caricatures were "popular". They could be viewer in public spaces such as taverns and ale houses, as well as in the street-facing windows of
print-shops. Drawing from popular themes such as carnival in which the king is symbolically and ritualistically mocked, and traditional notions of the king as an ally of the people, Gillray's satirical portrait of George III communicated on a number of levels to a broad spectrum of the urban populace both literate and illiterate. Yet, the plurality of viewing spaces, the diversity of the audiences for political prints, and the appropriation of familiar motifs of the king, outline hegemonic ideas about George III and the institution of kingship he symbolically embodies.

In consequence of the freedom of the press in Britain, political commentators possessed the liberty to criticize those in positions of power and hold them accountable. Using the visual language of portrait caricature, graphic satirists enjoyed many of the same privileges with regards to commentating on the political events and players of the day. And the king was not exempt from their attacks.

This thesis argues that political satires indeed "exposed" the king to graphic ridicule, but in so doing buttressed the political system of governing that "permitted itself to be "exposed" to satiric ridicule. Ironically, then, satires of the king helped give visual articulation and practical example to the notion of the British nation as a formidable fortress of freedom.
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INTRODUCTION
THE HEAD OF THE STATE

On Tuesday, 29 May, 1787, not far from Westminster Palace and the Houses of Parliament, a satirical print showing King George III as a feasting peasant woman appeared in the window of Samuel William Fores's Piccadilly print-shop, then one of the most popular commercial establishments of its kind in London.(1) Entitled Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast [Fig. 1], it depicted king, queen, and prince, with soup ladle in each hand, eating from a shared pot. Surprisingly enough, the name and address of this publisher and seller of prints were engraved below the satirical image. Since Fores had tory leanings (2), and the Tories were the traditional parliamentary defenders of the king, it seems odd that he chose to publish and sell a print which vividly mocked the monarchy.(3) Was there not a contradiction between supporting the values of kingship and distributing graphic satires which undermined King George III? If there was a contradiction, presumably it was not a serious one.

This apparent political schizophrenia in his allegiance to the king was not Fores's alone. Graphic regal satire of the late eighteenth-century is overwhelmingly Janus-faced: it mocks the man who is the reigning monarch while leaving curiously unscathed the quasi-divine institution of kingship that he personifies.

As the monarch who held the throne during military victories and Britain's greatest colonial loss—the United States of America—George III was apotheosized at one turn, and held responsible for national burdens of defeat at another.(4) And though he shared the Protestant faith of his nation (5), his Germanic roots and continued foreign political connections as the elector of Hanover made him an outsider and a suspect in
his own kingdom. Not only was George III of foreign descent, he was also a stutterer, a farmer by hobby, and a victim of bouts of "madness," bad eyesight and impaired hearing. He thus possessed a set of characteristics which provided satirists with a cornucopia of comic virtues, vices, and flaws to draw upon. For these reasons and others, political satirists and critics alike found on British soil both the timber of larger political causes and the kindling of individual eccentricities with which to build a roaring fire around King George III.

James Gillray's *Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast* provides the textual focus of this thesis. Gillray reached fame in his own lifetime, and has maintained a primary status in the historiography of eighteenth-century caricature and graphic political satire ever since. Twentieth-century art historians have pointed to him as the harbinger of political portrait caricature. But in the nineteenth century, Gillray had already received the title of "the greatest of English caricaturists, and perhaps of all caricaturists of modern times whose works are known" from Thomas Wright, Gillray's biographer and an historian of visual and literary caricature. Gillray belongs to the group of late-eighteenth century graphic satirists who transformed the fashionable hobby of caricature that young Englishmen returning from the Grand Tour brought back with them from Italy at the beginning of the century. Gillray, Thomas Rowlandson, James Sayers, and Isaac Cruikshank, along with lesser-known and less productive contemporary professionals and amateurs, transferred the aristocratically-rooted art of caricature to the political soil of the late-eighteenth century.

In contrast to satirical prints produced in Britain before the 1780s, and to most of those published contemporaneously with Gillray's copper-plate engraving, *Monstrous*
Craws stands out through its radically provocative application of facial and body caricature to the portraits of King George III, Queen Charlotte Sophia, and George IV, the Prince of Wales. Various degrees of caricaturistic distortion and exaggeration are observable in the three figures. But it is the figure of the king that is the most visually "charged". Befitting his role as the embodiment of national identity, the king carries the heaviest load of narrative, iconographic, and political meanings and satirical twists. As the living symbol of the nation, it is in his person that the tradition, myth, and legally-sanctioned privilege of kingship is revived again for another reign.

The tension between sharp satirical criticism and the maintenance of royal authority is particularly intricate in the body imagery and political references of Monstrous Craws. Despite the degree of caricature inflicted upon the representation of George III, his profile is detailed and individualized to render the identity of the figure immediately recognizable to contemporary viewers. Furthermore, the subject matter of the print is clearly political. The "New Coalition" between king and prince recalls the much publicized announcement of their reconciliation made a few days earlier, which was interpreted as ending a period of estrangement between the monarch and the heir over the issue of the prince's large and growing debts. Despite the attention to satirizing physical "attributes", Monstrous Craws does not sacrifice the opportunity for political commentary.

The union of portrait caricature joined with political content—which Monstrous Craws holds in balance—leads to two key questions which this thesis investigates. The first of these questions asks to what extent the lampooning of the body of George III in
Monstrous Craws provokes a critique of the king and his role as the head of the state. The second question analyzes the joint venture between graphic satire and political images of the king, and is thus concerned with the business of "out-of-doors" political opinion-shaping within the frame of Britain's Constitutional Monarchy in the late eighteenth-century, to which the trade of political caricature is closely tied. To answer these questions, two related issues are examined: shifts in notions of kingship in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain and the measure of subversive political content permitted in satirical images of George III.

The investigative components of this thesis are intended to provide an alternative to standard histories of graphic satire. These have tended to travel one of three main methodological avenues. The first focuses on the artistic producer—or author—of satirical prints as the locus of meaning. This method of study would, for example, either map Gillray's oeuvre along a chronological timetable, or divide it into predominant subject categories; art historical or social historical events or currents are generally superceded by the personal history of the artist. The artist's work and the artist's life are thus treated as two parallel chronologies which lead to conclusions of causes and effects. This thesis, however, downplays what Michel Foucault has termed the "authorial function" for two important reasons. First, since little documentation of the artist's political sympathies exists, any conclusions about his intentions would be founded largely on conjecture. Second, and more important for the specific task at hand, satirical prints were sold, displayed, and circulated in a variety of public spaces, and were bought, seen, and shared by different groups of people for different purposes. Such vast discrepancies in circulation, viewership, and usage need not imply that satirical images
of the king could mean anything at all to anyone who saw them. On the contrary, the plurality of viewing audiences can outline hegemonic ideas about George III and the traditional institution of kingship he symbolically embodies. The fact that the net cast by graphic political satire was broad and indiscriminate may support claims that Britons were relatively informed and generally curious about politics in the eighteenth century. The objective here, however, is to discover what common assumptions about the king and kingship that net encompassed. Furthermore, the political resonance of Gillray’s complexly coded carnivalesque of the monarch relies on the cultural currency of the satirical inversions the artist has employed; and cultural currency is built upon more-or-less shared assumptions, expectations, and beliefs. In other words, whether the image is politically subversive is determined by the meaning it takes on at a specific historical moment rather than the meaning the artist intended to inscribe onto it.

The second route taken by historians of graphic political prints is one that focuses on "reading" satirical picture stories iconographically, matching caricatured portraits to political players and reconstructing the narrative picture-puzzle to correspond to a political event. The "reading" of symbols, however, cannot suffice as the sole, or even the main, methodological tool when applied to satirical images of the king produced after the 1780s, when the visual language of graphic satire increasingly replaces symbols and emblems with personalized portrait caricature. As long as direct ridicule of the person of the king remained a taboo, satirists were compelled to rely on abstract symbols of kingship (most commonly the crown) or allegorical allusions to provide links between political messages and the individual subjects they signified.
But the taboo against derisive representation of the royal person appears to have been lifted in Britain after the regicide of Charles I in 1649. If the king could be mortally punished for his crimes, he could no longer be considered the hallowed earthly Christ, as had English monarchs before him. And if he could be punished on the scaffold, he could certainly also be ridiculed on the page. In conjunction with this permission to satirize the king, remnants of self-censorship which may have held satirists back from regal irreverence also slowly loosened, allowing satirists to caricature the identifiable body and face of the man who was king: to make the body of the king itself the site of satire. An iconographic analysis, therefore, cannot alone fully elucidate the meanings of satirical political prints mocking the king when symbols are no longer employed as the main pictorial vehicles to convey comic commentary or political critique. The strictly iconographic reading of satire also tends to treat political prints as mere supplementary data confirming historical exegesis. The pitfall of both approaches outlined above is that the visual aspects of political satire and the specific ways in which popular images function as visual objects get little or no attention.

The third conventional method for analyzing satirical prints focuses on a single medium or a particular genre of visual art. Here, for example, satirical prints are fitted into a hermetic category of "low art", vernacular visual culture, or political prints. Consequently, separated into an autonomous cultural sphere, visual objects become severed from other manifestations of culture to which they are vitally connected. Although factors such as aesthetic categories, formal innovations in pictorial conventions and technical advances in printmaking impact on how polemical prints functioned within the social and political sphere in which they circulated, these factors need to be
linked to broader social, economic, and political conditions. If, then, the strictly visual factors relating to satirical prints are historicized, much can be gleaned about their social uses, political function, and cultural position as commodities within ever-shifting traditions of vision.

Elements of authorial intention, iconography, and the tradition of visual vernacular culture will help to illuminate the following pages. But without an historical base to provide an understanding of how the king figured into the worldview of late eighteenth-century Britons, the singular use of any one of these methods cannot sufficiently answer the questions this thesis directs at the image of the eating peasant-king. Another kind of inquiry is therefore required, one which attempts to understand the function of graphic regal satire as conveying the contours of hegemonic notions of the king while simultaneously "caricaturing" its features.

Often called the "Golden Age of Political Caricature" by historians of political prints such as Dorothy George, Draper Hill, John Wardroper, and David Kunzle, the late eighteenth century was also an historical era of European nations in political crisis.(34) In France, to cite only one example, political turmoil led to the revolutionary restructuring of governmental bodies after the destruction of the Bastille in July of 1789. In late eighteenth-century Britain, however, there was no parallel revolution, not even a widespread political storm.(35 )

Yet Britain was far from immune to domestic strife, and the debt eighteenth-century graphic satirists owe to the political tensions of their age is often discussed by historians who examine the political import of print culture.(36) What historians have not asked, however, is: What debt did the apparent political stability of
eighteenth-century Britain owe to political satire for helping to give visual articulation and practical example to the notion of the British nation as a formidable fortress of freedom?(37)

The development of graphic political satire in the late-eighteenth century corresponds to the maturation of the first Western, early-modern structure of government which is frequently discussed under the rubric of representational parliamentary democracy.(38) Great Britain was the exemplary parent of nations which followed its parliamentary model of centralized government.(39) Certain elements and premises of the parental model were, however, reworked or rejected: neither the newly independent nation of the United States nor the renewed post-Revolutionary French state included, in their versions of parliamentary government, the monarchical components which to this day "crowns" Britain's Constitutional Monarchy.(40)

To investigate how contemporary notions of kingship were conveyed, subverted, or supported in political prints, Chapter One, "Framing Prints", begins with a discussion of the topical political subject of Monstrous Craws, followed by an analysis of the diverse viewing venues for political prints in relation to the periodical press and issues of censorship. The freedom of the press and the liberty of British citizens to hold those in power accountable are here related specifically to the mockery of the king in satirical prints. Social historians of the early modern period have often drawn the conclusion that the rise in literacy and a general thirst for "news" among all ranks of Britons fostered a complementary market for topical subjects in the informal graphic medium of political prints. In such studies, however, the importance of the unique political structure of eighteenth-century Britain in nurturing the political, economic, and social climate in
which political information and polemical prints could thrive is seldom more than broached. Chapter Two, "Siding With the King: The Making and Unmaking of Whigs and Tories", explores seventeenth- and eighteenth-century struggles for power between the king and Parliament that will help address issues relevant to contemporary interpretations of the narrative content of Gillray’s polemical *Monstrous Craws*. Chapter Two thus provides an historical armature of conceptions of kingship within the political culture of Britain’s mixed government, and examines the monarch’s shifting place within the Parliamentary balance of power. Chapter Three, "The Royal Sport of Satire: Humour in the Image, Act, Word", studies traditions of satirizing the king as a way of showing that the direct mockery of the king in *Monstrous Craws* is distinct from ritualistic and written forms of regal satire, as well as from conventional pictorial motifs signifying the monarch in earlier graphic satire. Even though *Monstrous Craws* borrows culturally resonant themes from the past, such as carnival and popular notions of the king as an ally of the people, in Chapter Three those broad themes are given historical specificity and their relevance for Britons in the late-eighteenth century is discussed. In the Conclusion, "Celebrating the King", I hope to show that these visually descriptive prints which burlesque the body of the British king may indeed have momentarily undermined public respect for George III; yet, at the end of the day, they also helped calm any rising storm around the institution of kingship. Links to the present political moment are suggested in the Tailpiece. Indeed, the present is what initiated this questioning of the "arch libellers" of the past.
CHAPTER ONE
FRAMING PRINTS

I. Seat of Power: Site of Satire

He is shown dressed in the clothes of a woman: the frock, apron, and shawl of a peasant woman. On his head he wears a bonnet which is tied under his fleshy chin. An immense sack-like appendage hangs heavily from his throat and rests on the rim of the circular cauldron from which he feasts. A heaping soup ladle is delicately held in each hand, and, even though the expanded member under his chin reveals that his hunger should already be satisfied, his mouth is open wide, and his head is slightly tipped back, in order that he may continue to stuff his craw.(41) His barely parted eyes add to the expression on his face; an expression which tells that he is taking great pleasure in the meal laid out before him. His profile concedes a full white brow beneath large deep-set eyes, full lips, and an almost too fine and noble nose for so round and globe-like a head. Across from him, also in the guise of a peasant, is a representation of a woman partaking in the seemingly simple meal with equal two-handed enthusiasm. Though her body appears almost gaunt, her fingers gnarled and her arms spindly, her craw is hefty and full. Her wide-open eyes betray any attempt to conceal the eagerness with which she empties the contents of yet two more ladles into her craw. Directly across from the space left vacant for us to view this plentiful peasants’ feast is a third figure who uses the same manner of eating with two oversized spoons. His large, heavy-lidded eyes underneath thick, light-coloured brows, and his long, sculpted nose that does not quite match his plump face, reveal a facial likeness to the figure to his left. But his utensils, inscribed with numerical figures, are shallower
than those of his companions and he holds them with almost affected delicacy. With the palm of his right hand close to his chest, he seems well aware that his craw is not inflated but rather flaccid and empty; the central focus, his craw hangs like a long, limp sack for all to see. He has arrived at the table wearing an elegant hat decorated with extravagant plumage—a costume appropriate for a royal prince. Indeed, the well-dressed central figure is a satirical rendition of George IV, the Prince of Wales, and, in 1787, the heir apparent. Framed beneath the arch of the Treasury, this feasting royal trinity of King George III, Queen Charlotte, and their eldest son, eat communally from the cauldron labeled "John Bull's Blood"—the blood of the English "everyman", whose labour is the sustenance and wealth of the nation. King George III, the father of the nation, is shown wearing peasant woman's clothes, a cannibal devouring the body of his most loyal imaginary subject. How weak, or perhaps how strong, must the symbolic pyramid of power be to allow, or to survive, such travesties of gender and rank as the image displays?

