



REFERENCE ONLY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree **PhD**

Year **2005**

Name of Author **CATHAM T. EMM**

COPYRIGHT

This is a thesis accepted for a Higher Degree of the University of London. It is an unpublished typescript and the copyright is held by the author. All persons consulting the thesis must read and abide by the Copyright Declaration below.

COPYRIGHT DECLARATION

I recognise that the copyright of the above-described thesis rests with the author and that no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

LOANS

Theses may not be lent to individuals, but the Senate House Library may lend a copy to approved libraries within the United Kingdom, for consultation solely on the premises of those libraries. Application should be made to: Inter-Library Loans, Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

REPRODUCTION

University of London theses may not be reproduced without explicit written permission from the Senate House Library. Enquiries should be addressed to the Theses Section of the Library. Regulations concerning reproduction vary according to the date of acceptance of the thesis and are listed below as guidelines.

- A. Before 1962. Permission granted only upon the prior written consent of the author. (The Senate House Library will provide addresses where possible).
- B. 1962 - 1974. In many cases the author has agreed to permit copying upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- C. 1975 - 1988. Most theses may be copied upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.
- D. 1989 onwards. Most theses may be copied.

This thesis comes within category D.



This copy has been deposited in the Library of

UCL



This copy has been deposited in the Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

**'THE BODY POLITIC AND THE
FAMILY QUARREL: THE WAR OF
AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE,
METAPHOR AND VISUAL
IMAGERY IN BRITAIN'**

THOMAS LATHAM

**CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF
PHD IN THE HISTORY OF ART AT
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON**

AUTUMN 2005

UMI Number: U592976

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U592976

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract:

Name of Candidate: Latham, Thomas Edward Mere

Title of Thesis: 'The Body Politic and the Family Quarrel: The War of American Independence, Metaphor and Visual Imagery in Britain'

Text:

The thesis examines images produced in Great Britain between c. 1765 and 1789, and relates them to general concerns about the relationship between Britain and the thirteen colonies on the Atlantic seaboard of North America that declared their independence in 1776. Anglo-American conflict in this period was frequently conceptualized through metaphors that imagined events as an attack on the body politic or a quarrel within the wider British family. The thesis is concerned with the connections between these metaphors through artists' embodiments of Great Britain and her colonies, principally as Britannia and an American Indian, and the ways in which they were contextualized by contemporary social, political and cultural experience. The various gender and generational permutations of the conflict metaphorized as a family quarrel relate the colonial relationship to wider contemporary concerns about the relationships between parents and children. Similarly the figurative division of the transatlantic community was imagined as the literal dismemberment of the British body politic, and contextualized through medical discourse and practice.

As a civil war the conflict was often conceptualised as a quarrel between male members of the family or a culinary attack on the colonial body politic. The entry of the European powers to the conflict seems to have brought about a trend away from the conceptualization of the war as a family quarrel. The entry of Spain to the war in 1779 destabilized this metaphor's narrative and gradually caused it to be replaced with other figures revealing a switch in perception from civil war to a more traditional view relating to the balance of power within Europe. Furthermore, the thesis suggests that the Franco-American treaties of 1778 and resultant military alliance were significant steps in the process whereby Anglo-American colonists came to be regarded as foreigners rather than fellow Britons.

Table Of Contents:

Acknowledgements	5
1. Introduction	9
2. The Body Politic	37
3. The Family Quarrel – Britannia and her Daughter	70
4. The Prodigal Son – Declarations of Independence	107
5. The Balance of Power	139
6. The Dismemberment of Britannia	171
7. Britannia's Blood	197
8. Sibling Rivalries	221
9. Conclusion	245
Bibliography	270
List of Illustrations	399
Illustrations	421

Acknowledgements:

First of all I owe a great deal to my supervisors Professors David Bindman and Stephen Conway, who guided this project from the beginning and helped me to turn a couple of sentences into an entire thesis. They showed interest in my research, encouraged me to take risks, pulled me back from taking the wrong risks, suggested possible lines of research and prevented me from making some rather obvious mistakes (any remaining mistakes are my own).

The staff of the History and History of Art Departments at University College London in general deserve some thanks for putting up with my loitering in their corridors for more than four years (especially Dr Claire Wilkinson, Dr Tom Gretton, Professor Helen Weston, and Diana Dethloff). Prior to that, the same would be true of the History of Art departments at the University of Leicester (Carol Charles, Professor Phillip Lindley, Nicholas Watson, Professor Alison Yarrington, Dr Thomas Frangenberg and Dr Geoff Quilley) and Aarhus Universitet, Denmark (Lars Kiel Bertelsen and Maria Fabricius Hansen).

The other postgraduate students at UCL have been a constant source of support and challenging ideas, in particular I owe much to those whose areas of interest overlap chronologically with my own: Dr Richard Clay, Dr Richard Taws, Sue Walker, Zoe Kahr, Mercedes Ceron-Peña and Emily Richardson. I would especially like to thank Emily for looking after things whenever I was in America conducting my research, and for being such a good listener. Material and ideas from chapter five were previously published in the journal *OBJECT*, and I would like to thank the editors for their many helpful suggestions, as well as the external validator Gill Perry.

I would like to thank Dr Emma Barker for her comments at my upgrade seminar, as well as those in attendance who were both encouraging and challenging. Similarly, I would like to thank Professors Diana Donald and William Vaughan for agreeing to be my final examiners.

A variety of conferences and institutions allowed me the opportunity to test out some of the ideas and material in this thesis before finally committing everything to the printer, and I thank them and the audiences who made such helpful comments.

The Arts and Humanities Research Board awarded me funds in order to pursue both my master and doctoral studies for which I am extremely grateful. A number of institutions in the United States of America also kindly awarded me with fellowships to enable me to travel and use their collections. I spent a very enjoyable month in 2003 at the Lewis Walpole Library in Farmington, Connecticut, and I would like to thank Maggie Powell, Susan Walker, Marielle Mudgett-Olson, Cindy Roman, Lenore Rouse, Anna Malicka and Jim Cassidy, as well as the other fellows in residence in August 2003 Karen Junod and Dr Luisa Cale. As well as being a valuable resource in its own right, the Paul Mellon Centre in London provided me with a fellowship that enabled me to spend three months based at the Yale Center for British Art in New Haven, Connecticut. Many people provided help, advice and suggestions during my stay there, including Julia Alexander, Julia Hyde, Susan Brady, Lori Misura, Phil Basner, Diana Donald, Marcia Pointon and Jason Schron. The John D. Rockefeller Jr., Library (part of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation) gave me a fellowship enabling me to use their collection for a month in 2005, and

thanks are due to Inge Flester, Margaret Pritchard, Laura Barry, Gail Greve and Jim Horn. Thanks to a Batten Fellowship from the International Center for Jefferson Studies at Monticello, Virginia, I was able to spend March 2005 based at the Jefferson Library. I would like to thank everyone there, but especially Andrew O' Shaughnessy, Sanders Goodrich, Anna Berkes and Eleanor Sparagna. I also owe thanks to Paul Babbitt at the University of Virginia, who helped me through an increasingly complicated US visa application process. The Maryland Historical Society awarded me a Lord Baltimore Fellowship to visit their collection in Baltimore, Maryland, in April 2005 and to use their H. Furlong Library Baldwin library. I would like to thank all the staff there who offered assistance and suggestions, especially Bea Hardy.

People at many other libraries, archives and museums gave me invaluable help and advice, and I owe thanks to the staff of the following: the British Museum, especially Aileen Dawson; the British Library; the Institute of Historical Research; the National Gallery, London; the Tate Britain gallery; the National Portrait Gallery; the Guildhall Library and Art Gallery; the National Archives at Kew; Lambeth Palace Library; the Wellcome Library; the National Maritime Museum; the Paul Mellon Centre, London and in particular Kasha Jenkinson; the Royal College of Physicians; the Library of Congress in Washington D.C.; the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale University, where I would like to thank the staff of its Map and Franklin Collections in particular; the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New Haven; the Harvey Cushing/John Hay Whitney Medical Library in New Haven, with special thanks to Susan Wheeler; the Mudd Library, New Haven; the Library Company of Philadelphia and Charlene Peacock; the curator of Fort Ticonderoga, New York,

USA - Christopher D. Fox; the National Museums of Scotland's Helen Osmani; Vincent Lavoie of the McCord Museum in Montreal, Canada; the Muscarelle Museum of Art, Williamsburg, Virginia; the New York Historical Society.

My work has also benefited from interaction with a number of individuals who offered help and ideas, and among these I would like to express to gratitude to Jami Bartlett, the Reverend Piers Warburton, Dr Kariann Yakota, the Financial Director of ABM United Kingdom Limited, Martin Doran, Chrissie Bradstreet, Dr J. E. Latham and last but not least David Keep.

Finally I would like to thank all my family and friends who helped get me into and through both the undergraduate and postgraduate parts of my studies. To thank them properly and give them the full credit they are due would take my entire allocation of words. However, I owe my father an enormous debt of gratitude in particular, since he kindly read everything I wrote with great attention to detail, and made many helpful suggestions. This thesis is humbly dedicated to Christopher, Beryl, Simon, Paula and Grace Latham.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Elaine Scarry has argued that when events happen on a scale beyond ordinary sensory experience, then they can only be apprehended through an invocation of models, maps and analogies.¹ Similarly, the psychologist Kenneth Gergen has noted that: 'In certain historical periods metaphors serve to express commonly held but imperfectly articulated feelings', and can therefore be considered in terms of collective expression.² This dissertation examines the visual field's engagement with metaphors that modelled, mapped and analogised the conflicts between Great Britain and her colonies on the Atlantic seaboard of North America, and in particular the dominant figures that imagined eighteenth-century Anglo-American conflict as a family dispute or an attack on the British body politic.³ These models pertained from at least the time of the American Stamp Act in 1765 and continue to have relevance

¹ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (New York & Oxford, 1985), p. 101. A number of studies of American political debate reveal how politics in particular resorts to metaphors to explain, conceptualize and persuade. George Lakoff, 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 1 of 2)', *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 3, (November, 1991). Available on line at: http://lists.village.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/ScholarlyLakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html. (unpaginated). George Lakoff, 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 2 of 2)', *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 3, (November, 1991). Available on line at: http://lists.village.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/ScholarlyLakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_2.html. (unpaginated). James F. Voss, Joel Kennet, Jennifer Wiley and Tonya Y. E. Schooler, 'Experts at Debate: The Use of Metaphor in the U.S. Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 7, nos. 3 & 4, (1992), pp. 197-214. Ann S. Pancake, 'Taken by Storm: The Exploitation of Metaphor in the Persian Gulf War', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 4, (1993), pp. 281-295. Jeffery Scott Mio, 'Metaphor, Politics, and Persuasion', in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1996), pp. 127-146. Jeffery Scott Mio, 'Metaphor and Politics', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1997), pp. 113-133.

² Kenneth J. Gergen, 'Metaphor, metatheory, and the social world', in: David E. Leary, ed., *Metaphors in the History of Psychology*, (Cambridge, 1990), p. 274.

³ This dissertation deals fundamentally with metaphor, and, as with any such project, it needs to be stated that it would be impossible to do so without recourse to figurative language itself.

for the so-called 'special relationship' between the United Kingdom and the United States today.⁴

In visual depictions of the metaphorical conceptualizations of the War of American Independence (1775-1783), artistic, semantic and rhetorical fields conjoin in images that embody nations and territories, mapping the national onto the individual and *vice versa*. Since at least early antiquity, bodies and families have been used to make something as abstract as society more concrete and apprehensible, with the family as the basic component of social grouping.⁵ Encouraged by semantic references to infant states, parent states, mother countries and fatherlands, personifications of bodies politic were easily placed within a framework of familial relationship. As Seth Thompson has noted metaphors involving embodiments and personifications of countries 'clothe the intangible, giving life to abstractions.'⁶ Imagined as bodies real, such bodies politic could be imagined as being born, marrying, growing old and dying, being dismembered and torn apart, being wounded and injured, or becoming infected thereby endangering their health.⁷

⁴ The 'special relationship' is normally supposed to pertain to Anglo-American relations from World War II onwards. John Dumbrell, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After*, (Basingstoke, Hampshire, & New York, 2001), p. 1.

⁵ Roger Hinks, *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, (London, 1939) pp. 67-76. Leonard Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World*, (New Haven & London, 1975), pp. 61-115. Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London), 1978, p. 11. Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the family and political argument in England 1680-1714*, (Manchester and New York, 1999), p. 23.

⁶ Seth Thompson, 'Politics without Metaphors is Like a Fish without Water', in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1996), pp. 185-201.

⁷ See, for example: A Farmer [David Cooper], *A Serious Address to the Rulers of America, On the Inconsistency of their Conduct respecting Slavery: Forming a contrast between the Encroachments of England on American Liberty and American Injustice in tolerating Slavery*, (London, [February] 1783), p. 5.

Eighteenth-century artists revealed the perceived political alignments and groupings of separate bodies politic such as Great Britain, America, France, Spain and the Netherlands by depicting them as members of the same family, as friends, outsiders, or enemies. Additionally, they were able to present any attack on the home nation – Great Britain – as a physical assault resulting in bloodshed, and any threat from within through the visual symptoms of sickness and disease. What is new about this period is the development and appearance of visual embodiments of America, which, for the first time, is allowed to act for itself and be included into relations between Britain and other European powers in its own right, rather than being subsumed within a representation of the British body politic.

The metaphors that form part of the subject matter of this dissertation were used to relate complex abstract ideas in a manner that was both concise and yet rich in meaning. As Raymond Gibbs has pointed out, metaphors can perform a social function in communicating ideas between two parties using a shared stock of experiences, interests and sensibilities, which allows for a certain amount of confidence that they will be understood.⁸ Part of the purpose of this dissertation is to reveal the culturally specific contemporary contexts that engaged and intersected with different aspects of the body and the family, and thereby increase our understanding of images where bodies politic are depicted as acting and interacting.⁹ Although metaphors often deal in abstraction, there is a relationship between family squabbles and bodily attacks as imagined by artists and their concrete social reality. The artistic use of individual personifications to stand in for the bodies of the British

⁸ Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, (Cambridge, 1994), p. 134.

⁹ On the culturally relative nature of metaphor, see: Christopher Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, (Oxford, 1999), p. 9.

and American people concealed the fact that the scenes of fighting, wounding and family separation depicted in images were happening to multiple bodies in reality. Furthermore, the representation of metropole and colony as single embodiments concealed the divisions in public opinion within the domestic populations. Yet, this process of reduction also helped to make the abstract concept of war visible, and ensured that the ultimate political outcome of the war would be linked to the fate of the whole nation rather than its individual parts.¹⁰ Despite their conceptual and figurative nature the metaphors examined in this dissertation will therefore be set against the actual physical experiences that helped give them a sense of reality to the eighteenth-century cultural producer and observer.

The various gender and generational permutations of the conflict metaphorized as a family quarrel use wider contemporary concerns about the relationships between parents and children to help rhetorical argument and explication on the subject of Anglo-American relations. The political divisions within the British transatlantic community were represented by artists as the literal dismemberment of the British body politic and contextualized through historical and literary precedent, cultural tradition, and culinary and medical discourse and practice. The visual record also points to the importance of the entry of the European powers to the conflict, since they seem to have brought about a trend away from the conceptualization of the war as a family quarrel. The entry of France, Spain and the Netherlands to the war in successive years from 1778 destabilized the narrative of this metaphor and gradually caused it to be replaced with other metaphorical constructions, suggesting a switch in perception of the hostilities from a civil war to a more traditional European-style

¹⁰ Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, pp. 70-71.

conflict relating to the continental balance of power. Furthermore, the Franco-American treaties of 1778, and resulting military alliance in the war, were significant steps in the process whereby British colonists in America came to be regarded as foreigners rather than fellow Britons.

My purpose in this introductory chapter is to introduce the metaphoric conceptualizations that contemporaries used to help them understand and explain the relationship and disputes between Great Britain and the thirteen rebellious colonies on the Eastern seaboard of the North American continent. I then set out my approach to metaphors and their social and cultural usages and contexts. There is a wealth of literature on the period and the American Revolution in particular, and my own interests and research need to be placed within the context of those scholars whose work overlaps or intersects with my own. Finally, I set out some of the terms of reference and parameters within which I have conducted my research, paying closer attention to defining my areas of interest and setting out the structure of the dissertation as a whole.

Metaphors of the War of American Independence

A variety of metaphors were used to conceptualize the events of the War of American Independence, the relationship between metropole and colony, and the very nature of the British transatlantic community itself – its commonalities as well as its differences. Some of these were rarely used rhetorically and did not figure in the visual field at all, such as those that imagined the American colonies as a hydra,

herd of cows, cat, Antaeus, shattered vase, or young lion.¹¹ Although others did occasionally cross over into artistic representation, by far the most prevalent and pervading metaphoric models were those that conceptualized the conflicts as either a dispute between two members of the same family, or as an attack on or within the British body politic. These dominant metaphors were taken from basic concepts of which everyone had experience, and which presented a common store of ideas that could be called upon to clarify, explain, imagine and visualize more abstract ideas. For example in 1775 the American loyalist Thomas Bradbury Chandler set down his belief that:

I consider Great-Britain and her colonies, with her other dependencies, as but one body, which must be affected throughout by the sufferings of any particular member. I consider them as constituting one great and illustrious family, to which I have the honour to belong...¹²

Chandler and many others used both models in this way to express a belief in the indivisible unity of the transatlantic British community represented as part of the same body or family.¹³ However, the presence of conflict in Anglo-American relations threatened this unity, and hence these metaphors were also used as a framework to characterize divergence and disunity as an intra-familial dispute or the dismemberment of the body politic.

By invoking tropes of body and family to explain political relationships writers and artists were merely engaging with a tradition of political theory that dates back to

¹¹ Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004), pp. 197-199.

¹² [Thomas Bradbury Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now? Or an Enquiry, how far The Americans are Bound To Abide by, and Execute the Decisions of, the late Congress?* (New York, 1775), p. 48. It should be noted that the original eighteenth-century spelling has been retained throughout this dissertation, except that the occasional use of 'f' has been converted to the more modern 's'.

¹³ The ubiquity of figures involving family has been noted, for example, in: Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*, p. 145.

ancient Greece. In seventeenth-century England Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* set out his ideas on the composition of the body politic, whereby the many are represented by the one, but it also noted how kingdoms were but families writ large, and that the relationship of ruling to ruled was as father to children.¹⁴ Hobbes also suggested that the offspring of a body politic were its colonies, automatically placing them in a conceptual parent-child relationship.¹⁵

Although there has been a tendency in later historiography to refer to the War of American Independence as a 'family quarrel', this phrase was certainly used at the time, with Benjamin Franklin, for example, admonishing John Bull in a 1766 edition of *The Gazetteer* for starting a '*Family Quarrel*' by initiating the Stamp Act.¹⁶ The phrase was used in satirical prints, speeches and tracts covering the conflict and also formed the basis of ballads, fables, political analogies as well as visual representations.¹⁷ Although, the word 'quarrel' was often used as a metaphor for war, and can be found in documents and pamphlets throughout the conflict, often it is clear that it was employed within the context of this idea of the 'family quarrel'.¹⁸

¹⁴ Part 2, 'Of Commonwealth', Chapter XVII, Sections 2 and 15 of: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, edited and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1996), pp. 111, & 114-115.

¹⁵ Part 2, 'Of Commonwealth', Chapter XXIV, Section 14 of: Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 168.

¹⁶ The phrase was later used retrospectively in: [Frederick Dalcho], *Practical Considerations Founded on the Scriptures, Relative to the Slave Population of South-Carolina. By a South-Carolinian*, (Charleston, South Carolina, 1823), p. 33 n.. Quoted in: Duncan J. MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution*, (London & New York, 1974), p. 28. For a more recent use, see: Elswyth Thane, *The Family Quarrel: A Journey Through the Years of the Revolution*, (London, 1960). Franklin used the pseudonym 'Homespun', *The Gazetteer*, (15th January 1766). See also: Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*, p. 197.

¹⁷ For some examples, see: *Bunker's Hill or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels*, 1775 (figure 3.2); Thane, *The Family Quarrel*, p.2; Worthington Chauncey Ford, *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, vol. II, (Washington, 1905), p. 182.

¹⁸ Johnson's dictionary gives the definition of 'quarrel' as: 'a petty fight; a scuffle... A dispute; a contest... A cause of debate.' Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers*. 3rd ed., vol. II, (London, 1765). This metaphor is used, for example, in: a letter from John Singleton Copley to his mother in Boston, written from Parma, Italy, and dated 25th June 1775, in: Charles Francis Adams, Guernsey Jones & Worthington Chauncey Ford, eds., *Letters & Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739-1776*, (Boston, 1914), p. 332; [William Poulteney], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, (London, 1778), p. xiv;

Often the effect of political rhetoric to use the 'family quarrel' was to recast disputes between Britain and America as a moral argument, and to discuss issues in terms of duty, obedience, subordination and maturity, rather than the more overtly political issues of taxation, representation, westward expansion, trade and church authority.¹⁹

There were other competing metaphors about the relationship between colonies and metropole, or states and government, many of them relating to farming, agriculture and the plant world. 'Plantation' was used virtually as a synonym of colony and the latter could be thought of as something that had been 'planted'.²⁰ The new world of America was also strongly associated with ideas and figures of cultivation, agriculture, growth, fertility and rebirth, which are so redolent, for example, in Crèvecoeur's *Letters to a Farmer*.²¹ However, even such arable figures were often unable to exist without conjoining with more familial metaphors. Although William Poultney saw a connection between colonies and farms, he was unable to use them to explain the current situation without resorting to the family as a means of describing the hierarchical relationship between them:

Considerations upon the French and American War. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament, (London, 1779), p. 26; *Thoughts on the Present War, With an Impartial Review of Lord North's Administration, in conducting the American, French, Spanish and Dutch War; and in The Management of Contracts, Taxes, the Public Money &c.*, (London, 1783), p. 28.

¹⁹ Lester C. Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Washington, D. C., 1991), pp. 192-195. Christianity's use of these two tropes would have reinforced their power and effectiveness in political rhetoric. Michael Walzer, 'On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 82, no. 2 (June 1967), p. 190. On the use of familial and corporeal metaphor in Christian thought and writing, see: John O'Neill, *Five Bodies: Re-figuring Relationships*, (London, 2004), pp. 39-42; Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, (Princeton, New Jersey, 1957), p. 201. Family metaphor appears in, for example, St Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (I Cor. 12:4-26), see: David J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, (Peabody, Massachusetts, 1999), pp. 51-85. See also: Trevor J. Burke, *Family Matters: A Socio-Historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians*, (London & New York, 2003).

²⁰ Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English language*, vol. I.

²¹ Crèvecoeur's *Letters* is also full of imagery relating to familial relationships. J. Hector St John De Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Susan Manning, (Oxford and New York, 1997). For the a study of the agrarian and familial metaphors in his writings, see: Annette Kolodny, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in American Life and Letters*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1975), pp. 52-66.

Colonies may be considered as farms belonging to the mother country or parent state; and like farms are subject to conditions in the mode of settlement, subordinate to the interest of the country, from which they are settled. Nor is there any greater hardship in this, than when a younger brother farms, of his elder brother, a part of their common parent's estate. He claims not the occupation of the farm as his patrimony, but as an indulgence due to their common relation...²²

In any case, plants can also be thought of as parents since they reproduce, with their fruit (the means by which their seeds are distributed) being considered as their offspring. Hence Thomas Jefferson could refer in his autobiography to the colonies that had not immediately been ready to sign up to independence in 1776 as 'not yet ripe' but 'fast ripening', further suggesting that they were soon to be mature enough to fall from 'the parent stem'.²³ However, such metaphors were rarely the focus of the visual matter that is the focus of this study.

There is one metaphorical system that does impinge fundamentally on the images produced during the War of American Independence, which is that of the 'balance of power', sometimes imagined as a pair of scales weighing up the strength of the two sides, thereby revealing concerns about who would ultimately win. The balance has a long tradition going back to Aristotle, and was in common usage in medieval medicine as the key to health in terms of balancing the four humours, but by the mid-seventeenth century both 'balance of trade' and 'balance of power' had become fixed orthodoxies of political economy and politics itself.²⁴ Although it had long been a staple of printed political satires, it only began to appear in images produced during this war following the entry of France in 1778. Horace Walpole revealed his anxieties about the additional entry of Spain in 1779 in a comparison between the

²² [Poulteney], *Plan of Re-Union*, p. 173.

²³ Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography*, published by The Thomas Jefferson Society, (Keswick, Virginia, 2000), pp. 7 & 10.

present state of affairs and those of the Seven Years' War: 'What is now to come. I know not – We have, they say, maintained ourselves against France and Spain – true, but with the trifling difference of having America in our scale – now it is in theirs.'²⁵ The introduction of France and Spain (and later the Netherlands) into the 'family quarrel' seems to have proved problematic for writers and artists alike. The Bourbon powers were straightforward enemies rather than relations and had to be inserted into 'family quarrel' narratives as outsiders. Ultimately, the increasing numbers of European enemies stretched such narratives beyond breaking point and, although the idea of the 'family quarrel' continued to refer to the Anglo-American part of the conflict, Britain's other enemies were treated as outsiders attempting to upset the war's 'balance of power'.

Metaphorology

Metaphorology is the study of the application and interpretation of metaphor, which is derived from the Greek word *metaphora* (*meta* meaning 'over' and *pherein* meaning 'to carry', resulting in a combination that signifies 'carrying over'), and

²⁴ Andrea Finkelstein, *Harmony and the Balance: An Intellectual History of Seventeenth-Century English Economic Thought*, (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2000), pp. 180-181.

²⁵ Letter from Horace Walpole to Sir Horace Mann dated 16th June 1779. W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith & George L. Lam, eds., with the assistance of Edwine M. Martz, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. XXIV, 'Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, 1774-1779', (New Haven & London, 1967), pp. 484-485. He had previously used the same metaphor in a letter to Mann dated 3rd April 1777 (see: p. 287). See also a similar concern expressed without explicit recourse to a balance metaphor in a letter to Henry Seymour Conway dated 16th June 1779. W. S. Lewis, Lars E Toide, Edwine M. Martz, and Robert A. Smith, eds., *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. XXXIII, 'Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Henry Seymour Conway, Lady Ailesbury, Lord and Lady Hertford, Lord Beauchamp, Henrietta Seymour Conway, Lord Henry and Lord Hugh Seymour, 1765-1795', (New Haven & London, 1974), p. 330.

describes the non-literal transfer of meaning from one word to another.²⁶ Unlike a simile, which makes a more controlled and explicit comparison between two items, the reader is required to do the work of making the connection between them.²⁷ Interest in metaphor and the way it works has a long history, and it was regarded in classical times as one of the four tropes of rhetoric alongside metonymy, synecdoche and irony.²⁸

However, studies of metaphor and metaphors have increasingly become multidisciplinary in nature, drawing on elements of literary criticism, linguistics, cognitive psychology, philosophy, education, anthropology, sociology, and geography as well as art history.²⁹ Theories on metaphor are no longer confined to scholars of literature, but have also been posited in many of these fields leading to a rich but sometimes confusing field of writing on the subject.³⁰ Scholars' understanding of metaphors and the way they work can essentially be categorized within three theoretical frameworks. The inexpressibility hypothesis, largely proposed by philosophers, states that metaphors give form to ideas and descriptions that would be virtually impossible with literal language. The compactness hypothesis, supported by many cognitive psychologists, suggests that metaphors can communicate a great deal of information in an extremely succinct manner, conveying

²⁶ The most comprehensive and up to date survey of theoretical writing on metaphors is to be found in: Miriam Taverniers, *Metaphor and Metaphorology. A selective genealogy of philosophical and linguistic conceptions of metaphor from Aristotle to the 1990s*, (Ghent, 2002).

²⁷ Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, p. 5.

²⁸ Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, p. 3. For example, Aristotle regarded it as part of the arts of language because he believed that the transfer of meaning took place at the level of words. Aristotle, *Poetics*, chapters 21-25. He also regarded analogy as a form of metaphor. Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, pp. 210-211.

²⁹ Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, p. xiv. Taverniers, *Metaphor and Metaphorology*, p. 87. For an example of the use of metaphorology in art history, see: Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1991).

³⁰ For an attempt to produce a theory of metaphor for art history, see: Carl R. Hausman, *Metaphor and Art: Interactionism and Reference in the Verbal and Nonverbal Arts*, (Cambridge, 1989).

complex ideas through commonly held cultural conventions. Finally, the vividness hypothesis, derived from hermeneutics and the social sciences, proposes that metaphors help to capture our phenomenological experience of the world, and are a means of linking subjective and objective understanding in a much more vivid and rich fashion than would be possible through literal language alone.³¹ My own understanding of metaphor and the ways in which it works are largely taken from compactness hypotheses, drawing on cognitive psychologists' proposals that metaphors can be thought of as experiential in origin and conceptual in nature, that they are derived from our experiences of the world around us and can help us to explain and understand abstract ideas like love, war, nationality and community.

In their 1981 book *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff, a professor of linguistics, and Mark Johnson, a professor of philosophy, argued that metaphor went beyond mere linguistic embellishment to affect the ways in which man thought about and acted within the social and physical world.³² They suggested that metaphors were drawn from a number of domains of experience derived from our bodies, our interactions with our physical environment and the way we interact with the social, political, economic, and religious institutions of our culture.³³ Their thesis also proposed that metaphors are largely conceptual in nature, that they can be systematized and that this conditions our thought and language to be created within

³¹ Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, pp. 7-8. Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, pp. 124-135. Ortony's work lead to the 'cognitive revolution' of metaphorology. Taverniers, *Metaphor and Metaphorology*, p. 83.

³² George Lakoff & Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, (Chicago & London, 1981). They expanded on their theories in subsequent publications. George Lakoff, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*, (Chicago, 1987). George Lakoff & Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, (Chicago & London, 1989). Lakoff, George, 'The contemporary theory of metaphor', in: Ortony, Andrew, ed., *Metaphor and Thought*, (Cambridge, 1993 (1979)) pp. 202-251. George Lakoff & Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, (New York, 1999).

³³ Lakoff & Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, pp. 117-119.

the same system. Taking the example of the metaphoric conceptualization of an argument in terms of war, Lakoff and Johnson argued that our understanding of a battle is used to partially characterize the concept of an argument, resulting in expressions from the vocabulary of war such as '*attack a position, indefensible, strategy, new line of attack, win, gain ground*'.³⁴ In other words we experience a conversation as an argument when our understanding of war fits our perceptions and actions of the conversation.³⁵ In their thesis it is the entailments (the contexts, experiences and understandings of the concepts) of metaphors that help to give them meaning, and it is the recreation of these entailments that can help us to the metaphors of the past.³⁶

The work of Lakoff and Johnson has received criticism from a number of sources, perhaps most usefully for the purposes of my own research from anthropologists. Hoyt Alverson, for example, has pointed out that their work is linguistically specific, and that the concepts they systematize do not always translate across language barriers.³⁷ Meanwhile, Naomi Quinn has suggested that metaphors do not structure understanding, but are rather selected from a pre-existing appropriate cultural store of knowledge.³⁸ My own approach is taken from this anthropologically critical view of Lakoff and Johnson's theories, whereby metaphors assist (but do not structure) understanding, and, though experiential and conceptual in origin, must be taken to be

³⁴ Lakoff & Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, p. 7.

³⁵ Lakoff & Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, pp. 77-82.

³⁶ See for example: Lakoff & Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, p. 140.

³⁷ In a criticism of: Lakoff, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Hoyt Alverson, 'Metaphor and Experience: Looking Over the Notion of Image Schema', in: James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, (Stanford, California, 1991), pp. 103-112.

³⁸ Naomi Quinn, 'The Cultural Basis of Metaphor', in: James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, (Stanford, California, 1991), pp. 60-66.

culturally, socially and (broadly) synchronically specific.³⁹ In this dissertation, I argue that metaphors provided frameworks drawn from contemporary cultural experience within which certain issues were conceptualized and explained, and furthermore that counter arguments were constrained to act within the same frameworks using related but redirected experiences.

A similar approach has been taken by Patricia Bradley in her analysis of the American use of slavery metaphor from the 1760s to the 1780s. Her argument is that it is only when the political meanings of slavery are added to the colonists' everyday experiences of the institution and black colonists, that a true picture of the force and effect of the metaphor can be properly apprehended today.⁴⁰ Those who have attempted to study the interaction between metaphors in the verbal and non-verbal arts have also largely relied on arriving at understanding through contextualization.⁴¹ Despite attempts in the 1950s by Ernst Gombrich to use metaphor in formal pictorial analysis to differentiate between pure symbol and the connotative metaphors that can be understood in the artistic handling of colour and contour, theorists have more recently tended to concentrate on questions of literal content and pictorial metaphor.⁴² Here, my interest is in understanding and interpreting the metaphors that

³⁹ This integrated approach based on a belief in the experiential and cultural origins of metaphors is set out, for example, in: Taverniers, *Metaphor and Metaphorology*, pp. 143-153.

⁴⁰ Patricia Bradley, *Slavery Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, (Jackson, Mississippi, 1998), p. 3. 'Naturalising the Family: Literature and the Bio-Medical Sciences of the Late Eighteenth Century', in: Ludmilla Jordanova, *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine, 1760-1820*, (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 182.

⁴¹ E. H. Gombrich, 'Magic, Myth and Metaphor: Reflections on Pictorial Satire', in: E. H. Gombrich, *The Uses of Images: Studies in the Social Function of Art and Visual Communication*, (London, 1999), p. 210. Sonia Sedivy, 'Metaphoric Pictures, Pulsars, Platypuses', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1997), pp. 107, 100-101 & 111-112. Victor Kennedy, 'Mystery! Unravelling Edward Gorey's Tangled Web of Visual Metaphor', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 3, (1993), pp. 181-182. Hausman, *Metaphor and Art*, pp. 118-121.

⁴² E. H. Gombrich, 'Visual Metaphors of Value in Art', in: *Mediations on a Hobby Horse: And other essays on the theory of art*, 4th ed., (London & New York, 1985 (1963)), pp. 12-15. On literal and metaphoric content, see: Norman Goodman, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*, (Indianapolis, Indiana, & Cambridge, 1976), pp. 45-95.

formed part of the source material for artistic production during the period of the War of American Independence, which inevitably relies more on the interaction of the verbal and non-verbal arts than such theories. I am not concerned with how such metaphors work, but rather their place in contemporary culture, and the way that artists succeeded in getting an audience to appreciate or think about one thing by presenting an image wherein the content is partially or wholly unrelated. My concerns are therefore with the contemporary contexts available equally to artists, consumers and spectators, an analysis of which can provide us with a clearer understanding of interpretational possibilities.⁴³ Understanding the metaphors that helped make the world more intelligible in the eighteenth century can do the same for the modern-day scholar.⁴⁴

Most if not all of the eighteenth-century writers and artists who produced the instances of metaphors which form the subject matter of this dissertation would have been aware that they were employing figurative tropes even if they would not have shared my belief in their conceptual nature.⁴⁵ However, there was considerable confusion at the time over the relationship between metaphor and other figurative forms such as analogy. Johnson defined analogy as a 'resemblance' between things, while Adam Smith told his students that 'metaphors are called contracted allegory and an allegory is named by some a diffused Metaphor'.⁴⁶ Indeed, scholars remain divided on the relationship between metaphor, analogy and simile, with metaphors sometimes thought of as compressed analogies or 'elliptical similes', analogies as

⁴³ The synchronic and social nature of metaphor has been noted in: Terence Hawkes, *Metaphor*, (London, 1972), p. 5.

⁴⁴ Hausman, *Metaphor and Art*, p. 9.

⁴⁵ For eighteenth-century views and uses of metaphor, see: Hawkes, *Metaphor*, pp. 30-33.

⁴⁶ Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English language*. In his sixth lecture at the University of Glasgow in 1762-63 and taken down by one of his students. This particular lecture was on Monday 29th November

complex similes, and similes as occasionally rooted in metaphors.⁴⁷ I have therefore followed the tendency in modern metaphorological studies to use metaphor as an umbrella term to justify a study of figurative language generally.⁴⁸

Existing Scholarship

This dissertation argues that the family provided the context for the dominant metaphoric model of the period of the War of American Independence and that issues of submission and subordination were played out within it largely through consideration of age and gender. Furthermore, images relating to attacks on the unity of the British transatlantic community were conceptualized in terms of dismemberment and it is the agency of that action and the question of restoration that is important to the interpretation of such imagery. After the entry of France to the conflict in 1778, when it looked increasingly likely that America would be lost to Britain, I argue that the body became a model that was better suited to conceptualize concerns about the integrity of the body politic, the loss of the colonies and the potential cost of that loss.

There is a small but growing body of scholarship on the metaphors of the American Revolution. The major work in this area has been undertaken by the rhetorician Lester Olson, who has studied much of the same visual material as myself but from a largely American perspective (both revolutionary and loyalist), with artistic

1762. Adam Smith, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, ed. by J. C. Bryce, (Indianapolis, Indiana, 1985), p. 30.

⁴⁷ Hausman, *Metaphor and Art*, pp. 16-18. Tilley, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, pp. 5 & 11.

metaphor often taking second place to figurative writing.⁴⁹ Olson too is interested in imagery using the family and body as representative of the relationship between colonies and metropole, but rather than seeing them as related but expressive in different ways, he deals with both at the same time. His reasoning is that the consideration of the colonies as either a child or the limbs of Britannia can be dealt with simultaneously since both were once part of the body politic - dismembered limbs were once physically attached to Britannia's body just as that body once contained the baby that, after its birth, grew into the American colonies. Both also imply expressions of subordination and submission to Britain, meaning that 'images of the limbs and the child had the potential to emphasize mutual concerns, values, and attitudes within the British empire...' and were 'most useful to those who sought to conserve political ties' within it.⁵⁰ For Olson the difference between the two is simply that the image of the child was less conservative, since the authority of a parent over a child is temporary, while that of the head over the limbs is permanent.⁵¹

What Olson's 1991 book *Emblems of American Community* omits is a full sense of the richness and variety that could pertain to each set of images. Furthermore, it takes no account of the way that the gender of America-the-child could be drawn into political debate between government and opposition. His work also removes any sense of chronology from the visual record by failing to take note both of the

⁴⁸ See, for example: David J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1999, p. 2.

⁴⁹ Olson, *Emblems of American Community*. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*. Lester C. Olson, 'Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 73, no. 1, (February 1987), pp. 18-42. Lester C. Olson, 'Benjamin Franklin's Commemorative Medal, *Libertas Americana*: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 76, no. 1, (February 1990), pp. 23-45. Olson, Lester C., 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian: Race and Gender in Eighteenth-Century British Caricatures', *Imprint*, vol. 17, no. 2, (Autumn 1992), pp. 2-13.

⁵⁰ Olson, *Emblems of American Community*, pp. 219-220.

⁵¹ Olson, *Emblems of American Community*, pp. 220-221.

developments within each metaphor as well as the way that the family as the dominant trope of the conflict was increasingly challenged by other conceptualizations (often concerning the body). In order to maintain its inner consistency, Olson's argument also presupposes a stage in the trope that is not present in the visual record (and only rarely referred to in the written one) – scenes of pregnancy, labour, and childbirth are completely missing, and even infancy is only rarely shown. Instead, the childhood of America is implicit in its representation as a native Indian, and it is the relative maturity and sex of that personification that is at question, not its genesis.

Most other studies of the metaphors and symbols of this period are linguistic, literary, or historical, taking as their source material the various pamphlets, letters, diaries, newspaper and magazine articles, books, pamphlets and tracts that have survived from the eighteenth century.⁵² Writers on the revolutionary period have tended to regard familial rhetoric (including both written and visual imagery) as if it had been something new, often ignoring the traditions and origins of such ways of thinking.⁵³ Occasionally a more interdisciplinary approach has been taken as in Sharon Block's historical examination of imagery pertaining to rape in early

⁵² Richard L. Merritt, *Symbols of American Community, 1735-1775*, (New Haven & London, 1966). Winthrop D. Jordan, 'Familial Politics: Thomas Paine and the Killing of the King, 1776', *Journal of American History*, vol. LX, no. 2, (September 1973), pp. 294-308. James Anthony Bekta, 'The Ideology and Rhetoric of Thomas Paine: Political Justification through Metaphor', Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, Ph.D. dissertation, (1975), Political Science. J. Vernon Jensen, 'British Voices on the Eve of the American Revolution: Trapped by the Family Metaphor', *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 63, no. 1, (February 1977), pp. 43-50. Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, enlarged ed., (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1992 (1967)), pp. 232-246. Christopher Brooks, 'Controlling the Metaphor: Language and Self-Definition in Revolutionary America', *Clio*, vol. 23, no. 3, (Spring 1996), pp. 233-254. Bradley, *Slavery Propaganda*. Charles A. Miller, *Ship of State: The Nautical Metaphors of Thomas Jefferson, With Numerous Examples by Other Writers From Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (New York & Oxford, 2003).

⁵³ See, for example its ascription to 'Whig Sentimentalism' in: Kenneth Silverman, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution: Painting, Music, Literature, and the Theatre in the Colonies and the*

American literature, which also encompassed some visual material, but such studies have been inclined to be too broad or too general in terms of subject matter.⁵⁴

The body has become almost ubiquitous in modern scholarship. As medical historian Mark Jenner recently noted, it seems to have become 'a new organizing principle within Anglo-American intellectual activity', and something that is interdisciplinary in its range, being used in historical, anthropological, literary, iconographic and sociological as well as medical analyses.⁵⁵ There are, for example, a number of studies of the French Revolution that use the body as a means to analyse the culture and rhetoric of late eighteenth-century France. Dorinda Outram has explained the transformation of the organization of power in Revolutionary France in terms of a redistribution of the King's body, while Antoine de Baecque has produced a study of the ways in which organicist metaphor was used in contemporary French discourse on corporality and kingship.⁵⁶ All such studies inevitably rely on a view that the body is one of the principal ways by which man understands and explains his environment, whether that be geographical (the brow of a hill, a headland), social (head of the household) or political (head of state).⁵⁷

United States from the Treaty of Paris to the Inauguration of George Washington, 1763-1789, (New York, 1987 (1976)), p. 84.

⁵⁴ Sharon Block, 'Rape Without Women: Print Culture and the Politicization of Rape, 1765-1815', *The Journal of American History*, vol. 89, no 3, (December 2002), pp. 849-868.

⁵⁵ Mark S. R. Jenner, 'Body, Image, Text in Early Modern Europe', *Social History of Medicine*, vol. 12, no. 1, (April 1999), p. 143.

⁵⁶ Dorinda Outram, *The Body and the French Revolution: Sex, Class and political Culture*, (New Haven & London, 1989), pp. 2-4. Antoine de Baecque, *The Body Politic: Corporeal Metaphor in Revolutionary France, 1770-1800*, translated by Charlotte Mandell, (Stanford, California, 1997 (1993)), for example, pp. 87-89.

⁵⁷ For example, see: Outram, *The Body and the French Revolution*, p. 1. For a recent art historical examination of corporeal metaphor and art beginning with the French Revolution, see: Linda Nochlin, *The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity*, (London, 1994).

It is also to historical studies of the French Revolution that we must turn for comparable examinations of the relationship between metaphor, images and issues of family and gender. Lynn Hunt's *Family Romance of the French Revolution* draws on Freudian psychoanalysis to examine the effects on the culture of the period of the way the family operated on 'both the conscious and the unconscious level of experience.'⁵⁸ Meanwhile Joan Landes has considered the ways that the representation of gendered bodies and female gender affected and reflected the relationship between individuals and the state.⁵⁹ However, interest in visual material relating to the period of the War of American Independence and the events leading up to it, has been largely illustrative rather than interpretative.⁶⁰

History books and illustrated guides have traditionally used visual material with scant regard to when an image was produced, the context of production and whether or not it was accurate in its depiction.⁶¹ The bicentenary of the Declaration of Independence in 1976 led to the organization of a large number of exhibitions all over the world, most of which featured visual material in some form or another, and their legacy is a wide variety of catalogues that quantify, list, group and thematize, but rarely interpret, the visual context of the images they include.⁶² There have been

⁵⁸ Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1992), pp. xiii-xv.

⁵⁹ Joan B. Landes, *Women in the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, (Ithaca, New York, & London, 1988), pp. 1-23.

⁶⁰ Michael Wynne-Jones, *The Cartoon History of the American Revolution*, New York, 1975. Peter D. G. Thomas, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: The American Revolution*, Cambridge 1986. On the other hand, one book on the political satires of the period fails to consider visual material at all. Bruce Ingham Granger, *Political Satire in the American Revolution, 1763-1783*, New York 1960.

⁶¹ Particularly annoying to me is the placement of contemporary eighteenth century images side by side with considerably later re-imaginings of the war in: Jeremy Black, *War for America: The Fight for Independence, 1775-1783*, (Stroud, 1998 (1992)).

⁶² Donald H. Cresswell, *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints. A Checklist of 1765-1790 in the Library of Congress*, (Washington D.C. 1975). *The American War of Independence 1775-1783*, exh. cat., (London, 1975). Hugh Honour, *The European Vision of America*, (Cleveland, Ohio, 1975). John Miller, Donald Anderle, & Julia van Schick, *The American Idea – Discovery and Settlement, Revolution and Independence – An Exhibition Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Founding*

some books and articles that have attempted to investigate and analyse the imagery of this period. Sometimes, as with Donald Grindle and Bruce Johansen's chapter on 'Symbolic identity as a prelude to revolution', there is an emphasis on an American point of view, but with little regard for the geographies, chronologies, iconographies or ideologies of production.⁶³

However, curators, collectors, and researchers such as Douglass Adair, Dorothy George, Joan Dolmetsch, R. T. H. Halsey, Edwin Wolf and Edgar Richardson have contributed to our knowledge of the range and possible contexts and meanings of satirical prints published during this period.⁶⁴ More thematic studies of material such as Amelia Rauser's examination of the use of liberty symbols in the satirical prints of the period have similarly added to the depth of our understanding of the way prints engaged with the events, issues and concerns of the time.⁶⁵ The history and development of the iconography of personifications of America has been dealt with

of the United States of America (March 16 – July 7, 1976), exh. cat., (New York, 1976). Kenneth Pearson & Patricia Connor, *1776: The British Story of the American Revolution*, exh. cat., (London 1976). Deborah Stanley Powers, *Revolutionary America*, exh. cat., (Bloomington, Indiana, 1976).

⁶³ This is the subtitle to a chapter entitled 'Mohawks, Axes, and Taxes'. Donald A. Grindle, Jr., & Bruce E. Johansen, *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*, (Los Angeles, 1991), chapter 7, pp. 111-140.

⁶⁴ Douglass Adair, 'The Stamp Act in Contemporary English Cartoons', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. X, no. 4, (October 1953), pp. 538-542. Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda*, (Oxford, 1959), pp. 150-170. Joan Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation: Satirical Prints on the Revolution at Williamsburg*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1976). R. T. Haines Halsey, 'Impolitical Prints'. *An Exhibition of Contemporary English Cartoons Relating to the American Revolution*, (New York, 1939). R. T. H. Halsey, 'English Sympathy with Boston During the American Revolution', *Old-Time New England*, vol. XLVI, no. 4, (Spring 1956), no. 164, pp. 85-95. Wolf, Edwin, 'Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act Cartoon', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 99, no. 6, (December 1955), pp. 388-396. Edgar P. Richardson, 'Stamp Act Cartoons in the Colonies', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. XCVI, no. 3, (July 1972), pp. 275-297. Edgar P. Richardson, 'Four American Political Prints', *American Art Journal*, vol. VI, no. 2, (November 1974), pp. 36-44.

⁶⁵ Amelia Rauser, 'Death or Liberty: British Political Prints and the Struggle for Symbols in the American Revolution', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), pp. 151-171. The subject of liberty has also been dealt with in a book published recently by David Hackett Fischer, though it is a much broader scale and looks at a much wider context and timeframe. David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas*, (Oxford, 2005), for example, pp. 1-166.

in books and articles by E. McClung Fleming, Hugh Honour and Lester Olson.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, the same exercise has been undertaken for Britannia, who usually represents the mother country in the material with which I am concerned, by Herbert Atherton, Madge Dresse and Roy Matthews.⁶⁷ John Bull as a representation of the British people, who plays a much smaller role in my work, has been analysed by Atherton and Jeannine Surel, and was recently the subject of a book on *Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England* by Tamara Hunt.⁶⁸

The painted arts form a small but nevertheless important part of my analysis of contemporary imagery. Although the production of paintings continued largely uninterrupted by the war, those that relate to it specifically are mainly portraits of the British and American officers who participated in it. However, I feel it is important to show that the same concerns and conceptualizations of the war that are revealed so directly in satirical prints are also present indirectly in what we might think of as high art. Those painters who were born in the colonies, but worked (however briefly) in England such as Benjamin West, Charles Willson Peale, John Singleton Copley and John Trumbull, have tended to receive most attention from art historians, though this has largely been monographic and looked at the artist's entire career,

⁶⁶ E. McClung Fleming, 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, (1965), pp. 65-81. E. McClung Fleming, 'From Indian Princess to Greek Goddess The American Image, 1783-1815', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. III, 1967, pp. 37-66. Hugh Honour, *The European Vision of America*, exh. cat., (Cleveland, Ohio, 1975). Hugh Honour, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time*, (New York, 1975). Olson, 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian', pp. 2-13. See also: Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom*, pp. 140-144.

⁶⁷ Herbert M. Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth. A Study of the Ideographic Representation of Politics*, Oxford, 1974, chapter 4, 'The Allegory of Patriotism'. Madge Dresse, 'Britannia', in: Samuel, Raphael, ed., *Patriotism: the Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, 3 vols., vol. III: *National Fictions*, (London & New York, 1989), pp. 26-49. Roy T. Matthews, 'Britannia And John Bull: From Birth to Modernity', *The Historian*, Volume 62, Number 4, (Summer 2000), pp. 799-820.

⁶⁸ Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, pp. 97-100. Jeannine Surel, 'John Bull', in: Samuel, Raphael, ed., *Patriotism: the Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, 3 vols., vol.

with the occasional study on individual paintings.⁶⁹ European-born artists such as the Englishman Henry Walton and the Irishman James Barry, have also been studied to varying degrees, while the Scottish painter Allan Ramsay will also feature in this dissertation, although his involvement is through his writing as a government polemicist rather than Royal painter.⁷⁰

The traditional view of political prints is that they represent a strong body of British opinion supporting the cause of the American colonies.⁷¹ In part this is because there is little agreement among historians on the state, nature and development of British public opinion in this period, and as Stephen Conway has recently pointed out 'it will surely never be possible to provide any definitive verdict on the relative strengths of pro- and anti-war parties.'⁷² Halsey claimed in 1956 that contemporary satirical

III: *National Fictions*, (London & New York, 1989), pp. 3-25. Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England*, (Aldershot, 2003).

⁶⁹ The principal monographs and catalogues on these artists are: Dorinda Evans, *Benjamin West and His American Students*, (Washington D.C., 1980). Helmut Von Erffa & Allen Staley, *The paintings of Benjamin West*, (New Haven & London, 1986). Charles Coleman Sellers, *Charles Willson Peale*, (New York, 1969). Edgar P. Richardson, Brooke Hindle & Lillian B. Miller, *Charles Willson Peale and His World*, with a Foreword by Charles Coleman Sellers, (New York, 1982). Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward, eds., *New Perspectives on Charles Willson Peale: A 250th Anniversary Celebration*, (Philadelphia, 1991). Jules David Prown, *John Singleton Copley. 1738-1815*, exh. cat., (Washington, D. C., New York & Boston, Massachusetts, 1965). Jules David Prown, *John Singleton Copley. Volume II. In England, 1774-1815*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966). Emily Ballew Neff, *John Singleton Copley In England*, with an essay by William L. Pressly, (London, 1995). Theodore Sizer, *The Works of Colonel John Trumbull: Artist of the American Revolution*, Revised ed., (New Haven & London, 1967 (1950)). Irma B. Jaffe, *John Trumbull: Patriot-Artist of the American Revolution*, (Boston, 1975). Helen A. Cooper, ed., *John Trumbull: The Hand and Spirit of a Painter*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1982).

⁷⁰ William L. Pressly, *James Barry: The Artist as Hero*, exh. cat., (London, 1983). William L. Pressly, *The Life and Art of James Barry*, (New Haven & London, 1981). Scott Paul Gordon, 'Reading Patriotic Art: James Barry's *King Lear* (1786-87)', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 36, no. 4, (Summer 2003), pp. 491-509. Dr M. Rajnai, (with the help of Miss Marion Spencer), *Paintings by Henry Walton, 1746-1813*, (Norwich, 1963). Evelyne Bell, 'The Life and Work of Henry Walton', *Gainsborough's House Review 1998/99*, pp. 39-104. Mark L. Evans, 'Paintings, Prints and Politics during the American War: Henry Walton's *A Girl Buying a Ballad*', *Print Quarterly*, vol. XIX, no. 1, (2002), pp. 12-24. Alastair Smart, *Allan Ramsay, Painter, Essayist and Man of the Enlightenment*, (New Haven & London, 1992).

⁷¹ Marcus Wood, *Radical Satire and Print Culture, 1790-1822*, (Oxford, 1994), p. 59.

⁷² It is the deeply divisive nature of the war that is important rather than its balance. Stephen Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, (Oxford, 2000), p. 130 (but see pp. 127-165 for a wider examination of scholarship to date and the nature and extent of these divisions).

prints: 'infallibly document the popularity in England of America's resistance.'⁷³ Since such views automatically placed the artists, publishers and printsellers in opposition to the government, it has been suggested that the fact, for example, that Sayer and Bennet listed their political satires right at the end of their catalogue means that they were aware of the risks inherent in making such material available, as customers would have had to scan more than 200 pages before finding them.⁷⁴ Of course, this only works if everyone had read the catalogue page by page from the front - opening it from the back would have brought one straight to them. Often the use of prints as evidence of British popular opinion is merely an appropriation to support an American perspective, whereas such images actually relate to events almost exclusively from the viewpoint of the metropole not the colonies.⁷⁵ It is a subtle difference, but I argue that prints from the period use the American issue as a stick with which to beat the British government, which is not the same thing at all as wholeheartedly supporting the colonial cause in each and every degree.

Definitions and Structure

The main period covered by this dissertation runs roughly from 1765 to 1789, that is from the Stamp Act to the French Revolution, and it is only in the final concluding chapter that I look beyond this period to cover the influence of the metaphors that interest me on the representation of national identity in the nineteenth century. Although the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) was itself about a struggle for

⁷³ Halsey, 'English Sympathy with Boston', p. 87.

⁷⁴ E. McSherry Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880 A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1987), p. 159.

European domination in North America (and to a lesser extent India), this has its own artistic conventions and an extension of my research to this period, though interesting, would have changed the focus more to Britain-France rather than Britain-America. Nevertheless, where images from the later period have their origin and basis in the imagery of this earlier conflict, this has been noted. Similarly, although there were signs of conflict within the British transatlantic world before 1765, these had little or no impact on the visual record in Great Britain with regard to the issues and subject matter of this dissertation.

Nor have I ventured beyond 1789, since the outbreak of the French Revolution changed the ways in which the British regarded the earlier upheaval within their own empire. Any consideration of these changes would require a whole dissertation in itself, since the War of American Independence had a profound effect on the way that Britain regarded the early years of the French Revolution and in turn altered the way in which the American Revolution itself was looked back on. In light of the Franco-American alliance of 1778, and subsequent French military support for the American cause there has been a natural desire on the part of scholars to look for links and points of comparison or difference between the two.⁷⁶ However, as Lynn Hunt has noted, it is easier to talk about the differences between the American and French Revolutions' relationship to familial metaphor than to discuss their similarities, particularly in terms of their consequences.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ For example, the figurative language of American literature is supported by British images in: Block, 'Rape Without Women'.

⁷⁶ One of the most recent is a study which examines the modern legacies of the two revolutions. Susan Dunn, *Sister Revolutions: French Lightning, American Light*, (New York, 1999).

⁷⁷ Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, pp. 70-73.

The question of whether the conflict of 1775 to 1783 was a war or a revolution has long divided historians, as shown by recent books with titles like *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783* and *The American Revolution, 1774-1783*.⁷⁸ For contemporaries it was known as 'the American war', a 'rebellion', and a 'civil war', but I prefer to refer to it as the War of American Independence, since I am more interested in the conflict as a war of secession between two geographically distinct parts of the world, than as a revolutionary overthrow of government.⁷⁹ To call it a war instead of a revolution also helps to restore the importance of the involvement of France, Spain and the Netherlands, especially since the latter two (unlike France) fought against Britain without treaties of alliance with the Americans. This reflects a growing trend in scholarship to see the conflict as a global war building on the work of historians such as Piers Mackesy.⁸⁰

Despite a concern with the connection between metropole and colony in the British transatlantic community - what Joseph Roach has called the 'circum-Atlantic world' - my focus is purely on the relationship between Great Britain (although the political views represented are largely those of the dominant England and London) and the thirteen rebellious colonies on the eastern seaboard of the North American

⁷⁸ Stephen Conway, *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783*, (London, 1995). Daniel Marston, *The American Revolution, 1774-1783*, (Oxford, 2002). It has also been suggested that it was a war with revolutionary features. Jacques Godechot, *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799*, (London, 1965), pp. 33-45. For a discussion of the conflict as a civil war and this aspect's subsequent erasure from the public consciousness, see: J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832 Political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 296-303 & 382-383. For a brief schematic of the different ways in which the conflict is described as a civil war, rebellion, revolution and war of secession, see: Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion Politics, & The Triumphs of Anglo-America*, (New York, 1999), Appendix 1, pp. 613-614.

⁷⁹ For references to war as an 'American War', a war of secession, and a civil war see the title and pp. 2 & 6 of: *Considerations upon the French and American War*. The Americans were rebels betrayed into conducting a civil war according to: *Americans against Liberty: or an Essay on the Nature and Principles of True Freedom, shewing [sic] that the Designs and Conduct of the Americans tend only to Tyranny and Slavery*, (London, 1775), pp. 28-29.

⁸⁰ Piers Mackesy, *The War For America 1775-1783*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964).

continent.⁸¹ Although occasional comparative material relating to the West Indian islands, Scotland and Ireland has been introduced, it was not my intention to examine each of these in depth, since to do so would have stretched the dissertation beyond breaking point. In any case, the relationship between Britain (or England) and each of these differs, having its own political history, traditions of cultural exchange and fault lines, meaning that they each deserve individual attention in their own right.⁸²

The next chapter begins my analysis of visual material with an examination of the implications of the depiction of the colonies as dismembered limbs. Chapter three looks at the familial metaphor of Anglo-American conflicts, arguing that they were conceptualized as a family quarrel. That chapter also concentrates on the female configuration of this quarrel, which represented America as a subordinate who owed her mother duties of obedience and loyalty. As a counterbalance my fourth chapter looks at the ways in which the war was gendered as male and the implications of this for political debate. An examination of the effects of the entry to the war of the European powers forms the basis of my fifth chapter, which argues that the narratives of the family quarrel built up until 1778 were challenged by the increasing numbers of enemies facing Britain allowing the rise of competing tropes. In the subsequent period the body as representative of British unity was placed under threat in imagery relating to dismemberment and blood loss, which will form the subject of my sixth and seventh chapters respectively. Chapter eight covers the failure of attempts to place Britain and America in a more equal sibling relationship both

⁸¹ The 'circum-Atlantic world' would include all the British colonies of the Americas, including those in the West Indies, and those that did not rebel against the mother country such as Canada. Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, (New York, 1996).

⁸² The best book on art and Anglo-Irish relations begins with the Irish rebellion of 1798, and allots a mere four pages to everything up to that point. Roy Douglas, Liam Harte & Jim O'Hara, *Drawing Conclusions: A Cartoon History of Anglo-Irish Relations, 1798-1998*, (Belfast, 1998), pp. 6-9.

following Independence in 1776 and after the end of the war in 1783. Finally, my conclusion in chapter nine suggests ways in which the subject matter of this dissertation affected how the Anglo-American relationship was depicted during the century after 1783, and the possible effects on American visual self-realization.

Chapter 2: The Body Politic

The direct connection we have with the body and the way we experience the world through our bodies makes it one of the most immediate, prevalent and expressive sources of material for conceptualizing and analogizing. As Roy Porter has noted, language itself reveals our need to envisage and engage with the world through the body and the body through the world. We commonly speak of bodies of knowledge, body politics, corporal punishment, right-hand men, somebodies, nobodies, headings, footnotes and so on, without any conscious awareness of their experiential origins.¹ In a world interpreted through the medium of our own physical sense of being, tables have legs, chairs have arms, wells have bottoms, hills have brows and rivers have mouths. Through this direct empirical link, a greater sense of reality is bestowed on our physical environment.²

Lakoff and Johnson argue that we experience our own bodies as containers bounded by a surface of skin, and that we impose this experience on the world around us, and in particular on territory. Just as we conceive of our bodies as having an inside and an outside, we see areas of land in the same way and talk of ‘the people *in* America’ or of ‘entering’ and ‘exiting’ a country.³ Frontiers, meanwhile, are barriers to be ‘crossed’, they can be both the cause and consequence of conflict, they give shape and definition to the political areas bounded within them, and our familiarity with the shapes they create in two-dimensional figures and on maps helps to naturalize

¹ Roy Porter, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900*, (London, 2001), p.35.

² Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (New York & Oxford, 1985), p.125.

³ George Lakoff & Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, (Chicago & London, 1981), pp. 29-30.

geopolitical identity.⁴ The body too is seen and recognized by its boundaries, its surfaces and the shape, form, texture and colour that they take. These are important points because this dissertation examines many images where the body is used to define, represent, naturalize and embody an idea, a race, a population, a society, a community, a nation or an empire, as well as an individual.

The widespread use of Britannia in coinage, medals, seals, ceramics, paintings, prints, maps, advertisements, book illustrations, book-binding tools and sculpture in the second half of the eighteenth century raises the question of what exactly she is used to represent. Curiously, despite its title, Tamara Hunt's recent book - *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England* - fails to address this issue beyond the suggestion that she 'symbolizes the spirit of the nation', while John Bull 'appears to represent the British people'.⁵ Herbert Atherton similarly noted that she represented the nation, but that that could mean Great Britain or just England, since the flag on her shield is sometimes just that of St George instead of the more usual combination with that of St Andrew.⁶ This is complicated by the fact that England was sometimes accepted by contemporaries as a synonym for 'all South Britain, including Wales'.⁷ It can be further complicated by noting that in poetical imagery at least she could also include Ireland, even though political union would not take place until 1801.⁸ As this chapter will show she could also be

⁴ Jeremy Black, *Maps and Politics*, (London, 2000 (1997)), chapter 5 'Frontiers', especially pp. 121-122 & 144-146.

⁵ Although referring to a specific print relating to the Napoleonic wars, this seems to sum up her view on these personifications in general. Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England*, (Aldershot, 2003), p. 143.

⁶ Herbert M. Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth. A Study of the Ideographic Representation of Politics*, (Oxford, 1974), p. 92.

⁷ *The Present State of the British Empire in Europe, America, Africa and Asia*. (London, 1768), p. 2.

⁸ *The Complaint: or, Britannia lamenting the loss of her children. An elegy. Inscribed to that learned philosopher and able statesman Benjamin Franklin*, (London, [1776?]), p. 1.

used to represent a transatlantic community of Britons covering populations on both sides of the Atlantic.

As a national symbol Britannia was therefore surprisingly non-specific and adaptable to circumstance. Linda Colley has shown how British nationhood was developed in the eighteenth century in response to issues of war, empire and religion, and how it could be defined, redefined and challenged by international and domestic events and rivalries.⁹ Ideas of what it meant to be British or English, part of a nation or an empire, or even just of a broad-based community, were not immutable or incontestable therefore, and so the symbols and emblems used to represent these ideas must also be regarded as subject to constant change, re-evaluation and reinterpretation. Even the word empire would have meant different things to different people in the eighteenth century.¹⁰ By examining the images used to represent such abstract concepts we may learn more about the ways in which they were invoked in the development of national and colonial identities, as well as what they can reveal about the developmental process itself.

This chapter is concerned with the ways in which eighteenth-century visual imagery conflated the concept of the body politic with one of the body as a metaphorical

⁹ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, (New Haven & London 1992), pp. 367-373.

¹⁰ Some of the ways in which the concept 'empire' was understood have been set out in: P. J. Marshall, 'Introduction', in: P. J. Marshall, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, 5 vols., volume II: *The Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2001, (1998)), pp. 4-8. See also: P. J. Marshall, 'Eighteenth-Century Britain and its Empire', *The Historian*, no. 68, (Winter 2000), p. 12. In the eighteenth century empire could mean, an extent of territorial rule, a state, dominion of the seas, control by right of conquest, or simply power over something or someone else. By mid-century, the first of these was starting to dominate understanding of the term, but was by no means accepted by everyone as having its current meaning of 'an extensive group of states or countries under single supreme authority'. Judy Pearsall, ed., *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, (Oxford, 1998), p. 604. For the different theories of imperial organization at the time, see: Randolph Green Adams, 'Political Ideas of the American Revolution: Britannic-American Contribution to the Problem of Imperial Organization, 1765-1775', Trinity College, Durham, North Carolina, Ph.D., (1922), History, pp. 16-18.

stand-in for the geopolitical state, as a figurative representation of its territory as well as its social and political substance, and as a demonstration of the basic relationship between metropole and colony. It examines the historical, theoretical and pictorial background of bodies politic, taking as an example an image developed by Benjamin Franklin as part of his opposition to the Stamp Act of 1765, which uses the body of Britannia to express a particular view of disrupted British unity.¹¹ Since it is the textual engagements of this work that help to give it meaning, this chapter also investigates the ways in which they help us to understand the wider context of this image, and provide a means for understanding issues of cause, effect, blame and solution. Finally, I look at subsequent uses of this cartoon's imagery to show how political and cultural events helped effect changes in the way such prints might have been interpreted.

Benjamin Franklin's *MAGNA Britannia: her Colonies REDUC'D*

The Seven Years' War attracted greater attention to North American affairs than ever before, not only among the general public but also politicians, as George Grenville's ministry of 1763-1765 made attempts to reverse a long period of neglect in colonial affairs. The Molasses Act (imposing a duty on foreign imports of the raw material for making rum) and Currency Act (restricting the issue of paper money as legal tender) of 1764 were effectively attempts to regulate American affairs, and assumed the right of the British parliament to do so. In February 1765 Grenville introduced a bill to parliament that would effectively introduce a tax in America on the stamped

¹¹ In a subsequent chapter I will look at how ostensibly similar visual material was used to express the division (or dismemberment) of the empire.

paper that had to be used for newspapers, many legal documents and ships' clearance documents, as well as press advertisements, pamphlets, playing cards, dice and calendars. Grenville intended that this Stamp Act should raise revenue to offset the cost of waging the Seven Years' War, help to maintain an armed presence in North America in the face of potential French aggression, and reassert British sovereignty and authority over the American colonies. The Act received royal assent on 22nd March and was due to take effect the following November. However, for colonists who were used to being mostly left to regulate their own affairs, the Stamp Act raised the question of whether or not a parliament in which they were not represented had the right to impose a tax on them. There was stiff resistance to its measures both at home and in the American colonies, accompanied by loud calls for the government to repeal it.

With parliament due to debate repeal in February 1766, Benjamin Franklin was among those called to give evidence, before the Stamp Act was finally abolished in March 1766. At the time, Franklin was the colonial agent in London for Pennsylvania, and was caught between an American opposition that was more radical than his own approach, and the necessities of negotiating the political scene in London.¹² On the one hand, believing an apparent lack of action on his part meant he was in favour of the Act, the mob in Philadelphia had threatened to burn down his house, and on the other it was necessary that he employ political and rhetorical conventions that could persuade the British establishment of the necessity of repeal. To salvage his political reputation, Franklin increased his efforts to get the Stamp Act revoked, and as part of these he produced a cartoon that depicted a statue of

Britannia as an embodiment of the British body politic entitled *MAGNA Britannia: her Colonies REDUC'D* (figure 2.1).¹³

A handwritten note in an unidentified hand on the copy in the collection of the American Philosophical Society mentions that it was invented by Benjamin Franklin, and that a copy was given to each member of Parliament the day before the final debate on the Stamp Act.¹⁴ Although the involvement of another individual in the artistic production of this etching should probably be inferred, Franklin has been shown to be very knowledgeable on visual imagery and symbolism and so it is likely that the programme for this image was set out wholly, or at least largely, by him.¹⁵ As an image, its success is attested to by the various prints based on it that were produced in Britain, America, France and the Netherlands between 1767 and 1780.¹⁶ In Franklin's print Britannia's body has been divided through the loss of limbs representing Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York and New England.¹⁷ The scene of

¹² On Franklin's involvement with the Stamp Act as both politician and printer and American resistance to it, see: Ralph Frasca, 'Benjamin Franklin's Printing Network and the Stamp Act', *Pennsylvania History*, vol. 71, no. 4, (Autumn 2004), pp. 403-419.

¹³ Ormond Seavey, *Becoming Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography and the Life*, (University Park, Pennsylvania, & London, 1988), pp. 196-197.

¹⁴ Since he needed to be seen to be taking action, he also distributed the etching to friends in America. For references to the cartoon in his papers, see: Leonard W. Labaree, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XIII, (New Haven & London, 1969), pp. 66-72, 170, 176, 189 & 509.

¹⁵ J. A. Leo Lemay, 'The American Aesthetic of Franklin's Visual Creations', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 465-466.

¹⁶ The various versions are listed in: Lester C. Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Washington, D. C., 1991), p. 203. The history and context of this image have been analysed a number of times. See, for example: Edwin Wolf, 'Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act Cartoon', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 99, (December 1955), pp. 388-396. Lester C. Olson, 'Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 73, no. 1, (February 1987), pp. 18-42.

¹⁷ Dorothy George suggested that a possible source for the idea of dismemberment in the images lies in the illustrations to Henry Stubbe's pamphlets on the Anglo-Dutch War published in 1672-3. M D George, 'America in English Satirical Prints', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, Volume X, No. 4, (October 1953), n. 36 on p. 520. George suggests *A Further Justification of the Present War against the United Netherlands*, but I have been unable to locate any appropriate source images in that particular pamphlet. However, in another of Stubbe's works, there is a copy of four Dutch images produced as anti-English propaganda, which include the obverse and reverse of a coin or medal showing Britannia in profile and seated on a globe. Stubbe noted below that the English are

dismemberment might be regarded as expressing the consequences of trying to use force of arms to reduce the colonies to obedience. Franklin wrote to his sister in March 1766, informing her that in these circumstance it shows that ‘the Colonies may be ruined, but that Britain would thereby be maimed.’¹⁸

In light of this, Lester Olson interprets this as an image of subordination and interdependence, and a warning against internal divisions, where failure to take the correct action could be fatal to the British Empire in that the partition of the body politic in *MAGNA Britannia* is ‘the equivalent of suicide for the empire’.¹⁹ Although I think the community represented by Britannia here is more selective than the use of the word ‘empire’ suggests, legal rhetoric at least used ‘body politic’ metaphor in the eighteenth century to explain and position parts of society within the hierarchy of the whole, while also stressing the interdependence of those parts.²⁰ Furthermore, as we shall see later, the limbs were regarded at the time as subordinate parts of the body. However, the question of suicide cannot logically arise here since I would argue that this is not meant to be seen as a real body, but rather a more notional one visually based on a statue, and, in that case, restorable.

The top left stump of Britannia is a pale disk in a pale circle – as the light seems to be coming from the (right rear) this is in full light – which suggests to me that this

represented by: ‘a Lyon painted with three Crowns reversed, and without a tayl: and by many Massive Dogs, whose ears are crop’d, and tayls cut off.’ This juxtaposition of Britannia and the dismembered British Lion may have been what helped to suggest the idea in visual terms. [Henry Stubbe], *A Justification of the Present War against the United Netherlands*. (London, 1672). The illustration is opposite page 40.

¹⁸ Letter dated 1st March 1766. Labaree, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, Volume XIII, p. 189.

¹⁹ Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era*, p. 204. See also: Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004), p. 78.

²⁰ Randall McGowen, ‘The Body and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England’, *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 59, no. 4, (December 1987), p. 660.

body might be made out of marble and that the shading elsewhere is just that, shading. The smaller discs could be the sockets into which the limbs would be fitted since large pieces of figural sculpture were rarely made from one block of stone. Robert Strange's engravings of Jan Van Rymsdyck's drawings for William Hunter's *Gravid Uterus* (*figure 2.2*) show the very different way that contemporary medical illustration treated the cross section of a severed leg. In Strange's work, the skin and subcutaneous fat are shown to be much paler than the muscle tissue they surround, while in the centre of the thigh, the pale, irregular oval of the bone surrounds the darker marrow within.²¹ It was standard practice in Italy from the mid-1500s onwards to restore the better antique sculpture that was unearthed there, and sometimes new limbs were added before the originals were unearthed. When the Grand Tour became popular among English gentlemen in the eighteenth century, this practice spread to British collectors, and would have been firmly established by the middle of the eighteenth century when this image was produced.²² This depiction of Britannia therefore seems to have less in common with a real life flesh-and-blood body than with the unrestored *Pasquino* (*figure 2.3*) in Rome, which was sometimes drawn into political dialogues critical of contemporary British governmental policy and action.²³ If so, then *Magna Britania* is a clear sculptural reference to the decline

²¹ William Hunter, *Anatomia Uteri Humani gravidi tabulis illustrata... The Anatomy of the Human Gravid Uterus exhibited in figures*, (Birmingham, 1774).

²² It was only in the last couple of decades of the century that the practice of restoration began to go out of fashion. Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900*, (New Haven & London, 1981), p. 103.

²³ The *Pasquino* had been unearthed during excavation of the Orsino Palace in Rome in 1501, and placed in the in the Via del Paione (Via del Governo Vecchio). It quickly became well-known as a site where anti-papal and political lampoons were placed, and remained so throughout the eighteenth century. On the history and mythologies of the statue, see: Carl Ankerfeldt, *Romerske Spottefugle: De talende statuer*, (København, 1965). For a British use of the statue as a means to satirically examine recent events, see: *Political Dialogues Between the Celebrated Statues of Pasquin and Marforio at Rome, In which The Origin and Views of the late War, the Secret Mediation of the present Peace, and the genuine Conditions of it, are brought to light.*, (London, 1736).

and fall of the Roman Empire contextualized through contemporary archaeology, but also holds open the possibility that the body politic can still be restored to wholeness.

The tradition of representing a city, land, nation or empire as an allegorical figure is a long one stretching back to antiquity. Such figures help to demonstrate the relationship between man and his environment, and require a common ground of knowledge in order to understand who or what they represent. Such personifications can be based on real, mythical or fictional beings, or even anthropological, social, or professional types, and are called into being at a particular time to suit a particular purpose and to act in a particular way.²⁴ Eighteenth-century satirical prints used a variety of embodiments to represent the parent state including those of John Bull, the British lion, and Jack England, but the most appropriate personification of the mother country was the female form of Britannia.²⁵ Initially created to celebrate the Claudine conquest of Britain in the first century A.D., the gender and iconography of the figure remained unfixed throughout the Roman occupation, though perhaps with a tendency towards the female through conflation with local goddesses. Under James I she became firmly established as a woman who symbolized the newly united crowns of England and Scotland, and, although she was to disappear during the Civil War and Commonwealth, she was revived with the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, appearing on the reverse of copper halfpennies and farthings from 1672 (*figure 2.4*). This numismatic presence helped to establish Britannian iconography as a woman shown in profile, facing left, classically robed, seated on a globe, with a

²⁴ Roger Hinks, *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, (London, 1939), pp. 1, 63 & 74.

²⁵ This was aided by a seventeenth-century conflation between Britannia and the Virgin Mary. Madge Dresser, 'Britannia', in: Raphael Samuel, ed., *Patriotism: the Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, volume III: *National Fictions*, (London & New York, 1989), pp. 26-49.

scrolled shield bearing the cross of St George superimposed over the saltire of St Andrew, and holding an olive branch in her right hand and a spear in her left.²⁶

Nearly a century later, the same basic elements can be seen in the Bartolozzi etching after a design by Cipriani known as the *Britannia-Libertas* (**figure 2.5**), which dates from before 1768, and is probably related to the various bookbinding stamps produced for Thomas Hollis from about 1759 onwards.²⁷ In this engraving, which replaces the spear with the *hasta* and *pileus*, Britannia appears to have been envisaged as a statue, while the addition of the liberty symbols made this image particularly suitable for use in relation to the disputes where colonists were claiming their rights to liberty as true-born Englishmen.²⁸ Benjamin Franklin was among the many American friends with whom Hollis exchanged letters and to whom he gave copies of his own publications, so it is possible that Franklin was already aware of *Britannia-Libertas* in 1766.²⁹ *Magna Britania* contains most of the same key iconographical elements, but in this case her limbs have been removed causing her to fall to the ground, resulting in an inability to wield her offensive and defensive capabilities in the form of a spear and a shield showing the Union Flag. The effects

²⁶ The first dies were created by Jan Roettier (1631-1703), who based his iconography on a sestertius from the reign (138-161 A.D.) of Antoninus Pius. This iconography was more or less standard until c.1797 when, to show British naval mastery, the spear became a trident, and waves and a background of a ship were added to the foreground. The history and iconography of Britannia is best set out in: Herbert M. Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth. A Study of the Ideographic Representation of Politics*, (Oxford, 1974), pp. 89-97. However, see also: Madge Dresse, 'Britannia', pp. 26-49; Marina Warner, *Monuments & Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form*, (London, 1985), pp. 45-49.

²⁷ For the imagery relating to Britannia and Thomas Hollis, see: Frank H. Sommer, 'Thomas Hollis and the Arts of Dissent', in: John D. Morse, ed., *Prints in and of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 111-160. See also: Frank H. Sommer, 'The Metamorphoses of Britannia', on pp. 40-49 of: Charles F. Montgomery and Patricia E. Kane, eds., *American art, 1750-1800 : towards Independence*, (Boston, Massachusetts, 1976). On Cipriani's bookbinding tools, see: W. H. Bond, *Thomas Hollis of Lincoln's Inn: A Whig and his Books*, (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 55-77.

²⁸ Although it was probably created some time beforehand, the engraving was used as the frontispiece to: Bolland, William, *Continued Corruption, standing armies, and popular discontents considered, and the establishment of the English colonies in America, with various subsequent proceedings and the*

on British trade are revealed by the upturned brooms attached to the masts of the ships in the background that indicate they are for sale. The consequences of this for Britons everywhere can be seen in the English oak, which is bare, leafless and unlikely to survive, while several branches of the British family tree have already been lost and lie scattered in the foreground.

As might be expected of a print produced by a colonial agent, *MAGNA Britannia* presents matters purely in terms of transatlantic concerns. The body of Britannia here does not seem to represent the empire since there is no extremity available for the British islands in the Caribbean nor its outposts in India, Africa and the Mediterranean.³⁰ Instead, she is used to symbolize Franklin's ideas about the unity of the British people at a time when many in the American colonies still thought of themselves as Britons.³¹ Indeed, that is exactly how many also saw them on the opposite side of the Atlantic, not as the subjects of Britons but their fellow-subjects.³² Horace Walpole, for example, wrote that: 'The English in America are as much my countrymen as those born in the parish of St Martin's-in-the-Fields...'.³³ This belief could also be expressed in solid bodily form, as shown by the call to his fellow Britons from one Whig writer to remember that Americans were 'bone of your bone,

Present Contest, examined with Intent to promote their cordial and Perpetual Union with their Mother-Country, for their Mutual Honour, Comfort, Strength, and Safety, (London, 1768).

²⁹ W. H. Bond, *Thomas Hollis of Lincoln's Inn*, p. 27.

³⁰ On Franklin's transatlantic notion of empire, see: Esmond Wright, "'The Fine and Noble China Vase, The British Empire': Benjamin Franklin's 'Love-Hate' View of England", *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 441-446.

³¹ Michael Zuckerman, 'Identity in British America: Unease in Eden', in: Nicholas Canny & Anthony Pagden, ed., *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, (Princeton, 1987), p. 115.

³² Dr Richard Price, *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1776), p. 99.

³³ Letter from Horace Walpole to Lady Ossory dated 26th October 1781. W. S. Lewis and A. Doyle Wallace, eds., with the assistance of Edwine M. Martz, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, volume XXXIII: *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with the Countess of Upper Ossory, 1778-1787*, (New Haven & London, 1965), p. 302.

and flesh of your flesh...'.³⁴ A view that there was no difference between English affairs at home in Britain and in the colonies overseas was also encouraged politically by the fact that colonial affairs were the responsibility first of the Southern Office, and then, under Rockingham in 1782, of the Home Office under Lord Shelburne.³⁵

Group identity, as expressed through issues of wholeness and the interrelation of parts, is a concern that appears repeatedly in Benjamin Franklin's political writings.³⁶ In the lead-up to the Albany Congress of 1754 - an early attempt by Franklin and others to get the American colonies to unite - he had produced his *Join Or Die* dismembered-snake motif (*figure 2.6*), which was to be reused by Americans during the revolution.³⁷ In *Join Or Die*, the colonies are represented as separate segments of a snake, which can only function properly when these are united and its body made whole. For Franklin, the failure of this Congress had been one of the factors that had confirmed both the necessity of such unity, but also the many difficulties involved in bringing it about.³⁸ In his Stamp Act cartoon, however, the colonies are not dependent on one another for unity, but on the mother country. The only thing that serves to unite the limbs is the torso. Detached from it, they appear separate, cannot be joined together to form a new body or coherent whole, and are doomed to remain a collection of parts should the body politic remain divided. The clues to how we might understand this aspect of the image lie in the implications of its textual engagement with fable and ancient history.

³⁴ *An Unconnected Whig's Address to the Public upon the Present Civil War, the State of Public Affairs, and the Real Course of the National Calamities*, (London, 1777), p.77.

³⁵ John Derry, *English Politics and the American Revolution*, (London, 1976), p. 195.

³⁶ Ormond Seavey, *Becoming Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography and the Life*, (University Park, Pennsylvania, & London, 1988), p. 190.

'BELLI SARIUS' and The Belly And The Members

Even though Lester Olson notes how classical myth could provide 'a typology within which recent events could be organized and understood by those who recognized the allusion', he seems to have overlooked *MAGNA Britannia's* use of Belisarius imagery.³⁹ Olson interprets this aspect simply in terms of a dire warning to a British government responsible for ignoring the colonies' assistance in past military conflicts, pursuing policies that would bring about military harm to the mother country, and damaging Britain's international reputation as a result of internal conflict.⁴⁰ However, the representation of Britannia as a statue-like figure suggests restoration of the *status quo* is possible, something that is also implicit in the words '*DATE OBOLUM BELLISARIO*' contained in the ribbon lying across the globe and lower torso of Britannia. This piece of text refers to contexts that suggest Franklin's cartoon goes beyond mere warning to actually apportion blame fairly even-handedly between both metropole and colony, while also creating a sense of cause and effect to the current state of Anglo-American relations.

'DATE OBOLUM BELLISARIO' is central to my interpretation of this cartoon. In the first instance, what no one seems to have noticed is the importance of the misspelling and placement of the word '*BELLISARIO*' in particular. In the eighteenth century, it was standard to spell the name of the Byzantine general as

³⁷ J. A. Leo Lemay, 'The American Aesthetic of Franklin's Visual Creations', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 475-480.

³⁸ Seavey, *Becoming Benjamin Franklin*, pp. 180, 186 & 213.

³⁹ Olson is referring to the myth of Hercules in connection with Franklin's involvement in the production of the *Libertas Americana* medal – see: Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*, p. 157.

⁴⁰ Lester C. Olson, "Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology", *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 73, no. 1, (February 1987), pp.

‘Belisarius’ (with one ‘l’). Using the double ‘l’ here therefore seems significant, as is the division of the word in two as ‘*BELLI SARIO*’ with a letter’s width between the two halves. Attention is further drawn to this feature by the pun that is created by the placement of the first half (‘*BELL*’) over Britannia’s own ‘belly’, and which also directs attention to the fable of *The Belly and the Members*.

There were a number of possible sources for Franklin’s knowledge of this moralizing tale. It not only featured in the many books of fables by Æsop that were popular in Britain and America, but also in the classical writing of Livy and Plutarch, and had been used by William Shakespeare in his play *Coriolanus*.⁴¹ In Æsopian fable, classical history and Shakespearean drama the members of the body rebel against the belly, which in classical writing had sometimes been the seat of direction for the body rather than the brain, and decide to starve it of sustenance.⁴² Ultimately the body escapes death when the members are made to see that all parts of it are interdependent, and that if the belly dies, so will they. In Livy and Plutarch’s histories, the Roman Consul Menenius Agrippa used the parable to end the secession of the plebeians in 494 B.C..⁴³ Although Leonard Barkan has suggested that the moral of the various versions of this story is that ‘the amputation of any one part of the body politic is fatal to all the others’, it should be noted that harmony is always

18-42 (particularly p.34). Olson, *Emblems of American Community*, 1991, pp. 204-205. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of American Community*, pp. 103-104.

⁴¹ Livy, *The Early History of Rome*, translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt, introduction by R. M. Ogilvie, (London, 1960, 1971), pp. 141-142. Plutarch, *Plutarch’s Lives, Volume I*, the Dryden translation, edited with a preface by Arthur Hugh Clough, introduction by James Atlas, (New York, 2001), p. 295. Shakespeare repeats the fable in Act I, Scene 1 of his play: Arthur Riss, ‘The Belly Politic: Coriolanus and the Revolt of Language’, *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 1, (Spring 1992), pp. 53-75. Riss relates Shakespeare’s use of ‘body politic’ metaphor in the play to the Midland Revolt against enclosure of 1607. See also: Barkan, *Nature’s Work of Art*, pp. 95-113.

⁴² Jacques Le Goff, ‘Head or Heart? The Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages’, in: Michel Feher, ed., *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, vol. III, (New York, 1989), pp. 13-14.

⁴³ The repetition of this fable is dealt with in: David George Hale, *The Body Politic: A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature*, (The Hague & Paris, 1971), pp. 26-41.

restored at the end of the story and the body survives.⁴⁴ A 1764 catalogue of the books in the Library Company of Philadelphia, of which Franklin was a member, lists the complete works of Shakespeare, an English translation of Livy's *Roman History*, and an edition of Croxall's *Fables of Æsop*, but however he derived his knowledge of the story, its inclusion in classical histories provided him with a clear example of its rhetorical use as a means of bringing about the end of a political rebellion.⁴⁵

The application of this fable in connection with Britannia also relies on an engagement with a tradition of 'body politic' metaphors that date back at least to classical antiquity.⁴⁶ Political societies have been described in Western thought in terms of bodies since Periclean Athens of the fourth century B.C., when a new political unity was achieved and the requirement to explain it was met through corporeal analogy.⁴⁷ It first appeared in British written political theory in the twelfth century when it was used by John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus*.⁴⁸ Such theories of bodies politic explained the state through a microcosm-macrocosm analogy, in which the microcosm of the body stood in for the macrocosm of the multiple bodies inhabiting the political state.⁴⁹ Most medieval texts also relied on a combination of the dual nature of the king's body as both part and representative of the state as a

⁴⁴ Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art*, p. 96.

⁴⁵ The details of these publications are given as: *Works of Shakespeare*, 6 vols., (London, 1745), *The Roman History by Titus Livius*, 6 vols., (London, 1744), and Croxall, *The Fables of Æsop*, 3rd ed., (London, 1731). *The Charter, Laws, and Catalogue of Books, of the Library Company of Philadelphia*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), 1764, pp. 66, 76 & 124. Franklin had helped to found the library in 1731 and was listed as a member on p. 149.

⁴⁶ Hinks, *Myth and Allegory*, pp. 67-76. Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art*, pp. 61-115.

⁴⁷ The tradition is even older in non-Western societies, in Persia, Egypt, China and India (where it can be traced back to at least c.1500 B.C.). Hale, *The Body Politic*, pp. 18, 19 & 24.

⁴⁸ John of Salisbury, 'Metalogicon and Policraticus', translated by Cary J. Nederman, in: Cary J. Nederman & Kate Langdon Forhan, eds., *Medieval Political Theory – A Reader. The Quest for the Body Politic, 1100-1400*, (London & New York, 1993), pp. 26-60.

⁴⁹ Hale, *The Body Politic*, pp. 13-15.

whole, and the Great Chain of Being that allowed the parts of the body to be assembled into a hierarchy, with, for example, the monarch as the head, soldiers and officials as the hands, and peasants as the feet.⁵⁰

In the seventeenth century, however, the body actual had become progressively less effective as an analogue for the political state. Thomas Hobbes, defined a body politic as: ‘a multitude of men, united as one person by a common power, for their common peace, defence, and benefit.’⁵¹ In the engraved title page to the first edition of *Leviathan* (*figure 2.7*) we can see how an artist chose to give visual form to Hobbes’s ideas on the body politic. While the head is singular, and wears a crown to show that this represents a monarchy, the arms and torso are given shape by means of a partial outline, and substance by being formed of many bodies. This is a notional collective body rather than one where different members and organs correspond directly to the various component parts of society.⁵² Two things seem to have effected this change. Firstly, the body became better known through medical and scientific scrutiny, and its interior easier to visualize in modern medical terms.⁵³ Secondly, the repeated purges of the middle decades of the century continuously challenged and dismembered the body politic, making the real body distasteful to

⁵⁰ Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, (Princeton, 1957), p.13. Barkan, *Nature’s Work of Art*, p. 82. On metaphor, hierarchy and the Great Chain of Being, see: George Lakoff & Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, (Chicago & London, 1989), pp. 166-169. Le Goff, ‘Head or Heart?’, pp. 12-27. Peasants were thought of as the feet as they were always in touch with the soil. John of Salisbury, ‘Metalogicon and Policraticus’, pp. 38-39.

⁵¹ See: Part 1, ‘Human Nature’, Chapter XIX, Section 8 of: Thomas Hobbes, *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*, edited and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1994), p. 107. See also: Part 1, ‘Of Man’, Chapter XVI, Section 13 of: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, edited and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1996), p.109.

⁵² Michael Walzer, ‘On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought’, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 82, No. 2 (June 1967), p. 199.

⁵³ Hale, *The Body Politic*, pp. 12 & 131.

thinkers like John Locke as a basis for explaining the polity.⁵⁴ In the decades following the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy, the body politic would be replaced in political theory by the idea of the social contract.⁵⁵ Thereafter, the body politic survived as a notional and artificial concept, that was used in metaphors of health and unity to describe the general state of political society rather than any theory of the ways in which it operated or was constructed.⁵⁶

The Belly and the Members already had a tradition of usage in political writing of the eighteenth century even before Franklin's print, as a warning against divisions within the notional British body politic.⁵⁷ There was also a tradition of assigning the limbs (or members) of the body politic to colonies, which drew the fable into political discourse.⁵⁸ A decade after the Stamp Act, in the context of actual American rebellion, the lexicographer Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) was to summarize imperial relationships in his 1775 pro-government pamphlet *Taxation No Tyranny* by noting that 'A Colony is to the Mother-country as a member to the body...'.⁵⁹ Croxall's *Fables of Æsop* gave the moral of the story as: 'if the Branches and Members of a Community refuse the Government that Aid which its Necessities require; the whole

⁵⁴ Paul D. Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns, 1650-1730*, (Cambridge, 1998), p.54.

⁵⁵ Even Thomas Hobbes's, by placing emphasis on the need for the consent of every member of the multitude in forming the body politic, essentially bases his work on this idea of a contract. See, for example, Part I, Chapter XVI, Paragraph 13 of: Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 109. See also: Part II, 'De Corpore Politico', Chapter XX, Section 2 of: Hobbes, *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*. pp. 109-110.

⁵⁶ Hale, *The Body Politic*, pp. 17, 129 & 131. Halliday, *Dismembering the Body Politic*, pp. 28 & 31.

⁵⁷ *The Government of the Human Body. A Tale. Address'd to the Freeholders of Great Britain, Not Improper To be read before the Ensuing Elections*, (London, 1741). The anonymous author acknowledges his debt to Livy on p. 6. For a later eighteenth-century example relating to the French Revolution, see: Sir John Ramsea, *The Head and Limbs, A Fable*, (London 1794), p. 8.

⁵⁸ *Monsieur in a Mouse-Trap: or, the Parable of the Shark & Herring Pond*, (London, 1691), p. 1.

⁵⁹ [Samuel Johnson], *Taxation no Tyranny; An Answer to the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress*, (London, 1775), p. 28.

must perish together.’⁶⁰ Since, in *MAGNA Britannia*, the colonies are represented as the limbs, Franklin seems to be criticizing resistance to the Stamp Act, but in that case his four choices of colony need to be explained.

Britannia’s limbs, if read from right to left as they lie scattered on the ground, reveal a select north to south arrangement of North American mainland colonies. Although each was an important province in its own right, there may be particular reasons why they were chosen for an image intended to appeal to British MPs. On 17th January 1766, Henry Seymour Conway - the new ministry’s Secretary of State for the South, a position that included purview over colonial affairs – laid certain letters and documents before the Commons as evidence of the American response to the Stamp Act. Among this evidence were the so-called Virginia Resolves passed on 29th May 1765, which had been an act of unconditional opposition to the Act, and had given ‘the signal for a general out-cry over the continent...’.⁶¹ New York had held a Stamp Act Congress in October attended by representatives of nine colonies, but its merchants had also started a boycott of British goods that had then spread to major ports like Philadelphia, Salem and Boston. The latter had been the site of angry mobs and riots in August, while the Philadelphian Assembly had passed its own resolutions on 21st September 1765, stating its objections to the tax on constitutional grounds. The overall impression gained from reading Conway’s evidence is that Virginia, New York, New England and Philadelphia were the principal seats of

⁶⁰ [S. Croxall], *Fables of Æsop and others. Newly done into English, With an Application to each Fable*. (London, 1731), p. 69.

⁶¹ Quoted from an extract from a letter to Conway from someone in New York dated 23rd September 1765. ‘Resolutions of the House of Burgesses in Virginia’, *Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest period to the year 1803*, vol. XVI: 1765-1771, (London, 1813), columns 123-124.

American resistance.⁶² Here we have a clue to Franklin's reasoning in deciding how to allocate Britannia's four limbs, and perhaps also to the etching's date since it may have been designed to remind politicians of the evidence they had already heard of American rebellion.

Virginia, though the largest and most populous of the colonies at the time, ironically (through foreshortening) takes up the smallest space in the etching, while New York as the left arm that had once held the spear is shown as weaponless and vulnerable to attack. In April 1766, Joseph Galloway, writing to Franklin's son William, noted that he was particularly struck by the 'lance from the thigh of New England, pointed at the breast of Britannica'.⁶³ In fictive space this lance balances on top of the shield lying behind Britannia's right leg and body, but in two-dimensional pictorial space it actually seems to emerge from the thigh of 'New Eng' and threaten the side of Britannia's chest containing her heart. The colonies therefore are presented as being both threat and threatened. Interestingly, Pennsylvania - the colony that Benjamin Franklin represented when he himself gave evidence to parliament in 1766 - has been depicted as the right arm that had held the olive branch of peace.⁶⁴ In his even-handed approach to the causes of political division, perhaps he was thinking of himself as a new Consul Menenius Agrippa mediating between the two sides and helping to bring about a restored and re-invigorated body politic.

⁶² 'Papers relating to the Disturbances in America on Account of the Stamp Act', *Parliamentary History*, vol. XVI, columns 112-133. On the seats of American resistance see: Francis Jennings, *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 92-93.