The description above responds to James Gillray's *Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast*. Although Gillray had produced a number of political satires of members of the royal family before 1787, *Monstrous Craws* marks the first time he used his graphic skills to escort his public into the private royal dining chamber in order to let them watch his majesty the king indulge in the commonplace ritual of eating.

The ostensible subject of *Monstrous Craws* is a notorious rift between the king and the heir. The conflict stemmed from the prince's princely spending, and was mended only days before Gillray's print was published. After prolonged
parliamentary pressure on the king to deal with the prince's ever-growing debts, he conceded to alleviate his son's financial burden with funds from his own Civil List. (45)

The topical political import of *Monstrous Craws* is imprinted on the ladles of the prince (labeled £60,000 and £10,000, the sum of the prince's allowance and the amount by which it was to be increased), and in the craws—or money-bags—of the king and queen which are being stuffed with John Bull's blood, turned into royal feast, turned into golden coins. (46) Since the issue of the prince's astronomical debts was a familiar theme in Parliament, the press, and in satirical prints, it was common knowledge that the prince had spent all his nuggets in the process of long "feasting", while the king had been "saving" his. (47) The "New Coalition" received wide coverage in the press, was celebrated in the pro-government press, and was publicly commemorated by the illumination of a representation of the king's crown and the prince's crest the evening after the decision was announced in the House of Commons. (48)

A copy of the print *Monstrous Craws* could be purchased for about half-a-crown coloured and one shilling plain, which was the going price in London for broadsheet prints at the time. (49) While prints were far less expensive than one-off oil paintings and watercolours, the purchase price of political prints kept them beyond the reach of a large portion of the urban public who often earned less than ten shillings a week. (50)

While many Londoners were without the means to own the latest graphic satire, the bawdy mockery and political messages communicated by the pictorial language of satire was still accessible to them. In the eighteenth century, prints were generally published and sold from the premises of a print-shop, (51) where—although this varied
prints", engravings after history paintings, maps, and official portraits of the same individuals who were satirized in political prints. [Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] Ale houses, taverns, and coffee-houses also provided alternate environments for the viewing and reading of satirized versions of history in the making.(52) There political prints were displayed alongside satirical ballads complete with melodies and lyrics for participatory entertainment (53), as well as newspapers for communal use—an added attraction, compliments of the coffee-house.(54) Posted on tavern walls, and exhibited in the street-facing windows of London’s many print-shops, the art of graphic satire was an integral part of the city’s public houses and street culture.(55) Unlike the printed word, spoken in private to a solitary reader, these satirical pictures told the tales of the latest events and curiosities and reached a broad spectrum of the public—ranging from literate members of parliament to illiterate urban labourers—for the price of a glance.(56)

For a contemporary public, the outdoor picture windows of print-shops would have made a striking contrast with the interior physical space of the most prestigious art exhibition in London: the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy.[Fig. 7] There visitors could see room after room of images rendered according to the academic standards of the day.(57) The exhibition of the Royal Academy attracted large crowds, but the official, state-sanctioned exhibition demanded a particular decorum and respect for the works selected for display that the urban space of the print-shop, tavern, or coffee-house could not claim. Writing in 1802, an emigre in London described the crowd waiting to see Gillray’s latest images as “a veritable madness. You have to make your way through
the crowd with your fists". (58) It is doubtful that even the largest crowds at the Royal Academy ever conjured a comparable mayhem. One could avoid the street ribaldry described above and still have access the latest satires in less public spaces, and in less participatory ways. The more fashionable print-shops, for instance, offered "lounges" where the identity of the burlesqued, and the political details of the satirical narratives, could be more comfortably and privately contemplated. (59)

The public venues for the viewing of prints, such as taverns and coffee-houses, were not entirely "democratic" and without political affiliation to a parliamentary faction or political ideology. (60) There were establishments known as Tory meeting spots, for instance, just as there were others that catered to Whigs or to radicals. (61) So although a variety of forms of political expression existed together in one public house, they were often pulled together by the harmony of political partisanship. (62)

The same could, of course, be true of any one print-shop in which the stock of political prints reflected the owner's political sympathies. The radical position of the publisher John Almon, for example, was well-known (63), as was that of the publisher-print-shop owner William Holland who gained notoriety through his publication of what some contemporaries considered pornographic poems. (64) For certain members of the public, the reputation of a particular print-seller could indeed make the visible space of the print-shop window a deterrence rather than an attraction.

A number of contemporary visitors from the Continent and from the United States commented on the unfamiliar profusion of prints in public spaces and their pictorial brazeness. (65) Reporting on the caricatures available in London, Louis Simond, a French-born visitor from the United States, wrote that
It must be owned...that the English do not spare themselves, their princes, their statesmen, and their churchmen, [who are all] thus exhibited and hung up to ridicule, often with cleverness and humour, and of course a sort of wit.(66)

One cannot say which came first, the expectation that the liberties ensured by the British political system should allow the free trade of political satire, or that the noted abundance and harsh humour of satirical prints proved that free expression of political opinion did exist among Britons. What one can surmise from such comments, however, is that the British situation with regards to political satire was utterly unique and foreign to the experience at home.(67) Less surprised than irritated by the accessibility of satirical prints and their content was an anonymous commentator for the Briton, a conservative newspaper, who in 1762 lamented that "the most indecent prints which obscenity and impudence can contrive were available to any passerby in London".(68)

Clinging to the margins of "respected" forms of cultural production, the popularity of graphic satire hinged less on cultural approval than "high" art forms. Because popular prints did not vie for the same kind of cultural patronage or endorsement as "high" art, they were received by their audiences in a manner different from that of academic or official forms of visual culture.(69) The artistic career of William Hogarth, which spanned the period from 1720 to 1764, is instructive in tracing the shifting status of prints in Britain during the first half of the Georgian era.(70) Although Hogarth also produced paintings, his canonical status in the history of British art is based predominantly on his engravings, particularly on his pictorial serial narratives such as Harlot's Progress (1733-34) and Marriage a la Mode (1745), which comment on social issues of prostitution and marriage contracts founded on parental expedience. Yet, the
exclusion of engravers from membership on the founding of the Royal Academy in 1768 attests to resilient aesthetic prejudices against the printed medium. (71)

Nevertheless, numerous innovations in engraving techniques throughout the eighteenth century did give prints a new face and a more reputable place in the hierarchy of the visual arts. (72) In addition, experimentation with earlier print-making methods multiplied the visual effects that could potentially be produced through the print medium, thereby sparking the interests of connoisseurs. (73) And satirical political prints clearly benefitted from innovations in the print medium at large.

However, the collecting of prints, including political satires, among connoisseur-collectors can be seen as affirming rather than challenging the aesthetic prejudice against the informal—read inferior—graphic medium. (74) Although framed prints functioned as affordable substitutes for oil paintings (75), the code for the "proper" manner of displaying, contemplating, collecting, and sharing art works was a strict one among those of wealth and "taste" in eighteenth-century Britain. (76) Codes of aesthetic taste dictated where particular works of art should be placed in the private home—and these codes were founded on hierarchies of both genre and medium. (77) Prints, and works on paper generally, were not to be hung on walls but rather carefully compiled into folios which were brought out for the specific purpose of viewing them in private or in intimate groups. (78) These guidelines for the physical arrangement of works of art in the private home, or confinement in the gentleman's library, reveal how an accessible and relatively inexpensive form of visual culture could in fact function as a kind of symbolic possession of cultural taste and social distinction. (79)
But the spectrum of viewing contexts for political satires in late eighteenth-century Britain was more multifarious and extensive than the dichotomy between private ownership and public sharing suggests. For example, besides taverns and the like where prints were displayed, at least one London print-shop entrepreneur provided a rental service by which folios of political prints were hired out for the evening. In the late 1780s, one could also visit exhibitions of "Entire Caricature Histories" [Fig. 8] for the admission fee of one shilling. Political prints were of interest to royalty as well, and George III, when at the royal residence at Windsor or Weymouth, had the latest Gillray print sent to him.

II. Casting the Satirist

By the late 1780s, Gillray was well-known for his graphic political satires not only in London but on the Continent and across the Atlantic as well; the sudden prominence of the Hannah Humphrey print-shop after 1791 is undoubtedly linked to its near-monopoly on Gillray's sought-after political prints. Before joining ventures with Humphrey, Gillray produced copper-plate designs for a number of different publisher-print-shop owners, and continued to hire out his talents to wealthy amateur artists who wanted their drawings—satirical and "serious"—engraved and reproduced. He also accepted commissions from ambitious politicians who understood the currency of graphic satire, especially in the latter 1790s when George Canning, then a junior minister under the conservative ministry lead by William Pitt the Younger, hired Gillray to produce sharp satires against the Opposition.
To deny that Gillray was keenly aware of the marketability of some political points of view over others is to obscure the function of prints as a growing industry both for domestic and foreign consumption, and as a propagandistic lever in the high stakes exchange of politics. The question of whether Gillray sold his political integrity in order to sell more political satires rarely enters into art historical accounts of the artist which focus instead on the engraver's political agenda and hold that his narratives blatantly or insidiously reflect political sympathies.

Whatever their final verdict with regards to Gillray, most historians of political prints agree that the essential function of political satire is to critique and oppose all figures and forms of authority: "a satiric temperament", writes Draper Hill, "seems to impel its possessor to the left, towards a philosophy of social justice".(87) Gillray's anti-Republican stance during the Terror and his acceptance of a pension from the Pitt Ministry from 1797 until the change of power in 1801 shows, to the contrary, that Gillray on occasion supported the conservative and ruling side. Nevertheless, Hill maintains that Gillray did not "soften his bias against authority" and joined the Tory camp only for practical reasons, quoting the artist's alleged reply that "the Opposition are poor, they do not buy my prints and I must draw on the purses of the larger parties".(88)

Casting Gillray in the role of the moral voice of the people against authority, Georg Piltz argues that "Gillray criticized, neither from the right or the left, but from below".(89) Too much evidence, however, challenges Piltz's romanticization of Gillray as an avant-garde liberal and leader of class struggle. For Ronald Paulson, being on the Ministry's payroll is not solid confirmation of the engraver's political
conservatism. Indeed, Gillray did not entirely stop producing prints that ridiculed Pitt and criticized his Ministry, even when they lined his pockets—and he was unreliable as a political asset for this reason. John Wardroper also contests that Gillray's short-lived business dealings with the tory-minded Ministry are a validation of the artist's political leanings to the right, claiming instead that Gillray's motley attacks reveal an utter political cynicism: Gillray was "back to normal" whenever he "lashed everyone with almost equal ferocity". In their defense of Gillray, Paulson and Wardroper construct an idealized portrait of the artist as a political outsider or a disenchanted, detached, political commentator. Though their positions are moderate in contrast to that of Piltz, they too align Gillray on the side of the opposition against the political status quo, and thereby attribute him with the "philosophy of social justice" that characterizes a "satiric temperament".

It would be helpful to know where Gillray’s political sympathies lay, but knowing this would not tell the full story of the ideological function of satirical representations of the king at the time. To do so, it is necessary to place satirical political prints within the frame in which they circulated in tandem with political ideas and opinions in the equally public and "out-of-doors" climate of the periodical press.

Censorship, or the lack thereof, played an important role in the content and circulation of political ideas in the press as well as in prints throughout the eighteenth century. Whereas the printing of each and every over-the-counter book, leaflet, and print was scrutinized under France’s absolute monarchy, pre-publication censorship
of the press had ceased to operate in Britain when the licensing act expired in 1795. But in Britain the machine of censorship was put into motion only after printed items had already hit the streets and shops, making the policing of "libellous" or "seditious" material much more difficult and far from thorough. The trend in Britain throughout the century was toward more liberties of the press, and toward greater freedom to express in published form criticisms of political means, measures, and individuals.

Gillray's representation of the eating peasant-king in Monstrous Craws is part of the eighteenth-century phenomenon which attests to the increasing circulation of political information, debates, and scandals through numerous popular forms including newspapers, pamphlets, ballads, and visual imagery. Many political prints of the day provide empirical evidence of a close dialogue with the press. Individuals with political power, authority, and privilege got the larger share of coverage in the press and "exposure" in satire than the Executive, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons—the three parliamentary bodies.

The preference for "human" subject matter by graphic satirists is not at all surprising. Given that caricature distortion lends itself much better to the depiction of individuals than to representation of bodyless principles or faceless parliamentary edifices, George III the man was the target favoured over the institution he represents among graphic satirists. And Monstrous Craws is clearly an example of satire writ large on the body of the man who is king.

The occasions on which engravers directed their sharpest needles specifically toward the identifiable, mortal body of the king is relatively small in number in contrast
to the wealth of satire in Britain in the eighteenth century. This suggests that the institution of kingship still wore a sacred halo of sorts. It is virtually impossible to conclude what would have been considered traversing the bounds of acceptable regal ridicule from the political prints produced during the reign of George III, since there were no prosecutions against graphic satirists for their political prints over this period (102)—not even during the hyper-paranoia that accompanied Britain’s war with France, when the Treasonable Practices Bill and the Seditious Meetings Bills of 1795 loomed (103). Ironically, both Bills were satirized in prints (104). Interestingly, only with the print entitled The Presentation—or—The Wise Men’s Offering [Fig. 9], of 9 January, 1796, did Gillray not evade governmental reprehension (105). The image questions the paternity of the next king’s heir, thereby exposing the purity and legitimacy of the monarchy to ridicule. Gillray’s print was encroaching the border of sacred territory (106). But it was not traversing it: the print was not censored, Gillray was not charged, and he did not stop producing satires of George IV or other members of the royal family.