⁶³ Letter from Joseph Galloway to William Franklin dated 29th April 1766. Jared Sparks, ed., *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, volume VII, (Boston, 1840), p. 312.

⁶⁴ *Parliamentary History*, vol. XVI, columns 137-160.

Belisarius: Britannia as a victim of an envious government

'DATE OBOLUM BELLI SARIO' not only gives access to fable as means of understanding *MAGNA Britannia*, but also appends a layer of meaning adduced from the reference to Belisarius (c. 505-564), a Byzantine general under Justinian, who had famous victories over the Persians, Carthaginians, Vandals and Goths, thereby restoring some of the greatness to an otherwise declining empire. 'DATE OBOLUM BELISARIO' (meaning literally 'give an obolus to Belisarius', where 'obolus' is normally translated as 'penny') and the reduction of Belisarius to the status of a blind beggar is an addition to his story from the Middle Ages.⁶⁵ It stems from a verbal tradition that was repeated in the twelfth-century *Chiliades* or *Book of Histories* of the Byzantine poet and grammarian John Tzetzes, whose version relates to a man ungratefully treated, blinded and reduced to begging for sustenance at the instigation of an envious imperial court. By the eighteenth century, this mythologized part of Belisarius's life had gained general favour as an 'example of the vicissitudes of fortune', but it also seems to have been more particularly applied in texts and pictures to military men who had been unjustly accused and cast aside by an ungrateful state, though they remained true to their country and ruler.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ The phrase appears nowhere in Marmontel's text, and he himself noted that his story was taken more from popular myth than historical truth. Marmontel, *Belisarius*, 2nd ed., (London 1767), p. vii.

⁶⁶ Gibbon noted that this part of the story was probably a fiction. Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. VII, (Dublin, 1788), pp. 389-390. The story's origins are set out in n. 69 on page 390. It was used in relation to army veterans forced to beg in: [George Colman], 'Thursday August 22, 1754', in: *The Connoisseur*, vol. I, no. XXX, 6th ed., (Oxford, 1774), p. 233. Eighteenth-century writers praised Belisarius as an example of a great man who remained loyal to an undeserving emperor. Jeanne R. Monty, 'The Myth of Belisarius in Eighteenth Century France', *Romance Notes*, vol. 4, no. 2, (Spring 1963), p. 128. For a pictorial example relating to the War for American Independence, see a painting by Henry Walton exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1778, which connects Belisarius to the brothers General Sir William Howe (commander-in-chief of the British forces in America from 1775 to 1778) and Rear Admiral Richard Lord Howe (who commanded British naval forces in America from 1775 to 1777). A subsequent print of this painting from 1785 altered the political reference to Admiral George Rodney. See: Mark L. Evans, 'Paintings, Prints and Politics during the American War: Henry Walton's *A Girl Buying a Ballad*', *Print Quarterly*, vol. XIX, no. 1, (2002), pp. 12-24.

It has become a commonplace of art history to discuss images relating to Belisarius in terms of the success of the novel written by Marmontel and published in English in 1767.⁶⁷ Certainly the novel increased the popularity of the theme for artists, however, even before 1766, it was a known subject of histories, plays, pictures and poetry, and Franklin might also have been familiar with either one of two well-known seventeenth-century paintings on the subject that were in British collections.⁶⁸ The first was a painting attributed to Van Dyck showing Belisarius in the act of begging, and owned by the Duke of Devonshire who displayed it at his house in Chiswick.⁶⁹ However, *MAGNA Britannia* was more likely related to the second, which was by Salvator Rosa and part of the collection of Lord Townshend.

Rosa's painting used the reduced circumstances of Belisarius as a metaphor for the fall of the Roman Empire, showing the general leaning against the base of a large building, surrounded by fragments of classical architecture and sculpture. By 1757, an engraving of this image by Sir Robert Strange (*figure 2.9*) had been produced since it was then reviewed by John Shebbeare in the *Critical Review*. Shebbeare

⁶⁷ See, for example, Albert Boime, 'Marmontel's *Bélisaire* and the Pre-Revolutionary progressivism of David', *Art History*, vol. 3, no. 1, (March 1980), pp. 81-101. See also: Frederick Cummings & Allen Staley, eds., *Romantic Art in Britain, Paintings and Drawings 1760-1860*, exh. cat., (Philadelphia, 1968), p. 99. The English translation of the novel appeared in the same year as its original publication in France, and this speed was noted in at least one review. *The Critical Review: or, Annals of Literature*, vol. XXIII, (1767), p. 179.

⁶⁸ In the eighteenth century, Belisarius was the subject of two-dimensional works by Benjamin Tate, Benjamin West, John Hamilton Mortimer, Joseph Wright of Derby, Angelica Kauffmann, John Hoppner, and William Hodges. For its appearance in paintings, see: Cummings & Staley, *Romantic Art in Britain*, p. 99. For textual examples, see: *Belisarius and Zariana, A Dialogue*, (London, 1710); William Philips, *Belisarius. A Tragedy*. (London, 1724) (first performed in 1720); Hugh Downman, *Belisarius*, (first performed in 1744); Adrien Richer, *The life of Belisarius, translated from the French; with some explanatory notes and observations*, (London, 1759).

⁶⁹ Horace Walpole, for one, doubted this attribution. Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England; With some Account of the principal Artists; And incidental Notes on other Arts; Collected by the late Mr. George Vertue; And now digested and published from his original MSS.* Vol. II, 2nd ed., ([Twickenham], 1765), p. 101. For a contemporary reference to the work, see: [John Glen King], *A Letter to his Excellency Count *** on Poetry, Painting, and Sculpture*. (London, 1768), pp. 43 ff.. It was a print after this painting that inspired Marmontel to write his novel. Jean-François Marmontel, *Mémoires*, edited by Jean-Pierre Guicciardi & Gilles Thiernet, (Paris, 1999), pp. 277 & 527, n. 486.

thought the juxtaposition of general and ruins in the work worthy of extensive comment:

Every particular of the scene betokens Decay. We see Fragments of Sculpture and Architecture, strewed on the Ground. A Pile of Building seems to nod and totter. An old Tree rears its blasted Top to Heaven. And *Belisarius* stands amidst the Ruins, a noble Monument of Greatness and Misfortune...⁷⁰

The subject was interpreted here as an example of virtue and fortitude in the face of cruel treatment by Justinian, and hence as a criticism of the emperor's behaviour towards Belisarius. Franklin had arrived in London on 26th July 1757 on a previous trip to Britain, and so it is possible that he was aware of both the publication of the engraving by Strange as well as this description of it, and that it inspired in part his image, with its own 'old Tree' and 'Fragments of Sculpture, strewed on the Ground'. The likelihood then is that he too was implying a criticism of leadership – in this case the British government, whose jealousy of colonial success had led it to introduce measures of control such as the Stamp Act.

The complete version of the '*DATE OBOLUM BELLI SARIO*' tag is '*Date obolum Belisario, quem virtus exultit, invidia depressit*', which translates as 'give a coin to Belisarius, who has been raised by virtue and depressed by envy'.⁷¹ This idea of the virtuous man who was the victim of envy, was often stressed by reference to the Belisarius myth in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He was used as an explanatory example in the section 'of ENVY' in Jeremy Collier's 1695 *Miscellanies upon moral subjects*, while De Crèvecoeur's *The American Belisarius* related its title to a Captain in the Militia who was the victim of envy at the beginning of the

⁷⁰ Quoted in: [John Shebbeare], *The Occasional Critic; or, the Decrees of the Scotch Tribunal in the Critical Review Rejudged*, (London, 1757), p. 74.

American Revolution.⁷² When someone who has suffered a setback is compared to Belisarius, envy thus becomes the underlying reason why others have acted against them.

The question of agency on the reduction and dismemberment of the body politic of the British empire is important here. In Franklin's cartoon, '*DATE OBOLUM BELLI SARIO*' is used as a double reference to *the Fable of the Belly and the Limbs* and the anecdote of the reduction of Belisarius to blindness and beggary. In the former it is the limbs that rebel, in the latter it is Justinian who orders the reduction of his general. Both stories therefore apportion blame, and it is divided between metropole and colony accordingly in *MAGNA Britannia*. Similarly, William Pitt, spoke in favour of repeal of the Stamp Act in 1766, but pointed out that the Americans themselves had 'not acted in all things with prudence and temper', which he ascribed to the injustice of the way they had been treated.⁷³

Although the Belisarius imagery in *MAGNA Britannia* was probably generated by Benjamin Franklin it would be impossible to say exactly what sources he drew on for it, especially since the general was so widely referenced in contemporary literature and histories. However, we do know that Franklin had purchased a copy of Alexander Ross's 1652 *History of the World* in April 1762, which sums up the Roman General's final days as follows:

⁷¹ [John Entick], *The Free Masons Pocket Companion*, (Glasgow, 1765), p. 40. It has more recently been translated as 'He who gives a coin to Belisarius, who emulated virtue, has suppressed jealousy and envy.' See: Cummings & Staley, *Romantic Art in Britain*, p.99.

⁷² Jeremy Collier, *Miscellanies upon moral subjects*, (? , 1695), p. 108. See J. Hector St John De Crèvecoeur's *The American Belisarius, or The History of S.K.*, in: Dennis D. Moore, ed., *More Letters from the American Farmer: An Edition of the Essays in English left Unpublished by Crèvecoeur*, (Athens, Georgia, & London, 1995), pp. 213-229.

⁷³ Quoted in: E. P Richardson, 'Stamp Act Cartoons in the Colonies', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. XCVI, no. 3, (July 1972), p. 288.

But after all his good services, upon suspicion of treason he was imprisoned, some say he was forced to begge for almes, but hee being found innocent, was restored to his wealth and honours, and two yeares after dyed in peace.⁷⁴

As with other accounts of his life, it is the restoration of Belisarius to a position of honour by Justinian at the end of the anecdote that is probably telling in this case, something also offered by *The Fable of the Belly and the Members*.

In Benjamin Franklin's *MAGNA Britania* print, Belisarius imagery is used metaphorically to add a layer of meaning to the representation of the British transatlantic community as a dismembered statue. Although the 'Belisarius' aspect of this work has been interpreted as merely a reference to Britannia's reduction to beggary, the image is much more complicated than such a simplistic view would suggest and works on several different levels.⁷⁵ It is not only used to account for and explain the separation of torso and limbs, but also to introduce notions of cause and effect to the image. Significantly, the Latin tag is draped across the globe and torso rather than the limbs, as if to emphasize that it is with the metropole that we must begin our search for meaning before spreading out to the members of the empire. Envy of the colonies leads to harsh treatment by the British government, leads to colonial rebellion, leads to the dismemberment of the British people, but they can still be reunited. What Franklin is suggesting in all this is that although divisions in the body politic have appeared, unity is both possible and desirable. Just as the statue of Britannia can be restored, just as the limbs were persuaded to end their

⁷⁴ There is no mention of 'Date Obolum Belisario' in this account, however. Alexander Ross, *The History of the World the Second Part, being a continuation of the famous history of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight*, (London, 1652), pp. 101-103 (the passage quoted is on p. 103). Franklin's copy came from an auction of the books of the late James Ralph. John Shipley, 'Franklin Attends a Book Function', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. LXXX, no. 1, (January 1956), p. 41.

⁷⁵ William Murrell, *A History of American Graphic Humor, Volume 1 (1747-1865)*, (New York, 1933), p. 4.

rebellion against the belly and save the life of the whole, just as Belisarius was restored to his former status by Justinian, so too will the British people be restored to unity and greatness in the world, when the Stamp Act and its measures of taxation have been abolished.

As mentioned previously, Franklin had formerly used ‘body politic’ metaphor as a call to unity in the context of the French and Indian War of 1754-1763, but he had also used it even earlier in a book published during the War of the Austrian Succession. He had combined fable and classical history with a *Hercules and the Wagoneer* woodcut (*figure 2.8*) published in 1747 in a work urging Pennsylvanians to unite and defend themselves in the face of an impending French and Indian war. This image was used as the frontispiece and connected directly to one of Cato’s speeches from the Roman historian Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*.⁷⁶ Later, in the same work, Franklin used ‘body politic’ metaphor to show the dangers of disunity:

Is not the whole Province one Body, united by living under the same laws, and enjoying the same Privileges? ... When the Feet are wounded, shall the Head say, *It is not me; I will not trouble myself to contrive Relief!* Or if the Head is in Danger, shall the Hands say, *We are not affected, and therefore will lend no Assistance!* No. For then the Body would be easily destroyed: But when all Parts join their Endeavours for its Security, it is often preserved.⁷⁷

Here we can see that a precedent is set for *MAGNA Britannia* in that *Æsopian* fable, classical history, a Latin quotation, and a reference to the dangerous effects of divisions with the body politic, were all combined in a call to unity, or wholeness.

⁷⁶ This image, its references and origins are dealt with in: J. A. Leo Lemay, ‘The American Aesthetic of Franklin’s Visual Creations’, pp. 466–471. Franklin only considered it necessary to translate the Latin quotation of Sallust in his second printing of the book. C. William Miller, *Benjamin’s Franklin’s Philadelphia Printing, 1728–1766: A Descriptive Bibliography*, (Philadelphia, 1974), pp. 220–221, nos. 416–417.

Subsequent divisions within the British body politic

Leonard Barkan has theorized that, in the modern era, people return to concepts of the body politic whenever their own bodies or rights are threatened by an administration that seems to regard them as less than human.⁷⁸ Personifications of the body politic are powerful images of unity and highly charged devices that tend to appear at times of internal division, or when division itself would be particularly harmful such as a time of war. The success of Franklin's vision of the British body politic is attested to by the fact that it was copied and adapted a number of times after its initial appearance in 1766.

In January 1767, Charles Townshend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed a number of taxes on goods such as wine, fruit, white and green glass, red and white lead, painters' colours and paper. The goods chosen were in themselves relatively unimportant in terms of overall volume of trade, but it was hoped that they would nevertheless raise sufficient funds to defray some of the costs of colonial governance, as well as reasserting Westminster's right to tax the colonies. The Townshend Acts received royal assent on 2nd July 1767 and inflamed an already tense relationship with the American colonies, resulting in resistance from colonial assemblies and a boycott of British goods, until the Acts were repealed in 1770. Since they were, in part, a replacement for the Stamp Act, and interpreted as yet another encroachment on their rights as Britons, it is understandable that *MAGNA Britannia* should make reappearances in connection with these duties, in Pennsylvania on a broadside

⁷⁷ [Benjamin Franklin], A Tradesman of Philadelphia, *Plain Truth: or, Serious Considerations On the Present State of the City of Philadelphia, and Province of Pennsylvania*. (Philadelphia, 1747), p. 9.

⁷⁸ Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art*, p. 62. John O'Neill, *Five Bodies: Re-figuring Relationships*, (London, 2004), p. 38.

(*figure 2.10*), and in London as an illustration in John Almon's magazine *The Political Register* (*figure 2.11*).

The former appended a description of the image and brief account of the life of Belisarius for its American buyers, and was probably produced by a supporter of Franklin or someone in his circle without his direct involvement.⁷⁹ Increased tension in the Anglo-American relationship is revealed by a clearer impression that the spear has gone through the thigh of the leg marked 'New Eng', while its tip now touches rather than points towards Britannia's left breast. The text made it clear that the print represented 'in one View, under the character of Belisarius, the late Flourishing State of Great Britain, in the Zenith of Glory and Honour; with her Fall into the more Abject State of Disgrace Misery and Ruin...'. The 'Unhappy and Miserable State of Great Britain, should the late Measures against America take Place' was compared directly to the way that Belisarius was blinded by Justinian, 'reduced... to the Greatest Poverty, and Obligated... to Subsist on the Alms of others.' Produced solely for an American audience, this time the image is possibly related to the organized campaign of non-importation that was joined by Philadelphian merchants in 1768 (and which also included those in New York and New England). Directed this time solely at an audience in the colonies, *The Fable of the Belly and the Members*, which had given them part of the blame for divisions within the transatlantic British community, was this time all but eliminated as a point of access. Although still misspelled, the letter's-width gap between 'BELL' and 'SARIO' has been removed by the artist and they are separated merely by striations and shading indicating a fold in the ribbon at that point. In Britain, however, the copy of *MAGNA Britania* in the

⁷⁹ The print dates from somewhere between 1767 and 1770. Wolf, 'Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act Cartoon', pp. 391-393.

Political Register copied Franklin's original fairly faithfully, and so the idea of responsibility for division on both sides remained, but for the last time.

The approach of war between Britain and her American colonies seems to have again made this image a suitable means of illustrating the causes and consequences of divisions within the body politic. In November 1774 one of the Darlys (either Mary or Matthew) published *BRITANNIA MUTILATED: or the Horrid (but true) Picture of Great Britain. When Depriv'd of her Limbs BY HER ENEMIES* (*figure 2.12*), which is a free adaptation of the Franklin original (or possibly the later Almon copy). Like the Philadelphia broadside, the image has been adjusted to reflect the worsening state of affairs. On the left stands a man (possibly a merchant) placed in the shade leaning on a barrel and surrounded by boxes and bales representing the goods of transatlantic trade. British policy has placed him in chains in its attempt to control the colonies through taxation. In the background there are now five (rather than three) masts with brooms upended on top of them reflecting an even greater danger to British empire over the seas. A chain entering the frame on the right leads to a metal band around Britannia's waist, meaning that even if she were whole she would be prevented from coming to the aid of the man opposite her. Curiously, she has mistakenly been represented with two right legs, which are marked 'Boston' and 'Halifax', while her right arm is now 'New England' and her left 'Philadelphia'. The olive branch of peace is absent now that war seems to be approaching. Any sense of colonial responsibility has been removed, however, since there is now no break in 'BELISARIO', which is spelled as is normal with just one 'l' - the enemies referred to underneath the image are solely internal and governmental. Britannia still seems to be represented as a statue, since, although she is naked, she has no nipples or body

hair, and her skin appears marble smooth and unblemished, but she is even further removed from, for example, her appearance in Cipriani's *Britannia-Libertas*, and restoration of the unity of this body politic is going to be a much tougher proposition.

The next reappearance of *MAGNA Britannia her Colonies REDUC'D* (*figure 2.13*) has been attributed to an unknown French artist. The only known copy (in the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania) bears an inscription in French on the back stating that when Franklin made his final visits in London to ministers and representatives of the nation in 1775, he left it to make them aware of the dangerous course they were taking, and again his involvement in its production must be inferred.⁸⁰ This is a free copy of the original, with some minor alterations, and, although the title remains in English, that the continent shown on the globe is marked '*AMERIQUE*' suggests it was French in origin. The limbs are no longer in the same places and in fact the legs are less obviously separated from the body; Britannia leans back more against the globe, is no longer threatened by her own spear, and her right breast is bared. The drawing is more accomplished in artistic terms and the figure is less distorted from the classical ideal. This time there is no break whatsoever in the name '*BELLISARIO*', although the double 'l' is retained. However, by 1774/1775, both the Daryl print and this one would have had their Belisarius aspects understood more in line with Marmontel's novel, whose great success on both sides of the Channel would have overwhelmed any other more *Æsopian* references.

The image's final known use was in a Dutch cartoon with French and German titles, usually dated from the very end of 1780 when the British declared war on the

⁸⁰ Frederic R. Kirkland, 'An Unknown Franklin Cartoon', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 73, (January 1949), pp. 76-79.

Netherlands (*figure 2.14*).⁸¹ This engraving, clearly copied from the Darly print, may therefore relate to the dearth of British successes between defeat at Saratoga in 1777 and the victories of Admiral Rodney (ironically against the Dutch) at the beginning of 1781. At the time it must have seemed, with the addition of yet another enemy, that the likelihood of Britain regaining an independent America was extremely small, and that restoration of the imperial *status quo* looked increasingly unlikely. To emphasize this point, the idea that this might be a statue is negated by the blood that is shown pouring from the sockets of Britannia's shoulders. In this respect, this particular image seems to have more in common with those of dismemberment and bleeding that will be dealt with in later chapters.

While Franklin's 1766 *MAGNA Britania* divides the blame and promises restoration of the imperial body, later images show subtle changes that reflect the way that attitudes on both sides were hardening as war approached and then broke out. The Philadelphian text lays great emphasis on the Belisarius aspect, but, significantly, it omits the happy ending of the General's story, and stresses the petty jealousies of the British government as the root cause of present misfortunes. Similarly, the unity of the transatlantic community of Britons is what is at stake in 1766, a unity expressed by the single body politic of Britannia. At that stage, Franklin saw restoration rather than secession as the desired outcome of his hard work; ten years later, however, his views had been altered by events. In 1776, having served on the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, he wrote to Lord Howe using a different trope to express the irrevocability of the break up of the empire:

Long did I endeavour with unfeigned and unwearied Zeal, to preserve from breaking, that fine and noble China Vase, the British Empire: for

⁸¹ Wolf, 'Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act Cartoon', p. 395.

I knew that being once broken, the separate Parts could not retain even their Share of the Strength or Value that existed in the Whole, and that a perfect Re-Union of those Parts could scarce even be hoped for.⁸²

Franklin's use of the past tense here suggests that he no longer considered prevention or restoration to be possible or even desirable. A long succession of failed attempts by the British government to control the American colonies and assert their authority through the imposition of taxes had led many British colonials to a desire to assert their own independence.

Conclusion

There seems to be an urge in mankind to reduce complex situations to their simplest possible configurations in order to better understand them. Using the body of Britannia as an allegorical figure of representation enables an otherwise scattered and numerous people to be defined within a clearly demarcated and assembled whole – a body politic. Essentially it brings the sometimes abstract concepts of race, people, society, nation and empire into the realm of the visible and the apprehensible. Once these various concepts have been presented visually as a body, that body can then begin to behave, act and interact in accordance with contemporary expectations, since it is drawn from experience that is both physical and social.⁸³ When Benjamin Franklin wrote to Dr Richard Price in 1780 to say that he wanted a plan to be produced whereby nations could settle disputes 'without first cutting one another's Throats' it was clear that he was imagining them as single embodiments used to

⁸² Letter from Benjamin Franklin to Lord Howe, dated 20th July 1776. William B. Willcox, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XXII, (New Haven & London, 1976), pp. 520-521.

represent and act figuratively for the whole.⁸⁴ This is an example of what Elaine Scarry has referred to as the idea of the colossus, whereby each side of any conflict - their armies and by extension their governments and populations - is represented in thought as a single embodied combatant, who is capable of inflicting and receiving injuries and acting on a colossal scale. This not only brings the conflict into the realm of the visible, since movements of armies become not movements of multiple bodies in real experience but instead just one bodily enactment, but also conceals the involvement of actual human bodies and relocates injury and death to an imaginary space.⁸⁵

However, in 1780, Franklin was the American government's appointed representative to the Court of France, and having been part of the committee appointed to draw up the Declaration of Independence in 1776, his loyalties and allegiances were clear. Within the context of the ongoing War of American Independence, Franklin's comment to Price contains the implicit idea that Great Britain and America are now separate nations, and hence separate bodies politic. In 1766, there had been little or no possibility of Americans being thought of as such and provided with their own separate political and national identity. Instead Franklin had envisaged them as fellow Britons and part of what we must consider a community, transatlantic in extent and British in origin, but forming one unified whole, where the colonies might be a territorially subordinate part but the people were not.

⁸³ This dual nature of the body is explored in: Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, (London, 1990), p. 65-81.

⁸⁴ Letter from Benjamin Franklin to Richard Price dated 6th February 1780. W. Bernard Peach & D. O. Thomas, eds., *The Correspondence of Richard Price. Volume II: March 1778-February 1786*, (Durham, North Carolina, & Cardiff, 1991), p. 58.

⁸⁵ Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, pp. 70-71.

In the single body of *MAGNA Britania*, the colonies are regarded as subsumed within the parent state, and it must first be extracted in order to be considered as a separate body politic in its own right. The context within which that separation took place was that of the family. By 1776, printmakers had long become accustomed to representing America as a separate body politic, showing its place within the empire through a use of familial metaphor, and, since members of the family may leave and have families of their own, it was a model that allowed a greater number of possible colonial relationships to be extracted and formed into narratives. These, then, will form the basis of investigation for my next chapters as I turn my attention from Anglo-American conflicts imagined as divisions within the body politic and start to look at how the same divisions were imagined as a family quarrel.

Chapter 3:

The Family Quarrel – Britannia and her Daughter

If bodies could be used to deal with issues of unity within the transatlantic British community, then so too could the family. Scholars such as Ludmilla Jordanova have noted how the ‘idea that the family could be taken as a prototype and microcosm of society was widely held and extremely attractive’ in the eighteenth century.¹ The emergence of a stable family-based society during this period allowed a situation whereby society and its basic unit (the family) could exist in a reflexive theoretical relationship.² Based on the belief that ‘Families are, in the detail, what communities are at large...’, it was possible for writers to use the family to describe the structures, organisations, duties and relationships of society in general.³ However, the family is more fluid in its make up than the body; it can be enlarged through marriage, procreation, and adoption, or conversely reduced through marriage, divorce, death, emigration and estrangement.⁴ Hence it is more open to use as a figure of disunity and potential separation than the body which is normally conceptualized as whole. Furthermore, unlike bodies politic, there is no certain end implicit in images of the family as applied to the conflicts between Great Britain and her colonies.

¹ ‘Naturalizing the Family: Literature and the Bio-Medical Sciences of the Late Eighteenth Century’, in: Ludmilla Jordanova, *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine, 1760-1820*, (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 167.

² Daniel Blake Smith, ‘In Search of the Family in the Colonial South’, in: Winthrop D. Jordan & Sheila L. Skemp, eds., *Race and Family in the Colonial South*, (Jackson, Mississippi, & London, 1987), p. 35. Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), p. 11.

³ James Ramsay, *An Essay on the Treatment and Conversion of African Slaves in the British Sugar Colonies*, (London, 1784), pp. 5 & 8.

The use of the semantic terms mother-country (which entered the English language in the sixteenth century) and motherland (from the eighteenth), infant colony and infant state may have encouraged people to view the relationships between the two through familial (and especially parent-child) metaphor.⁵ Even the modern use of 'metropole' as a synonym for the parent state of a colony is taken from Greek words meaning mother (*meter*) and city (*polis*), revealing how people's relationship to their place of origin has a long tradition of being viewed in this way.⁶ Mark Turner has argued that where something has been created out of nothing and sustains for some considerable time (such as the plantation of English colonies in the Americas from the early seventeenth century onwards) the cause and effect of that creation can be represented in terms of familial metaphors, whereby the cause is seen as parent and the effect as child. In this case, Great Britain is seen as the parent and the colonies as the child of that parent.⁷ In what has been called the 'compactness hypothesis' of metaphor, such figures allow complex configurations of information to be communicated much better and more succinctly than would be possible through literal explanation alone.⁸ These familial metaphors could be used to communicate ideas between two parties using a common stock of experiences, interests and sensibilities, and therefore relied for their significance on contexts drawn from

⁴ Marriage is a factor of both, since daughters leave one family and marry into another. Furthermore, sons can be regarded as both bringing wives and children to their old family, or leaving to form new families of their own.

⁵ T. F. Hoad, ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, (Oxford, 1986), p. 302. 'Mother country' and 'infant colony' are used in, for example: *An Impartial Sketch of the Various Indulgences granted by Great-Britain to her Colonies, upon which They have founded their Presumption of soaring towards Independence. By an officer*, (London, 1778), p. 8. For 'infant state', see: [Thomas Tod], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence. Shewing The great Advantages that will arise from it to the Manufacturers, the Agriculture, and commercial Interest of Britain And Ireland*, (Edinburgh, 1782), p. 2.

⁶ Hoad, *Dictionary of English Etymology*, pp. 85 & 292. Joseph T. Shipley, *The Origins of English Words: A Discursive Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, (Baltimore and London, 1984), p. 224.

⁷ Mark Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*, (Christchurch, New Zealand, 2000), pp. 74-75 & 123-130.

⁸ Raymond W. Gibbs Jr., *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 124-135.

eighteenth-century experience of what it was and what it meant to be a part of a family.⁹

The ubiquity of these conventional metaphors could occasionally trip up writers, leading to descriptions of the American colonies as ‘sisters to their mother-country’, but most people seem to have been aware of the tropes they were employing and made efforts to maintain some semblance of internal consistency.¹⁰ Writing in response to Thomas Paine’s pamphlet *Common Sense*, Charles Inglis, noted how: ‘Great-Britain is figuratively called the Parent State of the colonies; their connection, therefore, may be properly compared to the *relation* subsisting between parent and child.’ Inglis was aware of the fact that this is how the connection between the two had been described since the colonies had first been settled, and noted how this metaphor could be expanded into analogy in revolutionary rhetoric.¹¹ This chapter investigates the ways by which Anglo-American conflicts in this period were conceptualized as a family quarrel, and how this impacted on contemporary artistic production. I then turn my attention to the origins and development of the representation of the American colonies as a separate body politic, which could act within a family in relation to other allegorical personifications. Finally, I will argue

⁹ Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, p. 134. This was also true in diplomatic encounters between the English and North American Indians. Nancy Shoemaker, ‘The Body as a Source of Sameness and Difference in Eighteenth-Century American Indian Diplomacy East of the Mississippi’, in: Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter, eds., *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*, (Ithaca and London, 2001), pp. 211-213.

¹⁰ *An Essay on the Nature of the Colonies, and the Conduct of the Mother-Country towards them*, (London, 1775), p. 20. The text is otherwise curiously lacking in figurative language. Other writers referred to America as both male and female in making separate points. *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, (London, 1781), pp. 23-24. For a consciously figurative (and consistent) example, see: [Thomas Bradbury Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now? Or an Enquiry, how far The Americans are Bound To Abide by, and Execute the Decisions of, the late Congress?* (New York, 1775), p. 45.

¹¹ [Charles Inglis], *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated, in certain Strictures On a Pamphlet intituled Common Sense*, (Philadelphia, 1776), pp. 38 & 41. For an earlier use of familial analogy see letter number 106, dated Saturday, December 8, 1722 in: [John Trenchard], *Cato’s*

that the dominant way of referring to Anglo-American affairs using family metaphor was to see metropole and colony as mother and daughter, and that this was an orthodox configuration that was particularly appropriate for use in pro-Tory propaganda.

The Family and the Family Quarrel

As Dror Wahrman has recently noted 'the language of disrupted family relations was the lingua franca of the [American] revolution' providing a large number of people with the means to explain and understand contemporary events.¹² In 1783, the painter Benjamin West wrote to his former pupil Charles Willson Peale (who had spent the war in America) calling the war between Britain and her American colonies a 'Quarel', having previously termed it a 'war', 'contest' and 'revolution'.¹³ He was not alone in this and to an extent this reflects the way the war grew out of a much longer period of Anglo-American disputes.¹⁴ At the end of 1774 General Gage was reported in the British press as having written to the governor of Virginia (Peyton Randolph) to express his hope that such disputes would soon come to an end 'like the

Letters: or Essays on Liberty, Civil and Religious, And other important Subjects. vol. 4, (London, 1748), p. 7.

¹² Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven & London, 2004), p. 255.

¹³ Letters from Benjamin West to Charles Willson Peale dated 15th June and 4th August 1783. Lillian B. Miller, ed., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume 1. Charles Willson Peale. artist in revolutionary America, 1735-1791*, Sidney Hart, assistant editor. Toby A. Appel, research historian, (New Haven & London, 1983), pp. 391-394.

¹⁴ Among many examples of references to the war as a 'quarrel', see: Dr Richard Price, *Additional Observations on the Nature and Value of Civil Liberty and the War with America: also observations on raising money by public loans; an historical deduction and analysis of the national debt; and a brief account of the debts and resources of France*, (London, 1777), p. 78. [William Poulteney], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, (London, 1778), p. xiv. *Considerations upon the French and American War. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament*, (London, 1779), p. 26.

quarrels of lovers'.¹⁵ In May 1775, at the beginning of the War of American Independence, James Duane, a New York delegate to the Continental Congress, referred to the conflict as a '*family quarrel*' in a speech that urged reconciliation with the parent state.¹⁶ Native Americans were also drawn into the metaphors of the American War of Independence when the Continental Congress urged them not to take part on either side in what was a 'family quarrel'.¹⁷ In reply, the Mohawk chief speaking on behalf of the Iroquois told the Americans that since it was a 'family affair' they would remain neutral.¹⁸ Often it was a very particular type of quarrel that was envisaged by writers and satirists when they tried to make sense of the conflict - one between two different members of the same family - engaging with it rhetorically in order to comment on contemporary events or try to sway public and political opinion.

There are many different combinations of family members that might fall out with one another - brothers, sisters, cousins, husbands and wives, parents and children and so on - and most of them seem to have been used at some time or another in contemporary sources, perhaps reflecting the reality of the political disagreements that could arise on these issues and divide families themselves.¹⁹ In each case the particular familial relationship was chosen to highlight a specific aspect of the

¹⁵ 'Account of the Proceedings of the American Colonists, since the Passing of the Boston Port Bill (continued)'. *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLV (1775), p. 42.

¹⁶ Quoted in: Elswyth Thane, *The Family Quarrel: A Journey Through the Years of the Revolution*, (London, 1960), p.2. On the timing and circumstances of this speech, see: Lorna Gayle Cooper, 'The Olive Branch Petition to the King, 1775', M.A. dissertation in History, (College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, May 1767), pp. 11-12.

¹⁷ Worthington Chauncey Ford, *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, vol. II, (Washington, 1905), p. 182.

¹⁸ Quoted in: Carl Berger, *Broadsides & Bayonets: The Propaganda War of the American Revolution*, rev. ed., (San Rafael, California, 1976 (1961)), p. 74.

¹⁹ See for example the unpublished story drawn from experience of J. Hector St John De Crèvecoeur and set out in: 'An Happy Family Disunited by the Spirit of Civil War'. Dennis D. Moore, ed., *More Letters from the American Farmer: An Edition of the Essays in English left Unpublished by Crèvecoeur*, (Athens, Georgia, & London, 1995), p. 16.

relationship between two (or more) things. Dror Wahrman has recently noted how 'Britons mobilized practically every category of difference imaginable... to stabilize, to explain, to grasp, a conflict' that was effectively a civil war without a stable 'other'.²⁰ However, the family provided a general framework for presenting a multiplicity of often contradictory views that could express similarity as well as difference. References to family members of the same generation and sex could be used to conceal the differences between them, while gender or generational distinction instead emphasized them and allowed for the expression of an implicit power relationship. The painter Allan Ramsay used 'cousinship' to suggest that colonies were less dependent on Great Britain than plantations, while Benjamin Franklin referred to Britain and America as husband and wife in a pseudonymous newspaper article about the rights of the former to chastise the latter.²¹ For some, the American rebels and loyal British troops were brothers and sons of the same parent (England), while for the House of Burgesses in Virginia any attack on one of their 'sister colonies' was to be considered as an attack against them all.²² However, the dominant model by far was that of parent and child, which was supported by classical semantic convention, and had the advantage of involving those kinship terms that were could be most precisely defined and therefore commonly understood.²³ As one American loyalist noted, the individual colonies might be

²⁰ Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self*, p. 246.

²¹ [Allan Ramsay], *Thoughts on the Origin and Nature of Government, Occasioned by The Late Disputes between Great Britain and her American Colonies*, (London, 1969), pp. 61-62. Pacificus, [Benjamin Franklin, pseudo.], 'On Chastising the Colonies', *London Chronicle*, 11th-13th February 1766. For another example of the War of American Independence as a spousal quarrel, see: *John and Susan; or the Intermeddler Rewarded: A Tale address'd to the French King*, (Bath, 1778).

²² *Patriotic Perfidy, a Satire*. (London 1779), p. 10. The Association from which this comes was signed on 14th May 1774. 'American News', *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLIV (1774), p. 332.

²³ The use of the parent-child relationship was noted and discussed in, for example: Cartwright, John, *American Independence. The Interest and Glory of Great-Britain. A New Edition*. (London, 1775), p. 11. In the eighteenth century 'parent', 'child', 'mother', 'father', 'son', 'daughter', 'brother' and 'sister' fall into this precisely definable terminology, while 'cousin' need not even have been used to

‘justly considered... as *sisters*...’ but it ought to be remembered that ‘in the same sense, England is to be considered as its [America’s] *mother*; and the natural connection is much stronger between a child and its parent, than it can be between a sister and sisters.’²⁴

Randolph Trumbach has argued for two basic forms of kinship organisation from the eleventh century onwards – one synchronic and encompassing the extended family based on kindred relationships, and the other diachronic or patrilineal. He also argued for two types of family organisation - the patriarchal and the domestic, with the latter increasing in importance from the end of the seventeenth century. For Trumbach, European society in the period 1690 to 1780 was not bound together by kinship, but instead by patterns of friendship, patronage and neighbourhood.²⁵ According to Lawrence Stone there were three ways in which the word ‘family’ would have been understood in the eighteenth century: firstly, as the nuclear family made up of parents and children; secondly, as a synonym for ‘household’ including all those living under the same roof (parents, children, other relatives, and domestic servants etc.); and thirdly, as comprising a sense of the total lineage, both past and future, of families who could trace their family tree (usually those in the upper reaches of society).²⁶ Although neither theory is entirely mutually exclusive, uses of ‘family quarrel’ metaphor seem to engage with the full range of social and familial relationships of the second half of the eighteenth century. The focus on bi-polar interactions within the nuclear family between spouses, parents and children, or

refer to a close or near relation. Naomi Tadmor, *Family & Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*, (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 118-122, 125 & 139.

²⁴ [Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now?*, pp. 45-46. Like many American-written pamphlets, this one was quickly published in London.

²⁵ Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), pp. 11 & 287.

siblings does not preclude the invocation of other types of family. The connotations of race brought by the representation of America as an Indian can contain suggestions of the more inclusive 'household' model, while the use of the family to conceptualize dynamic historical and political phenomena such as colonisation and war inevitably brings issues of lineage and inheritance to bear on interpretation.

The domination of the mother-daughter model of the 'family quarrel' dealt with in this chapter reflects the emergence during the period of the War of American Independence of the cult of motherhood, and the way that mothers were increasingly valued as mothers, nurturers and child-rearers rather than just wives and the producers of heirs for the transmission of property.²⁷ Nevertheless, one of the central issues of the family narrative of metaphorical conceptualisations of the war was the transmission of territorial governance to the colonists, who had inherited by descent the rights of Britons everywhere. Ironically, therefore, their eventual independence came not from a claim to be foreign, but from a claim to have the same rights to liberty as inhabitants of Great Britain. Furthermore, the dominant female metaphors still had to be presented within the patriarchal structure of contemporary British political society. It is the sum of all these contexts of eighteenth-century 'family' that is important here, not just the individual instances.

The 'family quarrel' metaphor began appearing in satirical prints at the time of the Stamp Act crisis in 1765-1766. The ballad print *Goody Bull or the Second Part of the Repeal* (*figure 3.1*), produced some time shortly after the repeal of the Act in March 1766, shows Britannia lying on the ground, with an American Indian woman

²⁶ Lawrence Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987*, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 45-46.

pulling her hair, while William Pitt (identified by the crutch necessitated by his gout) pushes her back down as she tries to get up. A speech balloon issuing from Pitt's mouth refers to America as Britannia's 'daughter', a relationship that is made even clearer in the balled written beneath the image entitled *The WORLD turned upside down, OR The OLD WOMAN taught WISDOM*, the first verse of which establishes the idea that a mother-daughter quarrel is being used as an analogue for the political situation at the time:

Goody Bull and her Daughter together fell out,
Both squabbled and wrangled, and made a damn'd Rout;
But the Cause of their Quarrel remains to be told;
Then lend both your Ears and the Tale I'll unfold.

Other prints continued with this theme, and some like the 1775 engraving *Bunkers Hill, or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels* (*figure 3.2*), even used it specifically in their titles.

Images like *Goody Bull* fall into a general category of prints with the subject of the 'world-turned-upside-down' that effectively reinforce the *status quo* by showing how ridiculous it would be to overturn the natural order.²⁸ Pictorially reversing the gender roles assigned to women by contemporary society thus heightened the sense that this war was totally unnatural. Women were indoor, domestic creatures often depicted in contemporary art as soft and gentle mother figures, and not therefore supposed to go to war. Companion husband and wife portraits produced during the conflict emphasize this point, revealing the different worlds that men and women

²⁷ Stone, *Road to Divorce*, p. 170. Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, pp. 4, & 119-123. Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self*, pp. 12-14.

²⁸ Sheila O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England 1550-1850*, exh. cat., (London, 1990), pp. 122-123. For the French traditions of this type, of which the overturning of the age hierarchy was a subtype, see: R. Chartier, 'The World Turned Upside-Down', in: *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, translated by L. G. Cochrane, (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 115-126.

inhabited at the time in their poses, accessories, costumes and backgrounds.²⁹ Upsetting gender expectations in *Goody Bull* also plays on the way that, although parents were authorized to physically chastise their children, the reverse was not acceptable.³⁰ Children were believed to owe their parents honour, civility, submission, and manners, just as any inferior would to their betters.³¹ The Bible advised children to honour and obey their parents as did many advice manuals, often written in the form of letters from a parent to a son or daughter.³² America's hair-pulling in *Goody Bull* therefore transgresses the norms of socially accepted behaviour, presenting this not textually as a verbal family quarrel but instead pictorially as a physical one. Violently transgressive behaviour may have been sanctioned in *Goody Bull* by the similarly violent protests against the Stamp Act in Boston and elsewhere, but it was figuratively intensified following the outbreak of the war in 1775. As one poem from 1782 put it: 'For none but cowards, traitors, fools or knaves / Would plunge a dagger in their offspring's breast'.³³ As shown here, not all such violent imagery was anti-American, since the unnaturalness of the dispute could also be expressed by recasting British policy not as chastisement but as attempted murder, bringing figures of infanticide, patricide and matricide to bear on

²⁹ See for example: Benjamin West, *George III*, 1779, Oil on canvas, 100 ½ x 72 in. (255.3 x 182.9 cm), Royal Collection; & Benjamin West, *Queen Charlotte*, 1779, Oil on canvas, 101 x 71 ½ in. (256.5 x 181.6 cm) Royal Collection. While the King is depicted in military uniform in front of a military encampment, the Queen's portrait shows her with her children against a backdrop of Windsor Castle.

³⁰ *The Laws respecting Women, as they regard their natural rights, or their connections and conduct; also, the obligations of parent and child, and the condition of minors, etc.. In Four Books*, (London, 1777), p. 356.

³¹ Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, p. 245.

³² *Exodus: XX:2. The Letter of St Paul to the Ephesians: VI:1-2*. The best known example at the time was probably: Philip Dormer Stanhope, *Lord Chesterfield's Advice to his Son, on Men and Manners: or, a New system of education, in which the principles of politeness, the art of acquiring a knowledge of the world, with every instruction necessary to form a man of honour, virtue, taste, and fashion, are laid down ... The third edition. To which are now added, the Marchioness de Lambert's Advice to her Son, and Moral Reflections by the Duc de La Rochefoucault*, 3rd ed., (London, 1777).

³³ *The Triumph of Liberty and Peace with America: a Poem. Inscribed to General Conway*, (London, 1782), p. 6.

the situation and thereby using violence to demonstrate that either side could be in the wrong.³⁴

In creating two-dimensional representations that engaged with this mother-daughter metaphor, artists worked in the same way as writers who expanded on the basic idea of a family quarrel to create analogous narratives that could encompass their view of current political events. Satirists and polemicists often wrote from the viewpoint that Britain and America were 'in the circumstances of a tender parent, and a favourite child' between whom a disagreement had broken out.³⁵ For such writers, the transatlantic British community was 'one great and illustrious family' to which they belonged.³⁶ With the passage of time, the narratives thus created could become quite long and involved. Initially, around the time of the Stamp Act crisis, they formed the material of ballads such as *The WORLD turned upside down*, or that of c. 1766 attributed to Franklin with its first line of: 'We have an old mother that peevish is grown'.³⁷ However, by 1775 scenarios were produced by pamphleteers setting out transatlantic politics as if they were domestic squabbles:

They [American radicals] are naturally good-tempered; but for some time past they have been in an ill humour, and they are perpetually quarrelling with our mother, a venerable and worthy lady, but intirely [sic] without foibles. The beginning of the dispute was tolerably decent; but they now go on like a parcel of saucy and impudent hussies, threatening and abusing her; and they insist upon it, that she

³⁴ See for example: *Unity and Public Spirit recommended in an Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster, to which are added two odes: viz. The Miseries of dissension and civil war, and The True Patriot, inscribed to Earl Cornwallis, and Sir George Brydges Rodney, Bart.* (London, [1780.]), p. 48.

³⁵ *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America, in their private capacities as friends; tracing the several causes of the present contests between the mother country and her American subjects; the fallacy of their prepossessions, and the ingratitude and danger of them; the reciprocal benefits of the national friendship; and the moral obligations of individuals which enforce it with various anecdotes, and reasons drawn from facts, tending to conciliate all differences, and establish a permanent union for the common happiness and glory of the British Empire*, (London, 1775), p. 99.

³⁶ [Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now?*, p. 48.

³⁷ Robert Harvey, *A Few Bloody Noses: The American War of Independence*, (London, 2001), pp. 26-27.

shall fall down upon her knees, and publickly [*sic*] ask their pardon – for having lately exercised such an authority over them as she always used to exercise, and in such a way as she thinks is warranted by the laws of the land. It has been proposed to these daughters, to try if the matter in dispute with their mother cannot be settled in an amicable conference. But no; they swear and protest, that they will not exchange a single word with her in that way; but that they will stab the *old bag* to the heart, or starve her to death, but they will force her to a submission.³⁸

In this loyalist publication matricide is used to emphasize the wrongness of the American cause.

Such scenarios were also extended into stories that extended the parent-child conceptualisation of colonial affairs into parables and allegories.³⁹ These fables showed the consequences of certain types of behaviour and hence warned against them, while the apparent simplicity of the form they took meant they could present clear and powerful messages on the subject of the relationship between colonies and metropole.⁴⁰ Relying on the etymological root of ‘colony’ in the Latin ‘*colonia*’ meaning a farm, landed estate or settlement, 1775’s anonymously written *The History of the Old Fring’d Petticoat*, told the story of a mother who owns a farm and grows prosperous even as her children grow numerous.⁴¹ She decides to ‘transplant’ some of her daughters to ‘some excellent farms’ on the other side of a lake. After many years of happiness, her daughters begin ‘to think themselves princesses in their own right; and independent,’ the seed of discord is sown among them and they are

³⁸ [Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now?*, p. 46.

³⁹ Fables not dealt with here include America as a housewife and the British nation as schoolboys in: *The Patriots: or, an Evening Prospect on the Atlantic. In which some noted Political Characters are delineated; with strictures on those Ladies who have distinguished themselves in the Fashionable Modes of Gallantry*, (London, 1777), pp. 29-30. Britain and America are a nobleman and his children (whose gender is not made clear) in: Peter Grievous Esq. [i.e. Francis Hopkinson], *A Pretty Story Written in the Year of our Lord 2774*, (Philadelphia?, 1774 (1970)).

⁴⁰ Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004), pp. 217-218.

⁴¹ Hoad, *Dictionary of English Etymology*, p. 85.

roused to rebel against their mother.⁴² This satirical allegory emphasized the rebellion of ungrateful daughters against a tender and loving parent and was dedicated to the prime minister Lord North suggesting that this mother-daughter configuration was used to present a pro-government viewpoint.