III. The Free Press and "Enlightened" Politics

When newspapers became the prevalent channel for political satire—or "early cartoons"—much would change however; for circulating "alongside" newspapers, as in public houses such as taverns or coffee-houses, is not the same as circulating "within" newspapers (107). Until 1810 the most common format for political satires was the single sheet print, the publication of which would often be advertised in newspapers (108), and sold from the premises of print-shops. Censorship of individual prints in
the free market economy of independent producers and small, privately-owned print-shops was far less manageable than it would be in the controllable and accountable context of widely-circulating newspapers. (109) And as the new publishing parents of prints, newspapers' editorial policies circumscribed rules which all those sheltered under its roof were compelled to follow. As they became more and more attached to the fixed address of a newspaper, prints lost some of their youthful disrespect and vagrancy, for that traceable address could also serve as a potential magnet to attract accusations of libel.

The benefit of lax printing restrictions for engravers, publishers, viewers of political caricature and readers of texts critical of the state is clear; the benefit of permitting such liberties for the Crown and the Constitution, however, is less so. The lack of government scrutiny of published works, a phenomena unique to Britain at the time, must be factored into the maze of overlapping tensions and contradictions which pull together the relationships between visual culture and the "enlightened" politics of a constitutional monarchy on the changing field of social experience. (110) But it is insufficient to use the visual medium of political prints as just another witness in the defense of the virtually closed and triumphant case of the press.

When twentieth-century historians, such as F.P. Lock and J.H. Plumb, argue that the profusion of circulating political critique, in the form of daily, weekly, and bi-monthly newspapers, as well as pamphlets, ballads, and of course satirical prints, reveals the emergence in eighteenth-century of a politically-conscious public (111), they are in fact echoing claims made in the eighteenth century by conservatives, liberals, and radicals alike. (112) They are again reiterating eighteenth-century rationale
voiced when they claim that the liberty of the press played an integral role as an extra-
parliamentary tribunal which kept checks on the deeds of public and political
persons.(113) With regards to eighteenth-century attitudes toward the censorship of
the press, the view of Sir William Blackstone, a legal commentator, is a typical example:

The liberty of the press is indeed essential to the nature of a free state: but this consists in laying no previous restraints upon publications and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published. Every free man has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public: to forbid this, is to destroy the freedom of the press.(114)

An associated concept was that the freedom of the press was an indication of British liberties in general. For example, holding up the freedom of the press as a "peculiar privilege of the British subject", Edward Wortley Montague wrote in 1759 that

Freedom of thought, or the liberty of the mind, arises naturally from the very essence of our constitution; and the liberty of the press, that peculiar privilege of the British subject, gives every man a constitutional opportunity of laying his sentiments before the publick [sic].(115)

With the greatest of admiration, adherents to the full political spectrum invariably praised the freedom of the press as the exemplary, cherished liberty guaranteed under the British Constitution in the Georgian era.(116) Given this great pride in the liberty of the press in Britain, the "arch libellers" of satire may not have been so defamatory after all.(117)
Monstrous Craws is an example of visual satire at its most basic and farcical. The likeness of George III's profile to official representations of the king would have made the caricatured side-view portrait of the figure on the right of the image easily recognizable to contemporary viewers. Yet the print dismantles the king from his position at the pinnacle of the social and political hierarchy. Such are the fundamental visual puns of satire at its most accessible. An image of "Farmer George" stripped of his masculinity could strike a resounding chord of political impotency, and could engage a broad audience in the sport of royal ridicule—a sport played in Britain with national pride.

Before analyzing the tradition of graphic regal satire and how Monstrous Craws fits into or departs from that tradition, it is important to explore the dynamics between the institution of kingship and the system of parliamentary government which supports the sovereignty of the king. Indeed, central to assessing the way in which Monstrous Craws conveyed a political view of the monarchy is determining what was the significance of kingship and parliamentary challenges to the power of the monarch in 1787.

Long before the accession of George III in 1760, British kings and queens had been compelled to temper their prerogative rights with the advice and demands of Parliament. But it was after constitutional reforms gained as a result of the Glorious
Revolution of 1688 that each of the various tiers of constitutional power came to be viewed as mutually dependent upon and supportive of each other.\(^{(119)}\) When Blackstone, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* of 1765, argued that the British Constitution conformed to the laws of nature, and provided therefore a "rational" and "perfect" system of governing, he was endorsing the constitutional doctrine that had emerged out of the Glorious Revolution.\(^{(120)}\) He warned against abuses of power on the part of any one ruling constituent of the Parliamentary body, while eulogizing the theoretical postulations of three-part equilibrium on which the system of constitutional government was based.\(^{(121)}\) Building from the post-Revolution Coronation Act of 1689, which made joint possession of the throne by Mary and her husband William "legal", Blackstone rejected the notion of divine hereditary succession in favour of defending the monarch's right to rule on the basis of a social contract with the people.\(^{(122)}\) Henceforth absolute sovereignty of the legislature took the place of the absolute sovereignty of the monarch.\(^{(123)}\) Power was thus distributed between three separate legislative bodies: the Executive (the monarch's domain), the House of Lords, and the House of Commons. The interdependency of these three entities would, in theory, establish a mixed system of government whereby checks and balances would inherently guard against abuses of power by any one House, or any one person, namely, the king. The solidity of the political pyramid would thus be ensured. At the pinnacle of the great political body of Britain was the reigning monarch who symbolized the enduring strength of the institution of kingship— and by extension, the British Constitution as a whole.\(^{(124)}\)
Blackstone’s theory of contractual monarchy is conservative and radical at the same time. The conservative aspect of his theory stems from his defense of kingship as an integral and necessary component of the governing system he champions. As such, his vision of a perfect governing body is not different from the look of Britain’s pre-Revolutionary Constitutional Monarchy—a vertical hierarchical structure that places the king at its head. The radical implication of his theory is that the people’s contract with the king is voluntary, and, should the king violate the liberties of those whom he rules, also voidable.

Although Parliament in the eighteenth century (like in the seventeenth century) was divided into three separate, distinguishable, and interdependent entities, individuals within the Houses of Parliament were divided along an ideological and political fissure, which, roughly speaking, served to separate appointed and elected representatives into conservative and liberal factions. In post-Revolution parlance, these two parliamentary entities were often defined by the terms "Tory" and "Whig".

The problem of isolating the political principles which distinguish Whigs from Tories in the reign of George III is a daunting task, and any distillation of the key principles by which each party can be identified is wrought with contradictions. In part, the problems here go back to Parliamentary disputes during the reign of Charles I, when Parliament had been divided between Roundheads and Royalists. A half century later the Roundheads more-or-less became post-Revolution Whigs and the Royalists Tories, for the basic tenets each group espoused during the Civil War were recalled in 1688 by the two new political factions.
Although the Whigs took the lion’s share of credit for establishing the parliamentary gains and constitutional enactments of the Revolution, the Revolution was the work of both the Whigs and the Tories. Radical members of both parties joined forces against King James II to fight against his absolutist aspirations and attempts to sway England toward Catholicism. Since "church" and "king" were their key words, "revolution" was an uneasy fit for the Tory doctrine. The transfer of the crown in 1689 to the Protestant Mary, challenged the rule of hereditary succession—one of the two ideological mainstays of their traditional platform. Mary was only second to the crown after her Catholic half-brother, James Francis Edward—better known as "The Pretender". Banned from the throne because of his faith, the Tories were forced to choose the church over the king, less as a means of guarding the official faith than a means to protect their personal political places.

If the rule of divine hereditary succession was defied by the transfer of the crown to Mary, it was utterly broken when the British throne became the possession of the House of Hanover in 1714. This maneuver was necessitated by the need to fill the throne left vacant for want of an heir after the death of both Mary and her sister Anne, her successor. In strictly dynastic terms, George I was only fifty-seventh in line to the British throne. But the Act of Settlement (1701) shifted the throne into the Hanoverian line by parliamentary edict. Consequently, the theory of divine hereditary right was essentially deemed null and void. In order to regain credibility within the new framework of Hanoverian politics, the Tories were forced to amend, once again, one of their most fundamental political beliefs. Many Tories simply became Whigs to avoid inevitable political obscurity, and suspicion as old blood-line loyalists and traitors.
of the Hanoverian king, as well as the incriminating "Jacobite" label.(135) Conversely, the Whigs could easily take the side of the new king, since it was not to hereditary descent but to parliamentary decision—largely a Whig decision—that the first German Protestant George possessed the crown in 1714. Ironically, George I could be considered a "Whig king".(136)

II. Whig Distinctions

With the succession of each George throughout the eighteenth century, the number of Tories in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons declined until they reached near extinction in the 1780s.(137) But the impending extinction of old Tories did not endanger a new generation of conservatives who likewise supported the status quo just as strongly as had their conservative ancestors. Though the Tory title became increasingly unfashionable throughout the course of the eighteenth century, many of the political principles the Tories had defended in the pre-Georgian era continued to find voice in conservative parliamentarians. No longer Tories by name, the new conservatives either claimed party independency or consolidated into Whiggite factions which did not propose reforms brashly aimed to weaken the power of the Executive.

Yet, radical Whig notions which grew out of the political turbulence of the seventeenth century, such as the sovereign right of the people and contractual allegiance with the monarch, were not entirely diluted after 1780 as a consequence of the new homogenized "Whig" legislature. Although Hanoverian politics were dominated by
Whigs, conservatism and radicalism both survived in Parliament under the Whig name. (138)

Another important historical element factors into the reshaping of eighteenth-century British society and politics: the rapid growth of mercantilist wealth. Political power, economic strength, and the possession of land formed a kind of kinship triangle in which desire played out in both directions from each angle. And although the landed classes—composed traditionally of members of the aristocracy and the gentry—possessed the tangible, "respectable", and hereditary wealth of property, there were new fortunes to be made during the eighteenth century in courting commerce and trade. And, as J.G.A. Pocock has shown in his studies of eighteenth-century Britain, in this courtship between hereditary property and "paper" money, political power and social mobility could be the potential prizes that would secure a new source of wealth or legitimate a new social position. (139) As a result of the sometimes strained affections between the landed and the monied in the eighteenth century, generalizations with regards to class based party affiliations to whig or tory ideas fall into the confused smoke and mirrors of change. For the purposes of this thesis, the terms whig and tory are occasionally employed not to mark the revised boundaries of shifting social and economic allegiances, but rather as an economical way to identify distinguishing political views and as a way of separating those Whigs in parliament who defended the principles of popular sovereignty from those who were tory in essentially everything but name. Moreover, only the most striking features that distinguish whigs from tories (or radicals from liberals or conservatives) as they relate specifically to the institution of kingship and general partisan connections to George III will receive further elaboration.
Identifying splinter factions within the broad Whig generalization is thus necessary. Conservative Whigs, who kept the tory faith in order and permanence alive, need to be distinguished from liberal and radical Whigs who, with varying degrees of conviction, called for amendments which would reshape the social and political world of Britons—as the Revolutionary Whigs before them had done with disputable success. If the political pendulum swung toward conservatism during the second half of the eighteenth century, then the efforts of the reigning king to direct its path must be recognized. For George III did exercise his prerogative to appoint and dismiss ministers—evidence that George III did in fact rule as well as reign—which sometimes led to ministerial instability or odd coalitions, such as the Fox-North Coalition which was formed in April 1783. George III refused to offer his support to the coalition between Charles James Fox, one of the most progressive thinkers in eighteenth-century British politics, and Frederick North, whom he considered a traitor for his collaboration with Fox. At the time, Fox was increasingly held in contempt by much of the public for joining forces with North whose measures as Prime Minister he had strongly criticized between 1770 and 1782. The humiliating demise of this short-lived coalition, lasting only nine months, was unequivocal evidence that the key to maintaining a ministry was securing the king’s favour.

Among those eighteenth-century Britons whose investment in the politics of their country was active and tangible, there were differences of opinion as to how much power should be entrusted to the king. These same individuals did not differ on the issue of whether or not there should be a monarch to oversee the health of the polity however. The doctrine according to liberal Rockingham Whigs, for example, could
easily absorb the essentially pro-monarchical rhetoric of one of their most commanding spokespersons, Edmund Burke. For Burke, who history has come to know as the scribner of philosophical conservatism and the voice of traditional values, constitutional reform during the late 1770s and early 1780s was founded largely on economic strategies and criticisms of suspected secret influences of the Crown—not the Crown itself. Even among the more radical-leaning Rockingham Whigs who rallied around Fox, who proposed various bills in the House of Commons which attacked the prerogative right of the king, there was no call for the abolition of the constitutional monarch.

During the reign of George III, the institutional body of kingship was never rebuked by parliamentarians be they conservatives, liberals, or radicals. In fact, the decade of the 1780s saw a gradual rise in the popularity of the king, which would continue to climb in the 90s. The failed attempt on the king's life in August 1786, and his humanitarian acquittal of his assailant, further improved George III's public image. And, if only by default, the dissolute public conduct and lavish spending of the heir, immediately upon entering public life in 1783, gave a varnish of respect and admiration to the more temperate king.

Overall, dissent within the walls of power with regards to the king's constitutional role was far too quiet in the 1780s for the Richter scale of history to record as a convincing stress on the foundation of the British Constitution. It was from outside those walls that serious and far-reaching challenges to the constitution were made—in many of the same extra-parliamentary public spaces where graphic political satire coloured the walls.
Nevertheless, ideas of "who" the king is cannot be divorced from hegemonic beliefs regarding "what" the king is. Consequently, although *Monstrous Craws* is first and foremost a satirical image of the king, queen, and prince, it is also a text about monarchy and as such it is in dialogue with the contemporary discourse of the king's political role. As much as the caricatured portrait's likeness to the reigning king is justified by the royal effigy on circulating currency, the satirical narrative's relation to circulating ideas about the ruling king also gives force to the pictured text as a whole.