1775's *The Annals of Administration*, however, was a fable supporting the opposition's point of view, and was even dedicated to one of its leading members - Edmund Burke. Its introduction admitted that readers might find parallels between the characters in the fable and contemporary statesmen and events. In this story, Queen Georgiana has only one child, a son named Prince Colonius, who travels to a far-off land called Penniolana and decides to settle there. The infant state grows in wealth, population and civilisation until it nearly rivals the mother state - Anglacycondos - causing the Queen to become jealous and to demand Penniolana's obedience. She imposes duties with the intention of reducing the colonists to destitution and slavery and, when the Prince's appeals fall on deaf ears, open hostilities commence.⁴³

Of interest in comparing the two is the fact that, although both stories represent Britain as a mother, the colonies are female in the pro-government tale but male in the pro-opposition one. Artists too used both female and male personifications of America to represent the thirteen rebellious British colonies on the Atlantic seaboard of the continent, and, as this and the following chapter will argue, they did so for particular reasons. They were not merely illustrating these narratives but rather

⁴² *The History of the Old Fring'd Petticoat; a fragment: translated from the original MS. Greek of Democritus. With an epistle and dedication to Lord N-*, (London [10th November], 1775), pp. 4-14.

allowing the allegorical figures representing each side to act as if they were part of these broader narrative conceptualisations. The creation of such narratives provided a rhetorical background against which the traditions of artistic production could be brought to bear in making a particular and individual statement about Anglo-American relations. The narrative of 'family quarrel' metaphor must therefore be investigated in the same way as the other contemporary contexts and discourses with which such images engaged.

The Iconography of America

Unlike images of the transatlantic British community as a single body politic, pictorial consideration of the relationship between Britain and her American colonies as analogous to those between family members required the colonies to be represented as a separate figure. The violent extraction of America expressed in dismemberment imagery could occasionally be presented in terms of labour pains and birth:

The mother is in actual labour, the throes of delivery rend her whole frame – the too-robust and overgrown child is struggling in vain to burst her womb and get free. – It is an unnatural birth: shall the parent perish to save the child?⁴⁴

However, artists normally presupposed that this birth had taken place and that the child was grown to a size equal to the parent. The usual form chosen to represent this child was as an American Indian, which, as Ellwood Parry has pointed out, came

⁴³ *The Annals of Administration. Containing the Genuine History of Georgiana the Queen-Mother, and Prince Colonius her son. A Biographical Fragment. Written about the year 1575. Inscribed, by the proprietor of the Authentic Papers, to Edmund Burke, Esq.,* (London, 1775).

to symbolize the North American country more than any other race or racial group.⁴⁵ Although the word 'American' was used almost exclusively to refer to native Americans until the 1750s, there was a growing awareness of the diverse nature of populations on the North American continent, and so it was natural that people should want to assign a single identity to them. Referring to them as Americans concealed both this diversity and the British origins of many immigrants, and is part of the process of seeing them as foreigners.⁴⁶

When the British government had made attempts in the 1760s to treat with native Americans and to deal with their concerns over their own territory, the effect had been to produce a *de facto* imperial policy on white settlement and expansion. When an economic depression and a lack of available land in existing communities in the 1770s led many younger colonists to look to frontier land in the west to provide them with a secure future, they found that their geographical limits had been arbitrarily set for them by Westminster.⁴⁷ At least partially therefore, the War of American Independence, in so far as it was a struggle for control over westward expansion of the colonies in violation of British treaties, was a fight over actual natives and their territory. However, in the visual record the conflict was presented as one between a white Britain and an American Indian standing in for white colonial patriots.

⁴⁴ *A Letter to the Rev. Dr Richard Price, on his Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, (London, [1776]), p. 18.

⁴⁵ Ellwood Parry, *The Image of the Indian and the Black man in American Art, 1590-1900*, (New York, 1974), p. xi.

⁴⁶ Donald A. Grinde, Jr., & Bruce E. Johansen, *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*, (Los Angeles, 1991), p. 133. See the remarks on New Jersey's population in: 'An Abstract of Major Roger's Account of North America', in: *A New Collection of Voyages, Discoveries and Travels: containing Whatever is worthy of Notice in Europe, Asia, Africa and America: In respect to the situation and Extent of Empires, Kingdoms, and Provinces; their climates, soil, produce, &c.*, vol. II, (London, 1767), p. 113.

⁴⁷ Francis Jennings, *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 120-124. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, p. 21.

As Robert Berkhofer has argued, the 'Indian' is a western construct that has developed into a number of stereotypes, and needs to be disassociated from the multiplicity of native American tribes, cultures and customs.⁴⁸ Developed over the years since 1492, this construct was first established as a political and satirical tool by the visit of the so-called 'Four Indian Kings' to the court of Queen Anne in 1710, which played an important role in the establishment of a cultural understanding of empire.⁴⁹ In eighteenth-century Britain, encounters with the natives of America, Africa and the Pacific were used to reflect on British manners, behaviours and institutions.⁵⁰ By the 1760s, already outdated and mythologized notions about native Americans and their relation to Western society were, in turn, projected back onto a body that was then used to represent a large part of British territory.⁵¹ These notions were related to utopian ideas of man in his natural state, the concept of the 'noble savage' and ideas of race in natural philosophies.⁵²

Britons' knowledge and experience of American Indians came more often from printed books on history and natural philosophy, travel narratives and maps, newspapers and magazines, plays, novels, poems and prints than from rare

⁴⁸ Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*, (New York, 1978), p. 3.

⁴⁹ Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 75-76. Eric Hinderaker, 'The 'Four Indian Kings' and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 53, no. 3, *Indians and Others in Early America*, (July 1996), pp. 487-526.

⁵⁰ Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the native Caribbean, 1492-1797*, (London & New York, 1986), p. 231. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 26-27.

⁵¹ Lester C. Olson, 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian: Race and Gender in Eighteenth-Century British Caricatures', *Imprint*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 12. Grinde & Johansen, *Exemplar of Liberty*, pp. 38-39.

⁵² Hugh Honour, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time*, (New York, 1975), pp. 118-137. The sentimental model of the 'noble savage', so popular among the French *philosophes*, was, however, only a minor feature in Britain prior to the 1780s. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 76-77.

encounters with natives themselves (such as the 'Four Indian Kings').⁵³ Such second-hand knowledge could enable Edmund Burke to claim that: 'I think I know America. If I do not my ignorance is incurable, for I have spared no pains to understand it.'⁵⁴ Britons' mental conceptions of the continent were formed not only from such written material but also from the images that were created to illustrate them, which could be highly emblematic and allegorical in nature.⁵⁵

According to Richardson's illustrated 1777 edition of Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* the conventional iconography of America as one of the four continents consisted of a woman: 'almost naked, of a tawny complexion, and a fierce aspect... In the left hand she holds a bow, and in the right a bunch of arrows, these being the arms of both men and women in many of the provinces'.⁵⁶ The figure associated with this description (*figure 3.3*) depicts a bare-breasted woman with a feathered headdress, some cloth draped around her middle, sandals on her feet, three arrows pointing downwards held in her left hand and an unstrung bow in her right. Derived mostly from Spanish sources on the newly discovered lands and their peoples, this iconographic representation of the new world had remained largely the same for a century and a half by the publication of Richardson's translation.⁵⁷

⁵³ Grindle & Johansen, *Exemplar of Liberty*, pp. 37-59.

⁵⁴ Edmund Burke, *On the American Revolution: Selected Speeches and Letters*, Elliott Robert Barkan, ed., (New York, 1966), p.182.

⁵⁵ Sinclair Hitchings, 'London's Images of Colonial America', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), p. 13.

⁵⁶ Cesare Ripa, *A Collection of Emblematical Figures*, (London, 1777 (1593)), figure 60. On native Americans imagined as cannibals, see: Susi Colin, 'Woodcutters and Cannibals. Brazilian Indians as Seen on Early Maps', in: Hans Wolff, ed., *America. Early Maps of the New World*, exh. cat., (Munich, 1992), p. 179.

⁵⁷ In the 3rd edition of Ripa's work (the first was not illustrated) America is similarly shown, although one breast is covered, she holds one arrow (or possibly a spear) and the lizard is instead an alligator. Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia*, (? , 1611 (1593)), p. 360. On the Spanish origins of knowledge of native Americans, see: Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 4-12. See also: Lee Eldridge Huddleston,

Although the Ripan iconography continues throughout the eighteenth century as one of the four continents, McClung Fleming is wrong to suggest that the parallel use of the American Indian to represent just the British colonies between 1765 and 1783 was an entirely new development.⁵⁸ Ripa's work had provided a constant source for representations of the inhabitants of the new world, and his model became attached to the colonies of the North American continent from the 1620s through appearances in books and maps. The same use of bows and arrows by natives, often shown holding the single arrow pointing downwards taken from Ripa, can be seen in the title page of Captain John Smith's illustrated early history of the British colonies in Virginia and New England published in 1624 (*figure 3.4*).⁵⁹ The same basic image was used in the official seal produced in 1629 by Richard Trott in London for the New England Company for their Plantation in Massachusetts Bay. When John Leverett became governor in 1672, he had a replacement seal fashioned that conformed closely to the same design (*figure 3.5*) showing Massachusetts's emblem of an American Indian wearing a feathered skirt, and holding a downward pointing arrow in the right hand and bow in the left. The same design was repeated in contemporary woodcut prints, on indented bills (an early attempt at producing a paper currency in the 1690s), and continued in official use until the end of the seventeenth century, before reappearing on paper currency issued in the early 1740s.⁶⁰

The Origins of the American Indians, European Concepts, 1492-1729, (Austin, Texas, & London, 1967), p. 110.

⁵⁸ E. McClung Fleming, 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, (1965), p. 65.

⁵⁹ Captain John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles, with the names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours from their first beginning Anno: 1584 to this present 1624*. (London, 1624).

⁶⁰ Matt B. Jones, 'The Early Massachusetts Bay Seals', *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, new series, vol. 44, (April 18, 1934), pp. 13-44. See also: Eric P. Newman, *The Early Paper Money of America*, (Racine, Wisconsin, 1967), pp. 124-125 & 139-142. Native figures also appeared

The production of maps of new territories, as well as the naming and renaming of their interior spaces, is itself part of a process of claiming ownership, of dominating a new landscape and legitimating control, an obvious example of which is seen in the way New Amsterdam became New York when it was taken from the Dutch in 1664.⁶¹ Anne Palumbo has speculated that the cartouches of these maps may have been important sources of designs and ideas for artists and they often contained images of native Indians among the emblems and signifiers that helped identify the part of the world being shown.⁶² On early maps, these natives –often depicted with little or no regard for ethnographical accuracy - offered local produce to colonizing westerners to reflect the way that the new continent was initially seen as a new source of raw materials for Europe.⁶³ Later, these vignettes furthered a more mercantilist view, as the Westerners became merchants and plantation owners, but Indians always played the part of the subordinate partner in these exchanges and relationships, never, for example, receiving anything in return for their goods or labour.⁶⁴ This unequal relationship is revealed in the cartouche of one map of New York (*figure 3.6*), where the pictorial emphasis is on trade represented by barrels and bundles of goods waiting to be shipped by the vessels on a stretch of water (presumably the Hudson river) in the background. White mastery of the colonies is

on eighteenth-century currency produced by Georgia, New Hampshire, and New York (pp. 90, 161, & 203-212).

⁶¹ John Rennie Short, *Representing the Republic. Mapping the United States 1600-1900*, (London, 2001), pp. 13 & 20. On the early colonists' struggles to take control of the land from the Indians, both geographically and symbolically, see: James H. Merrell, "'The Customes of Our Country': Indians and Colonists in Early America", in: Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, & London), 1991, pp. 117-156.

⁶² Anne Cannon Palumbo, 'Prints into Paint: The Influence of Prints on Eighteenth-Century American Painting', *Imprint*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 19-20.

⁶³ Most early representations of Indians on maps seem to have been from the Carib, Anawak and Tupi-Guarani tribes of Latin America, Guyana and Brazil. Colin, 'Woodcutters and Cannibals', p. 175.

⁶⁴ Carla Mulford, 'Benjamin Franklin, Native Americans, and the Commerce of Civility', in: W. M. Verhoeven, ed., *Revolutionary Histories: Transatlantic Cultural Nationalism, 1775-1815*, (Basingstoke & New York, 2002), p. 58.

shown by the trader standing to the left of the armorial shield, whose goods far outweigh the number near the dark-skinned Indian standing on its right. Although the latter wears a feathered headdress and skirt, and carries a bow and arrows, his skin is dark, his hair is short and he has earrings similar to those of the slaves that appear on tobacco papers. He is a combination of a marker of geographical location and the racial provider of labour of the colonies, revealing the way that all information about the new world was filtered through a western lens, and presented using traditional European artistic and cartographical conventions.⁶⁵

Most maps relegated native populations and other subordinate races to inferior positions on the margins of the maps' surfaces. Their presence helped to associate the new world in the European mind with the dusky native who is at once both pastoral and warlike.⁶⁶ Since America was regarded as a 'wild and savage' country, the use of wild savages as illustrative material on maps matched this geographical description, and enabled map-makers to show them being civilized and tamed by Europeans as a metaphor for colonisation.⁶⁷ Cartographical cartouches provided shorthand visual identities for the North American colonies, and helped to reinforce such stereotypes among those who used them in both colony and metropole, as did other visual material.⁶⁸

Thanks to the slave labour that kept prices low, by the late eighteenth century tobacco consumption had reached all levels of society, and was smoked (mainly by

⁶⁵ Parry, *The Image of the Indian*, p. 2.

⁶⁶ Short, *Representing the Republic*, pp. 39 & 62.

⁶⁷ [Poulteney], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, p. 17.

⁶⁸ Colin, 'Woodcutters and Cannibals', p. 175.

men) or taken as snuff (by both sexes).⁶⁹ In the late seventeenth century, the image of the American Indian, who had grown and consumed it before the arrival of the white man, became associated with the product (an association that quickly spread to the black slave following their introduction to tobacco plantations in the same period).⁷⁰ Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Tobacco papers (labels used to identify and brand sellers and producers of the commodity) displayed Indians and blacks as consumers as well as labourers, to British customers. In *Edmund Gomonds Best York Sweet Scented Tobacco Bristol* (**figure 3.7**), a seventeenth-century woodcut engraving uses the image of the be-feathered Indian King to advertise the product, while an eighteenth-century example - *Charles Parker Tamworth* (**figure 3.8**) - has two smoking, very dark-skinned youths with black curly hair holding a giant wreath made of tobacco leaves framing the name of the vendor. Although they are largely presented as black slaves, both youths bear quivers of arrows which would normally be associated with Indians.

The inequality of the New York map seems reversed in 1778's *THE COMMISSIONERS* (**figure 3.9**), where an American Indian woman holding a pole topped with a liberty cap sits on top of a pile of bales and barrels - the importance of tobacco to colonial relations is shown by the prominence given to the barrels of it destined now for Germany, France and Holland. In another reversal of roles, one of the five commissioners kneeling before her - William Eden, the driving force behind the commission appointed by Lord North to negotiate with the Americans - says that

⁶⁹ James Walvin, *Britain's Slave Empire*, (Stroud, Gloucestershire, & Charleston, South Carolina, 2000), pp. 23-25.

⁷⁰ This association would ultimately lead to the nineteenth century's cigar store Indian. Parry, *The Image of the Indian*, pp. 68-71.

the British have ‘Ravishd, scalpd, and murderd [sic]’ the colonials.⁷¹ This behaviour would normally have been associated with native Americans rather than European gentlemen, and is part of this satirical attack on a government that had resolutely waged war for three years against its own countrymen, but now wished to concede almost all the demands made by the Americans in 1775.⁷² The print perhaps also deals with the fact that, despite initial attempts by both sides to get them to remain neutral, by 1778 many tribes had been drawn into the conflict, some on the side of the Americans and others for the British.⁷³ Since travel literature set down a view of native Americans as having ‘a savage, cruel appearance...’, the apparent whiteness of the Indian’s skin in *THE COMMISSIONERS* may, together with the halo effect and laurel wreath above her head, be an attempt to divorce this figure from such associations.⁷⁴

During the war the description of the Indians as ‘savage’ took on a new significance, and both sides used settlers’ fears of Indian savagery as part of their propaganda war.⁷⁵ The term ‘savages’ is derived from the Latin ‘*silvaticus*’ meaning a forest dweller or man of the woods, and was used by the British to refer to native Americans until the seventeenth century, when referring to them as ‘Indians’ became customary instead. However, the savage label persisted into the eighteenth century and, with its implied heathenism, was used to justify colonial exploitation and

⁷¹ The commissioners are: Lord Admiral Richard Howe, General Sir William Howe, Lord Frederick Carlisle, William Eden and Governor George Johnstone. The Howe brothers refused to serve under Carlisle’s leadership and only the other three actually went to the colonies.

⁷² Stephen Conway, *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783*, (London, 1995), p. 219.

⁷³ Some tribes remained neutral throughout, while others switched sides, and in that respect they reflected the divisions within the white population of the colonies. Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 26-46.

⁷⁴ ‘An Abstract of Major Roger’s Account of North America’, p. 160.

⁷⁵ Berger, *Broadsides & Bayonets*, pp. 81-95.

appropriation.⁷⁶ Savagery, for some eighteenth-century thinkers, was also one of the stages humankind passed through on the road to civilisation.⁷⁷ As John Locke put it in his second treatise on government: ‘in the beginning all the world was *America*’.⁷⁸ Although Britain and America are approximately the same size and age as they engage in fisticuffs in *The Female Combatants* (**figure 3.10**), the latter would still have been regarded figuratively as belonging to a younger generation since she is rudely dressed rather than wearing the fashionable attire of her civilized European counterpart.

Native Americans were not different in the same way that, say, those of Africa were, but rather were at an earlier stage of a relentless progression towards modern civilisation, as noted by William Robertson in his *History of America* first published in 1777:

In every part of the earth the progress of man hath been nearly the same, and we can trace him in his career from the rude simplicity of savage life, until he attains the industry, the arts, and the elegance of polished society.⁷⁹

William Russell concurred with this view in his own *History of America* from 1778, noting how man developed towards civilisation in a progressional model that ended with his ‘maturity’, with the inhabitants of the Americas (excepting those of Mexico and Peru) representing the earliest stage and hence both the youngest race of man and the least mature.⁸⁰ Since the growth of a person from infancy to adulthood was seen as an analogue to this ‘progress’, the ‘savage’ nature of the representation of

⁷⁶ Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 13 & 115-126.

⁷⁷ David Bindman, *Ape to Apollo: Aesthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18th Century*, (London, 2002), pp. 29 & 42.

⁷⁸ Chapter 5, paragraph 49 of: John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. with an introduction and notes by Peter Laslett, (Cambridge, 1988 (1960, 1967)). p. 301.

⁷⁹ William Robertson, *The History of America*, vol. I, (London, [1796?] (1777)), p. 268.

America therefore emphasized its relative youth compared with a white Britannia, but did not rely on gender or age to provide the context of that youth, merely ethnographical representation. Indians (and by extension America) could be conceptualized as wayward children requiring only the good example of their European elders and betters to develop in the right direction.⁸¹

The luxuries of civilisation are also attacked in *The Female Combatants*, where Britain is represented by a woman in fashionable dress, wearing pearls around her neck, and a tall wig topped by four ostrich feathers - a contemporary British fashion condemned by some as immoral.⁸² Her sex and dress reveal how Britons have become unmanned slaves to the luxuries of French fashion, while Americans are suggested to be slaves to French political influence through the presence of the French cockerel. Emblems and symbols in the front left and right foreground add information on each of these combatants. On the left, a shield hangs from the jagged stump of a tree, which, as in *MAGNA Britania (figure 2.1)*, seems to be dying. A compass with an arrow pointing north on the shield blames Lord North for the withered state of the tree and the woman's fighting stance. To the right a shield hangs from the branch of a young tree that seems to be growing healthily, and has a liberty cap on top of it (though here it has been coloured blue rather than the usual red). The banner with the motto 'FOR LIBERTY', metaphorically engages with the debate over whether or not Britain was trying to make the free men (and women) of

⁸⁰ William Russell, *The History of America, from its Discovery by Columbus to the Conclusion of the Late War. With an Appendix containing an account of the Rise and Progress of the Present Unhappy Contest between Great Britain and her Colonies*. Vol. I, (London, 1778), p. iv.

⁸¹ Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, p. 47.

⁸² Mary Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires, Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. V: (1771-1783), (London, 1935), p. 237.

America its slaves, not in the literal sense but in terms of arbitrary rule.⁸³ Using the discourse of liberty in such an image was not inconsistent with the representation of America as an Indian, since the love of liberty was regarded as being innate in the savage.⁸⁴ However, while America's demands for liberty might be interpreted as a sign that the printmaker was in favour of their cause, its juxtaposition with the French cockerel reveals that she has obviously forgotten the threat posed to her security by France (as seen in the Seven Years' War). This has allowed Americans to indulge in the savage behaviour against their erstwhile protectors expected not of their European ancestors but of the natives with whom they share a continent.

At this stage of the war, American behaviour is uncivilized (though neither woman ought really to be engaging in fisticuffs), but it is possible to detect a trend towards civilisation in the representation of America up to the end of the war in 1783. Since the beginnings of visual imaginings of the New World, encounters between Europe and America had been envisaged as the clothed meeting the naked, and the civilized meeting the savage.⁸⁵ The be-feathered hunter-gatherer image was firmly entrenched in the popular imagination, although there is no evidence to show that feathered skirts were ever worn, and by 1676, and the start of King Philip's War, New England natives at least had converted from the tomahawk to the musket. In *The Female Combatants*, America is bare-breasted, dressed in a feathered skirt and headdress, and using her fists as weapons, but in later prints, some or all of these aspects of costume, weapon and behaviour can be depicted closer to, or no different from, those

⁸³ *An Unconnected Whig's Address to the Public upon the Present Civil War, the State of Public Affairs, and the Real Course of the National Calamities*, (London, 1777), p. 78.

⁸⁴ 'Reflections on the War with the Savages of North-America', in: *A New Collection of Voyages*, p. 211. See also: Robertson, *The History of America*, vol. I, p. 416.

⁸⁵ Hulme, *Colonial Encounters*, pp. xiii & 3. See also: Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, pp. 8 & 9

of the European powers. In *Britania and Her Daughter* from 1780 (*figure 3.11*), for example, America is now fully clothed, perhaps having been civilized by association with France and Spain, while the weapon in her hand seems more like a short-handled axe than a true tomahawk.⁸⁶

By the year 1783, and the approaching peace treaty, the similarities between America and Britain seem as important as any differences. In *A Political Concert* (*figure 3.12*) the contrapposto poses of America and Britannia mirror one another. The former may still be bare-breasted and wear her usual headdress, but she is no longer wearing a feathered skirt, has classical sandals on her feet, and is holding a curved sword, while no attempt has been made to suggest that either her skin colour or hair are any different from those of Britannia. Both jointly hold the pole surmounted by a cap of liberty, representing independence for America and the idea that (as Britannia herself sings) 'Britons never, shall be Slaves'. Just as servants could try to imitate the fashions and behaviours of the elites they served, America here is shown as having been partially civilized by her close contact with Mrs Britannia.⁸⁷ Such changes to the iconography of America not only seem to reflect a growing acceptance of American independence, but also a hope that the new nation will be European looking and retain close ties with Britain in particular.

For Lester Olson, the most important thing about the use of visual representations of America as an Indian, was to show that it was foreign, uncivilized and therefore inferior, something that could be emphasized by either designating its gender as

⁸⁶ For more on this print, see chapter five.

⁸⁷ J. Jean Hecht, *The Domestic Class in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1956), p. 203.

female, or depicting its skin colour as non-white.⁸⁸ Although this was true of some images, it is in fact an over-simplification that does not do justice to the full complexities of the various images that used the Indian to connote America. When the personification first appeared in this form it was clear that the inhabitants of Great Britain were not yet ready to see Americans as anything other than Englishmen, although the war and independence undeniably helped change many minds.⁸⁹ The Indian was already a stereotyped image of the continent when it began to be used to visually represent the British colonies there during the Stamp Act crisis, and it was perhaps the behaviour of American radicals that was being designated as foreign rather than all of the inhabitants. Ironically, as the conflict progressed, there seems to have been an increasing tendency to civilize this representation, even as more people in Britain came to see American colonists as foreigners rather than fellow Britons. Furthermore, the ubiquity of 'family quarrel' metaphor during this period would also tend to argue against this, since it relied on a contemporary norm whereby directly consanguineous relations like daughters and sons were not thought of as foreign to their parents. Finally Olson's view fails to take into account the history of the representation and the way that it was altered to fit the moment. As Jordanova has noted, personifications change and alter to suit the historical and cultural moment, and they cannot therefore be regarded as fixed inviolable images. They are instead in a continual state of flux as they are interpreted and reinterpreted by those who use them within a constantly changing context.⁹⁰ There seems nothing metaphorically inconsistent with a basic model that involved Britain as a white mother and America as her white daughter, but the specifics of artistic interpretation

⁸⁸ Olson pays insufficient attention to consideration of skin colour in his thesis. Olson, 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian', p. 4.

⁸⁹ Marcus Wood, *Radical Satire and Print Culture, 1790-1822*, (Oxford, 1994), p. 59.

and political involvement require more synchronic rather than diachronic investigation.

Britannia and her Daughter

Most political satires that specifically used ‘family quarrel’ metaphor did so through the mother-daughter configuration, as explicitly set out in titles like *Britania And Her Daughter*.⁹¹ Britannia was a pre-existing national symbol using the form of an allegorical female figure, but it was also both normal and natural to represent America as female. Although named after the male explorer Amerigo Vespucci, it had been feminized in line with the other (already female) continents Africa, Asia and Europa, the latter deriving from Greek myth. Reflecting the emblematic use of the female form to express general and universal ideas from the Renaissance onwards, books like Ripa’s *Iconologia* helped to establish a visual tradition for depicting America as a woman, usually as a bare-breasted and barefooted Indian, with straight black hair, normally of a tawny or dusky complexion, and wearing a feathered headdress (and often a feathered skirt as well).⁹² Although there were exceptions to this – for example, the colonies were depicted as an aged white woman in a dress and shawl, and wearing shoes in *America in Flames* (*figure 3.13*) – the chief model was of this female-female conflict (as the next chapter will show the print record only really starts to represent the colonies as male in 1774 in the wake of the Boston Tea Party and during the build up towards war). There were also, as I

⁹⁰ ‘Feminine Figures: Nature Displayed’, in: Ludmilla Jordanova, *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine, 1760-1820*, (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 22.

⁹¹ Fleming, ‘The American Image as Indian Princess’, pp. 65 & 71.

⁹² Marina Warner, *Monuments & Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form*, (London, 1985), p. 12.

have argued, semantic, historic, and philosophic reasons for seeing the two in an intergenerational relationship. Since emigrants were often young and therefore left their parents behind in the mother-country, neither was it an enormous stretch of the imagination to move from regarding Americans as 'the sons of Englishmen' to seeing America itself as the child of the British state.⁹³ The normative visual conceptualisation of the 'family quarrel' was therefore as a dispute between mother and daughter, depicted as Britannia and America.

In 1775's *Bunker's Hill or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels* it is not necessary to specifically state that the white woman and female Indian are mother and daughter even though its title invokes the main concept of the metaphor. Yet, it contains what appear to be leading reins tied around the waist of America and held by Spain, which were used in the eighteenth century (as now) to control and restrict the movement of toddlers. Earlier that year, one correspondent of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, had addressed himself to the British parliament in noting that: 'In the style of metaphor you may sooth them [Americans] with the title of your children: it seems your intention to keep them in leading strings, even when they are grown up to the full stature of manhood.'⁹⁴ In this image however, these reins not only make out America to be a child, but also reflect the outside influence of Spain in rousing her to rebellion. Similarly, another satire from 1771 used them to show that the prime minister exerted too much influence over the King and treated him as a child, by describing the imaginary costumes they might have worn to a masquerade as: 'His M[ajest]y in a child's frock and bib, followed by L[or]d N[orth], in the habit of an

⁹³ *Considerations upon the French and American War*, p. 7.

⁹⁴ J. Boerhadem, 'A few Thoughts on American Affairs, humbly offered to Parliament', in: *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLV (1775), p. 70.

old woman, holding him in leading strings.’⁹⁵ The satirical print in question therefore not only presents the Battle of Bunker’s Hill of June 16th-17th 1775 as a family quarrel but as one between mother and daughter.

It seems most probable that where both antagonists are female but there is no visual reference to America as a daughter, or Britain as a mother, images were nevertheless informed by this particular conceptualisation. With this implicit model in mind it is possible to see how this normative configuration could be used to support the British government and attack the opposition. *The Parricide. A Sketch of Modern Patriotism* (figure 3.14) from the April 1776 issue of the *Westminster Magazine* is an anti-radical and anti-opposition print, which attacks these British factions for encouraging American armed rebellion, while attempting to restrain the government’s military response, and hence making the mother country vulnerable to attack. Although parricide can mean the murder of a parent, Johnson’s dictionary also gives another definition; that of: ‘One who destroys or invades any to whom he owes particular reverence; on his country or patron’ or one who murders the same.⁹⁶ There is then a double meaning to this reference. Not only is America attempting to murder her mother, but she is also the agent of politicians like John Wilkes who urges her to attack, the Duke of Grafton and Alderman George Hayley (Wilkes’s brother-in-law) who hold down Britannia, Charles Pratt (the first Baron Camden) who restrains the British lion, and Charles James Fox (with the head of a fox) and

⁹⁵ *The New Foundling Hospital for Wit. Being a Collection of curious pieces in verse and prose, by Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, Earl of Chesterfield, Delaware, Hardwicke, Carlisle, Lords Lyttleton, Harvey, Capel, Lady M. W. Montague, T. Potter, C. Townshend, J. S. Hall, J. Wilkes, D. Garrick, B. Thornton, G. Colman, R. Lloyd &c. &c. Adorned with a Frontispiece. Part the Third*, (London, 1771), p. 47.

⁹⁶ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers*. 3rd ed., vol. II, (London, 1765).

William Pitt (the Earl of Chatham with his crutches) who, if they do not actually participate in the attack, certainly do nothing to prevent it.⁹⁷

Often political prints use 'family quarrel' metaphor to comment on these political bystanders and participants and on their behaviour as well as that of national personifications. *The Parricide* suggests that Wilkes and the others, who ought above all to owe their allegiance to Britannia have instead turned on her, inflamed by the Medusa-like figure of Discord. This is paralleled in the ingratitude of America to the mother who nourished her with her own blood like the picture of the bird in the foreground, an image used the same year by a writer who noted that 'Britain, like the pelican, has fed her young with her blood; grown strong they rise up to prey upon her vitals'.⁹⁸ As in *Goody Bull* the natural order has been upset, something that is emphasized in the representations of Britannia and America. Not only does the latter have the same skin colour as her mother, but her tunic has been westernized and covers her breasts, she is wearing sandals instead of going barefoot, her weapons are a European axe and dagger not the usual tomahawk and scalping knife, and (although she wears a feathered headdress, which is all that really identifies her as America) her hair is curled and tied up rather than straight and flowing loosely. Instead, it is Britannia who has been stripped to the waist, revealing her breasts, her spear has been broken, her shield is being trampled underfoot by America, and she is barefoot. The implication is that America has ambitions to take over her mother's standing in

⁹⁷ I am not convinced that the lion is also being encouraged to attack Britannia as suggested by: Peter D. G. Thomas, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: The American Revolution*, (Cambridge, 1986), p. 136. Donald H. Cresswell, *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints. A Checklist of 1765-1790 in the Library of Congress*, (Washington D.C. 1975), p.290.

⁹⁸ This myth relating to the pelican had led to its use as a symbol of the crucifixion of Christ. *A Letter from an Officer Retired to his Son in Parliament*, (London, 1776), p.12.

the world, and that the radicals' and opposition's support for the former will lead to the ruin and degradation of Great Britain.

Although the accusation of 'parricide' was also made about the British government by Edmund Burke, this was to suggest that the Americans had been driven to rebellion by the mother country's treatment of them.⁹⁹ For the opposition, the Americans' behaviour could be presented as a kind of learned response, since a child's behaviour was generally believed to have been modelled on that of its parents, and mothers in particular were regarded as responsible for the future conduct of their daughters.¹⁰⁰ Their natural affection for their mother country had therefore been 'erased by repeated unkind usage on her part...', and they were merely acting towards Britain, the way Britain had already acted towards them.¹⁰¹ However, the image of the bird and the way America's actions in *The Parricide* have been instigated by the opposition itself, means that this print must be understood to show her as an ungrateful, undutiful and disobedient daughter committing murder on someone to whom she owes debts of all three.

Dr Josiah Tucker wrote during the Stamp Act crisis that parliament had behaved 'like an over indulgent parent to a favourite, froward Child', and had been 'continually heaping favours' on that child at the expense (both real and metaphorical) of other

⁹⁹ In a speech made in Parliament on 14th December 1778. *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLVIII (1779), p. 277.

¹⁰⁰ Augustus Lovemore, *A Letter from a Father to a Son, on his Marriage*, (London, 1778), p. 23. *Female Tuition; or, An Address to Mothers, on the Education of Daughters*, (London, 1784), p. 2.

¹⁰¹ 'Circulatory letter to other Houses of Representatives and Burgesses in American Colonies', dated 11th February 1768. Thomas Hollis, *The True Sentiments of America: Contained in a Collection of Letters Sent from the House of Representatives of the Province of Massachusetts Bay to Several Persons of High Rank in this Kingdom*, (London, [July] 1768), p. 63.

British subjects.¹⁰² However, more usually, implicit support for the parent often emerged as explicit criticism of its offspring. As the Bishop of Llandaff wrote about the colonies in 1774: 'much might have been ceded to their duty and obedience, which must be refused to their insolence and resistance.'¹⁰³ Rhetoric invoking the filial duties of gratitude and obedience could be used to present a view supporting the various British governments that, from 1765, directed the various colonial policies that caused conflict with the Americans. Allegations of American ingratitude were based on the idea that children had a duty of gratitude towards their parents in return for the support and protection they received during their formative years, just as the colonies had been nurtured and protected by Britain, for example in the Seven Years' War.¹⁰⁴ Although mothers were only concerned with the upbringing of their sons whilst still young, daughters were in their care until married and, as the captions of Colley's *A Political Concert* make clear, while 'Mrs Britannia' might generally be assumed to be married in such prints, her daughter 'Miss America' is not.¹⁰⁵ As filial duties, obedience and gratitude were therefore so strongly related to the relationship between daughters and their mothers, that American rebellion could be thought of in terms of disobedience and ingratitude, thereby potentially justifying military intervention as proper chastisement or punishment.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² [Dr Josiah Tucker], *A Letter from a Merchant in London to his Nephew in North America, relative to the Present Posture of Affairs in the Colonies*, (London, 1766), p. 23.

¹⁰³ Letter from Lord Barrington to the Earl of Dartmouth dated 24th December 1774. Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham, *The Political Life of William Wildman Viscount Barrington*, (London, 1814), p. 143.

¹⁰⁴ Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*, p. 209.

¹⁰⁵ [John Essex], *The Young Ladies Conduct: or, Rules for Education Under several Heads; with Instructions upon Dress both before and after Marriage. And Advice to Young Wives*, (London, 1722), p. xxxiii. Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), p. 69. See chapter five for more on how marriage impacted on 'family quarrel' metaphor.

¹⁰⁶ Wetenhall Wilkes, *A Letter of Genteel and Moral Advice to a Young Lady. In which is digested a new and familiar Method, a system of RULES and INFORMATIONS, to qualify the FAIR SEX to be useful and happy in every State*. (Dublin, 1740), pp. 86-87.

In *The Female Combatants* the woman on the left says to her opponent: 'I'll force you to Obedience you Rebellious Slut'. In reply, the American Indian declares that she will have: 'Liberty Liberty for ever Mother while I exist'. Clearly these are representations of Britain and her American colonies pictured as mother and daughter, for all that the latter has just landed a punch on the former's left cheek with her fist. Apart from her unladylike behaviour, America's tattoos, appearing as patterns of dotted lines, mark her out as a savage, while the peacock feathers in her hair suggest both exoticness and vanity. Here, Britain clearly places a child's duty of obedience to its parent in high regard. While parents were not expected to obey their children, it was a quality that was especially valued in daughters, and with regard to their mothers in particular.¹⁰⁷ Pro-government propagandists could therefore use 'family quarrel' metaphor to call American rebellion 'disobedience' and attack it as unnatural. As John Moore, the Bishop of Bangor, noted in a sermon to the House of Lords: 'Civil government was designed to protect the weak against the violent, *and the righteous against the lawless and disobedient*'.¹⁰⁸

In law, a father was invested with sufficient power to 'keep his children in subjection and obedience' and to 'lawfully correct his child whilst under age...'.¹⁰⁹ The ultimate means of subduing an obstinate child was whipping, although this was probably used less frequently as the eighteenth century wore on.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, sparing the rod and spoiling a child was thought to remove their fear of their

¹⁰⁷ *The Laws respecting Women*, p. 31. Lovemore, *A Letter from a Father to a Son*, p. 50.

¹⁰⁸ John Moore, Bishop of Bangor, *A Sermon preached before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church of Westminster, on Thursday, January, 30, 1777: being the day appointed to be observed as the day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I*, (London, 1777), pp. 7-8.

¹⁰⁹ *The Laws respecting Women*, p. 356.

¹¹⁰ Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, pp. 145-146.

parents and make them harder to control.¹¹¹ Even after 1775, the British government's supporters could use the parent-child metaphor system to describe prosecution of the war in terms of punishment and chastisement designed to bring colonial America back to its duty of obedience.¹¹² The argument used by the opposition to counter this, was to claim that the child-America had reached the age of majority for a son, and hence suggest that parental punishment was unlawful and wrong.¹¹³ The debate on the war, in so far as it engaged with 'family quarrel' metaphor, was presented in terms of gender, with supporters claiming that America was Britain's daughter, and opponents that he was her son.

Conclusion

Like the limbs in Franklin's image of the body politic, the depiction of America as Britain's daughter represented the colonies as subordinate parts of the British community, this time envisaged as a transatlantic family.¹¹⁴ The use of parent-child metaphor transformed colonial debate into one concerned with gratitude, obedience and duty, thereby disguising the role of other aspects (such as trade, economics, and legislative authority) of Anglo-American disputes.¹¹⁵ As dispute turned to actual

¹¹¹ Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, p. 247.

¹¹² Alexander Gerard, *Liberty the Cloke of Maliciousness, both in the American Rebellion, and in the Manners of the Times*. (Aberdeen, 1778), p. 14.

¹¹³ *An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain*, (London, 1778), p. 5.

¹¹⁴ Subordination in government and the family are analogized in: *A Father's Advice to his Daughters*, (? , 1776), p. 21.

¹¹⁵ Joseph J. Ellis, *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture*, (New York & London, 1979), p. 13.

conflict, it could also express a belief in the unnaturalness of what was initially imagined as a civil war through figures of infanticide, patricide or matricide.¹¹⁶

That the dominant normative model of the 'family quarrel' metaphor was of Britannia and her American Indian daughter raises the question of how it could be countered by those who opposed the British government. Ironically, just as British national identity was partially constructed in this period by reference to what was seen as its natural opposite (i.e. France), so too were the American colonists pictured as what they were not, their own 'vile opposites' - the Indian savages.¹¹⁷ Although British print makers had no problem in representing America as an Indian, at the time of the Stamp Act when most colonists still saw a future for themselves within the British 'family', cartoons were produced in Boston and Philadelphia that altered the representation of America to a European daughter.¹¹⁸ However, one of the reasons for the popularity of the parent-child configuration in Britain was that it contained sufficient room to manoeuvre for both sides to employ it in their rhetoric. For those who supported the British government's policies, it enabled them to concentrate on the fact that a child owed its parent duties of obedience and gratitude, issues that could also be related to other questions about the rhetorical conceptualisation of America such as those of gender and maturity. As Fergusson's *Moral Philosophy* set out: 'The right of the parent to command the infant child is original; but in every other instance, no man has an original right to force the obedience of another, except

¹¹⁶ *The Triumph of Liberty and Peace with America*, p. 6. *Unity and Public Spirit*, p. 48.

¹¹⁷ On the French as the 'vile opposites' of Britons, see for example: Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, (New Haven & London 1992), p. 368.

¹¹⁸ See for example: John Singleton Copley's 1765 *The Deplorable State of America* discussed in: Ann Uhry Abrams, 'Politics, Prints, and John Singleton Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. LXI, no. 2, (June 1979), pp. 265-276. See also: Wilkinson's 1766 [*The Deplorable State of America*] discussed in: E. P Richardson, 'Stamp Act Cartoons in the Colonies', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. XCVI, no. 3, (July 1972), pp. 275-286. See also: William Murrell, *A History of American Graphic Humor, Volume 1 (1747-1865)*, New York, 1933, pp. 22-25.

in obliging him to abstain or desist from wrongs.’¹¹⁹ Since daughters always owed this duty of obedience to another person (either their father, mother, husband or older male siblings), Fergusson presents this exception as male. For the opposition, it was possible to recast the ‘family quarrel’ as one between parent and son, and thereby claim that as a mature young man America should be allowed to live independent of interference. This male conceptualization of America is something to which I now want to turn my attention.

¹¹⁹ Adam Fergusson, *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*, (Edinburgh, 1769), p. 198.

Chapter 4: Prodigal Sons – Declarations of Independence

If the mother-daughter configuration of the ‘family quarrel’ analogy was both dominant and normative, it also was substantially a model that supported governmental authority and empire and therefore implicitly favoured that point of view. Those who did not share this viewpoint therefore had to find ways of subverting it to suit their own agendas. After the Declaration of Independence of 4th July 1776 Benjamin Franklin, for example, sometimes replaced consideration of Britain as mother with an allusion to stepmother or mother-in-law.¹ However, although this perhaps suggested unwarranted interference on the part of the mother country, it still could not fully justify rebellion on the part of a stepdaughter or daughter-in-law. Regarding America as a child or female allowed Britons to sidestep colonists’ demands not to be taxed by Britain without proper representation in its parliament, since neither group was enfranchised in the eighteenth century. America was in the same situation therefore as women and children in Great Britain in that they were virtually represented by politicians but denied direct involvement in the political process.² Only by re-gendering America could colonial radicals, their supporters and British opponents of the government claim that the former had a right to even partially direct their own affairs.

¹ Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004), pp. 197 & 225-226. Franklin refers to Britain as ‘a cruel Mother-in-Law’ in a letter to David Hartley dated 12th February 1778. William B. Willcox, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XXV, *October 1, 1777, through February 28, 1778*, (New Haven & London, 1986), p. 651.

² This point had to be specifically countered by colonists. See, for example: ‘A Letter from a Plain Yeoman’ published in the *Providence Gazette* on 11th May 1765. Edmund S. Morgan, ed., *Prologue to Revolution: Sources and Documents on the Stamp Act Crisis, 1764-1766*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1959), pp. 75-76.

Opposition writers in Britain seem to have increasingly turned to a view of America as 'male' and 'son' rather than 'female' and 'daughter' in order to justify American actions. As Dr Josiah Tucker, the Dean of Gloucester, noted: 'Metaphorical Objections are best confuted by metaphorical Replies.'³ Furthermore, opponents of the British government's American policies promoted an idea of America as grown to maturity rather than still an infant or child, in order to counter claims of obedience and dependency. As they were working within the dominant female model, despite conscious attempts to counter it through gender, there could still be lapses back into the normative conceptualization, with America being regarded on the same page as both 'the offspring of England' grown into its 'manhood', and Britain's 'American daughter'.⁴ Nevertheless, this counter-rhetoric was assisted by the fact that so many Britons regarded the War of American Independence as a civil war until the entry of France, Spain and the Netherlands, and as a conflict that was costing the lives of 'brothers, friends and countrymen' within the worldwide British family or community.⁵ Since both armies and governments could be regarded as exclusively male, and since initially both sides were seen as being fellow countrymen, it was also the male configuration of the 'family quarrel' that defined it as a civil war, a quarrel between father and son(s) or brothers.⁶

³ Dr Josiah Tucker, *A Series of Answers to Certain Popular Objections, against Separating from the Rebellious Colonies, and Discarding Them Entirely; being the Concluding Tract of the Dean of Gloucester [sic], on the Subject of American Affairs*, (Glo[u]cester, 1776), p. 60.

⁴ *An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain*, (London, 1778), p. 5.

⁵ *Civil War; A Poem. Written in the Year 1775*, ([London, 1780?]), p. 32.

⁶ Americans were the 'sons of Englishmen' according to: *Considerations upon the French and American War. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament*, (London, 1779), p. 7. The war pitted brother against brother according to: *Thoughts on the Present War, With an Impartial Review of Lord North's Administration, in conducting the American, French, Spanish and Dutch War; and in The Management of Contracts, Taxes, the Public Money &c.*, (London, 1783), p. 4.

Following the signing of Franco-American treaties of alliance in February 1778, there was a tendency for images to reflect this masculinization of the conflict's conceptualization with the appearance of greater numbers of images using representations of America as a male Indian. From about 1779 there was also an increasing tendency for artists to replace Britannia in satirical prints with male embodiments like the British lion, John Bull (sometimes with an actual bull as his stand-in), and the sailor Jack England. In the well-known image of *A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778* (**figure 4.1**), all the people and animals are male with the exception of the cow representing British trade. France, Spain, and Holland are all normally personified as male in any case, however, America is now also a man dressed in breeches and a ruffed shirt (the feathers in his headband suggesting he is still intended as an Indian), while a lion stands in for Great Britain, its mane signifying its male gender. To the right a free Englishman is dressed in mourning and lamenting the effects of the alleged misconduct in America of the two Howe brothers, who can be seen drinking together in the background in Philadelphia. Even the pug dog, which urinates on the lion by cocking its leg, is male.⁷

This chapter looks at the various ways in which the war was seen as a civil war and its Anglo-American participants were gendered as male. It was principally the colonists' supporters and the British government's opponents who rhetorically referred to America in these terms, arguing that for them the question was not one of American obedience and gratitude but of American maturity and hence a right to a

⁷ An explanation of the print appears with it in: *The Westminster Magazine*, (February 1778), p. 66.

measure of independence.⁸ This led some to imagine Americans as prodigal sons who, having been awarded their patrimony and wandered from the straight and narrow, could nevertheless be kept within the British family in spite of Independence. Imagery relating to America as male was used at various times, but mainly dominated the final years of the war when its conceptualization as a 'family quarrel' was challenged by the entry of other European powers to the conflict, a factor which also sometimes led to the pictorial masculinization of Great Britain.

Positioning the Male Within The Family Quarrel

Just as the parent-child configuration of the 'family quarrel' could be seen in terms of a mother-daughter dispute, it could also be regarded as mother-son or father-son. The former permutation, for example, allowed for greater emphasis on the subject of independence since boys generally passed into the care of their fathers once they had left the nursery, while the latter was particularly appropriate to considerations of tyranny and rebellion.⁹ Conceptualizing America as a son could also have other benefits. The fact that sons were incapable in law of executing any legal act of their own until they had come of age, could allow some to disregard the legality of the Declaration of Independence by emphasizing that it had arisen during a dispute between the mother country and her 'infant colonies'.¹⁰ More often, however, a male

⁸ As noted in: Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven & London, 2004), p. 250.

⁹ An Englishman, *On the Character and Manners of the French Nation Compared with the English*, in: *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVIII (1779), p. 260.

¹⁰ *An Impartial Sketch of the Various Indulgences granted by Great-Britain to her Colonies, upon which They have founded their Presumption of soaring towards Independence. By an officer*, (London, 1778), pp. 8 & 21. The charge of ingratitude was rarely employed when America was gendered as male, but there were exceptions. See: [William Poulteney], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, (London, 1778), p. v.

America was used to attack the parent state instead and present the war as a fight by a female England's 'harrass'd sons' against unnatural maternal interference.¹¹

Major John Cartwright, the Nottinghamshire landowner and radical, did not believe that the figurative familial relationship had any firm basis in rational argument, but nevertheless felt compelled to use it himself in order to counter the rhetorical constructions of government supporters.