III. The "Paternal Model: An Old Partnership"

Observing an image of George III as a feasting peasant woman, the viewer could hardly be confronted with a representation that more undermines public reverence and respect for the king. *Monstrous Craws* does not represent the regression of George III to peasant and to political impotence (the condition of most of the nation's peasantry, woman or man, at the time). The image shows rather a visual transformation of the king so utterly complete that it is unequivocally a reversal of the status, power, and gender of the king. But is it even simply that? Instead of emphasizing the gulf between the king and the peasantry, the image of the peasant-king may also suggest that there is no gulf at all; for the apparent contradiction of the peasant-king is not only a vividly farcical motif, but also a relic of an old partnership.

Picturing the social hierarchy turned entirely upside down, the social contrast between the king and the peasantry is a reminder of the moral and legal contract between he who looks down from the very top of the constitutional pyramid and those toiling at the very bottom. The tradition of reciprocal responsibility between the
monarch and the poorest subjects of the Crown stretches back to Elizabeth I who codified a set of emergency measures which were to be enforced in times of food shortages. According to these legal measures, commonly described by the term the "Paternal Model", local justices of the peace were empowered to fix grain prices and to enforce local market arrangements in order that the poor would have their share to eat. Interestingly, those whom the queen and her council held culpable for undue hardships were of the same economic group that the poor blamed: the wealthy. Elizabeth I's Paternal Model, written into the Book of Orders between 1580 and 1630, made clear the Crown's view that it was the "greedy desier" of those who "bee not content w[i]th anie moderate gayne, but seeke & devise waies to kepe up the prices to the manifest oppression of the poorest sort".

A number of incidents during the eighteenth century reveal that the Paternal Model continued to have force in the minds of disenfranchised Britons two centuries after Elizabeth I responded to the desperate needs of the country's poor. The reciprocal responsibility between the monarch and the poor was enforced by local juries and magistrates until the 1770s; but this usually occurred only after protests and threats left no alternative. Some fundamental principles of the Paternal Model, however, continued to operate as late as 1795. That the rich were being blamed for hardtimes is demonstrated by an anonymous letter sent to the Bailiffs of Whitney in 1767 in which the enemies of the poor are described as "damned wheesing fat gutted Rogues" who
Starve the Poor by such Hellish Ways on purpose that they may follow hunting horse-racing etc. and to maintain their families in Pride and extravagance.(156)

In such attacks on the wealthy, the king was often called up as the ally of the people.

On occasion, however, the king needed to be reminded of his responsibilities to the poor. For example, in a letter publicly-posted at Snow Hill in 1766, and signed "Kidderminster & Stourbridge", George III and his government are warned that,

there is a small Army of us upwards of three thousand all ready to fight
and I'll be dam'd if we don't make the King's Army to shite
If so be the King and Parliament don't order better
we will turn England into a Litter
and if so be as things don't get cheaper
I'll be dam'd if we don't burn down the Parliament House
and make all better.(157)

George III's traditional role as an ally and the benevolent father of his subjects is severely questioned in the above letter, and questioned without the ambiguity and exclusivity of language that often characterizes satiric verse at the time. What the bellicosity of the verse does call to mind, however, is Blackstone's notion of contractual sovereignty, as well as the radical Whig defense of the sovereign rights of the people to judge the monarch.

An anonymous copper-plate engraving entitled England's Firm Pyramid [Fig. 10] draws on the motif of parliament as a pyramidal edifice. What is striking about England's Firm Pyramid is that only a youthful George III, dressed in the full regalia of his station, and the workers of the land are given human form. All remaining
components of the social and political body are either excluded or merely implied by inscription on the slanting sides of the pyramidal structure from which the man who heads the state overlooks those who work the plow. Beneath the illustration is written:

Behold England's Pyramid gracefully peering.  
O'er a beautiful Campaign—Fields reaping—sheep shearing.  
The people all joyous, peaceful and prosperous.(158)

Nothing obscures the view of the "joyous, peaceful and prosperous" from the crowned king firmly placed at the apex of the constitutional pyramid and "gracefully peering" from above: timeless pastoral tranquillity ensured by the grace of the royal overseer. This print, which appeared in a pamphlet published near the end of George III's life, relies on the leitmotif of the monarch as the omniscient, benevolent guardian of the people.(159)

The theme of the king as the guardian of the people was a common rallying cry of pro-monarchists long before George III held the throne. And, as the warning—or rather warring—letter quoted above shows, it could also be held up as a reminder of the monarch's obligations by those whom the Crown had forgotten. Adapted to the erroneous representation of George III as a labourer of the land in Monstrous Craws, the traditional link between the king and the peasantry is an important sub-text of Gillray's satirical print.

The peasant-king in Monstrous Craws recalls the legal bond between the monarch and the poor, but with an added ironic twist. The representation of the peasant-king appears to close by inversion the social and political fracture between class extremes. But the single food staple of the royal peasants' feast is the blood of the polity—John
Bull's Blood. Does it signify royal generosity or voracious cannibalistic greed? Who in fact is being sacrificed for this feast of plenty?

The political message of *Monstrous Craws* is woven into the folds of the monstrous craws-cum-money bags of the king, queen, and prince. "Farmer George" eats what appears at first glance a bland meal of beans while simultaneously acting out his role as king in a theatre of power signified by the framing triumphal Roman arch of the nation's Treasury. Contradiction is the grammar of satire. How the king figures as the subject within the visual diction of satire is the focus of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
THE ROYAL SPORT OF SATIRE:
HUMOUR IN THE IMAGE, ACT, WORD

I. Veiled Identities and the Lingering Taboo

The earliest known "satirical" engraving of the British monarch is Miriceny's allegorical Diana and Callisto of 1585 [Fig. 11], which shows Elizabeth I as a victorious Diana and Pope Gregory XIII as the nymph Callisto defrocked by Truth and Time.(160) The compositional division between the Protestant victors and the expiring Pope—hatching the monsters of Catholic tyranny—emphasizes allegorical pretense while simultaneously underlining Britain's recent taking of the Netherlands from Spain and liberation from the Papal yoke. In terms of its depiction of the reigning monarch, the print is an anomaly: precocious for its time. Not surprisingly, the image idealizes the British monarch and honours her conviction to have "No Popery". Thus the print is not a satire of the monarch, but rather a propagandistic image supportive of the British monarchy and critical of its adversaries.

Before the legal and parliamentary challenges to notions of divine right peeled away some of the mystical, quasi-religious casing which had rendered the power of the king absolute, there was virtually no graphic tradition of regal satire in Britain.(161) But after 1649, with the example of Charles I and the outcome of the Civil War, the king could be held accountable, could be criticized, punished, and ridiculed. Free of the prohibition of royal ridicule, graphic satires of the king began to appear in Britain more than a century before George III took the throne and their numbers increased after the Glorious Revolution. Multiplying throughout the Georgian era, graphic satires
reached their peak of production during the reign of George III.(162) Consequently, when Monstrous Craws appeared in London in 1787, images which mocked the British king would no longer have struck Britons as entirely novel.

Corresponding to the gradual increased production of satirical prints of the king was the expansion of the pictorial codes of graphic regal satire, which eventually included direct and unambiguous references to the physical body of the king. The emergence of individualized portrait caricature was nevertheless tempered by former pictorial conventions of graphic regal satire. And even in what appeared wholly new, as in Gillray's physically metamorphosed king, there remained familiar visual reminders of pictorial traditions of the past.

The employment of caricatured likenesses allowed the artist to poke fun at a specific and identifiable individual rather than at a general and abstract social or political type.(163) Moreover, once the face of the subject could be rendered recognizable, abstract emblems became superfluous.

Superfluous they are in Gillray's Monstrous Craws. To quote Ronald Paulson:

If one caricaturist was responsible for the subversion of the royal icon (the image of the English sovereign stylized into ideal anonymity), it was Gillray, who individualized George III and Queen Charlotte in remarkable ways.(164)

But it was not always the case that viewers expected graphic satires to render highly individualized, caricatured portraits such as that of George III in Monstrous Craws. Before the 1780s, satirical graphic story-telling tended to rely on abstract symbols and generalized denotations which veiled the identity—albeit, often only thinly—of the
pictured king behind impersonal or anonymous emblems. (165) Indeed, implicit abstract emblems provided the satirist with a guarding shield while the lingering taboo of regal satire remained a specter of self-censorship. (166)

A typical example of the pre-caricature satire is an anonymous print which was issued on 19 December, 1738, entitled Solomon in His Glory. [Fig. 12] Here the emblem of the crown unmistakably signifies the wearer—a portly figure represented in a sexually compromising pose—as the king. George II is also called up by the portrait of his recently deceased wife, Queen Caroline who is shown in three-quarter view looking away from the seated couple. But the king-figure bears no identifying facial details that would denote George II, the man. Rather, the crowned figure is linked to "Solomon", renown for his wisdom, magnificence, and numerous foreign wives. In this print Solomon is muddled into a general ruler-figure, and any direct criticism of George II’s personal habits, and connections with German mistresses, lose force in the transhistorical blur. Indeed, in the guise of Solomon, the political acts of the reigning constitutional king may even be legitimated by the merge with the proverbial, good king Solomon—and George II’s well-known amorous pursuits forgiven.

Charles Grignion’s engraving of William Hogarth’s design for the Frontispiece in the Artists Catalogue, 1761 [Fig. 13] is also a variation on the impersonal style of graphic emblematics, although it is not a satirical image. An allegorical apotheosis of the king for his patronage of the arts, Grignion’s image shows a bust of George III placed in a fountain set against a rocky cliff. (167) He is identified by his likeness to the profile bust, as well as by the inscription "Georgius III Rex", and by the symbol of the crown at the culmination of the arch-shaped upper frame of the monument. The image is
clearly not a political satire, but the contrast between its almost Greco-Roman idealization of George III and Gillray’s travesty of idealized regal representations is nevertheless striking. The classical mode of the king’s portrait is enhanced in Hogarth’s design by the allegorical figure of Britannia, transformed into mythological muse. She has put aside her battle shield in order to collect from the royal fountain water with which she nourishes intertwining trees labeled "painting", "sculpture", and "architecture": an allegorical marriage between an earthly Apollo and the muse whose national sentiments are indubitably conveyed by her shield bearing the symbol of Great Britain.

Allegory remains an iconographic mode used among political satirists when portrait caricature begins to comes to the fore in the 1770s. The frontispiece for a political pamphlet entitled Take Your Choice! [Fig. 14], published by John Almon on 14 October, 1776, for instance, lends visual force to the political views discussed in the text by Major John Cartwright, a radical reformer and founder of the Society for Constitutional Information.(168) The print draws on the familiar structural motif of parliament as a pyramid which was used also in the aforementioned engraving England’s Firm Pyramid, and is an example of the power of images to convey concisely and with pictorial economy prevalent notions regarding the workings of government. The pictorial rudiments of the image are two pyramidal forms which are filled with emblematic references and labels alluding to Blackstone’s Commentaries, published in the previous decade. The pyramid on the left represents a government which adheres to the principles of constitutional monarchy, and the right pyramid depicts a government in an advanced stage of decay—only the corinthian column on which the crown is perched remains unscathed by the corruption of "Influence", "Expectations", "Places and
Pensions”, and "Douceurs". The figure of George III, identified by his crown, is shown on the second tier of the shellless structure, on the level labeled "Great Theatre Royal". But the figure of the crowned man is disembodied from the symbolic crown which looms above. Severed from his responsibilities as the head of the state, the health of the political body George III heads is endangered. This engraving belongs to the visual tradition of emblematics by virtue of the manner in which political concepts and assumptions are rendered as geometric structures embellished with impersonalized figures and abstract emblems. Although Take Your Choice! is not a caricature, it is indeed a political print. Like many political prints and graphic satires produced in previous decades, it employs emblems to convey a political view in pictorial terms.

Two anonymous satiric prints from around 1780 are of particular interest because of their animistic portrayal of George III— a narrative devise which looks back to the generalized comic prototypes of older popular images and secular parables. Popular images, ballads, and especially fables appropriated animal forms as a pictorially economical means to convey human characteristics—such as the "sly fox", the "lustful goat", and the "wise owl". This narrative shorthand was in fact exploited by Gillray, Rowlandson, and others in their satirical representations of the Rockinghamite Whig Fox [Fig. 15], whose unfortunate surname was a gift to satirists. In The Royal Ass [Fig. 16], the king is portrayed as a steadfast crowned farm animal being lead to Rome by Lord Bute, the immensely unpopular minister between 1760 and 1763 who was chosen by the king. Bute is shown walking on cloven-feet and dressed in tartan: the evil Scottish outsider misleading the duped Protestant king. Signifying the king as a crowned animal on the pilgrimage to the papal center had relevance in light of the
recent anti-Catholic Gordon Riots which swept through London for seven days in 1780, and took many lives. The only fault underlined by the image is the king’s blind obedience to his minister, who is shown as the misleading master of the rope. Similarly, Father Peters Leading His Mangy Whelp to be Touched for the Evil [Fig. 17] also deals with the anti-papist theme. Here a crowned faithful dog on a rope is being taken to the pope by a mendicant monk. "Father Peters" is a reference to Edmund Petre who was the confessor of James II. If a subtle conflation between James II and George III is intended, it certainly is an untenable one since George shared many of the religious prejudices of his anti-papacy subjects. In both these prints, the king is unquestionably signified by the royal headpiece worn by the ass and the dog, and as such the Crown is both ridiculed and implicated in a topical, contentious political debate on the rights of Catholics. Yet, because the king is represented not by his likeness but rather by abstract signification, the mortal body of George III is not subjected to the satirist’s distortions; the body of the living king remains intact.