Those who are so fond of placing them [i.e. Americans] metaphorically in the relation of children to a parent state... should recollect, that the power of a parent, even during childhood, doth not extend to any act of tyranny or injustice; and totally ceases when the child arrives at years of maturity.¹²

This idea of tyranny as a feature of parent-child relations, had long been regarded as a feature of the relationship of fathers to sons.¹³ At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Sir Richard Steele had written in *The Spectator* that when the proper ties of power and subjection between fathers and sons had been broken, it made them 'more emphatically tyrants and rebels against each other, with greater cruelty of heart, than the disruption of states and empires can possibly produce.'¹⁴ Similarly, Samuel Johnson had noted in 1751 in *The Rambler* how the 'regal and parental tyrant differ only in the extent of their dominions, and the number of their slaves.' For Johnson, the only difference between the victims of oppression by an absolute ruler and a parent, was that the oppressed were always visible to a bad father.¹⁵

¹¹ *The Triumph of Liberty and Peace with America: a Poem. Inscribed to General Conway*, (London, 1782), p. 10. The same poem uses the father-sons figure to emphasize the unnaturalness of a father-protector committing infanticide on: p. 6.

¹² John Cartwright, *American Independence. The Interest and Glory of Great-Britain. A New Edition*. (London, 1775), p. 8.

¹³ Mark E. Kann, *The Gendering of American Politics: Founding Mothers, Founding Fathers, and Political Patriarchy*, (Westport, Connecticut, & London, 1999), pp. 26-28.

¹⁴ Sir Richard Steele, *The Spectator*, no. 263, (Tuesday, January 1, 1712), p. 66.

This is essentially what the 'family quarrel' metaphor did, it reduced the events of the war down to a manageable size and made them apprehensible to the British public, and in turn meant that artists could make it visible pictorially. The satirical print, *Poor old England endeavouring to reclaim his wicked American Children* (figure 4.2), from September 1777 shows the male inter-generational conceptualization of the war and suggests engagement with the idea of paternal tyranny. On the right is an elderly veteran of past wars fought to secure the future of the colonies in which he had lost his left leg just below the knee, since replaced by a peg leg.¹⁶ Under his left arm is a crutch, the bottom of which rests on a shield displaying the Union Flag, and he is holding a whip. The impression of this print in the collection of the Library of Congress has the words 'THE ATLANTIC OCEAN' etched into the central area, showing that an east-west orientation is being used to geographically locate the two sides. On the left, therefore, are the Americans making disrespectful gestures towards the veteran: one fires peas at him, another bares the seat of his pants at him, while a third shakes his hat and points angrily at him.¹⁷ Although the Americans seem to be of a variety of ages, from the youth with the pea shooter, to the older man pointing, their bad behaviour is intended to show their contempt towards the man identified by the title as their father. The way that he is trying to 'reclaim his wicked... Children' is by pulling on strings that are attached to hooks anchored in their noses, while the whip suggests what he has in mind for them when he gets them home. Whether England is trying to pull just his sons or also the entire continent on which they are standing closer to him is open to question, but,

¹⁵ Issue number 148, dated: Saturday, August 17, 1751. [Samuel Johnson], *The Rambler. In Four Volumes*, 6th ed., vol. 3, (London, 1764), pp. 229-230.

¹⁶ The rarity of England's representation as an old man in this print is noted in: Joan Dolmetsch, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch (ed.), *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), p. 189.

like *The Female Combatants* (*figure 3.10*), this is an image that criticizes both sides. While the sons' behaviour seems disrespectful and immature, that of the father seems overly cruel, and there is little to suggest who started this quarrel. The print not only reveals the natural antagonism between fathers and sons, and an implied lack of gratitude and due respect for the British protection of American interests in the Seven Years' War, but also the effects of parental tyranny through the illegality of England's punishment, since most of the Americans seem to be depicted as being over the age of majority.¹⁸

Poor Old England is one of a minority of extant prints that represents America and Americans as male in sex, white in complexion and European in dress. Another image that eschews the normal iconography of the Indian is *Britannia's Ruin* (*figure 4.3*) published at the end of 1779. Here, a white male America holding a sword and staff with liberty cap demands the submission of Britannia, whose spear has been broken.¹⁹ He is less well dressed than the aristocratic Frenchman beside him, but still more fashionably attired than the common merchant representing Holland who is entering the picture on the right. The Spaniard meanwhile shows how backward looking the country is by facing the wrong way, allowing the printmaker to pun on the fact that he wants lost territory like Gibraltar 'back'. Apart from the presence of the liberty cap, the figure representing America can only really be distinguished by a process of elimination, which shows how useful the Indian was to the artists of prints

¹⁷ In later impressions, the reference to the Atlantic is missing, and the man in the centre is baring his bottom to moon England. Joan D. Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation: Satirical Prints on the Revolution at Williamsburg*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1976), p. 90.

¹⁸ *The Laws respecting Women, as they regard their natural rights, or their connections and conduct; also, the obligations of parent and child, and the condition of minors, etc.. In Four Books*, (London, 1777), p. 356.

¹⁹ The print is based on one published on 7th December 1762 during the Seven Years' War (*The Family Compact, Britannia's Ruin*, LWL – 762-12-7.1), which features Lord Bute instead of America. It is possible that this may have influenced the gender of the latter in the 1779 version.

– it was immediately identifiable – and it is for that reason that most male personifications of the colonies kept, at least in part, to the more traditional form.

The gender of Britain and America in the *General P-s, or Peace* (*figure 4.4*) is dictated by the need to show them standing up and pissing into a giant chamber pot, alongside the other male personifications of combatants, and hence show all five nations as men engaged in the same activity. Although, the Indian wears a feathered skirt and has a quiver of arrows, the symbols on the ground in front of the pot show greater equality than this representation of the Indian would suggest. Like the European powers, America has a flag by which it can be identified with thirteen horizontal stripes (but as yet no stars). There are also five swords lying idle during the peace negotiations, suggesting that America is no longer confined to using the tomahawk or scalping knife that the ‘Indian’ context might seem to require. America, central to the war as it is in the print, is shown as an equal participant in the peace process, even if he is still racially differentiated from the European nations. However, by using the Indian, the artist has been able to make him immediately identifiable, and this time it is ‘Jack English’ who is recognisable only by elimination of the other more standard representations.

The idea of these prints was to interpret current events and present them in as simple and as easily apprehensible a manner as possible (and sometimes even to make fun of the commonality of ‘family quarrel’ rhetoric). The problem for artists was that if there were visually no marked difference between Britain and America in their works in terms of either gender or race, then it would lead to the same confusion experienced by contemporary Britons, many of whom saw no difference between

British inhabitants of England and America. Just as Oliver Goldsmith, in his *An History of the Earth, and Animated Nature* published in 1774, used the term 'Americans' only to refer to those natives who had been there when white European settlers had first arrived, the visual use of the Indian automatically signified an inhabitant of the American continent.²⁰ Geography was what separated the two people, like the 'ATLANTIC OCEAN' in *Poor old England*, not nationality, and those across the Atlantic were merely 'distant fellow citizens'.²¹

There were those on both sides of the debate about the war who believed that Britons and Americans were essentially one people. A petition to George III from the Massachusetts House of Representatives dated 20th January 1768 acknowledged that the American colonists were the King's 'faithful subjects' who accorded him the loyalty and allegiance that was due to him, but clearly stated that they were also the 'brethren' of their fellow subjects in Great Britain, with the same 'rights, liberties, privileges and immunities'.²² For the former Governor Thomas Pownall, Americans were just one branch of a larger community, brought up as 'equal brothers of the same family'.²³ Although brothers could be placed within a hierarchy of their own dependent on age, the use of 'brothers' and 'brethren' reveals how closely alike the two populations were thought to be, since the word 'brother' could be used to denote

²⁰ Oliver Goldsmith, *An History of the Earth, and Animated Nature*, vol. II, (London, 1774), p. 229.

²¹ John Roebuck, *An Enquiry whether the Guilt of The Present Civil War in America, ought to be imputed to Great Britain or America*, (London, 1776), p. 1.

²² Thomas Hollis, *The True Sentiments of America: Contained in a Collection of Letters Sent from the House of Representatives of the Province of Massachusetts Bay to Several Persons of High Rank in this Kingdom*, (London, [July] 1768), pp. 5-7. The Americans were also fellow-subjects according to: Dr Richard Price, *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1776), p. 99.

²³ Thomas Pownall, *A Memorial Addressed to the Sovereigns of America*, (London, 1783), pp. 11-12.

anything that was alike and related in the sense of belonging to the same category or type.²⁴

The same similarity and lack of difference could also be invoked through metaphors of blood, since what essentially bound Britain and America together were ties of consanguinity.²⁵ When both sides had the same origins, the blood being shed on each side could be regarded as being the same:

Unhappy men! No foreign war you wage,
In your own blood you glut your frantic rage;
And while you follow where oppression leads,
At ev'ry step, a friend, or brother bleeds.²⁶

This blood is a stain on the character of Britain, which is defiled 'With the blood of brothers, friends and countrymen'.²⁷ In the eighteenth century, ties of blood were considered as more important than those of friendship, since blood decided relationship, class and status, and inheritance.²⁸ Before and during the war, the ties of consanguinity between the two populations were noted and invoked, and even after the war in 1784 familial metaphor could be used to suggest that ties of consanguinity remained between the two countries and would result in their remaining friends and allies in the future.²⁹

²⁴ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers*. 3rd ed., vol. I, (London, 1765).

²⁵ Thomas Day, *Reflections upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p. 15. I deal with the use of blood metaphors in relation to the diagnosis and treatment of the ills and wounds of the body politic in chapter seven.

²⁶ *The Desolation of America: A Poem*, (London, 1777), p.3.

²⁷ *Civil War; A Poem*. p. 32.

²⁸ As noted by the character Evelina when she reveals to Mr Macartney that they are in fact siblings. Frances Burney, *Evelina*, introduction by Margaret Anne Doody, vol. 3, (London, 1994), p.403.

²⁹ See, for example: Day, *Reflections upon the Present State of England*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p.15. Brian Edwards, *Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government, respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1784), pp. 3& 27.

This sense of similarity and of seeing the British on both sides of the Atlantic as brothers, fathers and sons from the same family was especially strong when the War of American Independence was considered as a civil war by contemporaries. Although there are links between this view and corporeal metaphors of dismemberment and disease in which the body can itself be considered as a kind of battleground and at once both 'the spoiler and the prey', it was the masculine conceptualization of the 'family quarrel' that was most often employed to express this idea figuratively.³⁰ In one satire, written as a dialogue between a British and an American merchant, civil war is defined as something unnatural, as a time: 'When subject is opposed to subject; father to son; and brother to brother'.³¹ This is how writers could bring both the unnaturalness and the potentially dire consequences of a civil war home to their readers, by reducing it to a one-on-one conflict between the male members of a family.³² This was particularly successful since the effects of such a war could also be expressed by reference to the family, as something that robbed 'a Father of a Son, or a Wife of an Husband...'.³³ The satirical print, *Poor old England*, from September 1777, therefore presents the war in the same terms as poets who would claim that '*Fathers with Sons in cruel war engage!*', that is as a

³⁰ *The Desolation of America: A Poem*, p. 22.

³¹ *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America, in their private capacities as friends; tracing the several causes of the present contests between the mother country and her American subjects; the fallacy of their prepossessions, and the ingratitude and danger of them; the reciprocal benefits of the national friendship; and the moral obligations of individuals which enforce it with various anecdotes, and reasons drawn from facts, tending to conciliate all differences, and establish a permanent union for the common happiness and glory of the British Empire*, (London, 1775), pp. 4-5. See also: William Steel Dickson, *Sermons on the following subjects. I. The advantages of national repentance. II. The ruinous effects of civil war. III. The coming of the Son of man, IV. The Hope of Meeting, Knowing, and rejoicing with virtuous Friends, in a future World.*, (Belfast, [1778?]), pp. 18-19.

³² See: 'Ah! Dire effect of Civil Rage! / Fathers with Sons in cruel war engage!' from: *The Miseries of Dissension and Civil War, An Ode. Unity and Public Spirit recommended in an Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster, to which are added two odes: viz. The Miseries of dissension and civil war, and The True Patriot, inscribed to Earl Cornwallis, and Sir George Brydges Rodney*, Bart, (London, [1780]), p. 43.

male inter-generational civil war, where the danger is that one or other side may be killed.³⁴

In July 1775, David Hartley, an advocate for peace with the Americans, wrote a letter to Benjamin Franklin in which he rejected the dominant rhetorical discourse of the 'family quarrel', suggesting that analogous references to authoritative parental rights presupposed an 'affection which cannot exist, having no foundation in nature beyond natural parents.' He therefore saw the use of the parent-child model as misleading, preferring to think of Americans as 'Bretheren [*sic*] and friends.'³⁵ For Hartley, brotherhood, fellowship and friendship were how he wanted to conceptualize what he hoped would be strong ties of mutual trade, assistance and co-operation between the two parts of the world. As dispute turned to war, and a rapid victory failed to materialize, it became clearer that Britain's recalcitrant children in America were not going to be returned quickly to their duty of obedience. With British defeats such as those at Saratoga in 1777 and Yorktown in 1781, the likelihood that America might end up outside the nuclear family of the worldwide British community only increased. However, Americans could still be the 'friends' that Hartley wanted them to be, and become 'worthy and respectable allies'. As first Britain's traditional French and Spanish Catholic enemies entered the war, and then her supposed friends the Protestant Dutch, many saw this Anglo-American friendship as essential to the survival of the British.³⁶

³³ Dickson, *Sermons on the following subjects. I. The advantages of national repentance. II. The ruinous effects of civil war. III. The coming of the Son of man, IV. The Hope of Meeting, Knowing, and rejoicing with virtuous Friends, in a future World.*, (Belfast, [1778?]), pp. 40 & 48.

³⁴ *The Miseries of Dissention and Civil War, An Ode.* [London?, 1780], p. 43.

In the eighteenth century, friendship could involve a close or distant relation, a patron, client or sponsor, or indeed anyone attached by warm affection, and was 'the larger institution under which kinship was subsumed'.³⁷ As a category, therefore, it was both broader and more general than simply family, and could both build on familial rhetoric, and also express a new, and renegotiated, relationship. As a way of providing a satisfactory ending to the civil war, it also played on both the common origins of the two peoples, and the use of the word as an antonym of 'enemy'.³⁸ As one anonymous political writer noted:

The English Nation has hitherto divided the whole world into two classes only, viz. Foreigners, who are always supposed to be, at bottom, enemies; and Englishmen, who are always supposed to be, at bottom, friends to England.³⁹

This had created a dilemma in how to regard the rebellious Americans, since they were not yet entirely foreigners, but nor were they exactly Englishmen anymore. Americans were largely descended from Englishmen, they called themselves Englishmen, they called Englishmen brothers, they spoke English, and had broadly similar laws, religions and customs, but even so they could no longer be regarded as fellow citizens. Their nationality was somehow overridden geographically by being removed from England itself.⁴⁰ Similarly, when large numbers of colonial loyalists transferred to London during and after the war and tried to fit into British society they found their own sense of identity under attack. Having previously seen no

³⁵ Letter from [David Hartley] to Benjamin Franklin, dated 22nd July 1775. William B. Willcox, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XXII, March 23, 1775, through October 27, 1776, (New Haven & London, 1982), p. 129.

³⁶ *An Address to the Rulers of the State*, p. 21.

³⁷ Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), pp. 64-66. See also: Naomi Tadmor, *Family & Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*, (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 129-131.

³⁸ *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America*, pp. 39 & 57. However, America could also be seen as both a friend and an enemy. [Lord Sheffield], *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*, 2nd ed., (London, 1783), p. 107.

inconsistency in regarding themselves as British-Americans they discovered that the two had become separable concepts - they were now Americans first and British only second.⁴¹

The Privileges Of Manhood

Although the question of maturity was not quite the central dynamic of the use of the family as a means of conceptualizing and framing the conflicts and arguments between Britain and her American colonies as Lester Olson has suggested, it was key to the gendering of America as male.⁴² Additionally, although there were occasions when America was described as an 'ungrateful Son', it was also chiefly opposition political rhetoric that concentrated on the maleness of America, the fact that he had now attained the age of majority, and his consequent entitlement to independence.⁴³ This debate over maturity was thus driven by their rhetoric, and when the American loyalist writer Charles Inglis felt compelled to point out that the '*relation of parent and child ends not, when the latter has arrived to maturity*', he was doing so in response to revolutionary rhetoric (in this case that of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*).⁴⁴

³⁹ Marcellus & Britannicus (Pseuds.), *Letters on the Present Disturbances in Great Britain and her American Provinces*, (London, 1777), p. 17.

⁴⁰ Marcellus & Britannicus, *Letters on the Present Disturbances*, pp. 19-20.

⁴¹ However, their allegiance to the North American colonies did not change their distaste for American independence or shake their fundamental beliefs in their position within the British Community. Mary-Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England: 1774-1789*, (London, 1974), p. 129.

⁴² Lester C. Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Washington, D. C., 1991), pp. 197-199.

⁴³ See, for example: *An Apology for the Times: a Poem, Addressed to the King*, (London, 1778), p. 33.

In the eighteenth century, English law only recognized two ages where children were concerned – infancy and majority. Parents had a duty to maintain their children during their infancy until they came of age when they were twenty-one years old, by which time they would probably have been settled, either by apprenticeship, employment or marriage, and thus having obtained a measure of independence from their mother and father.⁴⁵ The historian David Hume, who was scornful of the war, noted that the colonies could not be coerced, since they were ‘no longer in their infancy’, but this does not necessarily mean they had gone straight from infancy to adulthood.⁴⁶ Increasingly, there was also a social and cultural recognition of intermediate stages in infant development, especially in boys. As James Basker has argued, Samuel Johnson directed part of his writing in the *Rambler* to adolescents (even though he never actually used the word in his own writings).⁴⁷ Traditionally, in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, boys had adopted adult dress from the age they were ‘breeched’ at about seven years of age. However, by the second half of the eighteenth century, the introduction of the skeleton suit that had trousers instead, delayed breeching until about fourteen.⁴⁸ From that age boys could legally get married (albeit with their parents’ permission), and be sentenced to capital punishment in the courts.⁴⁹ This intermediate stage, was also the period when apprenticeships were entered into for boys, often for a period of seven years taking

⁴⁴ [Charles Inglis], *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated, in certain Strictures On a Pamphlet intitled Common Sense*, (Philadelphia, 1776), p. 38.

⁴⁵ *The Laws respecting Women*, pp. 350-352 & 424.

⁴⁶ From: Greig, ed, *The Letters of David Hume*. Quoted in: Delphy I. Fagerstrom, ‘Scottish Opinion and the American Revolution’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XI, no. 2, (April 1954), pp. 258-259.

⁴⁷ According to Basker at least 25 editions of *The Rambler* deal with the subject of adolescence. James Basker, ‘Coming of Age in Johnson’s England: Adolescence in *The Rambler*’, in: Serge Soupai. ed., *Les Ages de la Vie en Grande-Bretagne en XVIIIe Siècle*, (Paris, 1995), pp. 198-199 & 201.

⁴⁸ Female dress changed very little in the same period since they were always regarded as subordinate both as girls and as women. Karin Calvert, ‘Children in American Family Portraiture’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XXXIX, no. 1 (January 1982), pp. 87-113.

⁴⁹ *The Laws respecting Women*, p. 429.

them to the age of majority.⁵⁰ Recognition of adolescence helped to blur the boundaries between boy and man, and introduced the question of maturity. If an adolescent could work, marry and be executed, how then could it be decided when and whether he had attained man's estate? As a lexicographer, Johnson certainly provided no fixed age range for adolescence, the only consistent factor in his definitions being that adolescents were not yet adult.⁵¹

Politically this issue centred around the question of maturity – whether or not America could be said to have grown sufficiently to have earned its independence from the mother country. Within the traditions of 'body politic' metaphors and analogies examined in chapter two it was possible to consider that 'bodies politic as well as bodies natural undergo the *gradus* of youth, age and dissolution...'.⁵² Dr Tucker, whose interests in the colonial relationship were economic, and who argued that trade was more important an issue than subjection or subjugation, wrote the following in 1780:

Colonies while in their infant state, are always humble and modest; and while their very Existence results from, and every Hope is cherished by, the fostering care of the Mother Country, make suitable Returns of Gratitude, Duty, and Affection. But as they rise in Strength, and approach Maturity, they become proud and insolent; impatient even of the equitable Restraints, and incessantly aiming at Emancipation.- And this is but a Picture of what every Day passes in natural Life where the connection is much stronger and more endearing. The Child, advanced to Man's estate, and in Possession of the Means of Subsistence, withdraws from the Authority of his Parent...⁵³

⁵⁰ Georges Lamoine, 'La loi et les âges de la vie', in: Serge Soupal, ed., *Les Ages de la Vie en Grande-Bretagne en XVIIIe Siècle*, (Paris, 1995), pp. 68-70. *The Laws respecting Women*, p. 103.

⁵¹ Basker, 'Coming of Age in Johnson's England', pp. 198-199 & 201.

⁵² *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, (London, 1781), p. 24. See also: *A Letter to Doctor Tucker on his Proposal of a separation between Great Britain and her American Colonies*, (London, 1774), p. 26.

⁵³ [Dr Josiah Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War; Addressed to the Moderate of All Parties*, (London, 1780), pp. 25-26.

However, Tucker's analogy was based on experience and the benefit of hindsight. By 1780, it looked increasingly unlikely that the colonies would be forced back to their former subjection to Britain, and that American Independence could or would be overturned. Indeed, Tucker, had already advocated cutting Britain's losses, withdrawing from the rebellious colonies and concentrating on the country's own position as an independent trading power.⁵⁴ Before 1776, unlike a 'body natural', the actual age of a developing body politic like the American colonies was still open to debate - were they to be regarded as infant, or mature? In 1774, before the outbreak of war, Tucker had compared American rebelliousness to that of adolescent sons 'at the Ages of 14 or 16 Years'.⁵⁵ While even Thomas Paine in his influential tract *Common Sense* wrote of his adopted home as 'a youth, who is nearly out of his time', in other words, as an adolescent not quite having reached adulthood.⁵⁶

The one thing all this rhetoric had in common was that the body politic advancing to maturity was automatically assumed to be male: he advanced to 'Man's' estate and was no longer under the authority of 'his' parent; he was reared to 'manhood'; and was nearly out of 'his' time. The question therefore was not just whether the colonies were to be regarded as infant, or mature, but rather whether America was to be regarded as a boy, a youth, or a man?⁵⁷ Women were always seen as subordinate to a man, whether it was their father or their husband, or even a brother acting *in loco parentis* (although girls were also subordinate to their mothers), and only boys

⁵⁴ Tucker, *A Series of Answers to Certain Popular Objections*. Tucker saw himself as of no particular party and hence as an independent thinker and writer. [Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War*, pp. 6-7. He advises leaving the colonies to themselves on p. 8.

⁵⁵ 'The True Interest of Great-Britain set Forth in Regard to the Colonies; And the only Means of Living in Peace and Harmony with them.' in: Dr Josiah Tucker, *Four Tracts Together with Two Sermons, On Political and Commercial Subjects*, (Gloucester, 1774), p. 159.

⁵⁶ Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*, Gregory Tiertjen, ed., (New York, 1995), p. 36.

⁵⁷ [Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War*, p. 26. Macpherson, *The Rights of Great Britain asserted against the claims of America*, p. 64. Paine, *Common Sense*, p. 36.

therefore could grow up to attain a measure of independence and maturity. There was a cultural emphasis placed on this journey towards 'manhood' from a childhood that was equated with femininity, and expressed in the way a boy's clothes increasingly developed away from being a near copy of his mother's to equality with his father – from petticoats to breeches.⁵⁸ These changes helped to make the concepts of adolescence and maturity visible. For example, the Indian in *A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778* is clothed without the usual feathered skirt in attire that is similar to that of adult male Britons, with shoes, stockings and something approaching breeches. Since the Franco-American treaties signed that month were not yet common knowledge, this image presents a warning, a vision of the future, in which an independent America, takes over British trade together with France, Spain and the Netherlands.

In the early years of the war writers, such as the pro-American Dr Richard Price, looked at the position of the child in society to support their claims that the colonies were entitled to claim their independence from the mother country because they had grown to maturity:

Children, having no property, and being incapable of guiding themselves, the author of nature has committed the care of them to their parents, and subjected them to their absolute authority. But there is a period when, having acquired property, and a capacity of judging for themselves, they become independent agents; and when, for this reason, the authority of their parents ceases, and becomes nothing but the respect and influence due to benefactors. Supposing, therefore, that the order of nature in establishing the relation between parents and children, ought to have been the rule of our conduct to the colonies, we should have been gradually relaxing our authority as they grew up.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Calvert, 'Children in American Family Portraiture', pp. 100-101 & 105.

⁵⁹ Price, *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty*, p. 37.

As Price sets out, the qualifications for manhood were economic independence and self-control, which demonstrated that a youth no longer needed either the support, guidance or discipline of his father. This ensured that they could govern others (and have a successful family life) and could govern themselves (and show sufficient civility to get along with their fellow man).⁶⁰ Maturity was also a necessary requirement for citizenship, so it was important that the colonies, if they were to be successful in their claims to Independence, should be shown figuratively to have acquired it.⁶¹ A claim to maturity also put America past the age when a parent might expect to be able to inflict physical punishment on its offspring, although parents were advised in any case to 'suit the correction to their age as well as fault.'⁶² It is the lack of civility in the behaviour of the wicked sons in *Poor old England* that suggests they should not be regarded as independent men, and the severity of the punishment that shows their father to be a bad parent.

That the Americans were regarded by many as the sons of Englishmen, was consistent with the traditional generational relationship of colony to metropole, and connoted descent, ancestry, and similarity.⁶³ This enabled anti-government writers to argue that Americans were 'the offspring of England; but they are grown up, and claim their portion with the privileges of manhood.'⁶⁴ Although such references concealed the presence of other members of the population of the colonies, such as emigrants from Scotland, Wales, Ireland, France, Germany and the Netherlands, native Indians who had been there in the first place and Africans transported there to

⁶⁰ Kann, *The Gendering of American Politics*, pp. 72-74.

⁶¹ Kann, *The Gendering of American Politics*, p. 90.

⁶² *The Family In-compact, Contrasted with the Family Compact, A Tale, From Real Life*, (London, 1778), p. 18. William Penn, *Fruits of a Father's Love: being the Advice of William Penn to his children, relating to their civil and religious conduct, etc.*, 6th ed., (London, 1778), p. 37.

⁶³ *Considerations upon the French and American War*, p. 7.

work as slaves, they allowed this reality to be simplified and expressed in masculine terms. Conceptualized as male, America was entitled to claim its portion and lead an independent life, but this did not necessarily imply that the opposition in Britain were in any way pre-empting the Declaration of Independence when they used such rhetoric prior to mid-1776, since reconciliation within the male configuration of the 'family quarrel' could be promised by reference to prodigal son imagery.⁶⁵

John Raphael Smith produced a series of six prints depicting the story of the prodigal son in 1775, and Carrington Bowles published a cheaper, imitative version on one sheet the following year that was still being advertised in his 1786 catalogue.⁶⁶ Since parents' duties to their children were complete once they had settled them, the initial scene of these series, whereby the son receives his patrimony, can be regarded as dispensing with the notion of duty between him and his father to some extent. The possibility that equality might pertain to the father-son relationship was also taken up for the first time in a prodigal son series in Smith's *History of the Prodigal Son* (*figures 4.5-4.10*).⁶⁷ The usual pose of submission (with the returning prodigal crouching or kneeling in abasement before his father) in the fifth mezzotint (*figure 4.9*) has been replaced by one that shows them to be much nearer in standing. Here, although the son is depicted as being taller than his father (a height advantage exploited by Smith in the first and second scenes (*figures 4.5 & 4.6*) to suggest a son who believes he has outgrown his father's guardianship) he bows his head penitently

⁶⁴ *An Address to the Rulers of the State*, p. 5.

⁶⁵ The parable of the prodigal son comes from *Luke* 15:11-32.

⁶⁶ *The Parable of the Prodigal Son. St Luke. Chap. XV.*, etching and engraving, plate: 37.5 x 51.6 cm, designs: 17.5 x 16.5 cm. 'Printed for Carington Bowles, at his Map & Print Warehouse, No. 69 in St Pauls Church Yard. Published as the Act directs, 1. Augu. 1776', LWL – 776.8.1.1. Carrington Bowles, *Carrington Bowles's New and Enlarged Catalogue of Useful and Accurate Maps, Charts, and Plans; Curious and entertaining Engraved and Mezzotint Prints, Single or in Sets; including All the Branches of Penmanship: Black-Lines, Letter-File Maps, and Prints, School Pieces, Cards for Schools, &c. &c.*, (London, 1786), p. 113.

thereby bringing their heads to the same level. In the sixth and final print (*figure 4.10*) the two are equals at the family table and the father puts his hand on his son's shoulder in a gesture of friendship.⁶⁸

This story therefore was one that promised reconciliation and the unity of the family rather than its dissipation, which later enabled satirists like Gillray and Rowlandson to use it to question whether such reconciliations between parents and prodigals could ever really be attained in reality.⁶⁹ However, such prodigal son images addressed increasing concerns about the movement of sons to the cities and colonies, while the production of two such series in 1775 and 1776 suggest the extension of these concerns to Anglo-American relations themselves.⁷⁰ As Ellen D'Oench has suggested, these prints probably appealed particularly to the merchant class and landed squirearchy who believed in non-coercive child-rearing but at the same time feared the erosion of filial deference and respect.⁷¹ Prodigal son imagery allowed people who opposed the government's coercive measures against the American colonies in the early years of the war to suggest that the ties between colony and metropole would not necessarily be broken if the former were allowed greater self-governance and decreased British interference. The prodigal son would return to the fold if only the hand of friendship were to be offered by Great Britain.

⁶⁷ Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, p. 69.

⁶⁸ Edwin Wolf 2nd, 'The Prodigal Son in England and America: A Century of Change', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), p. 155. The other unique feature of the series is the melancholic reclining attitude of the penitent son in the fourth scene. Ellen D. D'Oench, 'Copper into Gold': *Prints by John Raphael Smith 1751-1812*, (New Haven & London, 1999), pp. 18-23. See also: Ellen G. D'Oench, 'Prodigal Sons and Fair Penitents: Transformations in Eighteenth-Century Popular Prints', *Art History*, vol. 13, no. 3, (September 1990), pp. 328-329.

⁶⁹ D'Oench, 'Prodigal Sons and Fair Penitents', pp. 323-324. See, for example: James Gillray, *The Reconciliation*, etching with hand colouring, published 20 November 1804 by H. Humphrey, 27 St James's Street, London, 27.4 x 35.6 cm, BM 10283.

⁷⁰ D'Oench, 'Copper into Gold', p. 22.

⁷¹ Prodigal son imagery and stories were particular popular in colonial America. Wolf, 'The Prodigal Son in England and America', 145-174. D'Oench, 'Prodigal Sons and Fair Penitents', p. 324.

Since family and friends were concepts that were familiar to all and everyone had some experience of them, it would have been easy for an audience to identify with their metaphorical usage, while at the same time recognizing references to contemporary events. This familiarity made it easy for writers and artists to elaborate on the basic idea of the 'family quarrel' to produce narratives with other features that were consistent with the basic root metaphor. In satirical prints, this idea of the returning prodigal was referenced in the 1780s, but using the mother-daughter configuration rather than the more usual father-son model.⁷² For example, *The Reconciliation between Britannia and her daughter America* (**figure 4.11**) from 1782 shows one possible outcome to a quarrel – reconciliation. In this image, America is represented as a plump, dark-skinned American Indian prodigal daughter, barefoot, bare-breasted, and wearing a tobacco-leaf skirt and an ostrich-feather headdress. Tucked underneath her arm is a pole with a liberty bonnet on top of it. Britannia, meanwhile wears a long classical style robe and has a spear and shield with the cross of St George. The two rush to embrace one another promising to kiss and make up and let bygones be bygones. The only thing that might prevent this action on America's part is the rope tied around her middle that is being pulled on by personifications representing France and Spain. By this stage of the war it must have been clear that the *status quo* of the British Community was not going to be restored (hence America is allowed to keep hold of the *hasta* and *pileus*), and thus the reconciliation here is more in anticipation of a positive future relationship between the two countries. At the time, separate negotiations between Britain and America (without the other nations involved in the war) were being conducted with a view to

⁷² Prodigal daughter narratives seem to have been popular in Britain in the final decades of the eighteenth century. Ellen D. D'Oench, *Prodigal Son Narratives, 1480-1980*, exh. cat., (New Haven & Middletown, Connecticut, 1995), pp. 16-18 & 37.

keeping American friendship after the war.⁷³ If this image seems to continue the mother-daughter tradition while at the same time presenting the two as friends, then it must be remembered that parents could also exist in an amicable relationship with their children, as shown by the final scene from Smith's *Prodigal Son* series.⁷⁴

Images Of A Male America

As Olson has noted, McClung Fleming's categorization of the 'Indian Princess' omits consideration of those images that represented America as male rather than female.⁷⁵ A number of different views have been presented on the regendering of America, its timing and in particular its causes. While Joan Dolmetsch was content merely to suggest that the masculinization of America occurred in about 1780, David Fischer has interpreted it as a consequence of a series of American victories between the Battle of Trenton on 26th December 1776 and Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown on 18th October 1781, and Olson regarded the most significant factor as the Declaration of Independence on 4th July 1776 and the preparedness of Americans to defend it by force of arms.⁷⁶ Certainly male personifications could justify the representation of aggression and Washington's victories necessitated a re-evaluation

⁷³ Stephen Conway, *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783*, (London, 1995), pp. 229-230 & 235-236.

⁷⁴ Augustus Lovemore, *A Letter from a Father to a Son, on his Marriage*, (London, 1778), pp. 66 & 68.

⁷⁵ E. McClung Fleming, 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, 1965, pp. 65-81. Lester C. Olson, 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian: Race and Gender in Eighteenth-Century British Caricatures', *Imprint*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 13, n. 2.

⁷⁶ Joan Dolmetsch has suggested that this masculinization took place c. 1780. Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation*, p. 18, n. 1. David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas*, (Oxford, 2005), p. 142. Olson, 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian', p. 4. This change has also been noted in: Amelia Rauser, 'Death or Liberty: British Political Prints and the Struggle for Symbols in the American Revolution', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), p. 165.

of the abilities of the Congressional Army, but male representations of America appeared in political satires even before the start of the war in 1775, and the use of the male Indian did not become a common alternative for the female type until late in 1779, a year arguably without significant gains or losses on either side.⁷⁷ The earlier instances came at particular moments of American resistance to British colonial policies (the Stamp Act of 1765, the Townshend Acts of 1767, and the Coercive Acts of 1774) while later male representations probably have more to do with the entry of the European powers to the war from 1778 than anything else. From this point on, the war had to be fought on an increasing number of fronts as France, Spain and the Netherlands entered the War of American Independence in 1778, 1779 and 1780 respectively.

Each of these three European combatants was traditionally depicted during this period as male, and partly therefore America develops pictorially to become more equal with them; it is as if he is tamed and civilized by both his growing independence and increasing association with Europeans. Similarly, greater use of male embodiments of Great Britain is made by artists from 1778 in order to show that Britons are equal to the task of defeating their enemies, and to reflect the realities of the men fighting in the war. However, what seems to have escaped the attention of scholars is not so much the events that caused individual appearances, but the motivation behind this change from the normative female formulation. After all, the male Indian did not merely replace the female, but rather coexisted with it in the final years of the conflict, and this I interpret in terms of the political debate between a government fighting a losing battle, and an opposition led by Charles

⁷⁷ Jeremy Black, *War for America: The Fight for Independence, 1775-1783*, (Stroud, 1998 (1992)), p. 170.

James Fox and Edmund Burke who had used support for the Americans as a means of attacking Lord North's policies.

The earliest appearance of a personification of the North American colonies as an Indian is usually thought to come from the period of the French and Indian War. The 1755 print *Britain's Rights maintaintd: or French Ambition dismantled*. (**figure 4.14**) by Louis Pierre Boitard features a small, dark-skinned boy, with a feathered headdress and skirt, pointing to a map of the colonies from Virginia northwards.⁷⁸ His comparative youth compared to the figure of Britannia standing next to him is emphasized by the fact that he barely comes up to her waist in terms of height. In fact, he seems to be depicted on a different scale to the personifications mentioned in the text above each of them. His appearance is much closer to the figures on tobacco papers advertising the products of the colonies and discussed in chapter three, and he probably has more to do with the nearby emblems in the lower part of the print - the British lion and French cockerel - with whom he engages verbally. His presence as an emblematic symbol of place rather than the personification of a body politic is emphasized by the fact that only the boy, lion and cockerel are associated with speech balloons, while the other personifications such as Britannia, Mars, Neptune and the Genius of France all have their utterances displayed in the row of boxes along the top. For these reasons, I doubt that this is intended to be understood in the same way as the later embodiments of America as the Indian that appear from the Stamp Act crisis onwards.

⁷⁸ For example, this figure is identified as America in: Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation*, p. 18.

In the 1760s I have found only two extant prints that feature a male Indian as a representation of the British colonies in America, both of which may show him as Britannia's protector. The first, *The STATE of the NATION An: Dom. 1765 &c.* (*figure 4.15*), has the Indian standing in front of Britannia and holding up an arm to fend off a sword thrust from George Grenville, who is also being stopped by the Earl of Chatham holding the pole and cap of liberty. The copy of this print in the British Museum is interesting because only the names of the politicians had been written underneath the image showing that the allegorical personifications were already immediately identifiable. The second was a mezzotint from 1768 made in London by the American artist Charles Willson Peale during his time in London as a pupil of the Pennsylvania-born painter Benjamin West, after two copies of paintings he had produced of William Pitt (*figure 4.16*).⁷⁹ The image, which had been commissioned by a group of Virginia planters, depicted Pitt, the Earl of Chatham, as a senatorial defender of British liberty. He is shown wearing Roman dress, holding a scroll of *Magna Charta* in his left hand, and pointing in a rhetorical gesture with his right hand to a statue of Britannia, which has a staff with a cap of liberty in place of her spear. Underneath Britannia, mostly concealed in the shadows, was a male American Indian, holding a bow in his right hand, with a quiver of arrows on his back and his left hand on the shoulder of a dog sitting beside him.

⁷⁹ There are minor differences to the copy of the mezzotint in the collection of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation such as the addition of writing identifying the two seventeenth-century writers as 'Sidney' and 'Hamden', and this may therefore be evidence that it is from a 2nd state. See the letter from Wendy Shadwell of the New York Historical Society to Joan Dolmetsch dated 13th April 1974 in file number: CWF – 1953-747. The print is undated, but is generally accepted to be from 1768. On the basis of the corrected perspective of Whitehall and the profile of Sidney, it seems to be taken more from the second of the two portraits, but Peale did make some changes to minor details that do not appear in either painted version. Eric Langford, *The Allegorical Mr Pitt: A Bicentennial Biography*, [Montross, Virginia, 1976?], p. 71. On the production of the mezzotint, see also: Wendy Shadwell, 'The Portrait Engravings of Charles Willson Peale', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch,

This image shows the complex interplay and exchange of visual imagery at this time, with the likeness of Pitt being taken not from life but from a bust by West's friend the sculptor Joseph Wilton, while some of the allegorical devices from the print, as well as the references to Sidney and Hampden may have been taken from the visual material created in the circle of Thomas Hollis, who was also known to Wilton.⁸⁰ America's unusual position, sitting protectively at the foot of a Britannia trampling on a pro-American petition, together with the presence of the dog as a traditional symbol of loyalty, makes this an atypical image of American loyalty using the male representation.⁸¹ However, if the Britannia statue is interpreted more as a liberty figure since her shield with the union flag (as well as her act of trampling the petition) is placed in the shadows resulting in greater visual emphasis being placed on the *hasta* and *pileus*, then it might be regarded as appropriate as a vision of the colonies as the true loyal protector-defender of British liberties. In the words of the print's title, America is *Worthy of Liberty*, just as *Mr Pitt scorns to invade the Liberties of other People*. Peale had been involved in political campaigns against the Stamp Act in Maryland, and was not only sympathetic with the subject of the

ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), pp. 126-128.

⁸⁰ Lillian B. Miller (1923-1997), & Sidney Hart, eds., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume 5. The Autobiography of Charles Willson Peale*, David C. Ward, senior associate ed., Lauren E. Brown, ed. assistant, Sara C. Hale, ed. assistant, (New Haven & London, 2000), n. 80, p. 34. Charles Coleman Sellers, 'Charles Willson Peale as Sculptor', *American Art Journal*, vol. II, no. 2, (Fall 1970), p. 5. Lillian B. Miller, ed., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume 1. Charles Willson Peale. artist in revolutionary America, 1735-1791*, Sidney Hart, assistant ed., Toby A. Appel, research historian, (New Haven & London, 1983), n. 3, p. 77. On Hollis and Wilton, see: David Wilson, 'A bust of Thomas Hollis by Joseph Wilton RA: Sitter and artist revisited', *The British Art Journal*, vol. V, no. 3, (Winter 2004), pp. 4-26. On Thomas Hollis and the arts, see: Frank H. Sommer, 'Thomas Hollis and the Arts of Dissent', in: John D. Morse, ed., *Prints in and of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 111-160.

⁸¹ The presence of the dog, may also serve to demonstrate that open hostilities between Britain and her colonies were unlikely as yet, since it was noted that a native American leaves his dog at home when he is going to war. William Burke, *Storia degli Stabilimenti Europei in America*, (Venice, 1969), vol. I, p. vii. Cited in: Jules Prown, 'Charles Willson Peale in London', in: Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward, eds., *New Perspectives on Charles Willson Peale: A 250th Anniversary Celebration*, (Philadelphia, 1991), p. 40.

commission, but probably also forced to rely on such subtle means of expression as an American artist studying in London.⁸²

Otherwise, the male Indian figure does not enter the print record in earnest until about 1779-1780. There is an Indian in *The Whitehall Pump* (**figure 4.17**) - published as an illustration in *The Westminster Magazine* for April 1774 - that may be male although he is mostly obscured by the body of Britannia lying on top of him. He seems to have the same shaved head as seen in *A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778*, and therefore it is presumably also a male Indian in the earlier print. Apart from another male Indian normally attributed to 1774 and said to represent America, its sex then reverts to the more usual female until the aforementioned *A Picturesque View* from early 1778.⁸³ Thereafter male and female Americas both make appearances in satirical prints, although the former comes in many different guises. America is a male youth who appears to be paying too much attention to the French cockerel on his right shoulder in a print published in the August 1778 edition of *The London Magazine* (**figure 4.18**) defending the failure of Admiral Keppel to defeat the French fleet that summer. As the title of the August 1779 print *THE HORSE AMERICA, throwing his Master* (**figure 4.19**) makes clear, it is a stallion that is bucking to get rid of its rider in the form of George III. In December 1779's *Britannia's Ruin*, he is a white man in European dress with a staff and liberty cap, but at around the same time the male Indian reappears and remains until the peace of 1783.

⁸² Prown, 'Charles Willson Peale in London', p. 39. Laura K. Mills, *American Allegorical Prints: Constructing an Identity*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1996), p. 20.

⁸³ G. Terry, *The Parliamt. Dissolved, or, The DEVIL turn'd FORTUNE TELLER*, mixed method engraving, [1774?], 9 3/4" x 6 1/4", BM 5238.

It seems ironical that the arrival of combatants outside the British family allowed for the visual representation of America as a man. As the next chapter will argue, when America remained as female in such European male company she could be regarded as a reluctant or easily influenced ally, or even a possession to be fought over. Masculinization therefore ensured that America could be represented as an active participant in the war, even if (racially) he was not presented as an equal partner, and emblems sometimes made clear his own personal motivation for fighting. In *THE PRESENT STATE OF GREAT BRITAIN* from 1779 (*figure 4.20*), the Indian is attempting to steal the liberty cap from the dozing Englishman, who is only being defended by the kilted Scotsman on his right, looking fierce and seizing the Frenchman by the throat. Again this is an entirely male image of the war, and one that presents the transfer of liberty from England to America in those terms.⁸⁴ Indian women in prints possess the *hasta* and *pileus* as a passively assumed right in keeping with the conventions of representing universal values like liberty as allegorical female figures, while their male counterparts are allowed to actively take part in the process of transfer.⁸⁵ Similarly, it is a male Indian who runs away with Britannia's head and left arm still holding the olive branch of peace in *BRITANIA'S ASSASSINATION, or --- The Republican Amusement* (*figure 4.21*), which was published when separate negotiations to end the war were being conducted between Britain and America. The male representation of the latter is therefore used by artists to show that he can act independently outside of his former place within the family, while the female version always acts by reference to either her mother, or the European powers who seek to usurp that parental position of power.

⁸⁴ Rauser, 'Death or Liberty', pp. 153-154 & 167.

⁸⁵ Marina Warner, *Monuments & Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form*, (London, 1985), p. 12.

Since the male representation connoted maturity, even though this existed in an ambiguous relationship with the progressional racial model that saw native American society as younger than European civilization, artists were forced to produce exceptions to present a male view of the war, but suggest that America could still be forced to remain within the family. Admiral Rodney's capture of St Eustatius on 3rd February 1781 was celebrated in James Gillray's *The Dutchman in the Dumps* (*figure 4.22*). Appropriately for a print about a naval victory Britain is represented by an English tar, who takes the Dutchman's purse while using gin instead of smelling salts to try and bring him back to his senses. A Frenchman and a Spaniard stand nearby, clearly alarmed at the news of the British victory, but the most interesting feature of this print is the representation of America. Although the latter is depicted wearing breeches and a tail coat, he is clearly both smaller and younger than the other countries, with boyish round cheeks and youthful curly hair. The renewed hope of a successful conclusion to the war created by Rodney's successes in the West Indies seems to have revived a view of America as immature, and reopened the possibility that he can be returned to his duty of obedience to the mother country, something emphasized by the contents of his speech balloon: 'America now, / To Old England must bow.'

Similarly, when Rodney's victory at the Battle of the Saints on 12th April 1782 was commemorated by the Jamaican House of Assembly with the 1783 commission of a statue of the Admiral, the island, depicted in colonial seals as a young woman kneeling in submission to the monarch, was represented as a much younger female figure. The work was produced in Britain by John Bacon the Elder and arrived on the island in 1790, when it was erected on the northern edge of the parade ground

that would eventually also be bordered by the House of Assembly, the Governor's residence and the court house. In one of the *bas reliefs* of the pedestal Britannia protects Jamaica from the French (*figure 4.23*), where the island is personified by a female youth, who appears to be an adolescent of about thirteen years old although she has her back to the viewer. Jamaica is shown holding tightly to Britannia's left leg and cowering beneath her raised shield. As Joan Coutu has suggested this statue as a whole presented a clarified and distilled view of the empire that had emerged from the War of American Independence.⁸⁶ Through pose and gender, the colony is shown as being subordinate to the mother country and reliant on her for protection, while Jamaica's youthful appearance adds the suggestion that she is immature, inexperienced and dependent on a position within the British community, as firmly attached to her mother in imperial terms as she is in the *bas relief*.

Conclusion

The rhetoric of the period of the War of American Independence that conceptualized Anglo-American disputes as a family quarrel allowed the colonies to be referred to metaphorically as either female or male. The former represented a normative view that most often supported the claims of the British government that colonies were subordinate to and reliant on them for protection and support, and in turn had duties of obedience and gratitude. In turn, the opposition in Britain were able to support American calls for reduced governmental interference by repositioning the colonies as a mature male member of the family entitled to a measure of independence.

⁸⁶ Joan Coutu, 'The Rodney Monument in Jamaica and an Empire coming of Age', *The Sculpture Journal*, vol. 2, (1998), p. 55.

Imagery related to the biblical notions of prodigalism further enabled some to hope that the Americans would remain closely tied to the mother country after the war. However, the visual record suggests that although such ideas were influential, of greater import to the artistic gendering of America was the entry of the European powers to the war from 1778.

France, Spain and the Netherlands could not be conceptualized as part of the family, they were outsiders, and although the latter had traditionally been regarded as a friend, the Bourbon powers were traditional enemies of Great Britain. America was either a passive dupe of these countries, or an active and willing ally, in which case it was cast in the same terms as a hostile, male enemy to lessen the differences between them. That this gender change was not wholesale shows how much disagreement there was among Britons on how to regard the war and America's place within it. Was it a civil war into which France and the others were interfering? Or, was it now a more traditional European style war, in which Britain had increasing numbers of enemies arrayed against her? Answering these questions will form the focus of the next chapter, which examines the effects on the 'family quarrel' of the broadening of the scope of Anglo-American conflict from 1778 onwards.

Chapter 5: The Balance of Power

The twin images *The Colonies Reduced* and *Its Companion* (**figure 2.11**) represent two of the ways by which the relationship between Great Britain and its American colonies could be conceptualized – as body to limb, and as parent to child. If the bottom picture represents the ‘family quarrel’ between the two, then it also draws other European nations into this domestic squabble. The American Indian is being driven into the arms of France, which was how the results of British government policy were described both before and during the War of American Independence.¹ France, protects America with his sword, blinding Britannia in one eye, while Lord Bute, blamed for causing the quarrel, makes ready to stab the mother country in the back, raising her skirts and inviting Spain, and another man with a Maltese Cross on his coat (possibly Austria), to strike home. In the background a Dutchman walks off with one of Britain’s ships, while in the foreground what is usually identified as a rattlesnake seems to be defending America.² Published in *The Political Register* in 1768, the involvement of other countries in the Anglo-American ‘family quarrel’ was then merely a matter of conjecture and anticipation. However, a decade later the signing of two Franco-American treaties in February 1778 brought the first of them into the war.

¹ For America being ‘thrown’ figuratively into the arms of France and Spain, see: Dr Josiah Tucker, ‘The True Interest of Great-Britain Set Forth In Regard to the Colonies; And the only Means of Living in Peace and Harmony with them.’ in: Dr Josiah Tucker, *Four Tracts Together with Two Sermons, On Political and Commercial Subjects*, (Gloucester, 1774), p.203; [*Arguments in favour of recognizing the independence of the United States.*], (? , [1777?]), p.1; *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, (London, 1781), p.12.

² E. McClung Fleming, ‘The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783’, *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, (1965), p.71.

Satirists were faced with a number of issues caused by the entry of France to the conflict. On the one hand it was Britain's traditional enemy across the Channel, and therefore ought to have been America's enemy as well though the treaties of alliance and trade suggested otherwise. On the other hand, although it was obviously not part of the British community imagined as a global family, it had entered the war taking the part of Britannia's recalcitrant daughter and a way had to be found to deal with it within the framework of the 'family quarrel'. Then there was the question of whether or not France was fighting on behalf of America, or on behalf of its own interests. As the *Gentleman's Magazine* noted in 1778, France had 'little reason to enter into a foolish quarrel' except as a means of gaining revenge for its defeat in the Seven Years' War.³ Such issues were only complicated further by the subsequent entry of Spain in 1779 and the Netherlands in 1780. Towards the end of the war, the effectiveness of the 'family quarrel' metaphor as a conceptual model lessened, and in the 1780s Great Britain and America might still be represented as Britannia and her daughter, but the presence of other combatants in images reveals more about the way the war's balance of power was regarded by contemporaries.

If we see these nations as personifications with all the social implications that this implies - neighbours, friends, enemies and relations - then it is possible to regard their actions in terms of narratives containing metaphorically consistent features.⁴ Such narratives, based on the basic concept of the 'family quarrel', changed and

³ 'Domestic Intelligence', *The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment*, vol. X, (1778), p. 555.

⁴ George Lakoff, 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 1 of 2)', *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 3, (November, 1991). Available on line at: http://lists.village.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/ScholarlyLakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html. (unpaginated). V. W. Turner, *Dramas, fields and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*, (Ithaca, New York, 1974). Mark Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*, (Christchurch, New Zealand, 2000), p. 20. George Lakoff, 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor', in: David E. Leary, ed., *Metaphors in the History of Psychology*, (Cambridge, 1990), p. 243.

developed in response to experience and were fitted into a scenario that had a coherent internal structure formed from contemporary events. These may not have been synchronous with those events, but rather created retrospectively, as their impact and importance were assimilated. However, eventually the tension created by the addition of ever greater numbers of enemies to such conceptualizations created an instability in these extended narratives of the 'family quarrel' metaphor. The entry of the Spanish to the war in 1779 created a conceptual crisis that eventually ruptured this particular trope leading to its replacement in the 1780s by another that allowed for consideration of all the combatants via a different metaphor – that of the balance of power – revealing a shift in the way that the war and its participants was understood, and further removing the Americans from consideration within the British body politic.

This chapter therefore examines the effects on images employing 'family quarrel' metaphor of France's entry to the war, and shows how its intervention could be conceptualized in terms of the seduction and then abduction of Britannia's daughter, leading to a view of the Franco-American alliance of 1778 as a kind of marriage. At the same time, fears of a Catholic invasion in 1778 and 1779 led to concerns about the fitness of Great Britain to defend itself from French and Spanish attack, which in turn assisted in the masculinization of the war. This period forms a turning point between two metaphorical representations, which invoked the 'family quarrel' and the 'balance of power' between the various warring nations, the latter of which was used by artists to reassure Britons that its armed forces would be able to overcome their enemies. This in turn shows how the War of American Independence came to

be thought of as a conflict to be fought by reference to traditional European balance-of-power politics, rather than as just a civil war.

The Bourbon Family And the Quarrel Between *Britania And Her Daughter*

This opening of new fronts against other European nations in the summers of 1778 (France) and 1779 (Spain), who both had imperial interests in the Americas, did not end the concept of the 'family quarrel'. In May 1779, the potter Josiah Wedgwood was still discussing the 'the relations of *parent* and *child* as applied to Britain and America' with the philosopher and radical William Godwin.⁵ The satirical ballad print *Britania And Her Daughter* (**figure 3.11**) published on 8th March 1780, with its image, speech balloons and accompanying song, similarly represents the American War of Independence as a family quarrel, this time including France and Spain as America's lovers, who have seduced her away from her proper allegiance to her mother and are ready to fight Britannia to defend their joint paramour. On one level, it is simply a call for a return to the *status quo*, expressing the hope that the French and Spanish will be made to pay for interfering in the war, and that America will return to its proper place within the British community. While not being explicitly pro-government it is at least favourable to the British prosecution of the War, its sense of bravado assisted by the fact that the threat of invasion had diminished considerably since none had materialized the previous summer. However, on another level it shows how the greater threat to Great Britain's international interests

⁵ Letter from Josiah Wedgwood to Thomas Bentley dated 9th May 1779. Ann Finer and George Savage, eds., *The Selected Letters of Josiah Wedgwood*, (London, 1965), p. 232.

was now thought to come from France and Spain, rather than from American rebellion.

The addition of the helmet to the iconography of Britannia reinforces her military preparedness to take on three enemies. She is now dressed partly as a classical soldier, and since allegorical prints often 'invoked the past in order to glorify the present', a connection between the British and Roman Empires is probably intended.⁶ Following the publication of the first volume of Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* in 1776, there was much contemporary debate on the reasons for the fall of Rome and parallels drawn between contemporary events and those of the past.⁷ After they had met in Paris in 1777, it was suggested that Benjamin Franklin had implied Gibbon would soon be writing about the decline and fall of the British Empire, while Charles James Fox's copy of the second volume published in 1781 was annotated with a verse that began: 'King George in a fright / Lest Gibbon should write / The story of Britain's disgrace...'.⁸

In his essay 'Of National Characters', David Hume suggested that national character was created by morality, and that it could be understood through a representative sample of its individuals. He noted that:

⁶ Laura K. Mills, *American Allegorical Prints: Constructing an Identity*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1996), p. 6.

⁷ See for example: *A Letter to Doctor Tucker on his Proposal of a separation between Great Britain and her American Colonies*, (London, 1774), p. 27. *Unity and Public Spirit recommended in an Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster, to which are added two odes: viz. The Miseries of dissension and civil war, and The True Patriot, inscribed to Earl Cornwallis, and Sir George Brydges Rodney, Bart.* (London, [1780]), p. 2. Thomas Day, *Reflexions upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p. 19. Gibbon possibly intended such references in his work. Joseph War Swain, *Edward Gibbon The Historian*, (New York and London, 1966), pp. 126-7.

⁸ Swain, *Edward Gibbon The Historian*, p. 83. J. G. A. Pocock, 'Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* and the World View of the Late Enlightenment', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, (Spring 1977), n. 15 on p. 294.

If a state consists altogether of merchants, such as HOLLAND, their uniform way of life will fix their character. If it consists chiefly of nobles and landed gentry, like GERMANY, France, and SPAIN, the same effect follows.⁹

The standard stereotyped visual representations of these nations in satirical prints seem to have followed the same line of thought; Holland was represented by a merchant, France by an aristocrat, and Spain by a courtier. Hume claimed that the British, as individuals, were more mixed than others and therefore had the least fixed national character, which partly explains why prints used not only Britannia, but also George III, the British tar, John Bull and the lion to embody different aspects of the home nation.¹⁰ In *Britania And Her Daughter*, Spain is shown as a Spanish-Don type, his feathered hat, breeches and cloak confirming the traditional view of the country as old-fashioned and living off the glories of the previous century.¹¹ France, however, is represented by a well-dressed man in fashionable attire, an image derived from the *petit-mâîtres* of London with their assumed exaggerated airs, and ideas above their station, something that was readily applied to the British view of the French state as a whole.¹² Interestingly, while all three European powers have similarly sized shields, Britannia's weapon, the spear, has a longer reach than her rivals' swords.

Between France and Spain stands America, represented as an American Indian woman, holding a scalping knife and tomahawk. Her clothes suggest an attempt has been made to depict her in classical-style dress, rather than the more usual feathered skirt. The three ostrich feathers in her head-dress probably refer to the traditional

⁹ 'Of National Characters', Essay XXIV, in: David Hume, *Essays and treatises on several subjects*. New edition, (London, 1758), p. 124.

¹⁰ Hume, 'Of National Characters', p. 124.

¹¹ Herbert M. Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth. A Study of the Ideographic Representation of Politics*, (Oxford, 1974), pp. 87-88.

rivalry between Hanoverian monarchs and Princes of Wales, thereby confirming that a state of intergenerational familial conflict persists between America and Britannia. The wearing of such feathers was a contemporary British fashion condemned by some, not for its appearance, but instead for its immorality, which supports a view that this print may be more critical of her than her mother.¹³ Although the use of a feathered head-dress is consistent with the traditional representation of America as a native Indian, I think that she should be understood here as a formerly child-like and savage country trying to imitate or ape European ways.

Yet, there is nothing in the image to suggest anything except a stand-off between Britain on one side, and Spain, America and France on the other. Only the text tells us of the relationships between the four countries and presents Britannia and America as mother and daughter, and only the words explicitly engage with 'family quarrel' metaphor and suggest a rationale for the scene portrayed. By the time this print had been published, Britain had been at war with all three for more than half a year. The entry of Spain and France to what had been considered a civil war had widened the conflict, but also clarified it for many people, since they were able to direct hostility at two long-standing enemies.¹⁴ Hence, the speech balloons make it clear that Britannia believes America is only kept from her proper allegiance to the mother country by French and Spanish interference. Spain announces that he will soon have America wearing a chastity belt, implying a desire to control access to her fertility, while America says that she is prepared to join her new allies in trying to slit her mother's throat. Meanwhile, France looks forward to a wedding dinner of roast

¹² Atherton, *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth*, pp. 85-87.

¹³ M. D. George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vol. V, (London, 1970-1954), p.237.

¹⁴ Dror Wahrman, 'The English Problem of Identity in the American Revolution', *American Historical Review*, vol. 106, no. 4, (October 2001), p. 1262.

John Bull, and therefore is inserted into the quarrel here, not just as a suitor to America, but as a prospective bridegroom.

The ballad beneath the image is to the tune of *Derry Down*, and suggests a narrative for the involvement of the two Bourbon powers. The first verse reads:

Miss America North, so News-paper reports:
With her Mother-Britannia one day had some words,
When behold Monsieur Louis avanc'd a new whim,
That she should leave her Mother for to live with him.

Here, we notice that the idea of a family quarrel is established in the story and further developed by having France trying to seduce America away from her mother. Although America consents to run away with France in the second verse, this would actually have been understood by contemporaries as the abduction of an heiress.

The depiction of France as an aggressive sexual male was not a new satirical construction. Invasion can be described metaphorically as rape and Nathaniel Parr's 1742 print *French Pacification or the Queen of Hungary Stript* (*figure 5.1*) shows the use of this sexualized metaphor in the context of an earlier conflict over territory. As Adam Fergusson noted in his *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*: 'Among nations, the act of the sovereign, or of those employed by the sovereign, is considered as the act of the nation' and accordingly the French here are represented by Cardinal Fleury, the principal director of Louis XIV's foreign policy, while the Austrian empire is represented by Queen Maria Theresa, just as George III would later stand in for Britannia in *The Belligerent Plenipo's* of 1782 (*figure 4.13*).¹⁵ In what is a particularly shocking move for a supposedly celibate man, the Cardinal makes a grab

¹⁵ Adam Fergusson, *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*, (Edinburgh, 1769), p. 229.

for the low countries while the Austrian queen tries to protect them.¹⁶ She is depicted in the *Venus pudica* pose of the Medici Venus, while around her, her clothes are carried off by Naples, Spain in the form of Don Diego, Emperor Charles VII the Elector of Bavaria, Frederick Augustus II the Elector of Saxony (acting here for Poland), and Prussia. Each item of clothing represents a piece of Austrian territory; Maria Theresa's stockings are Parma, her shoes are Milan, her shift is Bohemia, her petticoat is Moravia, and her gown is Silesia. The provinces that make up an empire are here visualized as clothes, and their removal as invasion and conquest.

Similarly, France's attempt to remove Britannia's toga in 1775's *Bunkers Hill, or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels* (*figure 3.2*) must be interpreted as his intention to gain territorial compensation for the loss of Canada in the Seven Years' War.¹⁷ This print represents the first real battle of the war, which took place near Boston, Massachusetts on 17 June 1775, as a family dispute, with Britannia preparing to plunge her spear into America. Lord Bute, in his Scots cap and tartan waistcoat, points to this figure as if to claim responsibility for her taking up arms. His other arm is around the shoulder of Lord North, the First Lord of the Treasury, under whose leadership the war was begun, and who therefore points to Britannia since he is responsible for Britain taking up arms. To their right sits the Chief Justice, the Scots-born Lord Mansfield, holding a large book that is also partially supported by a demon. Spain, in a slashed doublet and jacket, stands astride two globes representing the new world of the Americas and the old world of Europe. He pierces Britannia's

¹⁶ Michael Duffy, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: The Englishman and the Foreigner*, (Cambridge, 1986), p. 140.

¹⁷ Many Britons felt that securing Canada in 1763 had allowed Americans to rebel because it had removed their need for British protection from France. *An Unconnected Whig's Address to the Public upon the Present Civil War, the State of Public Affairs, and the Real Course of the National*

shield, bearing the union flag, with his sword, while the fashionably dressed France runs her through the heart.

The implication at this early stage of the war was that France and Spain were controlling the conflict in order to step in and take possession of whatever they could. France was Britain's major religious, martial, commercial and imperial rival in this century, and almost as soon as hostilities had broken out between mother country and colonies, France and to a lesser extent Spain had been introduced into the general debate on the war, and their involvement much anticipated.¹⁸ Initially, it had been suggested that France or Spain would take possession of, rather than ally with, the American Colonies, since they could not risk the precedent of recognizing the independence of colonies as that might incite similar rebellions in their own dominions.¹⁹ Furthermore, their Catholicism and despotic governments seemed to rule out any possibility of Americans seeking help from them. However, long before the Franco-American alliance in February 1778, both France directly and Spain indirectly had given America financial aid.²⁰

Calamities, (London, 1777), p.54. See also: [William Pulteney], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, (London, 1778), pp. 128-9.

¹⁸ *John the Painter's Ghost: How he appeared on the night of his Execution to Lord Temple; and how his Lordship did communicate the same at full court, to the astonishment of all present, now partially, and circumstantially related*, (London, 1777), p.17.

¹⁹ Tucker, 'The True Interest of Great-Britain Set Forth In Regard to the Colonies', p.202. *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, p.19. See also: Solomon Lutnick, *The American Revolution and the British Press: 1775-1783*, (Columbia, Missouri, 1967), pp. 209-210. Fear for its own American possessions led to Spain's delayed entry to the war, and explained that fact that it did so as an ally of France not America. John Lynch, *Bourbon Spain, 1700-1808*, (Oxford, 1989), pp. 319-320. Anthony H. Hull, *Charles III and the Revival of Spain*, (Washington D.C., 1981), pp. 245-246.

²⁰ The French assisted the Americans through a private company set up under Caron de Beaumarchais, and allowed American privateers to use French ports. Spain, though more reluctant to give direct aid to the Americans, did so indirectly by depositing a million *livres* in the French Treasury in August 1776. This money was promptly issued to Beaumarchais by Louis XVI's leading minister, the comte de Vergennes, who controlled French foreign policy 1774-1784. Hull, *Charles III and the Revival of Spain*, pp. 246-247 & 253.

In *Britania and her Daughter*, France is constructed principally in terms of a very particular type of man, the effeminate fop, which makes it particularly suitable for inclusion in the 'family quarrel' metaphor as a dangerous outsider - a seducer and abductor. There is a certain amount of ambiguity in this construction since criticism is also being directed at the British upper classes who favoured France and French fashions and could be attacked for allowing themselves to be corrupted by them.²¹ The print *My Lord Tip-Toe. Just Arrived from Monkey Land* (**figure 5.2**), shows a thin, richly dressed mincing British Aristocrat newly arrived from, and corrupted by, France. His thinness suggests that his diet has more of the French *soupe maigre* or *fricasee* to it than good British roast beef. The *Nivernois* hat he carries in his left hand is the height of fashion, and the bunched hair at the back of his neck is a distinguishing feature of eighteenth-century macaronis. France was a place where fine clothes were almost the national vice, and was also the up-to-date enemy, unlike Spain, which was seen (and represented) as a country that was living in the past.²²

Fops like *Lord Tip-Toe* or the character of Mr Lovel in Fanny Burney's novel *Evelina*, sprinkled their conversation with *bon mots* and French epithets, and were satirized for it in prints, novels and plays such as David Garrick's popular patriotic farce *Bon Ton* of 1775.²³ Foppish fashion was also specifically linked with lewd and

²¹ *The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment*, vol. XI, (1779), p. 460. John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1997), pp. 82-84.

²² Dr Josiah Tucker, *Cui bono?, or, An inquiry. what benefits can arise either to the English or the Americans, the French, Spaniards, or Dutch, from the greatest victories, or successes, in the present war, being a series of letters, addressed to Monsieur Necker, late controller general of the finances of France*, (Gloucester, 1781), p. 17. Dr Josiah Tucker, *A Brief Essay on the Advantages & Disadvantages which Respectively Attend France and Great-Britain, with regard to Trade*. (Dublin, 1787), p.33.

²³ Frances Burney, *Evelina*, introduction by Margaret Anne Doody, (London, 1994), vol. 1, p. 123. Richard Bevis, *English Drama: Restoration and Eighteenth Century, 1660-1789*, (London & New York, 1988), p. 231.

seductive behaviour, and French culture with coquetry and infidelity.²⁴ France was described as a country where 'gallantry' was the reigning and ruling passion; gallantry, at the time, being virtually a synonym for seduction.²⁵ In men, such behaviour could also be regarded as effeminate.

Effeminacy was used as a means of defining the boundaries between acceptable and deviant masculine behaviour, and was drawn into political and social debate as an affront to civic humanism, a surrender to private desires and a need to display.²⁶ This heterosexual view of effeminacy resulted in a lack of public virtue, control and adherence to duty, and was believed to be caused by spending too much time in female society, paying too much attention to women, as well as being too preoccupied with luxury and refinement, both originating in France.²⁷ The formation of the Anti-Gallican Society in London in the 1750s reminds us that an eighteenth-century culture existed that promoted British masculine virtues in opposition to French luxuries. Hence, both the vanity of the fop and his propensity for luxury, refinement, fashion and seduction were seen as effeminate. The traditional representation of France as the effeminate fop therefore combined a criticism of certain kinds of British behaviour with a reminder of the source of that corruption - the enemy waiting to take advantage of a people led by men who had themselves

²⁴ 'Memoirs of a Young Man of Fashion', *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVII, (1778), pp. 20-22.

²⁵ See for example: 'On the Character and Manners of the French Nation Compared with the English', (Letter IV), *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVII, (1778), p. 486. See also: Marlene LeGates, 'The Cult of Womanhood in Eighteenth-Century Thought', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, (Fall 1976), pp. 32-32. For gallantry as a synonym for seduction, see: *The Progress of Gallantry; A Poetical Essay. In Three Cantos*, (London, 1774), p.21. For gallantry as a particular criticism of the moral and sexual conduct of the upper classes during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, see: Donna T. Andrews, "'Adultery à-la-Mode': Privilege, the Law and Attitudes to Adultery 1770-1809", *History*, vol. 82, no. 265, (January 1997), pp. 13-14.

²⁶ Philip Carter, 'Men about town: representations of foppery and masculinity in early eighteenth-century urban society', in: Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, eds., *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, (London and New York, 1997), pp. 40 & 56.

²⁷ Carter, 'Men about town', pp. 35 & 44.

been unmanned. At the same time this allowed for a strong contrast with British manliness, which was often said to be lacking at this period, as in Elizabeth Griffith's 1779 play *The Times*, where the character Sir William Woodley lamented that no real men had been born in the last thirty years, just macaronis.²⁸ Since seduction was considered a form of effeminacy, a France represented as an effeminate fop in *Britania And Her Daughter* could be seen as a suitor for (or seducer of) America, and there were certainly those who felt in 1777 that France would court her if Britain did not bring the war to a swift conclusion.²⁹

The introduction of a sexual connotation to the 'family quarrel' conceptualization with the expansion of the war disguised its political causes and stressed the need instead for national moral reformation.³⁰ It is probably no coincidence that 1779 saw an attempt by the Bishop of Llandaff to have a law passed against adultery in an attempt to improve the moral constitution and health of the British body politic.³¹ Metaphorically speaking the domains of love and seduction on the one hand and war and empire building on the other are all closely linked, thereby allowing reciprocal conceptualizations whereby each can be thought of in terms of the other. *The London Magazine* noted in 1779 that women: 'wait impatiently for an attack; and you wish to be attacked with vigour, that it may be in your own power either to hold

²⁸ Stephen Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, (Oxford, 2000), pp. 89-90. Elizabeth Griffith, *The Times*, in: Melinda Finberg, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Women Dramatists*, (Oxford, 2001), Act III Scene 1, p. 162. Concerns about gender roles and in particular manliness were a common feature of eighteenth-century conflicts, as pointed out in: Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven & London, 2004), p. 242.

²⁹ [Arguments in favour of recognizing the independence of the United States.], p. 1.

³⁰ Something similar has been noted in connection with the advent of the French Revolution by: Andrews, "Adultery à-la-Mode", p. 17.

³¹ *The London Magazine, or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVIII, (1779), p.225.

the besieger at defiance or to surrender at will.³² Different vocabularies and jargons belonged to different types of suitors, but those compatible with metaphors of love and war belonged in particular, as Amanda Vickery has suggested, to rakes who were wont to fund their extravagances by marrying heiresses and widows for their money.³³

Family Alliances and the Family Quarrel

Marriages can be regarded as alliances, in which case seduction might be regarded as the formation of alliances. At a time when there was still hope of a reconciliation with America, France had to be cast as the villain in the narrative of Anglo-American relations, and hence as a seducer. After the signing of the alliance at the beginning of 1778, I would argue that France was recast as an abductor. This had the advantage of retrospectively absorbing the France-as-seducer scenario, by redefining it as a false courtship concealing an intent to abduct America. As Sharon Block has noted, in late eighteenth-century print culture, seduction narratives could express the dangers of a lack of discipline and morality, but rape narratives allowed for a greater focus on political enemies.³⁴ The abduction or theft of a daughter was feared as her property became her husband's after their marriage, and she took his social

³² The letter is from John Buncle Junior. 'An Entertaining Conversation in Stow Gardens', *The London Magazine, or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVIII, (1779), p. 116.

³³ Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*, (New Haven & London, 1998), p. 45. For a visual example, see: William Hogarth, *The Rake's Progress, Plate 5, first state, Married to an Old Maid*, etching and engraving, 1735, 31.6 x 39.1 cm, British Museum.

³⁴ Sharon Block, 'Rape Without Women: Print Culture and the Politicization of Rape, 1765-1815', *The Journal of American History*, vol. 89, no 3, (December 2002), p. 858.

position.³⁵ Since America was sometimes described as the heiress of England, we can see how France might be inserted into the metaphorical narrative as an abductor - taking over the American colonies would compensate him for the territorial and financial costs of defeat in the Seven Years War.³⁶

Eighteenth-century discourse on abduction cuts across a number of other discourses on subjects such as the law, masquerades, and marriage, each of which was consistent with the narrative of *Britannia And Her Daughter*. Legally, the male abductor was always held to be responsible, and force or compulsion to have been used, even where this was not the case. Furthermore, under British law, a parent was justified in committing assault and battery in defence of the person of their child. Hence, this metaphorical construction legitimated retaliation, and allowed anger to be directed entirely at France-the-abductor, whether or not America-the-heiress was seen as innocent.³⁷ Eighteenth-century literature was full of accounts of men attending masquerades in disguise who abducted wives and daughters in order to seduce and rape them.³⁸ With hindsight, the French were later described as having disguised their real intentions to the rest of Europe after 1775, while 1778 was the point at which France finally threw off its 'mask with respect to America'.³⁹

³⁵ *The Laws respecting Women, as they regard their natural rights, or their connections and conduct; also, the obligations of parent and child, and the condition of minors, etc.. In Four Books*, (London, 1777), p. 149.

³⁶ *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, p. 23.

³⁷ *The Laws respecting Women*, pp. 53 & 357.

³⁸ See the introduction to: Finberg, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Women Dramatists*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. See also: Patricia Meyer Spacks, 'Ev'ry Woman is at Heart a Rake', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, (Fall 1974), pp. 39 & 45-46.

³⁹ *The London Magazine, or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVIII, (1779), p. 582. Charlotte Cowley, *The Ladies History of England; from the Descent of Julius Caesar to the Summer of 1780*, (London, 1780), p. 670. For the proliferation of concerns surrounding disguise and identity during the war see: Wahrman, 'The English Problem of Identity in the American Revolution', pp. 1236-7 & 1246.

The creation and maintenance of political and economic alliances of the aristocracy depended to an extent on marriage, and, since the dominant representations at this time are of a male France and a female America, relations between them could be regarded metaphorically in this way.⁴⁰ A rebus from May 1778, [*Britannia toe*] *Amer[eye]ca* (**figure 5.3**), metaphorically refers to the Franco-American alliance in such a way. This print was produced as a satire on the commissioners entrusted by Lord North to deliver his conciliatory propositions to the Americans, and hence Britannia is represented holding out an olive branch in her left hand. A translation of the first five lines reads:

My dear Daughter I cannot behold without great pain your headstrong backwardness to return to your Duty in not opposing all the good I long intended for your sole Happiness & being told that you have giv'n your hand to a base and two-faced Frenchman...⁴¹

Here, America is seen as entering into a marriage with France willingly, albeit having been duped into doing so. By describing French arrangement of the alliance as duplicitous, Britons could continue to see America as innocent and to maintain hopes that a reconciliation would eventually be achieved.

Marriage was regarded as a union of bodies as well as of hearts, via the legal expression of religious doctrine from *The Letter of Paul to the Ephesians* (V:31): 'a man shall leave his father and mother and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.'⁴² A wife's body was therefore legally subsumed by that of

⁴⁰ Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), p. 98. *The Laws respecting Women*, p. iv. See also: *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVII, (1778), p. 254. Lawrence Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987*, (Oxford, 1990), p. 6.

⁴¹ Donald H. Cresswell, *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints. A Checklist of 1765-1790 in the Library of Congress*, (Washington D.C., 1975), p. 306.

⁴² [John Essex], *The Young Ladies Conduct: or, Rules for Education Under several Heads; with Instructions upon Dress both before and after Marriage. And Advice to Young Wives*, (London, 1722), p.96. On the 'union of two hearts in love' see: *A Dictionary of Love. Or the Language of Gallantry*,

her husband, and socially she was considered as lost to her own family.⁴³ On 7th December 1778, Lord Stormont, who had been British ambassador to France at the time the Franco-American alliance was signed, told the House of Lords that America should be considered as a part of France rather than as a separate enemy.⁴⁴ Within the parent-child scenario of the ‘family quarrel’, the danger was that once America had ‘given her hand’ to France, she would become a part of a hostile Catholic power. The French would have ownership of her land and wealth, and be accorded her loyalty as of right, since a daughter’s love and duty towards her parents were transferred automatically to her husband after marriage.⁴⁵

Incorporating France within the mother-daughter ‘family quarrel’ enabled the maintenance of figurative consistency since stereotypical views of France were already appropriate to conceptualizing it as a seducer-abductor type. The long anticipation of French involvement in the conflict probably also eased its insertion into the metaphor and merely required the elaboration of an already existent and dominant narrative. However, concerns about the fitness of Britain’s leaders to lead, and her soldiers to fight and to keep France and Spain at bay were particularly acute during the invasion scares of 1778 and 1779. Attention turned from America to Europe, not only to new opponents in the form of old enemies but also within to the condition of Great Britain itself. After all, *A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778* (**figure 4.1**) includes all the opponents Britain faced or

(London, 1787), p. 136. *The New English Bible*, (London & Edinburgh, 1972 (1961, 1970)), p. 914. For the effect on family relations and kinship of this incorporation on marriage, see: Naomi Tadmor, *Family & Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*, (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 133-138.

⁴³ *The Laws respecting Women*, pp. 31, 65 & 148. Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*, p. 61. [Essex], *The Young Ladies Conduct*, p. 101.

⁴⁴ *The London Magazine, or Gentleman’s Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVII, (1778), p. 590.

⁴⁵ Augustus Lovemore, *A Letter from a Father to a Son, on his Marriage*, (London, 1778), p. 50. *A Father’s Advice to his Daughters*, (? , 1776), pp. 19-20.

would face during the war, but, as the title reveals, it is more concerned with the state of the nation itself than international politics.

There appears to be a natural development to the metaphorical description of the relationship between France and America in the narrative set out variously in the text in *Britannia And Her Daughter*. The first verse of the ballad establishes the mother-daughter quarrel and casts French interference as seduction. France's speech balloon refers to a 'Wedding Dinner', while the second verse refers to his abduction of America and the way Spain was brought into the war. The fourth verse relates the failure of Lord North's attempts at achieving a reconciliation between Britain and America, and by the next a state of war exists between the two sides. Yet although the narrative is complete it is not sequential. I believe this is because its plot does not develop in step with contemporary events, but rather as a reaction to them. Instead, events are assimilated retrospectively in a manner consistent with the 'family quarrel' metaphor, just as, in the 1780s, long-predicted French involvement came to be seen as having been inevitable from the very start of the war.⁴⁶

Dates help to situate and order events, but they do not necessarily help to explain the impact of those events on culture and society. The signing of Franco-American treaties of amity and commerce and alliance on 6th February 1778, did not amount to an immediate declaration of war on the part of France. The British government was only informed that France had recognized American independence in March, but were still not aware at that time that a treaty of alliance had also been signed ensuring that France and America would combine forces if France were to be

⁴⁶ *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, p.8. See also: Day, *Reflexions upon the Present State of England*, p. 4.

attacked by Britain. With no immediate declaration of war, there was an initial period where hostilities with France took on an on-again-off-again nature as alternately war and peace were announced throughout the summer of 1778.⁴⁷ Although France's entry into the war was formally announced by royal address in November, the January 1779 edition of *The Town and Country Magazine* could still report that 'no regular declaration of war has been made in Europe on either side'.⁴⁸

Once open warfare between the two European powers had begun, Admiral d'Estaing's failure to take first New York and then Newport, Rhode Island, convinced France that she could no longer continue the war with only American help, and attempts were renewed to get Spain to join the alliance. On 12th April 1779, a Franco-Spanish alliance, the Convention of Aranjuez, was signed renewing the family compact, and was followed on 16th June by what amounted to a Spanish declaration of war on Great Britain. A state of war now effectively existed between Britain and the House of Bourbon.

If Spain's entry to the war did not immediately disrupt the 'family quarrel' metaphor, this was because it took place through the Family Compact and allowed the European enemy to be redefined as a rival family – the house of Bourbon.⁴⁹ In the November 1779 print *The Family Compact* (**figure 5.5**), France and Spain are seen acting as Catholic powers in league with the devil, wearing the triple crown of the papacy and clerical bands. Together, they dance over either a map or a bird's-eye

⁴⁷ Lutnick, *The American Revolution and the British Press*, pp. 140-141.

⁴⁸ 'The State of Europe for January 1779', *The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment*, vol. XI, (1779), p. v. See also p. 107 for rumours of a Spanish decision to join the war on France and America's side at the end of 1778.

⁴⁹ David Hartley, *Letters on the American war. addressed to the right worshipful the mayor and corporation, to the worshipful the wardens and corporation of the Trinity-House, and to the worthy*

view of the American Colonies, including Canada. However, Spain's entry does seem to destabilize the 'family quarrel' metaphor and lessen its effectiveness in conceptualizing events. Since the narrative cannot cope with successive additions of enemies it removes them from consideration within this metaphorical framework. Subsequent prints may still represent Britain and America in the parent-child relationship, but the French Spanish and Dutch become instead an array of individual enemies to be fought in addition, and new metaphors come to be used.

War with France and Spain brought fears of invasion to the mainland in 1778 and 1779, and the speed with which rumours could spread and cause panic suggests that there was little confidence in the armed forces' ability to defend the nation.⁵⁰ Military camps were set up along the routes of possible invasion in the south and east of England, and quickly entered popular culture. Since the threat was present only for part of the year (invaders need favourable winds and available crops for food and fodder, limiting potential invasions to late summer or early autumn) the camps had a 'season' just like the entertainments in London.⁵¹ They were much visited by the nobility and middling sort, and guided tours were even advertised for city dwellers.⁵² They captured the popular imagination aided by their inclusion in entertainments in London such as *The Camp* (first performed on 15th October 1778 at Drury Lane) and *A Trip to Coxheath* (performed at Sadler's Wells in July 1779).

burgesses of the town of Kingston upon Hull. by David Hartley, Esq.; member of Parliameant [sic] for the town of Kingston upon Hull, 7th ed., (London, 1779), Letter 1, p. 1.

⁵⁰ Lutnick, *The American Revolution and the British Press*, pp. 149-155.

⁵¹ In 1778 and 1779, the heightened threat from Europe ensured that camps lasted unusually long at five months duration. J. A. Houlding, *Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795*, (Oxford, 1981), pp. 331-333.

⁵² Gillian Russell, *The Theatres of War: Performance, Politics and Society, 1793-1815*, (Oxford, 1995), pp. 33 ff.

Threat of invasion refocused attention on matters that were much closer to home than the transatlantic Anglo-American relationship, and provided a more traditional and less equivocal enemy in the form of Catholic France. The French, fears about abduction, and the contemporary fashion for masquerades were all associated with military camps in one contemporary satire:

Col'nel Toper intended, a smug masquerade,
Of the French, had we not been wisely afraid,
Who perhaps in disguise in the midst of a dance,
Might prisoners all make us, and take us to France!⁵³

Since masquerades were places where costumes blurred the boundaries between genders, and where members of the opposite sex could meet and associate with greater sexual freedom than otherwise allowed in polite society, it is worth raising the question of which side's soldiers would have been emasculated by engaging in such a dance.

The print *A Trip to Cocks Heath* (*figure 5.6*) (possibly by J. Mortimer) answers this question and is quite explicit in showing the eroticized and sexualized nature of the camps.⁵⁴ Of them all, Coxheath was the most significant, and in 1778 it was three-and-a-half miles long and contained between 15,000 and 17,000 militiamen.⁵⁵ The introduction of France to the war, and the camps associated concerns about military

⁵³ Letter II from Tommy Toothpick in: *The Camp Guide: In a Series of Letters, from Ensign Tommy Toothpick, to Lady Sarah Toothpick, and from Miss Nelly Brisk, to Miss Gadabout*, (London, 1778), p. 5.

⁵⁴ Russell, *The Theatres of War*, p.39.

⁵⁵ George Frederick Raymond, assisted by Alexander Gordon and Hugh Owen [and others], *A new, universal and impartial history of England, from the earliest authentic records, and most genuine historical evidence, to the year 1788. Containing a clear, authentic, candid, accurate, faithful, and circumstantial account of every memorable transaction, interesting event, and remarkable occurrence recorded in the annals of Great Britain*. [London, 1787.] p. 587. 'Domestic Intelligence', *The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment*, vol. XI, (1779), pp. 330 & 387. See also: Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, pp. 120-122. On the history and practicalities of camps in the context of the British army in the eighteenth century, see: Houlding, *Fit For Service*, pp. 323-347. Warley, the next most significant camp, held 11,000 men. J. R. Western, *The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century: The Story of a Political Issue, 1660-1802*, (London & Toronto, 1965), pp. 387-388.

leadership and the capability of the British armed forces to win the war, with wider social issues and notions of national character. In *A Trip to Cocks Heath*, an assortment of people invade the camp with the intention of treating it as a source of amusement. They are led by a woman in a military-style coat riding on the back of a man dressed as an officer. The camp's sole defence is a few phallic cannons, one of which aims down rather than up, and another of which is fondled by three women. It is the female sex that is in control here, having taken over not only the male officer's military dress, but also the direction of operations at Coxheath. That such camps could be described by the *Town and Country Magazine* as places where the sexes vied with one another to make the most military appearance, and as much the fields of Venus as the fields of Mars, shows how they were seen as a site for the battle of the sexes.⁵⁶

In one sense, as Gillian Russell has noted, all the camps did was to bring to the surface concerns held by society in general in the 1770s about the place of women in society, their role in civilizing male behaviour, and the effects on masculinity of association between the two sexes.⁵⁷ Such effeminizing association with women was linked in the British mind with French social practice and cultural influence, which meant that satires could regard potential invasion in more than just military terms.⁵⁸ There were those who claimed, for example, that: 'our present effeminacy and venality are owing in a great measure to the change of manners in the fair sex, and

⁵⁶ *The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment*, vol. X, (1778), pp. 123 & 359.

⁵⁷ Russell, *The Theatres of War*, p.38. The same concerns similarly led to heroines in contemporary drama becoming weaker and gentler. V. C. Clinton-Baddeley, *The Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre After 1660*, (London, 1952), p.76.

⁵⁸ Michèle Cohen, 'Manliness, effeminacy and the French: gender and the construction of national character in eighteenth-century England', in: Tim Hitchcock, and Michèle Cohen, eds., *English Masculinities 1660-1800*, (Harlow, Essex, 1999), pp. 50-57.

the ascendancy they have gained over us.'⁵⁹ When women wore clothes modelled on military uniforms (a fashion said to stem from the wives of aristocratic officers in the militia) and walked with a masculine swagger they seemed to be usurping man's usual place in the world.⁶⁰ The very camps which were supposed to project manliness in order to protect England from effeminizing French influence, were shown in *A Trip to Cocks Heath* to have been overrun by women and an already effete and subdued officer class.

Similarly, the body of the officer, recruit or militiaman could be used to comment on the metaphoric health of the nation's constitution, as well as its fitness to fight a war. Recruitment was a particular concern of the post-1778 period of the war, when mobilization efforts increased dramatically.⁶¹ Bunbury's *Recruits* from January 1780 (*figure 5.7*) shows three different types of recruits, who are being inspected by two officers in front of 'The Old Fortune' (of War) Inn. The appearance of the recruit seems to have been a key factor in determining his suitability. As one contemporary military author noted:

according to the principles of our time we pay no particular attention to moral character, nationality, profession, mental aptitude and so on. Size and external appearance determine our choice... How the lad looks is his chief, in fact his only recommendation.⁶²

⁵⁹ 'Moral & Historical Memoirs', *The London Magazine, or, Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVIII, (1779), p.181.

⁶⁰ Nicholas Penny, ed., *Reynolds*, exh. cat., (London, 1986), p. 289. The role of military costume in contemporary cultural concerns about gender boundaries as highlighted by the war has been noted in: Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self*, pp. 252-253.

⁶¹ Overall it has been suggested that about half a million Britons served in the armed forces between 1775 and 1783, equivalent to about 1 in 7 or 1 in 8 of the available manpower. Stephen Conway, 'British Mobilization in the War of American Independence', *Historical Research*, vol. 72, no. 177, (February 1999), pp. 65-66.

⁶² J. Cogniazzo, *Frey müthige Beytrag zur Geschichte des österreichischen Militairdienstes*, (Frankfurt & Leipzig, 1779), page unknown. Quoted in: Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*, (London, 1987), p. 94.

Men were drawn from a wide variety of backgrounds and classes, as suggested by the range of characters depicted here.⁶³ The first recruit is young, short, overweight, and has a heavy-lidded, slightly stupid expression on his face. He is wearing an apron and possibly therefore intended to represent a craftsman. The next in line has his hands in his pockets, a sour expression, and is somewhat thin and weak, suggesting that his character is probably the same as his body. The light-weight nature of some recruits was commented on in the House of Commons where one politician was reported as having seen ‘a Set of *Things* that were called Soldiers, who really did not weigh as much as their Arms, and their Accoutrements.’⁶⁴ The third prospective soldier could be a veteran of past campaigns, since he appears older and is placed directly beneath the inn sign, which depicts a one-armed, one-eyed, and one-legged soldier with a frothing tankard of ale in his right hand. Since he is the only recruit shown to have some measure of discipline and control over his own body, this print projects an image wherein only a minority of Englishmen are fit for active service. Filling the levy was often of more importance to recruiters than the physical fitness of the men they recruited, which led to concerns in official and officer circles about the ability of the militias to defend Britain.⁶⁵ Contemporary commentators like Lord Orford - who claimed to have dismissed twenty ‘misshapen, underlimbed, distempered’ men - surely exaggerated the unsuitability of recruits, since there could not have been as many cripples, criminals and paupers inducted into the army as some suggested.⁶⁶ However, this does reveal the extent to which

⁶³ Conway, ‘British Mobilization in the War of American Independence’, pp. 58-59. See also: Stephen Conway, ‘“The Great Mischief Complain’d of”: Reflections on the Misconduct of British Soldiers in the Revolutionary War’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XLVII, no. 3, (July 1990), pp. 374-376.

⁶⁴ *St James Chronicle*, 23rd-25th November 1780.

⁶⁵ Western, *The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 249.-254

⁶⁶ WO. 1/1000, Lord Orford, 20 April 1778. Quoted in: Western, *The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 275. Conway, ‘British Mobilization in the War of American Independence’, p. 69.

people were concerned about Britain's ability to continue fighting an escalating war from 1778, and how this could be expressed by means of the unfit male body.

Satires on the camps and recruitment therefore questioned in some respect or other the masculinity of the bodies of men raised and deployed to fight the colonial rebels and save Britain from foreign invasion. In order to counter such anxieties and to reassure, artists began to emphasise the military aspects of Britannia's iconography – the helmet and increased reach of her spear in *Britania And Her Daughter* would be examples of this – or to replace her with a male embodiment.

France, Spain and the Netherlands - *The Balance of Power*

If the entry of Spain intensified concerns related to defence from invasion and stretched (but did not necessarily break) the 'family quarrel' narrative, then two factors allowed for a new conceptual metaphor to take hold and begin to gain dominance - one concerning the balance of power in the war. Firstly, if Admiral Keppel had failed to destroy the French fleet in an engagement off Ushant in July 1778, there at least had been no mainland invasion since. Late in 1779, the whole of the Spanish fleet had abandoned the idea of invading Britain and left Brest for the siege of Gibraltar accompanied by four French ships of the line. Admiral Rodney's relief of the garrison at Gibraltar at the beginning of 1780 ensured that French and Spanish attention remained focused there on the European front, and also provided a major victory for the Royal Navy, restoring confidence and holding out the promise of more to come. There was then a renewed sense of confidence in the British

navy's ability to not only fight a war on several fronts, but also to win it. Secondly, there was the entry of the United Provinces to the war.

Like the French and Spanish, Dutch involvement in Anglo-American conflicts was also anticipated, though to a lesser degree, and in commercial rather than martial terms. In 1768, *The Political Register* had depicted France and Spain as characters in the foreground of events, but the Dutch as acting almost behind the scenes taking over British trade in the background. The United Provinces were a maritime mercantile power with colonies in the Americas and had traditionally been seen as among Britain's 'natural Protestant friends and allies' in Europe, partly for religious reasons and due to the struggles they too had had against Catholic powers, but also because of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of Alliance of 1678, which had brought Britain assistance in, for example, the War of the Austrian Succession.⁶⁷ However, Holland's seeming willingness to supply the American rebels through its own Caribbean colonies meant that they could only be regarded as Britain's 'apparent' friends, and when the government learned that the Dutch had signed a treaty with the Americans in 1778, and also to keep them out of the League of Armed Neutrality, the British declared war on the United Provinces on 20th December 1780.⁶⁸

The Dutch do not appear to have been incorporated rhetorically into the 'family quarrel' in the same way as France and, to a lesser extent, Spain, even though the domains of friendship and family overlapped. Instead, we can see how the

⁶⁷ [Thomas Tod], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence. Shewing The great Advantages that will arise from it to the Manufacturers, the Agriculture, and commercial Interest of Britain And Ireland*, (Edinburgh, 1782), p. 60. Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1989), p. 200.

December 1780 declaration of war was visualized in a print from the following month, which uses scales to represent *The Ballance of Power* (figure 5.8) and shows that even now Britain's enemies cannot match her. Britannia, in classical dress and wielding a short Roman sword labelled 'The Sword of Justice', easily outweighs the combined forces of France, Spain, America and Holland (all of whom are unarmed). The Dutchman, motivated by financial gain, has only just climbed onto the scales, and in doing so loses his money, as well (prophetically) as his colonies of St Eustatius, Saba, St Martin, Demerera and Essequibo. Even though America is shown in a state of melancholia, regretting her actions and acknowledging her punishment as just, she is nevertheless counted as just another of Britain's enemies.

This is how war and politics had traditionally been conducted in Europe, where a series of treaties and alliances ensured that each side in any potential conflict had allies it could call on to counter the threat from rivals.⁶⁹ British involvement in the Continent was partly necessitated from 1714 by the need to protect Hanover, but her ability to make alliances with the Dutch and the Prussians had been of considerable assistance in previous wars. However, Britain had found itself without an alliance at the beginning of the 1770s, at the same time that an unstable international situation had caused concern in Lord North's government over the relative balance of European forces.⁷⁰ Attempts to find an ally intensified after 1778 but failed, which left Britain standing alone against four enemies. Ideally the scales in *The Ballance of Power* ought to be evenly balanced so that, with neither side having the advantage,

⁶⁸ *An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain*, (London, 1778), p. 26.

⁶⁹ David P. Fidler, & Jennifer M. Welsh, eds., *Empire and Community: Edmund Burke's Writings and Speeches on International Relations*, (Oxford & Boulder, Colorado, 1999), p. 42.