The examples of popular prints and engravings above all make reference to the king without pictorially lampooning George II’s or George III’s body. King George II as Solomon is represented in a compromising position, but the king-figure’s features are neither individualized nor distorted. In Hogarth’s design, George III’s features are individualized but also idealized. The figure of the king in the frontispiece of Cartwright’s political tract is dwarfed to the point where no features are distinguishable except for the identifying crown; and the satirical depictions of the crowned ass or dog denote the king without making direct reference to the body of George III.
Monstrous Craws belongs to an entirely different sub-category of prints and graphic satire: portrait caricature. The employment of recognizable monarchical signifiers which characterizes emblematical graphic satire kept attacks politely distanced from the body of the indirectly signified king. But in Monstrous Craws the identifiable body of the living king is neither avoided nor idealized, but rather amplified, "charged", and mocked.(173)

The transformation to portrait caricature with regard to regal satire was a gradual process, and evidence of direct ridicule of the identifiable body of the king can occasionally be observed in prints produced during the 1760s and 1770s, the first two decades of George III's reign. Importantly, however, George III is rarely shown without accoutrements which mark him as the king. One exception is an anonymous engraving entitled The Botching Tailor Cutting his Cloth to Cover a Button of 1779 [Fig. 18] which depicts George III without his official headpiece or customary royal accessories. The representation of George III in profile is strikingly similar to effigies of the king on coins and medals in circulation at the time [Figs. 19, 20], and would certainly have aided the viewer in connecting the figure of the "Botching Tailor" with George III, as would the reference to the king's much ridiculed alleged fascination with buttons.(174) As the Prime Minister during Britain's war with the United States, North is shown as the keeper of the very large swatch of fabric labeled "North America", "West Indies", and "Africa". At the instruction of the kilted Scot, Lord Bute, the king is about to sever "Ireland" from the remaining piece of cloth to which Hanover remains attached. In the background, the pope, wearing a tiara, and the Catholic Pretender to the Crown look on. Behind them, a picture with the caption reading "Flight into Egypt" depicts the king and queen
mounted on an ass on route to Hanover. Published while the specter of rebellion loomed over Ireland, and while the political wounds inflicted by the loss of the American colonies were far from healed, the satirical excuse for mocking George III’s interest in buttons is overshadowed by references to the present political situation of mismanaged foreign affairs. But, like the crowned ass and dog, the "Botching Tailor" is shown as the duped victim of others’ schemes.

There is little distortion of facial features of the king in The Botching Tailor Cutting his Cloth to Cover a Button: what exaggeration there is has the effect of idealizing rather than lampooning the body of the king. In Monstrous Craws, however, a set of characteristic physical features of the king replace abstract emblems common to the earlier pictorial codes of graphic satire, and also reject the allegorical propensity toward idealizing the physique and visage of the king.(175) The king’s round head, thick fair eyebrows, large protruding eyes, hefty middle, and so forth, are the highly "individualized emblems" of George III in Monstrous Craws: the new codes of regal satire in its matured form a la Gillray.(176) Thus, although the artist has stripped away the salient symbols of kingship, the specific features of the famous face help connect the corpulent figure in peasant woman’s garb with the body of King George III.(177) Despite the insult to his body and rank, as the identifiable George he remains in the regal seat of power at the same time that his unadorned mortal body is the site of satire in Monstrous Craws.

In Gillray’s satirical narrative, the body therefore becomes the chief carrier of comedy and critique. The same approach to the royal subject would, of course, be considered inappropriate for a life-size academic portrait.(178) The visual ridicule
of satirical political portraiture in the latter decades of the eighteenth century comes as no surprise however—it had become the expected pictorial language of political caricature. Yet, could it be that the "expected" subversion of turning the table of power around—ruling king to victim of satire—is also the unexpected spice that makes a distasteful structure of privilege and power palatable?

Monstrous Craws takes as its subject not the "universal" ideal of kingship but the individual, the man, and all his mortal flaws. Representing George III in all his unglorified, profane humanness may be taking the symbolic sacred core from the empirical body of the person of the king. Or it may suggest his mortal body is a doubtful castle for its residence. But it does not question existing social hierarchies or snuff the candle of kingship.(179)

A likeness of the symbolic father of the nation has resonance even when his mortal being is being humiliated. Although Gillray's image of the eating king forefronts the mortality of the monarch, his portrait caricature of George III serves also to secure the symbolic longevity of the sacred institution which the living, reigning king embodies.(180) And what could more significantly connote life and regeneration than the natural function of eating?

II. Ritualized Regal Satire

Ridicule of the king was expressed in cultural forms such as popular rituals, plays, ballads, poems, and prose long before the eighteenth century.(181) Indeed, the essence of popular early modern rituals in Europe and their various attendant paraphernalia was the derision of the high in rank or station, and the elevation of the
low or common.(182) After the king in heaven, the earthly king was the living symbol of ultimate power and proximate divinity—the all-encompassing butt of carnivalesque profanity.

The peasant-king in Monstrous Craws recalls the tradition of the mocked or "carnivalesqued" king.(183) Though the practice in Britain of mock coronations and the like had waned long before Hanoverian accession, the memory, or the fantasy, of turning the zenith of power into the nadir of commonplace is inscribed into the comic guise of the king in Monstrous Craws.

Gillray's representation of the royal body is carnivalesqued not only by dressing the king as a peasant, but also by dressing a man as a woman, and by giving a human an animal attribute. At various levels, Gillray is making use of the carnivalesque theme which had been treated for centuries in popular culture.(184) But his subject, George III, brings that theme into a contemporary frame of reference; into an historical frame in which the signifying potential of the "carnivalesqued king", animal-man, and cross-dressed man, had shifted.

The play on inversion the image of George III in Monstrous Craws evokes is up-dated also by its reference to a popular contemporary "amusement" in London from which the title of Gillray's print in part derives. For the price of a shilling, one could visit the exhibition of "Monstrous Craws, Wild Human Beings". According to an advertisement in the Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser of 29 May, 1787, the three living "spectacles" of the exhibition, two female and one male, ate from ten in the morning until ten at night.(185) In fact, the three "wonderful phenomena" were sufferers of goitre, and had large growths under their throats which moved when
stimulated by eating, speaking, or laughing.\textsuperscript{(186)} The exhibition of the three "wild human beings" with "monstrous" appendages was a popular attraction when Gillray's print was published. No doubt the overgrown glands and the apparently insatiable appetites which attracted the curiosity of the public provided the satirical iconography of the bizarre added body-parts for the royal three.

Eating is obviously central to the narrative composition of the "New Coalition Feast". The alleged quantity of food consumption of the "wild human beings" correlates to the conspicuous consumption of the royals from the enormous central pot. The manner in which the king, queen, and prince eat (or, the lack of "manners" with which they eat), is also salient. Representing royalty in the act of devouring their meal two-fistedly suggests a social travesty: their manners suggest the coarse satiating of a farm-labourer's hunger, not the pleasing of an aristocratic appetite.\textsuperscript{(187)}

The resonance of three main carnival themes are evident in \textit{Monstrous Craws}, and it is important to see both the thematic roots of these motifs and how they are reworked in Gillray's portrait of the king. Peter Burke, in his study of popular culture in early modern Europe, discusses food (especially meat, which should come as no surprise given the root "carne"), sex, and violence—often in the form of animal "sports" or torture—as key ingredients of Carnival.\textsuperscript{(188)} These three elements could be expressed in ways that reflected regional and political specificity \textsuperscript{(189)}, but they were always conspicuous during Carnival by a license and an excess which everyday life did not allow.\textsuperscript{(190)} In \textit{Monstrous Craws}, the cross-dressing of the king, the abundant "feast", and the violence against the living implied by the cannibalistic feast are all
remnants of the popular ritual which permitted the world, for a designated time, to be turned upside down.

Travesties are the prerogative of the Carnival rite. Importantly, however, participation in the transgressing of codes is contained by and within the subversive event which is itself contained within the normative framework of the everyday. Carnival engaged the community in symbolically stripping the king of his privileges in a vicarious drama of law and order as misrule and folly. Carnival was a momentary subversion of hierarchical social order, and a time when aggression toward authority could be pardonoably unleashed. The print Monstrous Craws, however, is a fixed object which presents the king as a physical likeness and as an aberration of that likeness: the empirical "truth" of seeing juxtaposed with the fantastic. But is the laughter at the print's carnivalesque imagery "contained" by dominant, normative cultural codes in a way that parallels the containing of popular ritual within everyday propriety? Or, because the print is an object which is existent over time, rather than an act which lasts merely for the duration of rite, is it in fact more integral to, as well as more integrated within, the everyday, as a thread weaving in and out of the fabric of kingship thereby adding weight, texture, and strength to the discourse of authority?

Although public venues permitted viewers to "participate" in the viewing of satirical prints, rituals clearly produce meaning for participants differently than do static images for viewers, or written texts for readers. Images, even when their visual statements are made in the most transparent manner, leave spaces for individual interpretation. True, reading between the lines of almost any text gives the reader the
opportunity to devise his or her own impression of the work. But the heuristic path initiated by written texts is distinct from that inspired by images. The difference should not be underemphasized in relation to the satirical mode.

If ambiguity is a characteristic of the language of satire generally, then another layer of ambiguity is added when applied to visual satires with "explanatory" captions or titles. The doubles-entendres of visual metaphors and references, for example, are doubled again by incongruities between pictorial narratives and their accompanying texts, thereby widening the gulf between the "truth" of vision and authority of words, and the conceptual meaning finally attributed to the configuration as a whole by the viewer-reader. Though the strictly pictorial aspects of visual satires can be understood without "reading", the full meaning of graphic political satires often cannot be grasped without accessory texts which serve to add ironic twists to satirical images. This is clearly the case with Gillray's *Monstrous Craws*. For although the image shows a feast, only the text directs the viewer-reader to the reason for the celebration.

Because of their predominantly pictorial content, the visual content of satirical prints is accessible to an audience which encompasses illiterate as well as literate viewers. But one is also reminded of the literary tradition of satire as exemplified by writers such as John Dryden (1631-1700), Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), and Alexander Pope (1688-1744). For these exemplars of the Augustan satiric mode, the genre of satire provided a literary form which permitted references to the Classics and to the Bible as much as allusions to the present. In order to appreciate the agility of these literary academicians, and to understand the relevance of their mock-heroes, one would first have to be well-versed in the classical literary traditions they were parodying. Their
academic standards do not suggest a levelling of readership for satirical verse; for their satirical writings were clearly directed towards a learned readership that recognized the layers of literary and contemporary political references. Exclusivity is therefore a feature of the satirical writing of Dryden, Swift, and Pope—a feature which calls into question general assumptions regarding satire as an accessible and distinctly vernacular mode of expression opposed to elite culture.(198)

But pictorial satire of the 1780s is emphasized by its "readability", at least on the level of the visual. Hyperbole, preposterous juxtapositions, and surprising references are its keystones. Far from striving toward learned sophistication, such visual tactics often exploit the most base and vulgar aspects of humanity, as the popularity of scatological iconography in graphic satire attests.[Figs. 21, 22] These basic syntactic absurdities and profanities of visual satire add humour to the political content of satirical prints. But one wonders if the potency of visual humour does not distract from the potential criticality of political content?

III. The Safe Scope of Satire: A Psychoanalytic Sketch

The elicitation of a humourous response is a precarious venture, and the comedian-commentator constantly negotiates the fine line that separates the feasibly humourous from the possibly indignant. That Gillray was himself aware of the fine line the political satirist treads is shown by his declining of an offer to execute a series of engravings on Napoleonic crimes. In a correspondence of 1801, Gillray expressed reservations toward the commission saying that "I fear there will be little room for Humour in the life of such a cut-throat".(199) But that fine and shifting line between
what can be ridiculed and what cannot is sketched by prevailing cultural codes, traditions and the hegemonic worldview, which in turn determines the safe scope of satire.(200)

Outlining the safe scope of humour is precisely the object of Ernst Kris and Ernst Gombrich in their psychoanalytic examination of caricature. The problem with their analysis of the psychological function of the comic is the tendency to universalize human behaviour. This is in part the inevitable result of neglecting social, cultural, and political factors that are integral to assessing where the shifting line between acceptable and unacceptable ridicule is drawn within the frame of any one specific culture and historical moment.(201) However, their stress on the observing subject’s response to caricature is informing, and, as such, their theory of the comic is valuable. Recast in the historical framework of Britain in the late-eighteenth century, an understanding of the ways in which humour functions on the level of individual receivers can, in fact, provide a methodological support for the investigative aims of this thesis—the social function of critiques of hereditary power in graphic satire in the 1780s.

Kris’s and Gombrich’s emphasis on the psychological impact that caricature has on the viewer is antithetical to that of art historians whose examinations of polemical prints propose that political satires are expressions of the producer’s own political position. Yet, for entirely different reasons, Kris and Gombrich, too, accord the artist an important role. "Thanks to the power of the artist", they write,

the victim appears transformed and reinterpreted and only this interpretation contains criticism. Aggression has remained in the aesthetic sphere and thus we react not with hostility but with laughter.(202)
The task of the artist, then, is to contain aggression while also allowing hostility to vent in the form of the viewer’s release of laughter. According to Kris and Gombrich, the ego (the containment of aggression) maintains supremacy over primary impulses (which is the release of aggression in the safe expression of laughter) in caricature. Though their stress is on the psychological effect of caricature on the viewing subject, their understanding of the artist’s manipulation of viewer’s psyche and the power of caricature to contain aggression within the aesthetic sphere is evocative. This analysis of the function of caricature can be extended to bear on the "political mind" of a culture, and thereby lead to a questioning of another kind of "containment", "venting", and, indeed, manipulation.

As has been discussed in Chapter One above, establishing the producer’s political leanings does nothing to help illuminate the process by which ambiguous satirical codes and devices figure into the construction of meaning at the historical moment of reception. Yet satirists do have a hand in directing the interpretation of their pictorial parables. For instance, in choosing the culturally resonant themes and symbols that he does, Gillray encourages a particular path of recognition, cognition, and judgement. Importantly, cultural mechanisms have the power to coax viewers towards a particular assessment of political images as well.

It should be equally stressed, however, that caricature engages the viewing subject in an important way, for manipulation of the comic takes place also on the level of subjective interpretation. Here it is helpful to return to Kris and Gombrich. Caricature, they argue, "tries to produce an effect...on the spectator, who is influenced to accomplish a particular effort of imagination", and the effort of the viewer is spent on
discovering the "like" in the apparent "unlike" of the distorted subject of caricature. (205) In other words, the viewer engages with the comic image by trying to make sense of the ambiguity inherent in what they call caricature's "half-measures". The interpretive openness of caricature lies precisely in the space left incomplete, or vacant, by its "half-measures".

Because of the "inherent ambiguity of caricature"—and, it should be added, because of the "expected" outrageousness of its visual motifs—political messages delivered in the language of satire leave an "openness" which politically didactic or documentative texts are more likely to close off. (206) That is not to say that satirical texts do not represent a political position. But rather that a political way of seeing is not imposed on the viewer-reader with the persuasive force of a text which presents itself as "truth", or as simply the way things are. "Truth" and empirical validity are diametrically opposed to the rudimentary pictorial devices of satire such as obvious exaggeration and distortion. In the case of graphic political satire, meaning and political currency is more dependent upon how, and on what level, the viewer engages with the message s/he encounters than in the case of overtly persuasive written texts which generally convey messages in more certain terms. Paradoxically, graphic political satires might also insidiously darken the lines which the printed word renders as factual contours.