⁷⁰ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 525-526.

there was no incentive to go to war. What the artist and others like him chose to show instead was that, despite the numerical imbalance, Britain was still in a position to win.

This idea also appears in the near contemporaneous print *JACK ENGLAND Fighting the Four CONFEDERATES* (*figure 5.9*) (published from 20th January 1781), which expresses the same sort of sentiment as a rhyme that had circulated during the Seven Years' War: 'Two skinny Frenchmen and one Portugee, / One British sailor can beat all three.'⁷¹ Four foes face Britain this time: France in the person of the effete Monsieur Louis Baboon (whose reference to 'Dem Jersey Pills' refers to the recent Battle of Jersey); America as Yanky Doodle (an Indian of unclear sex); Spain as Don Diego; and the Netherlands as the rotund and slightly alarmed Mynheer Frog.⁷² The Frenchman is vomiting, the Spaniard bleeding from one eye, the Indian lying injured on the ground and the Dutch new arrival is overweight, out of condition and has his eyebrows raised in consternation. Only the Englishman seems to have the stomach for a fight, and his bravery is in stark contrast to the Dutch who were commonly seen as cowardly because of their increasing preference for neutrality in international conflicts.⁷³

The navy, which had been neglected and in comparatively poor shape in 1775 had, by 1780, been rebuilt to the extent that it was at least as big as it had been in the

⁷¹ Quoted in: Peter Kemp, *The British Sailor: A Social History of the Lower Deck*, (London, 1970), p. 127.

⁷² The personifications of France, Spain and the Netherlands are derived from: John Arbuthnot, *The History of John Bull. And Poems on Several Occasions by Dr Jonathan Swift, with Several Miscellaneous Pieces by Dr Swift and Mr Pope*, (London, 1750 (1712)), pp. 13-14. It is the Dutch that are frogs in the eighteenth century, not the French. David Bindman, 'How the French became Frogs: English caricature and a national stereotype', *Apollo*, vol. CLVIII, no. 498 (new series) (August 2003), pp. 15-20.

Seven Years' War.⁷⁴ With greater attention to maritime aspects of the war from 1778, Great Britain's naval fighting spirit is represented as Jack England, who can be recognized as a sailor (even though there was no uniform for the ordinary seaman until 1857) by his jacket, neckerchief, white trousers over stockings, straw hat, and buckled shoes.⁷⁵ With his weight evenly balanced, and his right fist clenched, Jack is clearly ready for action as a look of grim determination on his face suggests. Although, the kind of manly, stout-hearted, and brave sailor who was required and fostered by the navy at sea could be a liability on shore since they were prone to getting drunk and fighting, prints tended to ignore their potential threat to social order. Here this potential danger is negotiated through the way the artist has chosen to represent Jack as engaged in the art of boxing or bare-knuckle fighting.⁷⁶ This was considered as one of the 'trials of manhood' (as opposed to those trials of skill that involved weapons), was popular and regarded as being an especially British sport.⁷⁷ As with the militia and the army it was the 'able-bodied' who were sought for the navy, and this time the senior service is represented by someone who is both manly and fit to fight.⁷⁸ In a speech balloon, however, we find that his defiance is qualified by a call to end to internal division: 'Sink me but I cou'd beat them all if our Land Lubbers wou'd but Pull together'. The suggestion is that the country should unite in order to fight Britain's enemies overseas.

⁷³ Similarly, this neutrality was often interpreted as a desire to take advantage of the misfortunes of others for reasons of profit. Duffy, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832*, pp. 28-29.

⁷⁴ Clive Wilkinson, *The British Navy and the State in the Eighteenth Century*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, and Rochester, New York, 2004), pp. 209-210 & Appendix 7 on p. 224. Wilkinson has challenged the traditional view that the run down of the navy began immediately after the Seven Years' War. See, for example: Kemp, *The British Sailor*, p. 138. The British failure to mobilize the navy in the early years of the war is dealt with in: David Syrett, *The Royal Navy in European Waters during the American Revolutionary War*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 1998), pp. 1-16.

⁷⁵ Margarette Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750-1815*, (Aldershot, 2002), p. 10.

⁷⁶ Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy*, pp. 3 & 32.

⁷⁷ Elizabeth Einberg, 'Milton, St John, and the importance of 'Bottom': Another look at Hogarth's *March of the Guards to Finchley*', *The British Art Journal*, vol. V, no. 3, (Winter 2004), p. 29.

⁷⁸ Kemp, *The British Sailor*, pp. 97, 145 & 147.

In fact the War of American Independence was unpopular on the lower decks as the 'enemy' (the Americans) were regarded as being of the same blood and the same family as the sailors themselves, and there was some feeling that rebels had right on their side. As *JACK ENGLAND* suggests, something of the old spirit only returned when fighting against France from 1778 onwards.⁷⁹ The same sense of restoration of fighting spirit is present in *Britania And Her Daughter*, which also concentrates on France and Spain as Britain's traditional enemies, who are responsible for America's continued rebellion. The latter print, despite its title, also presents an image related to the balance of power metaphor, since it seems to chiefly depict the text of the sixth verse:

Then with Hatchet and Scalping-knife Miss did advance,
On one side of her Spain, on the other side France;
Britania thus threatned does all three oppose,
And how it will end the Lord above knows.

The remaining text (as well as the title) may refer to the protagonists within the framework of the 'family quarrel' metaphor, but visually Great Britain advances on one side and Spain, America and France on the other. At a time when the odds seemed stacked against Britain, this new conceptual model was used by people such as Edward Gibbon to express their doubts over continuing a war that seemed increasingly difficult to win, as they weighed up the potential gains and losses still to be achieved.⁸⁰ The longer reach of Britannia's spear acts in the same way as her greater weight in *The Ballance of Power* and the fitness and manly fighting stance of *JACK ENGLAND*, in that an image is projected of a Britain well able to stand up to, and even defeat, its combined enemies.

⁷⁹ Kemp, *The British Sailor*, p. 138.

⁸⁰ Letter from Edward Gibbon to John Baker Holroyd dated 25th July 1780. J. E. Norton, ed., *The Letters of Edward Gibbon*, vol. II, (London, 1956), p. 247.

Conclusion

The broadening of the conflict created a turning point for the metaphorical conceptualization of current affairs, disrupted the 'family quarrel' and ultimately allowed for the expulsion of America from the British 'family' of nations. In the process America had to be accepted as enemy rather than disobedient daughter. On 7th December 1778, Lord Suffolk told the House of Lords that, since its alliance with France, America should be regarded as one of Britain's natural enemies.⁸¹ Partly this was visualized through the masculinization of American representations, and partly by placing them in close proximity to personifications of the European powers. Seeing America as just one of a number of enemies also meant that the war could no longer be regarded as just a civil war and instead, despite its geographical scope, it was visualized as a more traditional European conflict. Rather than a transfer of animosity towards a more acceptable enemy across the Channel, the 'audible national sigh of relief' Dror Wahrman has detected arising from this turning point may be related to the shift in conceptualizations from the discomfort of a 'family quarrel' that blurred the boundaries between friend and foe, to a more traditional 'balance of power' that provided a more clear-cut identification of the enemies to be faced.⁸² Probably, this shift in tropes should also be regarded as an important stage in the chronology of the change that has so interested historians from consideration of the Americans as fellow Britons to a view of them as foreigners instead.⁸³

⁸¹ *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLVII, (1778), p. 589. For a suggestion that the Franco-American alliance could not have occurred until the colonists were prepared to regard themselves as Americans rather than Englishmen, see: William C. Stinchcombe, *The American Revolution and the French Revolution*, (Syracuse, New York, 1969), p. 4.

⁸² Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self*, p. 262.

⁸³ For a recent example of this, see: Stephen Conway, 'From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783', in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. LIX, no. 1, (January 2002), see for example: pp. 67 & 100. Conway also sees this turning point in the

With America partially removed from consideration within the 'family quarrel' through the availability of an alternative metaphor, attention was refocused on the homeland, the health and constitution of Great Britain and the internal divisions that many blamed for causing Anglo-American conflict in the first place. After the invasion fears of 1778 and 1779 had subsided, confidence in Britain's ability to fight this multi-fronted war was restored resulting in the beginnings of a militarization and masculinization of British personifications. However, an acknowledgement that the colonies could be or had been lost, led people to ponder on how and why this had happened as well as the possible consequences. One of the ways that artists engaged with these issues was through a return to dismemberment imagery, which will form the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: The Dismemberment Of Britannia

The 'family quarrel' metaphors of the War of American Independence relied upon an idea of the family as a complete unit (albeit made up of individuals) that ought not to be divided among itself. Yet, war was also a time when family members were often separated as the popularity of eighteenth-century ballads and prints on the subject of the sailor's farewell and the sailor's return reminds us.¹ When the radical Thomas Day noted in 1782 that: 'America is now divided from the Parent country', his comment not only implied familial division but also physical separation.² Artists could visualize this separation by showing Great Britain and her colonies as a physical object or animate body and then removing a part of it. The violent nature of the war that caused this removal could further be depicted as an act of biting, cutting, tearing, ripping, slicing, or demolishing. This dismemberment imagery was used to conceptualize a number of dangers to the unity of the object of personification, and also to ascribe blame to the agency of the dismembering.

The disputes between Great Britain and her American colonies had been thought of in terms of a number of enactments on the body from the beginning. The difference between the imagery examined in this chapter and that in my second is the greater emphasis placed on the agents of dismemberment. In the eighteenth century, the Crown, the Church and family patriarchy all variously made claims on the body. While the Crown administered justice and organized military service, the Church was concerned with baptism, marriage, burial, resurrection and exorcism, and the

¹ Charles Napier Robinson, *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction. The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor's Life*, Introduction by John Leyland, (London & New York, 1909).

bodies of family members, as well as other members of the household such as servants, lay under the patriarchal power of fathers, husbands and masters.³ Just as people were divided religiously into body and soul - the former cared for by parents and the latter by the clergy - so too were bodies divided scientifically into an inside looked after by the physician, and an outside treated by the surgeon.⁴

There are therefore a diverse number of eighteenth-century discourses that involve and intersect with different aspects of the body, all of which require elaboration not only in terms of what they reveal but also what they conceal. This chapter looks at how a whole can be divided, at visual expressions of divisions of the body politic, and at who is doing the dividing. Although all the images examined here feature the removal of parts from a whole, this is achieved in a number of ways, each with a different import and purpose. I begin by looking at the breaking up of a food animal as a context for conceptualizing the War of American Independence as a civil war, before going on to deal with John Singleton Copley's painting of *Watson and the Shark*, in which it is the body of a man that is being devoured. This leads to an examination of images dealing with the dismemberment of the body of Britannia and the context of amputation. Finally I look at the role of agency in dismemberment imagery to suggest that these are not separations caused by internal divisions, but rather by external or outside forces.

² Thomas Day, *Reflections upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p. 2.

³ Roy Porter, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900*, (London, 2001), p. 26.

⁴ Wetenhall Wilkes, *A Letter of Genteel and Moral Advice to a Young Lady. In which is digested a new and familiar Method, a system of RULES and INFORMATIONS, to qualify the FAIR SEX to be useful and happy in every State*. (Dublin, 1740), p. 86. Surgeons were confined to the treatment of external complaints such as skin conditions, boils, wounds, injuries, broken bones, and venereal disease. Porter, *Bodies Politic*, p. 173. Christopher Lawrence, *Medicine in the Making of Modern Britain, 1700-1920*, (London & New York, 1994), pp. 12-13. Lois N. Magner, *A History of Medicine*, (New York, 1992), p. 164.

The Dismemberment of Food

The dismemberment of animals for food as well as the experiences of preparing, cooking and eating them were used a number of times in relation to the American War of Independence. Transferring the acts of cutting, biting, plucking and maiming to the body of an animal did not entirely conceal the role of death in the war, but did at least help to make it more impersonal and less painful. When the kingdom of Poland had been partitioned by the European powers in 1772, this too had been envisaged as the division of a food item, but the political nature of the partitioning was emphasized by representing the country as a piece of confection. In *The Polish Plumb Cake* (**figure 6.1**), published in 1774 in the *Westminster Magazine*, Poland is a cake that has been divided between Leopold II of Austria, Louis XVI of France, Catherine the Great of Russia and Frederick I of Prussia. Each of these monarchs is shown as having an instrument for cutting the cake: swords for Leopold and Frederick, a knife for Louis and an axe for Catherine. In the background King Stanislaus of Poland weeps into his handkerchief, while the Turkish Sultan menaces him with his sword. The image suggests that the division of Poland has been a 'piece of cake' for the European powers, that has only caused distress to King Stanislaus. Europe had interfered in the country before with the War of the Polish Succession of 1733-34, and the suggestion here is that outside forces have a right to a share in what they themselves have created.

By using food animals to represent America, Britain is essentially saying the same thing as when she is represented as her daughter – that the colonies have been raised and nurtured by (and are subordinate to) the mother country, who therefore has a

right to benefit from them and also to decide their fate. *The Englishman in Paris* from 1777 or 1778 (*figure 6.2*) shows an Englishman greedily tucking into a goose's drumstick, which he has taken from a dish intended for some French patrons in a Parisian restaurant. According to the verse below the goose represents America:

An American goose came hot from the spit
 Egad says the Englishman I'll have a bit
 His jaws he applies with wond'rous speed
 To devour the viands on which others shou'd feed.
 Fie, fie, Monsr. La Anglois cries the frenchman; - forebear,
 Why the limbs of your brother thus furiously tear?
 Think you we'll tamely look on and starve?
 No, no Monsr. Anglois, we wait for to carve.

That the print refers to the Englishman feeding on the limbs of a brother suggests that the civil war aspect of the conflict could be thought of in terms of cannibalism, with America as the victim since most of the food imagery of this period assigns the roles of eater to Britain and eaten to America. Although this is an anti-war print (and probably also anti-governmental), the artist is also satirizing French hairstyles, fashion and cooking, with the same implied criticism of British aristocracy described in the last chapter. On the wall of the restaurant hang two pictures - one that shows two male pugilists and the other a Roman Catholic cleric. Since boxing was thought of as a peculiarly British sport, these vignettes possibly represents the civil war between Great Britain and America presented as a boxing match, with the Catholic powers in Europe carefully standing by, ready to step in and take advantage of the situation and grab whatever territory they can, something that is reinforced by the verse beneath the image. As one contemporary written satire pointed out, without Britain's protection and reputation America was in a very vulnerable position: 'Every state in *Europe* might be for a wing, a leg, a breast, or a pinion of your [i.e.

Europe might be for a wing, a leg, a breast, or a pinion of your [i.e. America's] body: you would be subject to be cut up and carved like a woodcock or a turkey...'.⁵

Henry Walton's painting *A Girl Plucking A Turkey* (*figure 6.3*), which was first exhibited at the Society of Arts in 1776, is ostensibly a genre piece showing a kitchen maid preparing the bird for the oven. William Pressly has suggested that this refers to the War of American Independence and represents a 'pro-English statement reflecting popular sentiment against the ungrateful colonies'.⁶ However, there is more to it than that, and the fact that the Turkey was a North American bird, when added to contemporary examples of dismemberment imagery relating to fowl, argues for a more specific message.⁷ The maid's apron is plaid, which was exported to America 'Principally for slaves', and would have been associated in the viewer's mind with Scotland, the Scots and the unpopular Earl of Bute.⁸ Bute had been blamed for perceived deficiencies in the Peace of Paris, which had ended the Seven Years' War and secured Canada but lost potentially more lucrative sugar islands captured in the Caribbean. This had also meant that there was no French threat to Americans from the North to keep them in need of British protection. It was popularly believed that Bute had retained control of British policy even after he had left the office of first minister in 1763, and Bute, Scotland, and Scottish influence in

⁵ *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America, in their private capacities as friends; tracing the several causes of the present contests between the mother country and her American subjects; the fallacy of their prepossessions, and the ingratitude and danger of them; the reciprocal benefits of the national friendship; and the moral obligations of individuals which enforce it with various anecdotes, and reasons drawn from facts, tending to conciliate all differences, and establish a permanent union for the common happiness and glory of the British Empire*, (London, 1775), p. 92.

⁶ William L. Pressly, *James Barry: The Artist as Hero*, exh. cat. (London, 1983), p. 61.

⁷ Although it has been suggested that Benjamin Franklin proposed the Turkey as a national symbol instead of the eagle after the war, this has been doubted and his comments interpreted more as a satire on the Society of the Cincinnati. J. A. Leo Lemay, 'The American Aesthetic of Franklin's Visual Creations', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 497-500.

the government were all therefore variously blamed for causing Anglo-American conflict and leaving Great Britain vulnerable to European attack, as shown in the companion image to *The Colonies Reduced* from 1768 (*figure 2.11*) and *Bunkers Hill, or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels* from 1775 (*figure 3.2*).⁹ Furthermore, the two Jacobite rebellions of the first half of the eighteenth century had strongly associated the Scots with rebellious behaviour and its presence in the colonies merely confirmed suspicions that they were a bad lot who fomented American rebellion.¹⁰ Walton's painting, therefore, probably blames Scottish influence for the war, with the plucking of the turkey's feathers representing the removal of the need for protection, while at the same time suggesting that conflict will be disastrous for the colonies just as the bird will be cooked and eaten.

A similar message is made more explicitly in a mezzotint from the same year entitled *The Wise Men of Gotham* (*figure 6.4*). Here the Earl of Bute dressed in his plaid prepares to chop the head off the goose that laid the golden eggs.¹¹ After Bute and his cohorts fail to make it lay twice a day, they resort to the extreme measure depicted in this print. That the goose is America comes from the way it is described as being enchained and deprived of its liberty, and is reinforced by the open sack of golden eggs on the floor that is labelled taxes as well as the dog urinating on a map of North America. While the government prepares to kill the colonies, the British

⁸ [Lord Sheffield], *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*, 2nd ed., (London, 1783), p. 9.

⁹ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1989), pp. 350-256. Stephen Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, (Oxford, 2000), pp. 9 & 200. For the Scottish as responsible for war in America, see: *The Conquerors. A poem. Displaying the glorious campaigns of 1775, 1776, 1777, &c. &c.*, (London, [1778]), pp. 19 & 67 n. ++.

¹⁰ *John the Painter's Ghost: How he appeared on the night of his Execution to Lord Temple; and how his Lordship did communicate the same at full court, to the astonishment of all present, now partially, and circumstantially related*, (London, 1777), pp. 1-2.

people represented by the lion in a picture at the top are fast asleep and oblivious to what is happening elsewhere. The image portrays the colonies as ‘victims of British greed and power’, since the use of the fable suggests that Britain had been receiving a steady financial benefit from its colonies until it tried to gain more through taxation.¹² Not killing the goose will therefore continue to bring economic rewards, while severing its head from its body will not only lose the trade and prosperity derived from America, but also the colonies themselves.

In a slightly later print, *The Bull Roasted: or the Political Cooks Serving their Customers* of 1780 (*figure 6.4*), bits of roast John Bull are being served up to three people seated at a table in the kitchen – a Frenchman, an American Indian woman and a Spaniard. Each awaits their portion of beef, a bit of the brown for Louis, some of the buttock for America and some rump for Don Diego. The involvement of the Dutch in the war is anticipated by his inclusion on the floor in front of the table with a bowl of beef broth. The print makes it clear who is to blame for the carving up of the British Empire by having George III turning the spit watched by the Earl of Bute, while Lord North is shown as serving up John Bull on a plate to Britain’s enemies. Here it is probably the British people and the integrity of the global British community that are threatened by a governmental desire to continue the prosecution of a war that it looked increasingly unlikely to win.

Whether it is America or Britain that is being dismembered and eaten, these satirical prints use a culinary context to remind the viewer that the parts that are eaten cannot

¹¹ After the Townshend Duties of 1767, Benjamin Franklin regularly referred to the colonies as the goose that laid the golden eggs in London newspapers. See for example: *The London Chronicle*, (16th-18th August 1768), written under the pseudonym N.M.C.N.P.C.H..

be reattached - the body politic cannot be made whole and live again. However, when it is the human body that is being devoured, then survival is possible even though the body may be maimed. John Singleton Copley's *Watson and the Shark* (*figure 6.6*), first exhibited in 1778, has been linked symbolically with the possible loss of the American colonies, through its engagement with dismemberment imagery and issues on liberty.¹³ This multi-layered work is often drawn into the issue of slavery since it prominently features a black man in the composition and Watson was noted as being against the abolition of the slave trade.¹⁴ *The General Advertiser, and Morning Intelligencer* of 27th April 1778 wrote of Copley's *Watson and the Shark*: 'Its *whole* is very fine, though there are some inaccuracies in its *parts*.'¹⁵ One of the inaccuracies thought worthy of comment at the time was the unreal aspect of the shark.¹⁶ The same sense of unreality noted by contemporary reviewers invites interpretations of this painting that dwell on abstracts as much as particulars.¹⁷ As Geoff Quilley has recently pointed out, a political reading of the shark would have

¹² Bruce Tucker, 'Symbols of the Revolution', in: Donald K. Moore, ed., *Liberty's Impact: The World Views 1776*, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976), p. 49.

¹³ See for example: Albert Boime, *The Art of Exclusion: Representing Blacks in the Nineteenth Century*, (London, 1990), p. 35. Guy C. McElroy, *Facing History: The Black Image in American Art 1710-1940*, exh. cat. (San Francisco, 1990), pp. xi & 5. Geoff Quilley, 'Questions of loyalty: the representation of the British West Indian colonies during the American revolutionary war', in: John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, eds., *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830*, (Aldershot, 2005), p. 127. Watson was anti-American independence and pro-slavery according to: William Dunlap, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*, vol. 1, (Boston, 1918), p. 133. For the painting's relationship to prints (particularly of dismemberment) see: Ann Uhry Abrams, 'Politics, Prints, and John Singleton Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. LXI, no. 2, (June 1979), pp. 265-276.

¹⁴ Boime, *The Art of Exclusion*, p. 21 ff. Quilley, 'Questions of loyalty', p. 129. On Brook Watson's involvement in the slave trade, see: Thomas Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade by the British Parliament*, vol. II, (London, 1968 (1808)), p. 89. Samuel Isham, *The History of American Painting*, new ed., (New York, 1927 (1905)), p. 26. Webster is adamant that Brook Watson never engaged in the slave trade, and that Isham's account held a number of inaccuracies. J. Clarence Webster, *Sir Brook Watson: Friend of the Loyalists, First Agent of New Brunswick in London*, (Sackville, New Brunswick, 1927), p. 24.

¹⁵ *The General Advertiser, and Morning Intelligencer*, (27th April 1778), p. 4. See also *The Public Advertiser*, (28th April 1778), p. 2.

¹⁶ *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (25th April 1778), p. 2.

¹⁷ Reviewers' concerns focused on the boat and the sailors, the shark and the sea. *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (25th April 1778), p. 2. *The General Advertiser, and Morning Intelligencer*, (27th April 1778), p. 4. *The General Evening Post*, (28th-30th April 1778), p. 4.

been almost unavoidable at the time when viewed against the backdrop of the ongoing war, and it is the role of the shark as it relates to the theme of dismemberment that I want to examine here.¹⁸

The painting's abstract nature is emphasized by the way it was originally exhibited under a title beginning *A boy attacked by a shark...*, even though a letter in *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser* of 17th April 1778, and the engraving from the following year, make it clear that it depicts a scene from the early life of one Brook Watson.¹⁹ Watson was born in England in 1735, but sent to Boston Massachusetts in about 1749 in the care of a relative named Levens who had trading links with the West Indies. In 1749, this relative sent Watson to Havana Cuba, and once there he decided to go for a swim. However, while swimming he was attacked by a shark, which, on its second pass, tore off his right foot to just above the ankle.²⁰ In the picture the shark is returning for its third pass, but Watson is about to be saved by a boat of sailors from the ship he had travelled on. He was treated in a Spanish hospital where his right leg was amputated just below the knee, and thereafter he wore a wooden leg. He subsequently lived in Nova Scotia for a number of years, where he worked, among others, for Lieutenant Colonel Monckton. In 1759 he returned to London, where he went into business trading principally with North America, and it was his tea, exported to New England, that was tipped into the sea during the Boston Tea Party of 1773. In 1775 he was asked by the British government to actively sound out opinion in America, but while operating there as a

¹⁸ Quilley, 'Questions of loyalty', p. 127.

¹⁹ The painting was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1778 as: *A boy attacked by a shark, and rescued by some seamen in a boat; founded on a fact which happened in the harbour of the Havannah*. The 1779 mezzotint engraving by Valentine Green mentions that the painting was owned by Brook Watson. The letter, probably sent by Watson himself, is reprinted on p.56 of: Ellen G

spy, he was uncovered by the Americans and forced to sail home from Quebec in November 1775.²¹ In 1782, he was appointed Commissary General under Sir Guy Carleton when the latter succeeded Sir Henry Clinton as commander-in-chief of the British army in America, and assisted in the transportation of loyalists from New York to Britain after the war. He later served as a Member of Parliament for the City of London, and became a governor of the Bank of England, Lord Mayor and a baronet before his death in 1807.²²

Copley's own politics are ambiguous at best, which has enabled writers to claim him for both sides in the war.²³ Letters home to his wife suggest that he was disturbed by the prospect of war in 1775 and concerned for the safety of his family in Boston. His concerns about the coming turmoil seem natural in light of the fact that an angry mob had already attacked his father-in-law's house in November 1773 because of the latter's position as agent for the East India Company. Although Copley was doubtful that the British could win the conflict, his correspondence does not provide much evidence to support one view or the other.²⁴ In any case, Copley seems to have been more pragmatic than political as a painter, producing portraits in Boston of both Whigs and Tories, and attempting history paintings in England that could appear to

Miles, *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century*, with contributions by Patricia Burda, Cynthia J. Mills, Leslie Kaye Reinhardt, (New York & Oxford, 1995), p. 61.

²⁰ *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (17th April 1778).

²¹ Brook Watson did not therefore travel to England as a companion of Copley, as suggested by: Martha Babcock Amory, *The Domestic and Artistic Life of John Singleton Copley, R.A. With Notices of his Works and Reminiscences of his Son, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain*, (Boston, New York & Cambridge, 1882), p. 71. Isham, *The History of American Painting*, p.26. It is debatable whether Copley would have known that Watson had been a British spy, as suggested by: Boime, *The Art of Exclusion*, p. 24.

²² The best source for biographical information is: Webster, *Sir Brook Watson*.

²³ He was wholly pro-American and pro-independence according to his granddaughter. Amory, *The Domestic and Artistic Life of John Singleton Copley*, p.26. Albert Boime has suggested that Copley's leaving America must be seen in terms of opposition to the war. Boime, *The Art of Exclusion*, p. 25. *Watson and the Shark* was anti-Whig, and Copley more pro-Britain according to: McElroy, *Facing History*, p. 6.

be sympathetic to the American cause (*The Death of Chatham*) or strongly pro-British (*The Death of Major Peirson*).²⁵ The artist's desire to move to England and visit Italy must be seen, at least partially, in terms of a desire to better himself. In New England the market had obliged him to concentrate on portraits, and eighteenth-century artistic ambition rested to an extent on the requirement to move beyond them to history paintings.²⁶ When the opportunity to travel to Europe came from an associate of his wife's family, Copley must have been keen to seize on it.

Watson and the Shark was probably commissioned by Brook Watson at the end of 1777 or very early in 1778, at a time when the British had recently suffered defeat at the hands of the Americans at Saratoga.²⁷ One of the crisis points of the war, this American victory had raised the prospect of British defeat and increased the likelihood that France and Spain would become involved in the war. The possibility that Britain might lose its American colonies was therefore particularly topical during the painting's production. Although the setting is a Spanish possession (Cuba), the Caribbean islands had a strong sense of identification with the Americas as a whole because the traditional artistic embodiment of the continent was of a Carib princess.²⁸ Furthermore, both British and American identity was derived at

²⁴ See for example the letter dated 2nd July 1775, reproduced in: Amory, *The Domestic and Artistic Life of John Singleton Copley*, pp. 57-58.

²⁵ In 1782, Copley started work on two other paintings, *King Charles I Demanding in the House of Commons the Five Impeached Members* (intended as a companion to the *Chatham*) and *Monmouth before James II Refusing to Give the Names of his Accomplices*, both of which have themes of resistance to absolute monarchy, and might therefore suggest sympathy with the cause of the American Colonies. However, William Dunlap argued that Copley's choice of subject was driven by patronage or circumstance. Dunlap, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*, p. 133.

²⁶ Roger B. Stein, 'Copley's *Watson and the Shark* and Aesthetics in the 1770s', in: Calvin Israel, ed., *Discoveries and Considerations: Essays on Early American Literature and Aesthetics Presented to Harold Jantz*, (Albany, New York, 1976), p. 96.

²⁷ Ellen G Miles, with contributions by Patricia Burda, Cynthia J. Mills, Leslie Kaye Reinhardt, *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century*, (New York & Oxford, 1995), p. 56.

²⁸ The view of Havana harbour was probably based on an engraving by Peter Canot, after a drawing by Elias Durnford, entitled, *A View of the Entrance of the Harbour of Havana taken from within the*

least partly from the sea in the eighteenth century - after all it was the Atlantic seaboard colonies that were in revolt, all the European-born colonists had arrived originally by ship and they had strong links with the sea through fishing, smuggling and trading.²⁹ The painting therefore shows the fate of an Englishman in the Americas being dismembered by the shark that rears out of the water on the right to make its final attack.

The significance of the shark itself has received scant attention in scholarship regarding this work. Although it is closest in appearance to a tiger shark, it is not an exact depiction of a particular species, but generalized and composite in nature, and may therefore represent something more abstract.³⁰ The legend of Valentine Green's engraving of *Watson and the Shark*, as well as a number of contemporary reviews of the painting, emphasized the fish's voracity, greediness and ravenousness.³¹ Voracity was also be used metaphorically to describe the territorial aspirations of the French. One tract from 1778 used the shark to refer to France's involvement in the current war: 'Let us beware of that voracious shark, who, after having seized our American daughter, has turned this maimed prey, like a shield, to meet the blows of its parent.'³² This was nothing new, since a 1691 satire on Louis XIV entitled *Monsieur in a Mouse-Trap: or, the Parable of the Shark & Herring Pond*, similarly compared the behaviours, attitudes and ambitions of France to that of a shark. In this

Wrecks, and published by Thomas Jeffreys in 1764. See: Miles, *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 58. That Moro Castle at Havana was included by Copley was noticed by: *The St James's Chronicle; or, British Evening-Post*, (25th-28th April 1778), p. 4. E. McClung Fleming, 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, (1965), pp. 65-68.

²⁹ Stein, 'Copley's *Watson and the Shark* and Aesthetics in the 1770s', pp. 116-117.

³⁰ Miles, *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 58 & n. 24 p. 68.

³¹ The shark is voracious according to: *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (25th April 1778), p. 2. The shark is ravenous and greedy according to: *The St James's Chronicle; or, British Evening-Post*, (25th-28th April 1778), p. 4.

pamphlet the French shark is described as ‘a voracious, cruel, tyrannical Fish’, who raised armies and oppressed his subjects in order to invade the territories of others. Significantly perhaps, the intention of this French shark was to ‘*snap off a whole Limb, or Branch of the Empire, together at a Mouthfull [sic]...*’.³³

The Rolliad, a satire on William Pitt the Younger, referred to Brook Watson and the circumstances by which he gained his wooden leg by suggesting that the shark had eaten his ‘luckless limb’ for breakfast.³⁴ This acknowledgement that Watson’s leg had been food for the shark places this painting halfway between those images using food as the object of dismemberment and those that refer instead to amputation of a human limb. Seen against this context of contemporary dismemberment imagery, Copley’s *Watson and the Shark* should probably be understood, at least in part, as a warning of the dangers to Great Britain and its colonies of the involvement of France and Spain in the war with her American colonies. The maritime theme of the painting accords with the fact that such a widening of the conflict would place an increasing emphasis on naval superiority. As Dr Josiah Tucker pointed out in 1780, once Britain’s supremacy at sea was lost, her empire ‘in every Quarter of the Globe, would [will] be totally dismembered’.³⁵ In Copley’s painting, the same greedy appetite, ambition, speed and violence ascribed to *The Englishman in Paris* are this time credited to the shark, with its voracious Bourbon-like appetite for territory.

³² *An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain*, (London, 1778), p. 5.

³³ *Monsieur in a Mouse-Trap: or, the Parable of the Shark & Herring Pond*, (London, 1691), pp. 1-4.

³⁴ [Joseph Richardson and others], *The Rolliad, in two parts: Probationary Odes for the Laureatship; and Political Eclogues: with Criticisms and illustrations by the original authors*, 21st ed., (London 1799), p. 90.

³⁵ [Dr Josiah Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War; Addressed to the Moderate of All Parties*, (London, 1780), p. 22.

The Dismemberment of the Body

Elaine Scarry has theorized that since the body confers reality on a situation, it is used for conceptualization where there is a crisis in substantiation. Where an idea is the subject of conflict or potential conflict, the body is introduced to control thinking and to conceal reality within what is, effectively, a competition for the truth.³⁶ Images of dismemberment ostensibly present an anxiety that the disputes between Britain and America could or would lead to the break up of the transatlantic British Community. However, when real bodies began to suffer the same fate, the images are abstracted, and the bodies removed from direct experience, only to return once more when the public were forced to confront the unpalatable truth that America would be lost and that Britain's best blood had been spilled in vain. In my second chapter I looked at Benjamin Franklin's image of the dismembered body politic against contexts of restoration and rebellion, however, as the war progressed and it looked increasingly unlikely that the *status quo* of the Anglo-American relationship could actually be restored, dismemberment imagery focused more on the questions of irrevocable loss and the process of dismemberance. Food imagery abstracted the question of loss, but the human body could bring into play issues surrounding the actual pain and trauma caused by the removal of a limb. Copley's *Watson and the Shark* is silent, but Brook Watson's open mouth, the urgency of his stretching reach for the thrown rope and the imminence of the shark attack heighten the sense of danger and allow the spectator to identify with his plight. Similarly, the use of the living body in other images of dismemberment from this period focuses attention on

³⁶ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (New York & Oxford 1985), pp. 125-127, & 134-138.

what is at stake in losing part of the body politic, as well as the question of whether or not the remainder of the body can survive.

Our understanding of the dismemberment in Copley's *Watson and the Shark* is partly conditioned by the traditions of imagery that appeared sporadically related to previous eighteenth-century wars. *The Conduct, of the two B*****rs* (figure 6.7) from 1749, for example, shows Britannia on the dissecting table being disembowelled, with her arms, marked 'Gibraltar' and 'Cape Breton', having already been amputated.³⁷ This satirical print is an attack on the then prime minister Henry Pelham and his brother the Duke of Newcastle, accusing them of plundering Britain's resources in the interests of George II. In 1748, Newcastle had conducted peace negotiations after the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748), in which Britain had kept Gibraltar in southern Spain and Cape Breton in Canada (captured in 1745). These were important symbols to Britons of their martial supremacy over the Catholic powers of France and Spain, but it is suggested here that they will be sacrificed by the Pelhams in order to safeguard Hanover represented by the white horse licking at Britannia's blood.³⁸

Similarly, the loss of Minorca in 1756 during the Seven Years' War had been depicted as the loss of a limb in *The English Lion Dismember'd* (figure 6.8), where it is the right front paw of the British Lion (marked 'Minorca') that has been cut off. Such imagery could be recycled during the War of American Independence, with the aforementioned image being reused as *The English Lion Dismember'd Or the Voice*

³⁷ This is the earliest dismemberment print to include Britannia according to: John C. Riely, *The Age of Horace Walpole In Caricature: An Exhibition of Satirical Prints and Drawings from the Collection of W. S. Lewis*, with an introduction by Dale R. Roylance, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1973), no. 65.

of the Public for an Enquiry into the Public Expenditure of 1780 (*figure 6.9*), where this time the lion's severed paw is marked 'America'. Here the paw has been cut off by a male American Indian, while a Frenchman says 'Either by Policy or Force, I must Obtain some limb or Other' and a Spaniard bemoans the fact that all his wages will be spent in exchange for nothing. Although clearly related to concerns about the immense cost of an apparently unsuccessful war, it adds these to calls for political reform. The use and reuse of dismemberment imagery, however, meant that it was common by the 1780s to refer to the effects of the war on the British Community, and the likely loss of the American colonies, as 'the dismemberment of the empire...'.³⁹ More often than not, this was envisaged in terms of the loss of a limb (or member) of the British body politic represented as Britannia.

The chief focus of the October 1780 print *His Majesty's Royal Letters Patent. The New Invented Method of Punishing State Criminals* (*figure 6.10*) is the impending dismemberment of Britannia identified by her shield with the union flag on it. In a scene reminiscent of the 1757 execution of the French regicide Damiens, this is to be achieved by tearing her limb from limb, since her left leg is tied to a post marked 'Court Influence', held by a bowed figure (possibly Lord North) on a road marked 'Despotism', while her other limbs are tied to horses being ridden in different directions.⁴⁰ Britannia's right leg is being pulled by a horse labelled 'Tyranny' on the road to America, while her right arm is pulled by 'Venality' towards Spain, and her left arm by 'Ignorance' towards France. However, the agency for this

³⁸ Mark Hallett, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth*, (New Haven & London, 1999), pp. 228-232.

³⁹ [Sheffield], *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*, p. 101. See also: Brian Edwards, *Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government, respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1784), p. 2.

dismemberment is not assigned to these foreign powers themselves directly, since the riders are not dressed as the stereotypical personifications of those countries. Instead we are invited to look closer to home for the cause of Britain's woes. On a plinth behind Britannia, the execution scene is being watched by George III, while the Earl of Bute stands astride (showing his ascendancy and influence over the King), urging on the horses with whips. On the front of the plinth, just beneath the King, appear the ironic words: 'Great is our Lord, and great is his power. Yea and his wisdom is infinite.'

This image not only suggests the infliction of punishment on the body of Britannia, but also the presence of pain, which could itself be regarded as a form of chastisement, correction and God's punishment for human failures and wickedness.⁴¹ Furthermore, it was a sign that something was wrong with the whole body politic, since: 'When any part of the body is in pain, we need no physician to tell us the whole frame is suffering...'⁴² The punishment visited on the body politic by the King and Bute in *His Majesty's Royal Letters Patent* is only to the benefit of its enemies, and furthermore it will result in the dismemberment and possibly also dissection of Britannia. Capital punishment was the only source of corpses for dissection in the eighteenth century and a fate that was feared by criminals and the common people alike, which often led to executions dissolving into scenes of disorder as the bodies were fought over by the mob and the medical profession.⁴³ Since America has now been externalized in this image, Britannia's body itself has become the object of

⁴⁰ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated from the French by Alan Sheridan, (London, 1977 (1975)), pp. 3-5.

⁴¹ Magner, *A History of Medicine*, p. 291.

⁴² *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America*, pp. 84-85.

contestation, to be fought over externally by America, France and Spain, and internally riven by political factionism.

Externally, the body was in the care of the surgeon, and surgery must be considered as one of the principal ways in which dismemberment of the living body would have been understood. The paw in *The English Lion Dismember'd* has clearly been sliced off in an action similar to amputation, suggesting the enactment of surgical procedure and the requirement for continued medical attention. In this case, the print is closely related to domestic politics as much as the international nature of the war, but, although the ruling classes were sometimes metaphorically referred to as physicians, there are no references to them as surgeons.⁴⁴ Although surgery was beginning a slow rise towards acceptance as a highly valued profession, its practitioners still had a relatively low status in eighteenth-century society, especially when compared to the higher regarded physicians. While physicians required degrees from recognized universities, were book-learned and relied on networks of patronage, surgery was controlled by local corporations, was learnt through apprenticeship, was practised with the hands and could only treat conditions obvious to the senses.⁴⁵ Surgery therefore dwelt only in the domain of the visible and the tangible, and was thus particularly suitable for referencing in visual material, as opposed to the more abstract and verbal physic.

⁴³ Porter, *Bodies Politic*, pp. 51 & 219. Peter Linebaugh, 'The Tyburn Riot Against the Surgeons', in: Douglas Hay, Peter Linebaugh, John G. Rule, E. P. Thompson, Cal Winslow, eds., *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1975), pp. 74 & 76-81.

⁴⁴ Politicians are physicians in: [Thomas Tod], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence. Shewing The great Advantages that will arise from it to the Mamufacturers, the Agriculture, and commercial Interest of Britain And Ireland*, (Edinburgh, 1782), p. 1.

⁴⁵ The emphasis on the hands of the surgeon can be seen in René Croissant de Garengot, *Treatise of Chirurgical Operations*, (London, 1723). Cited in: Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1991), p. 51. See also: W. Black, M. D., *An Historical Sketch of Medicine and Surgery, from their Origin to the*

At this point, medicine was not technological or scientific, but rather a matter of common negotiation between patients and their physicians. Physical examination was cursory and ritualistic, with greater importance placed on the patient's own descriptions of their symptoms.⁴⁶ Accustomed to self-diagnosis, patients invariably sought second, third or fourth opinions until they found a diagnosis they were happy with.⁴⁷ The use of home cures and remedies, and the proliferation of medical articles and advertisements in the press, were mirrored in the letters to newspapers and magazines, tracts and pamphlets that diagnosed the ills of the state of the nation. This as well as the commonality of seeing amputees on the streets, the increasing numbers of anatomy theatres that gave public lectures and the grounding of surgery and art in anatomical study would have ensured a reasonable level of knowledge in the public.⁴⁸ We can assume therefore a certain awareness of medical discourse and knowledge by the audience for the paintings and prints in which I am interested. The middling and upper classes, as well as the artists (with their own study of anatomy), would have been comfortable discussing the health of the body politic, or recognizing the dangers inherent in the wounding or maiming of the body of Britannia.

Present Time; and of the Principal Authors, Discoveries, Improvements and Errors, (London, 1782), p. 285.

⁴⁶ The same was true of the medical examinations given to new recruits in the navy, which allowed a number of women to join the service. Suzanne J. Stark, *Female Tars: Women Aboard Ship in the Age of Sail*, (London, 1998 (1996)), p.89, but see also: pp. 145 & 162.

⁴⁷ Porter, *Bodies Politic*, pp. 89, 151-3, 209 & 273. For an example of self-diagnosis of the need for amputation, see the case mentioned in: Edward Ives, *A Voyage from England to India, in the Year MDCCLIV*, (London, 1773), p. 133.

⁴⁸ Stafford, *Body Criticism*, p. 49. At William Hunter's school of anatomy there were often more than a hundred in attendance at dissections, and Edward Gibbon and Edmund Burke are among those known to have attended. Roy Porter, 'William Hunter: a surgeon and a gentleman', in: W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (ed.), *William Hunter and the eighteenth-century medical world*, (Cambridge, 1985), p. 22.

Hence, in 1781, Josiah Tucker could propose a settlement of the conflict that would involve splitting the thirteen rebellious colonies between loyalists and rebels, and describe it as cutting off a diseased limb.⁴⁹ In July 1782, Charles James Fox was reported as suggesting in parliament that the British government wanted to ‘lop off’ America.⁵⁰ These and other comments, such as that by Lord Shelburne that the colonies were to be ‘severed’ from Great Britain, should be understood in terms of an act of physical or surgical violence.⁵¹ Until the nineteenth-century development of anaesthesia and antisepsis, amputation (one of the oldest forms of surgical intervention in the history of man) was only carried out when the wound was otherwise life-threatening.⁵² Without anaesthetic, it required great speed on the part of the surgeon and the use of assistants to restrain the patient and hold the limb to be operated on, something often represented in illustrations to books on surgery.⁵³ In *Forearm and leg amputations (figure 6.11)* from the English translation of Lorenz Heister’s *General System of Surgery* published in London in 1743, each operation requires two or three assistants to restrain the patient and hold the limb.⁵⁴ In the context of the American War of Independence these assistants were present by the

⁴⁹ Josiah Tucker, *Cui bono?, or, An inquiry. what benefits can arise either to the English or the Americans, the French, Spaniards, or Dutch, from the greatest victories, or successes, in the present war, being a series of letters, addressed to Monsieur Necker, late controller general of the finances of France*, (Gloucester, 1781), pp. 126-127.

⁵⁰ Reported in: *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (24th July 1782).

⁵¹ Reported in the 15th October 1782 edition of *The Morning Post*, as quoted in: Wead, ‘British Public Opinion of the Peace with America in 1782’, *The American Historical Review*, vol. XXXIV, no. 3, (April 1929), p. 518.

⁵² General anaesthesia was developed in the 1840s, with antisepsis following in the 1870s. Magner, *A History of Medicine*, pp. 279-282. For descriptions of contemporary amputations see: Edward Alanson, *Practical Observations upon Amputation, and the After-Treatment*, (London, 1779), p. 33 ff.

⁵³ Benjamin Bell, a surgeon at Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, could divide all but the bone in a thigh amputation in six seconds, while the French Napoleonic surgeon Larrey, needed only an average of three seconds in the field. Owen H. Wangensteen & Sarah D. Wangensteen, *The Rise of Surgery From Empiric Craft to Scientific Discipline*, (Folkestone, 1978), pp. 16-17, 30-36 & n. 1 on p.586. See also: C. F. V. Smout, *The Story of the Progress of Medicine*, (Bristol, 1964), p.111. The eighteenth-century emphasis on speed and strength gradually gave way in the next century to the valuation of a deliberate and subtle touch guided by humanity and sensitivity. Magner, *A History of Medicine*, p.290.

⁵⁴ Laurence Heister, *A General System of Surgery in Three Parts*. (London, 1743), illustration opposite p. 350.

1780s in the form of the European powers, and therefore it is in this period of the war that conceptualizations of the dismemberment of Britannia as amputation dominate, since France and Spain were thought to have entered the war therefore with the aim of ‘dismembering America from England’.⁵⁵ The same sense of speed that was a feature of the shark’s style of attack could therefore also be applied to a different means of French attack on Britannia’s limbs.

However, dismemberment imagery could also be turned against the European powers. *The Belligerent Plenipo’s* of December 1782 (*figure 4.13*), which concerns the then ongoing peace negotiations, is unusual for a dismemberment print in that Britain and America are both depicted whole, while France, Holland and Spain have each lost a limb. The American Indian woman’s statement that: ‘I have got all I wanted Empire!’, is a reference to the provisional treaty signed separately between Britain and America at the end of November 1782, which had recognized the latter’s independence and ceded large areas of territory between the Mississippi and the Great Lakes. The image and speech balloons make it clear that the three European powers in the centre want to exchange pieces of British territory for their lost limbs, which lie at the feet of George III. France wants to swap his arm for Canada and Grenada, Holland wants Ceylon and Eustatia for his foot and Spain wants Gibraltar for his leg.⁵⁶ The blood pouring from the Frenchman’s wound is a reflection not of losses during the current war, but rather of the significance of the French loss of Canada following the Seven Years’ War. This earlier loss of territory had possibly also been thought of in terms of dismemberment (an anonymous poet noted in 1778 that: ‘bleeding *France* still feels the ill-heal’d wound’), and was popularly believed

⁵⁵ *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, (London, 1781), p. 13.

by the British to be his motivation for entering the War of American Independence.⁵⁷

On the other hand, sufficient time has passed since Britain had gained Gibraltar (under the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713) for the Spaniard to have been fitted with a wooden leg.

The problem with using amputation as a means of visually referencing dismemberment was that such cases had such a high mortality rate that they also included an implicit threat to the life of the injured body. For example, it seems not unreasonable to assume a 50% mortality rate in the eighteenth century for amputations of the thigh.⁵⁸ If France could not stem the flow of blood from his stump in *The Belligerent Plenipo's* then it is extremely likely that he would die from blood loss.⁵⁹ This might be acceptable for an enemy, but not for Britannia, nor even for her soldiers and sailors, fears for the lives of whom prompted a number of works aimed at improving surgical care in this area.⁶⁰ For this reason, artists probably preferred to dismember less sensate animals and statues rather than people, which perhaps reminded them too much of the actual bodies being injured during the war.