Between encouraging some "collective" political critique and provoking a subjective humourous response is a plethora of possibilities of how a satirical image of the king can be broadly functional in a political manner and singularly interpreted. Because in Monstrous Craws this whole spectrum is confounded within the
representation of the body of George III and the animistic member growing beneath his chin, political commentary and carnivalesque comedy become two halves of one body: two distinct yet inseparable halves. The one half is the living body of George III. The other is the symbolic corpus of kingship which osmotically procreates the myth of royal right and privilege in the living mortal body of he who is king. It is the latter, the symbolic half, that makes George III, or any man, king. Without the symbolic half he is but a man, nothing more. Within the representation of the burlesqued body, the mortality of George III and the mythology of kingship are inextricably intertwined.(207)

Can the body of the sacred, immortal king be severed from the mortal being—the living embodiment—in an ideological and political system which incorporates a king who both reigns and rules?(208) The sacred core pumps life through the symbolic body—the essence—of kingship; it can be taken from one living body and transplanted into another, and can survive each monarch's death. It exists at the same time within and without the living, empirical body of the monarch.

The beheading of Charles I in 1649 did not cause the death of the myth of kingship; it only caused it to withdraw into a state of dormancy. With another living cipher, the royal myth came back to life. And the sturdiest sutures to keep the man joined to the myth are representations that show that the miracle has been performed.(209)

Satirical representations of George III which directly mock his physical body are not divorced from the dominant discourse of kingship. They cannot be. Nor are they disengaged from official forms of regal representation. For they all occupy a space
within the complex network of defining and supporting texts which are in and of themselves the link that ensure the life of the symbolic body of kingship. Although they may appear to be depraved blasphemies of the semi-sacred institution of kingship, regal satires respond to the discourse of kingship, and are informed by its legend. Since the living, reigning king is the embodiment of national identity in whose body an era is all-embracingly distilled, mocking the man who is king brings the institution of kingship and all it connotes into the joke. The joke would be impotent, meaningless, without reference to kingship, and satires of George would be aristocratic caricatures, not "political" satires. (210)

Yet, if direct ridicule of the king's body remained for so long disguised beneath abstract allusions for a political reason, as discussed earlier in this chapter, then the reasons for lifting this taboo of regal representation must also have a political foundation. This question is addressed in the conclusion.
CONCLUSION
CELEBRATING THE KING

"Only the wicked Governors of Men dread what is said of them."(211) Cato’s Letters, 1720

"Against the private life of the King calumny itself could not discover an objection."(212) Adolphus, The Constitutional King, 1804

If there was a marriage between graphic political satire and George III, it was a surprisingly untroubled one. Indeed, it was a remarkably functional one. But how could the irreverent attacks of satire not harm the status of the person at whom they were directed? Were not the implications of showing the royal family voraciously devouring the symbolic body of the British polity stretching satire to the border of treason—particularly for a king who shared his sovereign duties as head of the British Constitution with his position as elector of the Hanoverian kingdom on the Continent.(213) Obviously not. Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast was not censored. The boundary between humour and insulting ridicule was not transgressed. Representing the king as a greedy, cannibalistic peasant was not breaking with royal decorum, in as much as royal decorum restricted the content of satire.

The political events and intrigues surrounding kings before George III undoubtedly resulted in a slow but steady rethinking of the king’s power, which went hand in hand with the inculcation of a different notion of the king’s role as crowning cap of the constitution and father of the nation. Certainly from the time of Henry VIII, the longer end of political rope was at time held by the Executive, and at other times was in the possession of the two remaining Houses of Parliament. After the regicide of Charles I, however, political rhetoric of the British Constitution underlined the crucial
importance of "balanced" power. In theory, this form of "balanced" government achieved perfect equilibrium between powers of the state, and liberties of its subjects. Couched in the rhetoric of dangers to liberty and fair government, political theorists throughout the eighteenth century warned that too much political weight on the side of the Executive, or any one element of the legislature, would tip the scales of justice and liberty: but blame would most often be laid on aggressive and self-seeking individuals rather than on measures or the much prized and praised edifice that was the British Constitution. George III himself, writing to his closest advisor in 1780, described the system of British government as "this excellent Constitution....the most beautiful Combination that ever was framed."(214)

The power of the king was to be balanced and checked by that of the two remaining Houses of Parliament: this was the legal outcome of seventeenth-century parliamentary discord. But how would changes in parliamentary law impact on extra-parliamentary notions of the monarch’s role, function, and royal prerogative? The contrast between British and French monarchs in the eighteenth century is instructive here. There is a striking difference between the symbolic shroud of kingly divinity which cloaks the Protestant British king of foreign descent and the Catholic French king at the end of an almost three centuries long, unbroken lineage of ruling Bourbons. When the Hanoverians were given the throne in 1714, their accession could only be founded on divine right with the greatest of faith, for it was to national choice, caution against absolutist aspirations, and an anti-catholicism bordering on the xenophobic, that they owed possession of the crown. In effect, the absolute authority of the king was, so to speak, hollowed out, and the body of the king became the reminding embodiment
of what once was. The symbolic link to the divine was yet to be severed in France whereas it had been severed and resurrected by Parliament in Britain a century earlier. (215) No doubt some of the "magic" of the divine ruler had been cut away in the process. Yet much of it remained in the thoughts of the monarch's subjects (as indeed it does to this day). All this has to be considered as George III's royal inheritance, the trump card of Parliament, and the fodder of satirists.

Satirical prints were part of the public sphere at a moment when self-apotheosizing parliamentary discourse often revolved around the freedoms and liberties which the British Constitution allegedly secured. Not surprisingly, many parliamentary tug of wars between Tories and Whigs, and their various splinter groups, were fought over the question of which side was the true defender of British liberties and which was merely the pretender. The outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789 necessitated constructing defensive fortifications around the discourse on British freedom and indeed the British monarchy—both of which appeared ancient in contrast to the demands and ideals of French Republicans. But before the Revolutionary sans culottes became emblems of evil for many Britons—the carriers of the French "republican virus"—it seems that good could have the odd dance with evil on the soil blessed by the British Constitution. (216) Hence the curious ambivalence in representations of George III in political satires produced after Louis XVI was brought to the scaffold.

In all but the most radical circles, the British king was an accepted component within the constitutional machine. (217) But acceptance did not rule out criticism and political caricature participated in the playing-field of out-of-doors political criticism. The same is true of the viewers of satire which included both those who had political
clout and those whose participation in politics was restricted to symbolically clouting power, ridicule being among the repertoire of equipment to employ in their criticism of misrule.

Was satire a safety valve that ensured that any displeasure with the political state of things would dissipate into harmless laughter before it could solidify into mass dissent? Or was political satire a demonstration that parliamentary checks and balances extended to include all social concentric circles of allegiance? Ironically, it was both. An image of the George III eating John Bull’s Blood hit home the fact that much British blood had been spent since the third George had taken the throne, and pointed directly at the abuses of the king. But this criticism could be absorbed, dissipated, and turned into palatable humour.

Indeed, the topical import of *Monstrous Craws* points an unabashed finger at an abuse of the Crown—the prince’s extravagance. The delicate situation of the prince’s spending was converted into a kingly coup for George, however. On May 24, it was announced in the House of Lords that

> an additional allowance [would be allotted] to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, out of his Majesty’s Civil List, in order to remove every possible doubt of the sufficiency of his Royal Highness’s income to support amply the dignity of his situation, without occasioning any increase to the annual expense of the Public.

The royal reconciliation received wide coverage in all shades of the popular press. Gillray’s print is a satirical "celebration" of the corresponding political event. But
unlike government newspapers, which reported the event in terms of the great magnanimity of the king both towards his son and his subjects (220), Gillray's image of "a New Coalition Feast" uses an entirely different trope. Taking into account the well-publicized blemishes on the relationship between father and son caused by the prince's spending habits, the artist tints the irony of his image of George III with judgement—the king who shares his feast but at the same time stashes reserves in his craw. In the terms of the reconciliation, George III demonstrates his dedication to the well-being of his subjects as well as a fatherly compassion for his son. The public announcement of the reconciliation emphasizes the domestic and public responsibility of the father and king. In some newspaper reports of the prince's debts, criticisms of him are only thinly disguised. The contrast between the extravagance and impudence of the prince and the paternal generosity and public responsibility of his father is forefronted by the public announcement of the outcome of the financial conflict (221). This contrast is writ large in the moralizing sub-text of Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast. It is no great leap to suggest that George III's paternal generosity as the male head of his family could have implications for his role as symbolic father of British subjects. But, dressed as a woman and a peasant, he appears quite ineffectual both as father and king.

The public and political rift between king and prince spill over onto Gillray's image of the domestic coalition around the royal dining table. Gillray makes the contrast between king and prince stark and obvious: their costumes, manners, and appetites for the golden nuggets are the product of more than a generation gap. But there is also great political import in the comical dichotomy embodied in their differing
physical constitutions which makes Gillray's joke suddenly more sober. Recognizing that their feast consists of the life-blood of the polity, and that their craws appear like money bags, the obligation George III has to the social contract between himself and his subjects becomes highly questionable.

Rumblings within the "excellent constitution" surface in Gillray's mocking of the mortal body of the king in Monstrous Craws. While the different spending habits of the king and the prince provide the "topic" of Monstrous Craws, the historical thesis is beyond that which meets the eye. Indeed, what is significant in the graphic irony of the feasting king is that only the abuses of the man are exposed. And by engaging in laughter over ridiculous George III the privileges of class power are made momentarily tolerable, and the abuses of power perhaps even forgiven. Laughter: the great ameliorant. Autocratic monarchs might not allow their subjects the sight of graphic royal derision and the fantasy of levelling. That Britons possessed the liberty to laugh at the king is inseparable from their granting an approving nod; an approval that pays homage to the head of the British Constitution and supports the political system that values "balance" in its hierarchical order. Ridicule of the mortal man does not impede the resurrection of the regal body of the king who must never die.(222) Rather, satire acts here as a mischievous Puck guiding monarchs through the kingly passage from the one era to the next; satire's mere existence both buttresses and cushions the formidable fortress of British liberty.

Although laughter recognizes undemocratic privileges and the abuses of power, it does not necessarily call for their destruction. Stripped of the emblems of his rank, George III in Monstrous Craws is, ironically, still represented as a disciplining and
benevolent father of his son, and by extension, of the nation. In the satirizing of the king, the abuses of power and public funds are put into visual form, but there is no suggestion that the political fabric should be ripped, torn, or refashioned. The regal body of the king remains solidly placed at the pinnacle of the pyramid that is the British Constitution, with the crown its capping lantern, while the sound of laughter at the sight of George echoes off the walls of the vast political order.
TAILPIECE

This paper has analyzed the function of one particular polemical caricature of George III, king of Great Britain, within the historical frame of the late 1780s. I hope that it has also brought to mind the opaque contradictions of the political present. Twentieth-century systems of parliamentary governing are the Western world’s inheritance from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain; the culmination of over three hundred years of people’s struggle for parliamentary reform. And at every new stage of democracy, be it reformed representation, "universal" male suffrage, or the long struggled for and much resisted franchise for women, there is a discourse which celebrates each new perfection of parliamentary democracy. There surely will be another eulogy to democracy when the struggle of Black South Africans can no longer be resisted by the White ruling minority. But the eulogy will be sung by those who have finally "granted" Blacks their human rights.

In the politically tumultuous climate of the 1990s, the doctrine of representational parliamentary democracy has again become the model of political liberty and personal freedom for recently fallen states which have admitted their failures to provide citizens with the fruits of a once revolutionary manifesto and utopian vision. Parliamentary democracy is the political model to which former Soviet states aspire, and a political dream for which Chinese students continue to be imprisoned.

But in the Western world, the failures of democracy are seldom admitted. Discontents are now, as they were in Georgian England, silenced not by censoring repression but rather by the self-censoring "successes" of democracy. If we examine the crystallization of the "enlightened" political structure of Great Britain’s parliamentary
democracy after the Glorious Revolution, despite successive polishings of its undemocratic edges, we might see the first ideological cold war for the supremacy of a particular kind of governing system, and perhaps the first time discontents were silenced by success. And finally, the time when the liberty to express discontent with the Crown added luster to its jewels.
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5. Both the Anglican Church of England (the official religion of the nation) and the Lutheran faith of the Hanoverian kings fit into the broad category of Protestantism. The glue that joined the Lutheran Hanoverian kings to the Anglicanism of the English subjects was their position of opposition to Roman Catholicism. Ed. Jeremy Black, Britain in the Age of Walpole (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 6.
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41. "Craw", in the latter part of the eighteenth century, had many uses in the English language. It could refer to the external reservoir for food underneath the head of a bird as well as to the crop attached to the top of its head—almost like a "crown". It was also a derisive term referring to the stomach of a human or animal. The term "craw-thumper" could be applied, insultingly, to a Roman Catholic devotee. Oxford English Dictionary, second edition, vol. III (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), p. 1125.
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For example, commenting on the widespread interest in politics in England, J.W. Archenholtz wrote that "It is often with the greatest difficulty that you can prevail on an Englishman to speak; his answer is seldom more than a yes or no; but if one has the address to turn the subject to politics, his face immediately brightens
up, he opens his mouth, and becomes eloquent, for this topic, if we may use the expression, is combined with his existence." A Picture of London (1797), p. 63, and quoted in Marshall, Dr. Johnson's London, p. 131. For the responses to the “licence permitted to the people” in Georgian England, as well as to their interest in politics, see Porter, English Society in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 103-104.

68. Briton, 11 September 1762.


70. See Godfrey, Printmaking in Britain, pp. 32-36, where he discusses the problems Hogarth faced as an engraver working in a situation of scant patronage for English engravings when there was a preference for French prints. According to Godfrey, Hogarth raised the standard of prints and stimulated an interest for indigenous work. Commercial expedience is also mentioned as a driving force behind Hogarth's ambitious innovations.

71. Ibid., p. 43.


73. Godfrey, Printmaking in Britain, p. 43.


77. Ibid.

78. Kunzle, The Early Comic Strip, p. 5. Hogarth's narrative sequences are an exception here. As Kunzle explains, they could indeed have been bound into albums, but their size also warranted being hung side by side in succession for the viewer to follow the sequence of the picture story.

79. The development of "a hierarchy among plural uses of the same material" is a point Chartier forwards with regard to reading practices in The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France, pp. 10-11.


84. For a discussion of the print-shops with which Gillray was associated, see *The Works of James Gillray, The Caricaturist*, ed. Wright, p. 11.


87. Hill, *Fashionable Contrasts*, p. 13. Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21, is an exception with regards to the prevalent notion among historians which holds that graphic political satire is inherently oppositional.


90. Paulson, *Representations of Revolution*, p. 190, writes that Gillray’s business connection with the conservative ministry did not rule out “the possibility of sudden attack...pension or no pension”.

92. This is demonstrated by Gillray's attachment to the Pitt ministry through George Canning as mediator after 1795 (and into the early 1800s). This association is discussed in detail by Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, pp. 56-72, 102-117; and mentioned by Wardroper, *Kings, Lords, and Wicked Libellers*, pp. 10-11.


96. Downie, *Robert Harley and the Press*, p. 1. On the Stamp Act (proposed in 1704 but not adopted until August 1712) as functioning as a substitute for censorship because it served to temporarily reduce the circulation of political newspapers, see Lock, *Swift's Tory Politics*, pp. 2-4, 12, where he writes that "Britain was the wonder of Europe in the freedom of political writing and in the size of its politically aware and active nation." (p. 2) See also Harris, "Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole", in *Britain in the Age of Walpole*, pp. 199-210.

98. Lock, *Swift's Tory Politics*, p. 2, states that "In 1695 pre-publication censorship had been allowed to lapse.... Stringent libel laws remained available to the government of the day, but they were hard to enforce and convictions were difficult to obtain. Some of the most objectionable publications were prosecuted by way of example, but it proved impossible for governments to exercise the general restraint on the press that had existed before 1695 and that were still usual in Europe. The result was a large increase in the volume of printed political comment, and especially the amount of outspoken criticism of the government and its policies that was perforce tolerated."


100. See Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 31. In his examination of the press in England, Hellmuth, "The palladium of all other English liberties", p. 472, discusses how the "language of political journalism was entering a new phase" in the 1760s and 1770s. He notes as striking that the "political writers of the 1760s did not draw a clear line between the public and the private sphere. They did not merely report on daily political affairs; they also commented, with ruthless sarcasm and keen invective, upon the private lives of politicians. The majority of political commentators were protected by anonymity." Hellmuth’s comment is instructive for the context and content of graphic political satire. Like the political journalism Hellmuth discusses, the content of political satire is provided as much by the deeds of political personalities as the personalities of politicians.


102. Political prints, states Thomas, "unlike the press...enjoyed a practical immunity from persecution, however outrageous or obscene they became: perhaps because the necessary proof of identification would expose the victim to further ridicule". *The American Revolution*, p. 12. Feaver, *Masters of Caricature*, p. 12, and Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 21, also mention the greater freedom of graphic political satirists in contrast to political commentators whose venue was the written press.

103. See Brewer's essay "'This Monstrous Tragi-Comic Scene'", pp. 11-25 (esp. pp. 18-19).


105. The print was published by Hannah Humphrey on January 9, 1796. The event
of Gillray's arrest and release without charges is discussed by Hill, *Mr. Gillray*, p. 61-63; and by Dickinson, *Caricatures and the Constitution*, p. 17.

106. Questions regarding the paternity of monarchs became a hot issue in the previous century when James's "son" was rumoured by his opponents to be fathered by a miller. Carretta, *George III and the Satirists*, p. 8.

107. See Anderson, *The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture*, p. 2, where she discusses at length the technological advances of the first quarter of the nineteenth century which caused a thorough transformation of the mass-market publishing industry. After 1830, "pictorial magazines were a major means of diffusing the printed image". This shift is also mentioned in Feaver's *Introduction to The Masters of Caricature*, p. 8.


109. Hill, *Fashionable Contrasts*, p. 7, discusses the stabilizing controls of editorial policies in the nineteenth century which had an influence on what subjects were available to political satirists. He states that "The liveliness, ferocity and general independence of pictorial satirists at the century's end has much to do with the fact that their medium was the copper-plate engraving, produced in comparatively small numbers for individual sale. Working in this manner they were free of many of the editorial restrictions and considerations of taste imposed on their successors once caricature became caught up in the regular machinery of weekly and daily journalism."

110. On the freedom of the written press which she claims was second to that of print-sellers, see George, *English Political Caricature to 1792*, p. 122.


112. Even critics who denounced the press's representation of people or events as "irresponsible" or "immoral" were ultimately in favour of a free press. See Hellmuth, "The palladium of all other English liberties", pp. 467-501, which examines the debate over the freedom of the press in eighteenth-century England.
See also Downie's study of political literature in the early eighteenth century, Robert Harley and the Press.


116. Ibid., p. 493. That Whigs and Tories alike praised the "free press" is also remarked on by Harris, "Print and Politics in the Age of Walpole", pp. 189-210 (esp. pp. 196-197).

117. I borrow the term "arch libeller" from a comment in The Public Advertiser, 5 June, 1765, by George Bout-de-ville (a pseudonym, no doubt), which reads: "Every window of every printshop is in a manner glazed, and the shop itself papered, with libels.... One arch-libeller in particular has rendered himself more than a hundred times liable to prosecution.... He has dealt his grotesque cards from house to house and circulated his defamatory pictures from Town's end to Town's end." The reference is to George Townshend who published card-sized caricatures. Wardroper, Kings, Lords, and Wicked Libellers, p. 6.

118. On the "liberty of abusing their betters, the boast of the English", see The Works of James Gillray, ed. Wright, p. 12. George describes the availability and widespread nature of satire—as written texts and graphic illustrations—as follows: "Satire was the language of the age.... 'Squibs' were on every table... satire was in the air'.... And though satire reflected the (diminishing) scurrility of the day, it could be enjoyed because basically society was assured, stable and content." George presents the idea that satire was a place for exchange both in terms of the production and discussion of written and graphic satire. Though George provides a wealth of information, I disagree with many of her rather conservative conclusions, most notably, with her equation that eighteenth-century English "society was assured, stable and content" and satire could thus be enjoyed. Hogarth to Cruikshank, p. 13. See the very interesting contrast Jon P. Klancher makes between the circulation of ideas in the coffee-houses and the periodical press and the relatively efficient postal service in England with the stagnation of ideas in France where organs of intellectual exchange were less available. The Making of English reading Audiences, 1790-1832 (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1987), pp. 29-32.

119. The uniqueness and the "excellence" of the British Constitution were sources of national pride, at least for those who gained from it. When, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, Blackstone wrote that the king could "do no wrong", or
"think no wrong", his political amnesia glossed over the charges made against the Stuart king a century earlier. For an indepth analysis of the changing faith in divine right in England as revealed by the termination of the practice of the hereditary miracle of royal "touching" under the Hanoverians, see Bloch, The Royal Touch (esp. pp. 218-223); and Harry T. Dickinson, Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), p. 28. For an account of prevalent notions regarding divine right before 1688, see Birch, Representation, pp. 35-36.

120. Green, The Hanoverians, p. 29.

121. Much of what Blackstone has to say stems from John Locke’s treatise on Civil Government of the previous "revolutionary" century. Just as Locke does not question the king as a necessary component for a properly balanced constitution, and merely seeks to define—or redefine—the particular powers of the Crown, Blackstone foresees problems occurring only from the abuse of the Crown’s, or any one Parliamentary body’s, power. Green, The Hanoverians, pp. 14-16, 29-30; Carretta, George III and the Sattirists, pp. 1-4. On John Locke, see Birch, Representation, pp. 31-35.


126. An interesting and helpful—albeit reductive—description of the "archetypal tory" and "archetypal whig", is provided by Downie, in Robert Harley and the Press, pp. 7-8. A full understanding of the political differences between the Whigs and Tories requires an examination of economic factors which are beyond the boundaries of politics but are inextricably intertwined with political maneuvers during the "Financial Revolution" after 1688. P.G.M. Dickinson, The Financial Revolution: A Study in the Development of Public Credit (London, 1967). Such factors would include the growing mercantile economy of Britain, the founding of the Bank of England in 1694, the expansion of the British Empire and the great wealth generated by commercial exploitation of the colonies. How such money matters link with the political and economic interests of the Tories and, especially, with the Whigs in the eighteenth century is far from settled and continues to be an arena of contention among historians. Stone talks about the rise of mercantile interests in the era leading up to the Glorious Revolution and the founding of Bank of England, but he links these economic transformations to social classes and to the emergence of notions of "possessive individualism", not
to a particular political group or party ideology. "The Results of the English Revolutions of the Seventeenth Century", pp. 23-108.


128. Neither the division between the two pre-Revolution political groups nor the categorization of emergent Whigs and Tories is as tidy as this fifty year political evolution suggests, however. See Robert A. Smith, Eighteenth-Century English Politics: Patrons and Place-hunters (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), pp. 121-125.


130. At this point it is helpful to quote Pares’s brief description of the main tenets of tory ideology as outlined in Limited Monarchy: "The watchword of the Tories was Church and King. They insisted upon the sacramental character of hereditary monarchy, in order to protect themselves against a recurrence of political and social disorder, of rule by the army, the saints, or even the levellers. They had difficulty in reconciling this high doctrine with resistance to the king actually on the throne over questions of religion and foreign policy; but they made ingenious attempts to preserve their principle from contamination by their practice. Thus, in the crisis of Charles II’s reign, they offered to limit the powers of the Roman Catholic successor to the throne; this was unlikely to have proved effectual, nor was it much less offensive to James II than excluding him altogether, but it would have distinguished the title to the throne, which could only proceed in hereditary succession, from the exercise of government, which could be alienated without sacrilege. In 1688, when James II forced them to choose between church and king, they chose the church at the price of resisting the king; they probably did not mean to turn him out of the country, but they resigned themselves, whether gladly or not, to seeing him go. Then they had to square these proceedings with the doctrine of divine hereditary right. It was not easy." p. 3. See also Brewer, Party Ideology, pp. 39-54.

131. Mary was the daughter of James II and his first wife Anne Hyde. See Dickinson, Liberty and Property, pp. 29-31.

132. See Ibid., pp. 13-27, on the religious, political, pseudo-scientific, and historical discourses which supported the doctrine of divine right monarchy and passive obedience to the king, God’s earthly agent. The Tories, argues Dickinson, were committed to the theory of divine hereditary right; and even after James II’s actions began to threaten the privileges of men of property, even the staunchest
supporters of the Tory doctrine found it difficult to oppose the king with a clear conscience.


134. There were, however, some foiled attempts to reinstate the Stuart Pretender to the throne until the Battle of Culloden (1746) dashed the hopes of ardent adherents to the doctrine of divine hereditary rule.

135. The transformation of the Tories in the post-Revolutionary period of Hanoverian accession is complex and not without contention in the historiography of eighteenth-century British politics. I forward the reader to two opposing views on Tory "Jacobitism" in the early eighteenth century: Eveline Cruikshanks, Political Untouchables: The Tories and the '45 (1979), where she takes the position that the event of Hanoverian accession drove Tories to become Jacobites; and Linda Colley, In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-1760 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982), where the author argues convincingly that the Tories did not acquiesce to a secondary parliamentary position so easily, and instead negotiated for themselves a new position which would allow them to regain power within Hanoverian politics. On the redefinition of Tory principles after 1788, see also Dickinson, Liberty and Property, pp. 33-42; and Brewer, Party Ideology and Popular Politics, pp. 41-44. In his Introduction to Britain in the Age of Walpole, pp. 1-22, Black discusses how the Whigs exploited the opportunity to incriminate Tories as crypto-Jacobites and thereby rally public odium against "treasonous" Tories.


137. Brewer offers statistical evidence of the decline of old Tories in parliament through the eighteenth century: "in the last parliament under Anne there were 358 tories and 200 whigs; after the election of 1715 the numbers were 117, and 341 respectively. Thereafter, except for a brief and inconsequential revival at the 1734 election, the tory party went into continuous decline: in 1742 136 of them sat in the lower house; in 1747 there were 117, and by 1761 this number had been further reduced to 113. By the 1780s there were practically no old tories left." Party Ideology, p. 41. What these numbers do not show, however, is the support of non-party conservatism.


142. Seven months after the publication of Burke’s enormously popular book *Reflections on the Revolution in France and on the Precedings in Certain Societies in London Relative to that Event in a Letter Intended to have been Sent to a Gentleman in Paris* (1790), which denounced—utterly and vehemently—the French Revolution, an increasingly radicalized minority of Whigs under Fox and Thomas Paine who still supported the Revolution, split from Burke. Godechot, *The Counter-Revolution*, pp. 57, 63.

143. Godechot, *The Counter-Revolution*, pp. 50-66, gives an interesting and critical summation of Burke’s political history including a subsection on his early Parliamentary career as a liberal Whig when conservative aspects in his thought are already evident. In his detailed exegesis of Burke’s *Reflections*, Godechet remarks that the book “has a universal significance; it is the breviary of the western counter-revolution—a fact that is universally recognized”. (p. 58)


145. Plumb discusses Burke’s Economical Reform Bills of 1783 which were presented to the House during the Coalition ministry. Plumb suggests that the Bills were largely “threats to the King of what he might expect unless he gave his confidence to the Rockinghams and allowed them to settle comfortably in the well-paid royal preserves”. Thus, even in what were seen at the time as radical anti-monarchical measures to restrict the power of the Crown, the intentions behind those demonstrations of Parliamentary strength were not to bring about a massive organic change but rather to make one’s stake within the political pyramid hold more solidly. *The First Four Georges*, p. 128.


153. See Winthrop, "Familial Politics", p. 300.


155. Ibid., p. 84.

156. Quoted in Ibid., p. 127.

157. Ibid.


161. Carretta, in George III and the Satirists, p. 1, states that "In 1760 King George III inherited two legacies from the Restoration of 1660: his crown and a tradition of regal satire. The civil war during the 1640s produced both. Prior to the struggle between Charles I and Parliament over the premises of power, satires against kingship are virtually unknown, in large part because the theoretically unlimited divine right by which monarchs ruled made such attacks sacrilegious.... Events of the 1630s and 1640s demonstrated, however, that power indeed limited theory. The direct, though gradual, result was what George III would later call 'this excellent Constitution...the most beautiful Combination that ever was framed'." (George III's quote is from a letter of 1780 to Lord North).


163. Fuchs, Die Karikatur, pp. 2-3, discusses the importance of capturing the features of the individual subject in the economical graphic technique of caricature.

165. See Kunzle, *The Early Comic Strip*, p. 357-359, where he traces the emergence of caricature as a commercial commodity, and discusses the formal features specific to this new brand of comic picturing which distinguished it from its "emblematic" predecessor.

166. Burke, *Popular Culture*, pp. 154-155

167. Carretta discusses the hope for a cultural renaissance at the outset of George III's reign, since, in contrast to the two Georges before him, the third George was considered a lover and patron of the arts. In *George III and the Satirists*, p. 42. The most tangible demonstration of George III's support of the arts is his role, albeit mainly a symbolic demonstration, in the founding of the Royal Academy in 1768.


173. Kunzle, *The Early Comic Strip*, p. 2, considers popular graphic art before the 1780s as "pre-caricatural".


175. To quote Paulson, *Representations of Revolution*, p. 182: "It took James Gillray in the 1780s and 1790s to join caricatured faces to caricatured (in the same sense of exaggerating a defect) bodies, and these to the Hogarthian symbolic scene and
the Rowlandsonian grotesque or monstrous metamorphosis." I am indebted to Paulson's solid statements about Gillray's innovations to the tradition of caricature, joined with Marin's enigmatic theoretical discussion, in Portrait of the King, about the body of the king. Combined, these writings gave me the means with which to examine how the carnivalesqued body of the king could function in Gillray’s satires.

176. Ashbee, Caricature, p. 81, mentions the process whereby physical details become necessary in political caricatures.

177. The effigy of George III was stamped onto medals and coins, so "circulating currency" here has a double meaning. As Marin discusses in the chapter entitled "The Royal Host: The Historic Medal", in Portrait of the King, pp. 121-137, the profile of the king had great political and public currency. Represented on coins, such medals have a double authority: the authority of the king and the authority of public usage, "which medal-money unifies perfectly as index, icon, symbol, and thing".

178. While the style and format of academic oil paintings are indeed at odds with small-scale political satires rendered in the informal graphic medium, there is one important feature which political prints share with history paintings—the most esteemed genre of academic paintings. Both history paintings and political prints draw their subject matter from important topical events: military victories, heroic defeats, ceremonies commemorating political changes such as coronations and royal weddings, and so forth (although, it should be added, history paintings often cloak the topical in historical or historical robes). The perspective on momentous events history paintings present, however, differs from the point of view offered by satirical political prints. On the one hand, history paintings serve a political function by rallying public praise, respect, or sympathy for individuals and events. Satirical political prints, on the other hand, flag cowardice instead of bravery, corruption instead of public responsibility, vice instead of virtue. In either case, both types of pictorial narratives carry a political, patriotic, and moral message. The academic painting, however, constructs a drama through which the viewer can vicariously experience power, distinction, fame, and heroism—possessions that few men and even fewer women could actually claim in the eighteenth century. Awed by "larger than life" characters—super-human epitomies of virtue—acting in the noble drama on the canvas, viewing subjects confirm their own (inadequate) humanity. Not so with the ridiculing caricatured portrait. "Greatness" lampooned on the seemingly irreverent page surely would be a comfort in contrast to confrontations with extraordinary courage and stunning magnificence. I refer the reader to Burke's discussion of the "little tradition" and the "great tradition", in Popular Culture, where he argues that "There were two cultural traditions in early modern Europe, but they did not correspond symmetrically to the two main social groups, the elite and the common people. The elite participated in the little traditions, but the common people did not participate in the great tradition. This asymmetry came about because the two
traditions were transmitted in different ways. The great tradition was transmitted formally at grammar schools and at universities. It was a closed tradition in the sense that people who had not attended these institutions, which were not open to all, were excluded. In a quite literal sense, they did not speak the language. The little tradition, on the other hand, was transmitted informally. It was open to all, like the church, the tavern and the market-place, where so many performances occurred." p. 28.

179. Although not directly discussing graphic burlesques of the king, Zizek, "The King is a Thing", p. 20, may as well be when he states that "The more we represent the king as an ordinary man, caught in the same passions, victim to the same pettinesses as we, i.e. the more we accentuate his 'pathological' features (in the Kantian meaning of the term), the more he remains 'king'. Because of this paradoxical exchange of properties we cannot deprive the king of his charisma by simply treating him as our equal. At the very moment of his greatest abasement he arouses absolute compassion and fascination."

180. Ibid.

181. See Burke's discussion of ruler prototypes in Popular Culture, pp. 150-155; and Mikhail Bakhtin, Rabelais and His World, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1984), pp. 81, 196-200, on popular, travestied forms of the king in medieval and renaissance festivals and rituals.

182. On charivari see Burke, Popular Culture, pp. 198, 200.

183. Ibid., pp. 188-189.

184. Ibid.

185. The World, Fashionable Advertiser, 28 May 1787, p. 1; The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser, 29 May 1787. The live exhibition was also listed under "Spectacles" in The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser, 29 May 1787.


188. Burke, Popular Culture, pp. 183-184, 186.


190. Burke, Popular Culture, p. 178.

191. Bakhtin, Rabelais and His World, p. 81.
192. Roger Sales, *English Literature in History 1780-1820: Pastoral and Politics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), p. 169, discusses the social function of the "carnival spirit" in early nineteenth-century England as "a vehicle for social protest and the method of disciplining this very spirit". Linking the function of the "carnival spirit" in his historical period and geographic area of study—England in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century—to the absorption of carnival festivities by the Roman Catholic church in sixteenth-century France, Sales describes how during the Renaissance "Emotions, which had been bottled up during the winter and during the purges and scourges of Lent, were allowed to fizz away for a brief but frenetic period. Plebians were allowed to mock patricians and they, in turn, either mocked themselves or the power of the church and state. There were reasons why the fizzy, dizzy carnival spirit did not necessarily undermine authority. First of all, it was licensed or sanctioned by the authorities themselves. They removed the stopper to stop the bottle being smashed altogether. The release of emotions and grievances made them easier to police in the long term. Second, although the world might appear to be turned upside down during the carnival season, the fact that Kings and Queens were chosen and crowned actually reaffirmed the *status quo*.


194. Ibid., where Burke notes the necessary participatory element of carnival, pp. 182, 187.

195. The merging of "truth" and fantasy in graphic caricature is discussed by Fuchs, in *Die Karikatur*, pp. 1-24.

196. I direct the reader to Chapter One, "Rabelais in the History of Laughter", of *Rabelais and His World*, where Bakhtin analyzes the transformation of the social function and cultural forms of laughter in Europe from the Middle Ages. I do not entirely discount Ashbee's statement that "since the coming of the printing press, [caricature] takes the place of the licensed buffoonery of medieval life, the court fool, the 'boy bishop,' the 'abbe des cornards,' and the rest". But it seems to me that his conflation is too simplistic. While caricature may serve a similar social function in terms of "licensed buffoonery", the different manner in which images and acts function must be taken into account. *Caricature*, p. 6.


198. Maria Renata Mayenova, "Visual Texts and Iconic-Visual Texts", in *Image and Code*, ed. Wendy Steiner (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1981), pp. 133-137, makes an interesting distinction between ambiguity and exclusivity as they relate to visual metaphors. She points out that ambiguity is in fact not a characteristic of a metaphor; rather, a metaphor is "a message whose content is built by the filling in of a number of predicates resulting from an understanding
of the motivation for introducing the metaphoric sign." (p. 135). Mayenova's semiotic discussion and her specific point regarding metaphors does not, however, contradict my argument here. That is, that the ambiguity of graphic political satire functions to make a space for individual interpretations, interpretations which are "de"limited by the viewer-reader's engagement with social and political "predicates" which load specific metaphoric signs with meaning.


202. Ibid., p. 203.

203. Ibid., pp. 201-202. That is, the belief in the sacredness of "magic" of the image must first lose force before the distorted, caricatured portrait can be taken as a joke rather than a threat or a danger.

204. In the psychoanalytic terms employed by Kris and Gombrich, "the comic originates in the conflict between instinctual trends and the superego's repudiation of them, and to grasp its position midway between pleasure and unpleasure. These are the roots of its double-edged character." "The Principles of Caricature", pp. 182-186.

205. Ibid., p. 183.

206. Paulson, *Representations of Revolution*, p. 187, states that "As so often in graphic satire from Hogarth (at least) onward, the viewer is given the choice of readings: a soft and a hard one. To ignore the subversive, the radical, the skeptical, even perhaps the nihilistic reading as Gombrich does is to miss half the truth."

207. I found James Cuno's discussion on the function of satires in which there is a disparity between ridiculed subject and viewing public extremely helpful and thought-provoking. In *Charles Philipon and La Maison Aubert: The Business, Politics, and Public of Caricature in Paris, 1820-1840*, pp. 43-44. One of the main functions of visual carnivalesques of power, I think, is that they allow a sense of superiority to be elicited by the "nonsense" of disrobing the grandeur of power. When the king is ridiculed in such a way, the viewer has the opportunity to look down onto the person who occupies the highest seat of power, and, in that moment of laughter, may fantasize on the levelling of political power and social privilege. Furthermore, since Gillray gives his caricatured portraits the details of the subject's face and flesh rather than merely the abstract symbols to signify their station, his images of the king are all the more powerful as vehicles for the fleeting transubstantiation of power from the king-made-hilarious to the
viewer-made-to-laugh. In other words, the more salient the features of the individual subject of the satire, the more easily facilitated the imaginary reversal of roles.

208. Pares, in *Limited Monarchy*, pp. 8-14, describes what it means for a king to reign as well as rule. In brief, the king is the head of the Executive—one of the three parliamentary Houses, or institutions. In theory, the Executive has as much power as the House of Commons and the House of Lords in a parliamentary monarchy, and each one parliamentary component is balanced and kept in check by the other two. The question over the king's ability to rule rests on whether he in fact has the power to influence or veto decisions made in Parliament, or if he is merely a reigning figurehead of the executive who speaks through the voice of the Prime Minister. Though this leads to a highly contentious debate among historians of the eighteenth century, it can be said that George III did at times wield his Executive power and as a result "ruled" the tides of Parliament in times of war and peace. He was the last British monarch to do so.


210. Burke, *Popular Culture*, pp. 150-155, groups representations of the ruler into three main categories: the ruler-conqueror, the just and wise ruler, and the ruler disguised as a peasant or craftperson. The latter motif seems to have been particularly common in Britain. Burke mentions the popularity of stories about Henry VIII wandering through the city at night to observe his constables on duty, tales about James V in Scotland who was said to wear the disguise of a beggar or a tinker, and a number of ballads that retold stories about meetings between different kings and common craftspeople (p. 152). He also mentions prototypes which carried negative connotations, such as the tyrant ruler.


215. On the symbolic and political function of the monarch in the Ancien Regime as preventing governments from appropriating power unto themselves, see Lefort, *Democracy and Political Theory*, pp. 16-18. See also Marin, *Portrait of the King*. 
216. The metaphoric terminology I am using here comes from Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, in which the revolutionary crowd in France is viewed by the author not only as a social and political threat in France but also as a "virus" menacing England. On Burke's traditionalism, see Norman Hampson, *The First European Revolution, 1776-1815* (New York: Norton, 1969), pp. 10-15.


218. Klancher, *The Making of English Reading Audiences*, p. 98. Burke defends "rituals of revolt", and states that "in Europe between 1500 and 1800 rituals of revolt did coexist with serious questioning of the social, political and religious order, and the one sometimes turned into the other. Protest was expressed in ritualized forms, but the ritual was not always sufficient to contain the protest. "The wine barrel sometimes blew its top." *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, p. 203.


Figure 1: James Gillray. *Monstrous Craws at a New Coalition Feast*, 29 May 1787.
Figure 2: James Gillray. *Very Slippy-Weather*. 10 February 1808.

Figure 3: Theodore Lane, *George Humphrey’s Print Shop in St. James’s Street*. 12 August 1821.
As sure as I am Parson Trelawny, They have dapp'd me up in the Print Shop. I have a great mind to break the window.

Don't be angry, Neighbours, you should not be surprised at anything in London! Why look ye there, I declare they have got me too in my Volunteer uniform—but no one quietly I take it; they like to see people in a passion...!

**Figure 4:** George Murgatroyd Woodward. *Caricature Curiosity*. 1806.
Figure 5: Edward Topham. *The Macaroni Print Shop*. 14 July 1772.

Figure 6: William Heath. *Good Humour*. 22 September 1829.
Figure 7: H. Ramberg and P.S. Martini. The Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 1787. 1787.
Figure 8: Richard Newton. *Holland’s Exhibition Room*. c.1795.
Figure 9: James Gillray. The Presentation—or—The Wise Men’s Offering. 9 January 1796.
BEHOLD
THE NUMEROUS AND DIVERSIFIED
BLESSINGS
OF THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

"Fortunate fields, and groves, and flowery vales;"  
Thrice happy Isles! But who dwells happy there?  
Not murmuring Radicals, but gentle Britons." — Miltion.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation. Fear God, honor the King.  
I will give them sure dwellings, and quiet resting-places.  
They shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into  
pruning-hooks.  
They shall sit each man under his vine, and under his fig-tree, none  
making them afraid." — Inspired Scriptures.

Figure 10: Anon. *England’s Firm Pyramid*. In The Palace of John Bull, Contrasted  
with the Poor "House That Jack Built". n.d.
Figure 11: Miricenys. *Diana and Callisto*. 1585.

Figure 12: Anon. *Solomon in His Glory*. 19 December 1738.
Figure 13: Charles Grignion and William Hogarth. Frontispiece to the Artists Catalogue. 1761.

Figure 14: Anon. Take Your Choice! Frontispiece. 14 October 1776.
Figure 15: Thomas Rowlandson. Royal Fox Hunt. 12 July 1806.

Figure 16: Anon. The Royal Ass. 20 May 1780.
Figure 17: Anon. *Father Peters Leading His Mangy Whelp to Be Touched for the Evil*. c.1780.

Figure 18: Anon. *The Botching Taylor Cutting His Cloth to Cover a Button*. 1779.
Figure 19: *Marriage Medal of King George III and Queen Charlotte.* Silver medal. c.1761.

Figure 20: *George III.* Silver Shilling. 1787.
Figure 21: James Gillray. The French Invasion—or—John Bull, Bombarding the Burn-Boats. 5 November 1793.

Figure 22: James Gillray. Evacuation of Malta. 9 February 1803.
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