The same idea of the dismemberment of a statue of Britannia seen in Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act cartoon (*figure 2.1*) re-emerged at the end of the war in 1782's *BRITANIA'S ASSASSINATION, or ---The Republican Amusement (figure 4.21)*.

⁵⁶ France never actually demanded the return of Canada, while by the time of this print, the Dutch had in fact recaptured St Eustatius.

⁵⁷ *An Apology for the Times: a Poem, Addressed to the King*, (London, 1778), p. 40.

⁵⁸ 45% to 65% is suggested by: Wangenstein & Wangenstein, *The Rise of Surgery*, p.49. Most patients of surgeons died according to: Smout, *The Story of the Progress of Medicine*, p. 111.

⁵⁹ James Rymer, *Observations and Remarks respecting the more effectual means of preservation of wounded Seamen and Marines on board of His Majesty's Ships in time of action*, (London, 1780), p. 11. See also: Wangenstein & Wangenstein, *The Rise of Surgery*, p. 19. After amputation, where haemorrhage took place, this was often within twenty-four hours, but could occur up to a month after the operation. Edward Alanson, *Practical Observations upon Amputation, and the After-Treatment*, (London, 1779), pp. 40-41.

This etching, attributed to James Gillray, shows a damaged statue of Britannia in the process of being slowly demolished. An American Indian man runs away with her head and left arm and is chased by a complaining Frenchman, while a Spaniard runs away with her right leg and a Dutchman with her shield. On the right hand side of the image, members of the new Ministry – Fox, Wilkes, Dunning, Richmond, Burke and Keppel assist in the demolition as one of them says ‘Leave not a Wreck behind’. Judges Thurlow and Mansfield pull on a rope tied around these politicians in order to try and restrain their republican excesses. However, unlike the statue of Franklin’s *MAGNA Britania*, this time the British body politic is unlikely to be restored, since the pieces here are being stolen away, and no attempt is being made by any of the Britons present to try and retrieve them. The new ministry’s drive to end the war and achieve a peace with America is satirized here for the lasting damage that the war will inflict on Britain.

Conclusion

All of the visual engagements with metaphors of dismemberment examined in this chapter have two things in common. The first is that an identifiable part is removed from a whole embodying a body politic. The second is that the images identify the agency of that removal. The same two features can be seen in instances of stripping metaphors such as Nathaniel Parr’s *F----H Pacification or the Q---N of H-----Y Stript*, (*figure 5.1*), where Maria Theresa’s clothes are both individually complete, but also part of a larger whole – her general attire - which would have been revealed

⁶⁰ Alanson, *Practical Observations upon Amputation*. Rymer, *Observations and Remarks*.

when she had been fully dressed. The fact that each territory is separately represented as a garment means that they can be stripped away by other European states, just as it was noted during the American War of Independence that America would eventually 'strip' Britain of her territories.⁶¹ Similarly, *THE BOTCHING TAYLOR Cutting His Cloth To Cover A Button* (*figure 6.12*), uses George III's hobby of button-making to show him cutting up a piece of cloth representing his dominions. 'North America' has already been removed and he is engaged in cutting off 'Ireland', leaving only 'Hanover' still attached to 'Great Britain'. The use of cloth and clothes, cutting and stripping, to represent the division of empire is, in a way, highly suitable to conceptualize the changes and exchanges of territory brought about by successive eighteenth-century conflicts, since cut cloth can be patched and mended just as the Austrian Queen can be dressed and undressed. However, while the issue of agency is also given prominence in dismemberment images from the War of American Independence, these also relied on the non-restorability of the embodiments being dismembered, just as, after the Declaration of Independence, Franklin described the British Empire as 'that fine and noble China Vase', which, once broken, could never be returned to its original condition and strength.⁶²

In the 1770s, food dismemberment was used to conceptualize the loss of America as the result of a civil war, since it is a fellow-countryman in *The Englishman In Paris* or British politician in *The Wise Men of Gotham*, who is depicted as killing or eating the colonies. Designating America as a food animal allowed satirists to show Great

⁶¹ *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, no. 3940, (Tuesday, January 1st 1782), p. 2. The newspaper's use of the feminine possessive pronoun suggests it is the mother country who is to be stripped.

⁶² Letter from Benjamin Franklin to Lord Richard Howe, written from Philadelphia and dated 20th July 1776. William B. Willcox, ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. XXII, March 23, 1775,

Britain as devouring itself while keeping the colonies in the same subordinate position they held as Britannia's daughter. However, after British defeat at the battle of Saratoga at the end of 1777, and with the entry of the European powers it was more often the human form of the British body politic that was shown as being under attack from outside forces. From that point, it was a combination of France, Spain, Holland as well as America that was depicted as aiming for the reduction of Britannia, and the actual dismemberment of the body seems to have been used to express the improbability that America will never be restored to its former position within the body politic. This was implicit in culinary imagery, but, in the 1780s, it was made more explicit as the food animal came to be replaced by the human body, and hence this loss was made more real through a more direct appeal to bodily experience. Throughout this development such changes seem to have been precipitated principally by changes in the agency of the dismemberment, with the pivotal event once again likely to have been the addition of the various European powers to the conflict; they not only ensured the likelihood of secession by America, but also increased the dangers to the mother country.

As the tide of the American War of Independence turned against Britain, images entailing the dismemberment of the human body not only connoted the loss of the colonies, but also the human cost in terms of the dead and wounded. If surgery could be used as a context to make this visible externally on the human body, then physic could be used as a context to reveal the internal damage done to the British body politic, since bleeding was not only a sign of physical damage but also a medical

through October 27, 1776, (New Haven & London, 1982), p. 520. Esmond Wright, 'The fine and noble vase', *Pennsylvania Magazine of Biography and History*, volume 111, (1987), pp. 435-464.

cure for illness and disease. The idea that the cost of the war came in terms of Britain's blood will be form part of the investigation of the next chapter.

Chapter 7: Britannia's Blood

Through 'body politic' metaphors and analogies the nation can be reduced to a single embodied entity, yet the body can also be reduced to consideration of the blood that courses through its veins and arteries giving it life. Blood can not only be used to refer to the war (the 'sanguinary projects' of the British government), but also be used to express relationship (consanguinity), disease, danger, expense, commerce and slavery (a 'trade in human blood').¹ Blood and bleeding are also visible signs of the injuring that is one of the aims of war - the intention being not just to kill the enemy but also to wound them and thereby give them the burden of caring for the injured, maimed and crippled.² This aspect of war is often hidden or goes unacknowledged, with the act of wounding transferred elsewhere to disguise the actuality of what is happening to real bodies.³ In the War of American Independence the shedding of blood was transferred from bodies real to bodies politic, with the physical harm inflicted on the members of Britain's armed forces hidden behind metaphors of blood and enacted on allegorical figures instead. In *Jack England Fighting the Four Confederates* from 20th January 1781 (*figure 5.9*) victories over France, Spain and America are visited physically upon the personifications of these nations. Following its defeat in the Battle of Jersey earlier that month, France is shown vomiting onto the ground announcing that: 'Dem Jersey Pills have made a me Sick', which suggests that he has been given a taste of his own medicine and not

¹ *Considerations upon the French and American War. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament*, (London, 1779), p.1. Dr Josiah Tucker, *Reflections of the Present Matters in Dispute between Great Britain and Ireland; and on the Means of converting these Articles into mutual Benefit to both kingdoms*, (London, 1785), p. 9.

² Owen H. Wangensteen & Sarah D. Wangensteen, *The Rise of Surgery From Empiric Craft to Scientific Discipline*, (Folkestone, 1978), p. 492. This very point is made in: *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, (London, 1781), p. 21.

found it to be of his liking. Meanwhile, Spain, dressed as Don Diego, is bleeding profusely from one eye socket exclaiming: 'By St Jago he has almost Blinded me.'⁴

The shedding of blood was not only a part of war but also one of the treatments available to physicians like the pills having an emetic effect on France in *Jack England*. Interest in bloodletting had been stimulated by William Harvey's discovery in the 1620s of the circulatory system, which had overturned the prevailing Galenic system. This discovery had also precipitated the use of the blood's circulatory system as a means of metaphorically understanding the way that money or trade circulated in the wider world. Images that incorporate politicians and a bleeding representation of the body politic could therefore also be used to express concerns over the cost of the continuation of the war, both financial and (through the process of transfer alluded to earlier) in terms of lives and manpower. In *Jack England* it is Jack who is healthy and his opponents who are ailing, but, as Fiona Haslam has pointed out, political satires also inflicted vomits, purges and bloodletting on embodiments of the British nation during times of crisis in order to try and restore the public good.⁵ Often such imagery placed politicians in the role of the physician trying to either kill or cure the body politic with their treatments. Political intervention in world affairs could thereby be conceptualized as a potentially dangerous medical intervention affecting the interior of the body politic.

³ Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (New York & Oxford, 1985), p. 64.

⁴ St Jago, or Santiago is a reference to St James, the patron saint of Spain, and a reference to its Catholicism.

⁵ Fiona Haslam, *From Hogarth to Rowlandson: Medicine in Art in Eighteenth Century Britain*, (Liverpool, 1996), p. 272.

In this chapter I investigate the various ways that the causes, effects and events of the War of American Independence were visited upon representations of the body politic. From the pivotal moment of 1778 onwards, the shift in the metaphoric understanding of the war noted earlier can also be seen in the way it was increasingly thought of as a wounding attack on the body of Britannia. The entry of the European powers focused attention on the internal balance of Britannia's constitution, and one of the ways in which the advantages and disadvantages of continuing the war were weighed up was through the consideration of the loss of British blood as through it were one of the costs of fighting. Finally, I examine images incorporating medical metaphors that revealed how the internal balance of Britannia's constitution had been upset, and ascribed the role of physician to politicians administering to the body politic as if it were their patient.

The Lifeblood of Britannia – Blood and the Body

Injury was acknowledged to be one of the occupational hazards of eighteenth-century sailors and soldiers.⁶ However, during the War of American Independence, some attention turned to the reduction in manpower resulting from unnecessary loss of life. The naval surgeon James Rymer, for example, estimated that blood loss was not only one of the major reasons for death in cases of amputation, but was also a major cause of death in those awaiting attention from surgeons. At the time only two of the screwed tourniquets invented by J. L. Petit in 1718 were available to each ship's surgeon meaning that, when ten or fifteen sailors might require the removal of limbs

⁶ Letter 5 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son, just entered into the Army, and about to go Abroad into Action. In Seven Letters*, (London, 1776), p. 45.

during or after an engagement, only two patients could be attended to at any one time; by the time their treatment had been dealt with another four or more might have died from loss of blood. Rymer therefore felt it was important that each surgeon should be supplied with tourniquets proportionate to the ship's compliment (for example, suggesting fifteen to twenty for a frigate).⁷ Through such texts the act of wounding, or being wounded, became a recognisable danger and a source of fear to those left behind in Britain who knew men fighting in the armed forces overseas. The wounding of an allegorical figure in a print, standing in for this reality, therefore expressed the same fears for the survival of the body politic and (from 1778) the continuity of an independent Protestant Britain in the face of the threat of Catholic invasion.

The Thistle Reel, A Vision (**figure 7.1**), which was published at the beginning of 1775, was a political satire that blamed Scottish influence in Westminster (and Lord Bute in particular) for those British policies that had caused unrest in America. Opposite the print *The London Magazine* carried an expanded (and unillustrated) narrative of this vision in which: 'a ghastly bleeding figure appeared – and said – I am the injured ghost of poor America!'⁸ Since the war was fought largely on American soil in the early years of the war, figures involving blood could easily be attached to the colonies during this period, with, for example, the painter John

⁷ Rymer, who had received support from the Surgeons' Company for his proposal for greater numbers of tourniquets to be available for use at sea, particularly objected to Petit's tourniquet since its sensitivity meant that constant vigilance was required to keep it at the required tightness. The surgeon's attention was therefore diverted from other cases, and he had designed his own tourniquet. James Rymer, *Observations and Remarks respecting the more effectual means of preservation of wounded Seamen and Marines on board of His Majesty's Ships in time of action*, (London, 1780), pp. 8, 9 & 13-15. Petit's tourniquet was nevertheless extremely useful 'in the hurry of battles' to stop haemorrhaging. W. Black, *An Historical Sketch of Medicine and Surgery, from their Origin to the Present Time; and of the Principal Authors, Discoveries, Improvements and Errors*, (London, 1782), p. 288.

⁸ *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. VLIII, (1775), p. 56.

Singleton Copley writing from Italy in July 1775 to his wife in Boston to suggest that America would be ‘deluged with blood for many years to come.’⁹ Even after the European powers had entered the war, it was still possible to prophecy that France and Spain were only supplying America to: ‘keep her upon her legs, till she is so drained of blood...’, and that she would not be strong enough to resist their territorial ambitions after the war.¹⁰

However, as the war progressed it was increasingly described as an attack on the body of Britannia, and in particular as inflicting some kind of physical wound that drew blood, sometimes copiously.¹¹ The entry to the war of Britain’s natural enemy France in 1778 caused much anxiety about Britannia’s ability to defend herself against a likely European invasion. Just as metaphors involving ‘the balance of power’ could be used to suggest she could still win despite increasing numbers of combatants, so too could sanguinary imagery be used to express the immediate threat to the home country: ‘though Britain bleeds at all her veins, there are yet remedies to stop the dreadful hæmorrhage; she will not bleed to death.’¹² Although this figure relies to some extent on a correlation between the apparent extreme danger to Britain of an expanded warfront, and the likelihood of increasing losses in terms of British lives, it does at least raise the possibility that this bloodloss is not yet fatal and might be stopped with the proper intervention. Visual images created in a similar vein to their literary counterparts are less bloody, but nevertheless engage with the same

⁹ Letter dated 2nd July 1775 from Parma, Italy, reproduced in: Martha Babcock Amory, *The Domestic and Artistic Life of John Singleton Copley, R.A. With Notices of his Works and Reminiscences of his Son, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain*, (Boston, New York & Cambridge, 1882), p. 57.

¹⁰ *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, p. 9.

¹¹ *A Letter from Britannia to the King*, p. 54.

¹² *An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain*, (London, 1778), p. 2.

anxieties about the increasing danger to Great Britain as, one by one, France, Spain and the Netherlands joined the fighting.

In part, this diminution of the presence of blood is due to artistic convention, since even satirical prints were produced in a culture that raised history painting above other forms of art. History paintings such as Benjamin West's *Death of Wolfe* of 1771 (*figure 7.2*) placed emphasis on the virtue of the hero's death rather than the wound that had caused it. What was important was not the means of his death, but the measure of his character and the significance of his actions. The inclusion of blood was therefore a minor consideration in such works and, for example, Copley's *Death of Major Peirson* (*figure 7.3*) is a curiously bloodless depiction of the Battle of Jersey. There is a trickle (rather than a gush) of blood from the chest of Peirson running downwards over the front of his uniform, the direction of its flow suggesting that it only emerged from his body after he had fallen into the position in which he is depicted, supported by the officers surrounding him. This is despite the fact that some accounts stressed the fact that he was shot through the heart – something that would have produced a much greater loss of blood.¹³ Similarly, John Trumbull's painting of *The Battle of Bunker's Hill* (*figure 7.4*) takes as its central act the prevention of the spilling of further blood, although a number of figures are already dead or in the process of dying and the setting is a particularly hard fought battle with a high casualty rate. Such history paintings were produced in the vernacular of the ideal, rather than being documentary depictions of the conditions of war, but it is possible that that they express the same concerns over blood loss seen in imagery relating to Britannia. In each case the red colour of the British uniforms provides the

artist with a means of suggesting this without having to overlay the representation of blood itself.

While, verbal rhetoric relies on exaggeration to create vivid literary images that must remain memorable within a continuous sequential form, single visual images present all their information at once. Although satirical prints employ exaggeration in terms of scale, caricature and hyperbole, they could also be subtle in referencing blood loss where it was not the main focus of the image. *The European Diligence* of October 1779 (*figure 7.5*) features a number of personification of countries - including two that would never take an active part in the war (Russia and Portugal) - while engaging with a number of different metaphorical conceptualizations of the war.¹⁴ Almost squarely in the centre of the pictorial space sits America, urging France to 'Strike Home' on her behalf (the gender of the personification is not clear, but, as Joan Dolmetsch has suggested, it is probably an Indian woman).¹⁵ She is riding in a wheelbarrow being pushed along by a Dutchman who is suggesting that his country's treaties with Britain are worthless when weighed against the financial opportunities to be had from trading with the latter's enemies. Alongside America are France and Spain, and, while the latter tries to persuade 'brother' Portugal to join the family compact, the former holds Britannia by the arm and stabs her through the heart with his sword. Britannia, with only a few drops of blood emerging from her wound, is lying on the ground being run over by the oncoming wheelbarrow. She has fallen on her shield and is therefore unable to protect herself with it, while her spear lies

¹³ See the letter from an anonymous writer in Southampton dated 9th January 1781, published in: Lieut.-Col. W. C. Rochfort, *The Invasion of the Island of Jersey, with the Proceedings and Sentence of the Court-Martial, held on Major Corbet, the Lieut.-Governor*, (Jersey, [1852]), p. 21.

¹⁴ A diligence was an open, public carriage, but is here shown as a wheelbarrow. Joan D. Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation: Satirical Prints on the Revolution at Williamsburg*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1976), p. 116, n. 2.

broken behind her. Her only possible source of protection comes from the large Russian soldier who advances on the Dutchman with his musket and bayonet, but in the meantime she can only bemoan the cruel actions of her neighbours in assisting her rebellious children.

The grouping within the wheelbarrow in *The European Diligence*, the inconsistency of the sizes of the personifications, and the oversized musket and bayonet of Russia all suggest engagement with 'balance of power' metaphor and the search of continental allies, although references to the family compact and the presence of female personifications for Britain and America suggest that on some level it also engages with 'family quarrel' metaphor. The spilling of blood takes up only a small part of the picture surface and is not the main focus of the print, but it is integral to its narrative since it shows that the Frenchman's sword has actually pierced Britannia's skin. Although by October 1779 the threat of Bourbon invasion had all but passed, Britons were not to know this at the time, and the presence of this wound signifies how close to home the danger from war had been brought by European involvement in the America War, since chest and abdomen wounds were normally fatal.¹⁶

As hinted at in *The European Diligence*, relations between Great Britain and France and the succession of eighteenth-century wars between the two were imagined in terms of the infliction of injuries on one another such as the 'recent wounds' inflicted on France in the Seven Years' War, which had fuelled their long-standing

¹⁵ Dolmetsch, *Rebellion and Reconciliation*, p. 116.

¹⁶ Not for nothing are these areas referred to as 'vitals'. Richard Hardaway Meade, *An Introduction to the History of General Surgery*, (Philadelphia, London & Toronto, 1968), pp. 20-21.

competition and mutual hostility.¹⁷ This was echoed in pamphlets and poems that described ‘bleeding *France*’ as still feeling ‘the ill-heal’d wound.’, which might refer to the territorial amputation of Canada, the crippling cost of defeat or the lingering resentment caused by its losses.¹⁸ The traditional enmity between Britain and France could therefore be seen as a still bleeding ‘eternal wound’; relations between the two being imagined as a series of interruptions or breaks in periods of peace, and such breaks conceptualized as wounds to be ‘patched, bandaged, or otherwise conspicuously tied together.’¹⁹ Given this conceptualization of Anglo-French relations, the entry of France to the conflict in 1778 must have been the main factor in the increase in the use and number of sanguinary metaphors after that date. By the 1780s the tide of British opinion seems to have been against further prosecution of the war as people came to the realization that continued conflict was likely to be incredibly costly, both in terms of money and lives, and with little potential gain. Already wounded (for example by Burgoyne’s surrender at Saratoga in 1777), ‘Britannia [was] now so maimed and wounded in both arms and legs, that she [could] scarce either work or walk,’ and further attempts to ‘crawl out and fight on her knees,’ would only result in her being ‘wounded to the heart.’²⁰ It is during this period therefore that Britons focused on weighing up the pros and cons of the war.

¹⁷ Thomas Day, *Reflexions upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p. 4. Day also referred to Holland’s losses of territory in the War of American Independence as injuries. See: p. 35.

¹⁸ *An Apology for the Times: a Poem, Addressed to the King*, (London, 1778), p. 40.

¹⁹ William Whitehead, ‘Ode for the New Year’. *The Gentleman’s Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLVIII (1779), p. 37. Barbara Maria Stafford, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1991), p. 164.

Blood And Treasure

One of the ways in which artists showed that a limb had been severed (rather than simply being missing) in dismemberment imagery was to depict the resultant bleeding. Such images tended not to show a jagged cut through flesh and bone, but instead a clean straight slice with lines and striations signifying the outward flow of bodily fluids and shading for the remaining area of the cross-section. The effect of this was to make it appear that the embodiment of the body politic being represented was actually a vessel, the contents of which were pouring out. In *The English Lion Dismember'd* from 1756 (*figure 6.8*), a paw marked 'Minorca' has been dismembered and both continuous and broken lines from the end of the lion's leg, as well as some squiggles on the ground beneath, suggest the flow of some liquid that is probably intended to be seen as blood. The same motif reappears in *The English Lion Dismember'd. Or the Voice of the Public for an Enquiry into the Public Expenditure* of 1780 (*figure 6.9*), though the paw is this time marked 'America'. The similarities in title and central focus reveal a continuity of thought in terms of dismemberment. However, what has changed between the two is a subtle alteration in the depiction of the effluvia leaving the lion's stump. The smooth lines of the earlier flow have instead become a series of curving squiggles that suggest something altogether more globular is being lost. The appearance is less of blood spurting from a wound, than of a steady stream of something more solid pouring out of the interior of the lion.

The frontispiece to Hobbes's *Leviathan* (*figure 2.7*) shows how the shape of the body politic can be thought of in terms of surface alone and hence separate to

²⁰ [Thomas Tod], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence. Shewing The great Advantages that will arise from it to the Manufacturers, the Agriculture, and commercial Interest of Britain And*

consideration of interior constituent parts. Although personifications in satirical prints behave like real people, there is a sense in which what we see is simply the exterior surface of a vessel, the contents of which are conceptual and contextual rather than physical. The figure of Britannia, for example, can embody the British (or English) nation, or the British (or English) people, she can include or exclude the American colonies, she can act as the government's representative or victim, and so forth. Although bodies politic like Britannia in *The European Diligence* can be injured and bleed like bodies real, such emissions are more metaphoric and symbolic than actual, which is sometimes revealed by the different means used to represent them. In the 1780 *English Lion Dismember'd* there is a suggestion that what flows from the severed paw of the lion is both blood, which should logically flow when a creature of flesh and blood has a limb cut off, and money, which would be closer in terms of appearance. The globular flow from the lion looks more like the coins being vomited by the figure of Sir Thomas Rumbold in 1783's *The Nabob Rumbled, or a Lord Advocates Amusement* (figure 7.6) rather than any straightforward spurt of blood.

By the time the 1780 *English Lion Dismember'd* was published, France and Spain had joined the war against Britain, and both they and America (depicted as a male Indian) are shown discussing whether or not the limbs of the lion will all be cut off, and to whom they might belong if that should happen. After defeats in America, and with the threat of European invasion, one of the ways in which Britons' expressed the burden of continuing the fighting was in terms of cost. On the left, Lord North struggles under the weight of the sack labelled 'Budget' he is carrying on his back.

This sack is shackled to the lion with a chain, thereby directly linking both dismemberment and financial considerations, something that is also emphasized in the full title of the print - *The English Lion Dismember'd. Or the Voice of the Public for an Enquiry into the Public Expenditure*. Here, both wounding (or bleeding) and money seem to be regarded as two aspects of the same issue.

There was a long tradition in body politic theory of linking blood and trade or money. The use of the way blood moves about the body as a metaphor for the way money passed from person to person within the body politic can be traced back at least to Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*, which suggested that commerce was: '...the sanguinification of the commonwealth: for natural blood is in like manner made of the fruits of the earth; and circulating, nourisheth by the way every member of the body of man.'²¹ Similarly, Thomas Pownall commented on the discussion of free trade with America in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* in terms of blood vessels and arteries and other channels through which commerce circulated.²² Meanwhile, John Dalrymple, the Earl of Stair, referred to the flow of money and external pressure, in such a way as to invoke the imagery of a tourniquet restricting blood flow.²³ The use of blood as analogue for the circulation of money allowed for further links to be made between the two, and by the end of the seventeenth century blood and treasure were being connected as the main costs of war.²⁴ In the eighteenth century this

²¹ In chapter XXIV, section 11. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, edited and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1996), p. 167.

²² Commenting on chapter eight of: Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, vol. I, (London, 1776). Thomas Pownall, *A Letter from Governor Pownall to Adam Smith, L.L.D. F.R.S being an Examination of Several Points of Doctrine laid down in his 'Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.'*, (London, 1776), pp. 44-45.

²³ [John Dalrymple], Earl of Stair, *An Address to the Public, on the Present Peace*, (London, 1783), pp. 1-3.

²⁴ See, for example, the letter dated 9th May 1670 from the Earl of Arlington to Sir William Godolphin (at the time Britain's ambassador to Spain) in: Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, *The Right Honourable the Earl of Arlington's letter to Sir W. Temple, Bar. From July 1665. Being the first of his*

seems to have become a standardized term of reference and, when combined with contemporary concerns about the size of the population and available manpower, allowed the blood of Britons to become equated with their nation's financial prosperity.²⁵

Songs, poems and political tracts referred to the cost to the nation of the war in terms of 'blood and treasure' as if both resources were inseparably linked in the contemporary consciousness.²⁶ Writers like Thomas Day and Dr Josiah Tucker suggested that Britain's 'best blood' had been a major part of the expense of the ultimately unsuccessful prosecution of war in America.²⁷ The loss of life was an expense to Great Britain, as were the loss of trade and cost of action. Where victories were won by the British, as at the Battle of Bunker's Hill, it was 'bought' with the 'lives of many veteran officers'.²⁸ By redescribing the injuring and loss of individuals as the loss of the nation's collective lifeblood, writers might be thought of as trying to conceal the realities of war, but although blood imagery generalizes it still acts as a reminder of the wounding of individuals in battle.²⁹ After each engagement dead and injured officers were individualized by being listed in tracts or

employments abroad, vol. II, (London, 1701), p. 297. Such a connection continued well into the nineteenth century. [T. Gowing], *A Soldier's Experience. Things not generally known. Showing the Price of War in Blood and Treasure*. (Colchester, 1883), p. ii.

²⁵ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1989), pp. 145-148 & 636-637.

²⁶ From: *The Britons Resolution to conquer their Rebels in North America*. Anonymous, *Four excellent new Songs: I. The Britons Resolution to conquer their Rebels in North America. II. Britannia's Address to her Children. III. The Lover's Parting. IV. The New Broom*, (Newcastle, 1776), p. 3. See also: [Charles Inglis], *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated, in certain Strictures On a Pamphlet intituled Common Sense*, (Philadelphia, 1776), p. 41.

²⁷ Day, *Reflexions upon the Present State of England*, p.3, see also: p. 86. Dr Josiah Tucker, *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal to Those Respectable Personages in Great Britain and Ireland, who by their Great and Permanent Interest in landed Property...*, (Gloucester, 1775), p.29. Five years later, he repeated this view, referring to the 'Expense of Blood and Treasure' in: [Dr Josiah Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War; Addressed to the Moderate of All Parties*, (London, 1780), p. 9.

²⁸ *The History of Lord North's Administration, to the Dissolution of the Thirteenth Parliament of Great-Britain*. (London, 1781), p. 208.

mentioned in newspaper reports. The sons of the widow of Admiral Edward Boscowen were her 'treasure', and it was probably the knowledge that she had a teenage son stationed in Boston that prompted her to express the general hope in 1775 that George III would be able to 'stop this dreadful effusion of the blood of his heroic subjects...'.³⁰ In the case of the 1780 *English Lion Dismember'd*, the effusion of blood and treasure (linked by the chain) is blamed on Lord North's government, with America, France and Spain shown as the main beneficiaries of its policies.

In a way, the coupling of blood and treasure as a reason against continuance of the war also engages with balance of power metaphors. As the tide of British expectations turned from confidence in victory to expectation of loss, hastened by the entry of France in 1778 and Spain the following year, Britons began to weigh up the pros and cons of continuing a war in which the odds seemed increasingly stacked against Britain. The expenditure of blood and money both argued against prosecution of the war, and it is no surprise therefore to find such figures appearing in the rhetoric of those who opposed the war, in Day's reflections, Tucker's economic arguments, or the Duke of Richmond's political speeches.³¹ The 1780 *English Lion Dismember'd*, also references another form of opposition to Lord North's government, that of the Associations first formed at York on 30th December

²⁹ Injuring is the central act of war, a fact that is often concealed through redescription according to: Scarry, *The Body in Pain*, p. 80.

³⁰ She described her eldest son William in his epitaph (he drowned while swimming at Jamaica in 1769) as her 'lost treasure' (p. 22). The 'effusion of blood' comes from a letter from Mrs Boscowen to Julia Sayer dated 10th June 1775 (p. 63). Mrs Boscowen's teenage son, George, was in the army in Boston in 1775. Once she had secured his return to Britain her interest in American events seems to have waned (pp. 55 & 85). Brigadier-General Cecil Aspinall-Oglander, *Admiral's Widow*, (London, 1943).

³¹ Day, *Reflexions upon the Present State of England*, p.3, see also: p. 86. Tucker, *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal*, p.29. [Tucker], *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War*, p. 9. *The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, (Tuesday 5th February 1782), p. 1.

1779, which had parliamentary reform as their aim.³² Calls for reform could be linked to the loss of the American colonies by ascribing the latter to political corruption, which had created an imbalance in the body politic resulting in sickness requiring urgent medical attention. While surgeons treated sickness as something specific, visible and localized on the surface of the body (i.e. something that could be cut out or removed), physicians treated it as a deviation from the sufferer's natural state. The physician's role was therefore to manage a patient's symptoms until a proper internal balance could be restored.³³

Diagnosing and Treating the Body Politic

In the dismemberment imagery examined in the previous chapter outside agents could effectively take on the role of the surgeon amputating a limb from the body politic. However, when dealing with its internal ills politicians were commonly placed in the metaphoric position of physicians attending the body politic.³⁴ The Royal College of Physicians had been founded in 1518, and during the early centuries of its existence physicians mainly attended royalty, the aristocracy and the very wealthy, and it was therefore a profession that was particularly associated with those in whom political power was vested. This connection was further promoted by the fact that doctors were reliant for business upon networks of patronage, thereby further associating them with the great and the good of the day. Among the curative

³² Stephen Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, (Oxford, 2000), pp. 218-224.

³³ Christopher Lawrence, *Medicine in the Making of Modern Britain, 1700-1920*, (London & New York, 1994), pp. 22-23.

³⁴ See for example: [Tod], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence*, p. 1. See: Roy Porter, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900*, (London, 2001), pp. 229-249.

treatments available to physicians were blistering, vomiting, purging and bleeding, with the latter always being carried out under the direction of a physician even though a surgeon sometimes actually bled the patient.³⁵ Bloodletting was used to cure inflammation, fevers, asthma, coughs, colics, fits, dizziness, headaches, sore throats, piles, abscesses, swellings, various diseases as well as haemorrhages.³⁶ It was possible therefore for Britannia's blood to be shed at the instigation of what Horace Walpole scornfully referred to as 'state-doctors or state-quacks' in an attempt to cure her of her internal illness, even though the treatment might seem to be at best unpleasant and at worst life-threatening.³⁷

One of the metaphors used to conceptualize the rebellion in the American colonies and the subsequent war was that of disease, which could be regarded as contagious and requiring treatment lest the balance within the body politic be disrupted irrevocably resulting in its death. In 1774 General Gage informed the government that: 'The disease was believed to have been confined to Boston, from whence it might easily have been eradicated; but now it is so universal, there is no knowing where to apply a remedy.'³⁸ Although initially localized in the colonies this disease eventually affected the entire body politic meaning that both America and Britain were suffering.³⁹ Once France had entered the war in 1778, fear of invasion spread

³⁵ [Humphrey Markwell], *Medicina Demudata. Or, an Examination of some Reflections on Bleeding, Vomiting and Purging in the Beginning of Fevers, Small-Pox, Pleurisies, and other Acute Diseases.* (Dublin, 1727), p. 17. Lois N. Magner, *A History of Medicine*, (New York, 1992), p. 164.

³⁶ Hugh Smith, *The Family Physician. Being a Collection of Useful Family Remedies.* (London, [1771?]), pp. 36-37.

³⁷ Letter from Horace Walpole to Sir Horace Mann dated 4th March 1760. W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith & George L. Lam (eds.), *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, Volume XXI, 'Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, 1756-1762', (New Haven & London, 1960), p. 378.

³⁸ The letter from General Gage in Boston dated 25th September 1774 was read out in parliament on 19th January 1775. *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. (1775), p. 53.

³⁹ *Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America, in their private capacities as friends; tracing the several causes of the present contests between the mother country and her American subjects; the fallacy of their prepossessions, and the*

‘like a contagion... along our coasts, and extended its alarming symptoms even to the internal parts of the kingdom’.⁴⁰ In such figures, the war itself was regarded as some kind of disease infecting the body politic, which, like ‘family quarrel’ metaphor, could express the unnaturalness and threat to the continuance of the body politic that it represented.

Others preferred to see American rebellion as symptomatic of some greater physical disorder in the state rather than a disease in itself.⁴¹ This allowed those disaffected with the current political system or critical of contemporary fashions to ascribe the war to a wide range of internal causes, both political and social, including luxury, the role of sycophancy, the weakness of councils and corruption among politicians, all of which had effectively weakened the metaphorical constitution of the nation.⁴² Corruption in the body politic could be likened to the corruption in government that had resulted in increasing taxes, declining trade, and the war in America.⁴³ Metaphorically, therefore, politicians could represent potential sources of both treatment and disease.

The Fox-North coalition formed on 12th March 1783 is satirized in the print *A New Administration; or The State Quacks Administering* (**figure 7.7**). Here we see a man with the head of a fox (representing Charles James Fox) lifting up the skirts of a

ingratitude and danger of them; the reciprocal benefits of the national friendship; and the moral obligations of individuals which enforce it with various anecdotes, and reasons drawn from facts, tending to conciliate all differences, and establish a permanent union for the common happiness and glory of the British Empire, (London, 1775), p. 84.

⁴⁰ *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, Vol. XLVIII (1779), Advertisement, p. i.

⁴¹ Marcellus & Britannicus (Pseuds.), *Letters on the Present Disturbances in Great Britain and her American Provinces*, (London, 1777), p. 4.

⁴² *The Family In-compact, Contrasted with the Family Compact, A Tale, From Real Life*, (London, 1778), pp. 8-9.

Britannia who has been brought to her knees by eight years of war and faction. In the foreground, Lord North prepares to use a syringe to deliver an enema to the sickly woman, who is clutching her stomach as if she is unwell. Since the satirist refers to the politicians as 'Quacks' rather than doctors or physicians, and depicts them acting in a highly inappropriate manner by lifting up Britannia's skirts in public (which is suggestive of sexual activity and rape), it is unlikely that the enema will cure what is ailing her. In fact the action of the 'State Quacks' with their syringe can be thought of as an attack on the body politic, just as in Samuel Foote's comedy *The Devil Upon Two Sticks* the character Julep notes that such equipment is made 'to attack only in the rear.'⁴⁴

An earlier print generalizes this idea of politicians treating the body politic by taking as its subject an apothecary, who would have come below both physicians and surgeons in the eighteenth-century medical hierarchy. *Prattle The Political Apothecary* (*figure 7.8*) does not satirize any particular politician but rather the way that the war was seen as an illness that could be medically treated. In the lines etched underneath the image, Prattle gives his considered opinion on how he would have conducted operations in North America in 1779:

Beg your pardon my Dear Sir – had it from my Lud Fiddlefaddle, nothing to do but cut 'em off pass the Susquhanna, and proceed to Boston possess himself of Crown point then – Philadelphia, and South Caroline would have fallen of course – & a communication open'd with the Northern Army – as easily as I'd open a Vein.⁴⁵

⁴³ 'On Venality and Corruption', in: *The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer*, vol. XLV (1776), p. 171.

⁴⁴ Samuel Foote, *The Devil Upon Two Sticks; A Comedy, in Three Acts*. (London, 1778), p. 29.

⁴⁵ The copy of this print in the collection of the Library of Congress omits the reference to 'South Caroline': LC – 1-5603. The publication line has been cut off both copies in the Lewis Walpole Library, but is present on the copy in the British Museum: BM - 5603.

Prattle has been depicted in an awkward attempt to reveal himself to be a man of fashion and society with his feet turned out and his wig with its thin pigtail queue. However, his chest is thrust too far forward, his bottom too far back and his legs are bent at an extremely unlikely angle. The distortion in his own form denotes his inability to heal the body, and can be extrapolated to an inability to heal others or to cure the problems of the military campaign in America.

Although *Prattle* is a satire on both the medical profession and the prosecution of the war, it also works against a context of the multiplicity of opinions held by the consumers of such prints. Although physicians made attempts to intellectualize and mystify their profession to raise their status above that of surgeons and apothecaries, physic was a subject with which literate people had at least some knowledge. Newspapers and magazines carried articles with medical information and most households would have owned at least one book on self-diagnosis and self-medication in an age when professional medical care could be expensive or not readily available.⁴⁶ For example, a 'List of Books at Mount Vernon' made by George Washington in 1764 included a copy of a work entitled *The Family Physician*, which was probably something similar to Hugh Smith's book of the 1770s that boasted in its subtitle it was a *Collection of Useful Family Remedies*.⁴⁷ It was possible therefore for such people to have an opinion on health and doctoring, just as it was possible for them to have an opinion on the war and the way it was being managed by politicians.

⁴⁶ Porter, *Bodies Politic*, pp. 152-153.

⁴⁷ W. W. Abbott and Dorothy Twohig, eds., *The Papers of George Washington. Colonial Series. Volume 7. January 1761-June 1767*; Philander D. Chase and Beverley H. Runge, associate eds., (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1990), p. 347. Smith, *The Family Physician*.

Apart from bloodletting, physicians could expel toxic substances from the body through vomiting, and purging, both of which were regarded as natural cures for complaints since vomiting and diarrhoea could both occur without intervention. Yet doctors were criticized for using these methods as a first recourse rather than a last resort to a cure. As one wit pointed out to the military surgeon (who would also have acted as physician):

Whenever you are ignorant of a soldier's complaint, you should take a little blood from him, and then give him an emetic and a cathartic – to which you may add a blister. This will serve, at least, to diminish your patients.⁴⁸

Doubts about such means of treatment raised suspicions of quackery and could be used to suggest that the policies of politicians (or state-doctors) were more likely to cause harm than to cure the patient.

A bare-breasted young Indian woman representing America is more victim than patient in *The able Doctor, or America Swallowing the Bitter Draught* (**figure 7.9**). She is being physically restrained by the Earls of Mansfield and Sandwich (who is lasciviously lifting America's skirt) while Lord North (with the Boston Port Bill sticking out of his pocket) pours the contents of a teapot into her mouth. The fact that the liquid is being vomited up again is made clear in the way it is being ejected upwards directly into the prime minister's face. Since Lord North is holding America by the throat it is possible that she could not swallow the liquid even if she wanted to. Sharon Block is correct to interpret this image in terms of a rape scene, but it also needs to be understood in the context of the medical imagery that viewed American rebellion as an illness and British politicians as quack doctors whose

⁴⁸ [Francis Grose], *Advice to the Officers of the British Army: With the Addition of some Hints to the Drummer and Private Soldier*, 5th ed., (London, 1783), pp. 59-60.

treatments were either ineffectual or making the situation worse.⁴⁹ Undoubtedly *The able Doctor* engages with contemporary fears about male doctors attending women, with its concomitant suggestions of intimacy and impropriety, but it also suggests that Lord North and his cohorts are more intent on harming than helping the American colonies.

The choice of tea as an emetic administered to America in *The able Doctor* is related to the Boston Tea Party of late 1773, but also refers to an event that took place on 24th January 1774 when John Malcom, the British customs official in Boston, was tarred, feathered, led to the gallows on the edge of town and only released after being forced to drink a large amount of tea. A number of mezzotint engravings were produced in 1774 portraying versions of this event.⁵⁰ For example, in *The Bostonians Paying the Excise-man or Tarring & Feathering* (**figure 7.10**) the Bostonians have Malcom in a recumbent position while they pour liquid into his open mouth from a teapot, which at the same time is either spilling out of his mouth or being vomited up again. On the liberty tree behind the Bostonians a copy of the Stamp Act has been pasted upside down showing that it is the cause of such abnormal behaviour. In the left background boxes of tea are being tipped over the side of a ship into the sea in an obvious reference to the Boston Tea Party (although the participants do not appear to be dressed as Indians). However, these relate to individual incidents, while Lord North's revenge is acted out in *The able Doctor* on

⁴⁹ For the War of American Independence and the context of rape, see: Sharon Block, 'Rape Without Women: Print Culture and the Politicization of Rape, 1765-1815', *The Journal of American History*, vol. 89, no. 3, (December 2002), pp. 858-864.

⁵⁰ See also: Anonymous, *A New Method of Macarony Making, as practised at Boston in North America*, Mezzotint, published by Carington Bowles, 12 October 1774, 14 ¼" x 10 ¼" (36.2 x 26 cm), BM 5232.

the colonies as a whole through their representation as an Indian, to the obvious distress of Britannia and delight of France and Spain.

There might be a link between such medical imagery and that involving scatology, which has a long history of use for the purposes of both humour and satire. Aristophanes used it with satirical intent, for example, in his play *The Clouds* of 423 B.C., and as a literary tradition it can be seen in the eighteenth century in the works of Swift (*The Wonderful Wonder of Wonders* of 1720) and Pope (*The Dunciad* of 1743).⁵¹ In the seventeenth century, the use of the term 'Rump Parliament' ensured that scatological humour featured quite prominently in political satires, something that continued into the subsequent century with one satirical toast of the 1770s being: 'The Parliament-House / May the members be upright and make good motions.'⁵² Since an eighteenth-century slang term for the toilet was the 'House of Commons', such motions made within the 'Commons' could therefore be either bodily or political.⁵³ In *The CONGRESS or THE NECESSARY POLITICIANS* (**figure 7.11**), two men are seated on the lavatory in 'a necessary house' – another slang term for toilet. While one tears up the October 1774 'Resolution of the Congress' to use as toilet paper, the other reads one of the pamphlets responding to Samuel Johnson's pro-government *Taxation no Tyranny*.⁵⁴ Possibly this particular print is an attack on parliamentary opposition both for and against the government's North American policies, revealing perhaps what the unknown artist thought of politicians in general. However, while scatological imagery was used to satirize politicians, it does not

⁵¹ The tradition of using scatology in literary works for the purposes of satire has been traced in: Jae Num Lee, *Swift and Scatological Satire*, (Albuquerque, New Mexico), 1971.

⁵² *The Comet: Or, Meteor of Mirth, consisting of Entire new Toasts, Sentiments, Hob-Nobs, Boozing Similes, High Thoughts and Fashionable Ideas*, (London, 1772), p. 8.

⁵³ Jonathan Green, *The Big Book Of Bodily Functions*, (London, 2001), pp. 72-73.

seem to have been used directly in conjunction with personifications of bodies politic, despite the fact that diarrhoea was a sign that there was something wrong with the internal functioning of the body and its constitution, and could also be the necessary cure for the ailment.⁵⁵ Whereas the other medical imagery I have examined assigned politicians the role of physician, scatology seems to have been too firmly attached to them as patient or target and hence unsuitable for diagnosing the ills of Britannia. This suggests that perhaps scatology is used more to ridicule the processes of politics, while medical imagery ridicules the actions, policies and attitudes of politicians themselves.

Conclusion

Blood metaphors were used during the War of American Independence to express concerns about the threat to Great Britain from outside attack, about the loss of British lives, and about the damage caused to the balance of the body politic by impolitic decisions made by successive governments. All these concerns used figures of blood to mediate between what was happening in the interior of the body politic and the exterior world around them, and were particularly prevalent during the final years of the war. This turning inwards reflects the shift in the nature of the conflict from a civil war to a more European style one where balance was important both within and without the body politic. Although there are instances that state Britannia will survive in spite of her bleeding, the majority of this imagery expresses concern for the health of the British body politic should the war continue, and

⁵⁴ Possibly this is intended to be the anonymously written: *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet entitled Taxation no Tyranny*. (London, 1775).

ultimately turns to an attack on politicians showing a lack of confidence in their administrations.⁵⁶

There remains one area of blood imagery that has not been dealt with in this chapter – that of consanguinity, or the idea that Britons in Europe and Britons in the American colonies were of the same blood. Although expressed rhetorically this was not a direct feature of artistic imagery since it was expressed more easily visually through ‘family quarrel’ metaphor.⁵⁷ However, there is a sense in which the family relationship between the two populations remained in a quasi-familial relationship even after the war, as independent Americans made a case for themselves to be regarded on equal terms with their British counterparts. As a limb of the body politic, a child of the mother country, or a member of an inferior race America was represented as subordinate. The next chapter will investigate the failure of attempts to recast the Anglo-American relationship in a more equal and brotherly role in an attempt to justify the independence gained from a war of secession rather than a rebellion.

⁵⁵ W. Cockburn, *The Nature and Cures of Fluxes*, (London, 1724), pp. 1-2.

⁵⁶ *An Address to the Rulers of the State*, p. 2.

⁵⁷ *An Unconnected Whig's Address to the Public upon the Present Civil War, the State of Public Affairs, and the Real Course of the National Calamities*, (London, 1777), p.77.

Chapter 8: Sibling Rivalries

Both before and during the war the British populations in America and Great Britain were seen by many as being the same - having the same blood coursing through their veins and therefore tied together by consanguinity.¹ Their shared origins brought the two into a strong familial relationship since ties of blood were regarded as being more important than those of friendship.² Blood decided relationship, class, status and inheritance, while corrupted blood meant loss of relationship, a lowering of class or status and meant that the body could not inherit. The subject was taken seriously enough that it was noted: 'Nothing but the renovating power of an act of parliament can restore inheritable qualities to corrupted blood.'³ Blood could in fact be used to describe both what tied people together and what kept them separate, since consanguinity simultaneously connoted similarity as well as marking out members of the same family so closely related that they were prohibited from marrying.⁴

The family created by blood relationship provided a trope that could be used to differentiate and demarcate a population group, providing a model that expressed the unity of Britons and British-American colonists while also encompassing their quarrels. Within that family the parent-child configuration was a figure of authority and subordination and one that became increasingly unstable in the years following

¹ See, for example: Thomas Day, *Reflections upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782), p. 15.

² This sentiment was expressed, for example, by the character of Evelina after revealing to Mr Macartney that they are in fact siblings. Frances Burney, *Evelina*, introduction by Margaret Anne Doody, (London, 1994), p. 403.

³ *The Laws respecting Women, as they regard their natural rights, or their connections and conduct; also, the obligations of parent and child, and the condition of minors, etc.. In Four Books*, (London, 1777), p. 383.

the American Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the Franco-American treaties of 1778. If America was to be kept within a British sphere of influence and not allowed to strengthen ties with France then a new way of imagining the transatlantic relationship would have to be found.

The term 'brother' is one that not only belongs to familial relationship but by semantic extension denotes anything that is alike and related in the sense of belonging to the same category or type.⁵ Although brothers can exist within a natural hierarchy this is a period long before Orwell's authoritarian big brother, and there remains a sense of group allegiance and mutual interest to the metaphoric use of the term in the eighteenth century. This chapter will therefore look at the various ways in which the trope of 'brothers' impacted on the production of visual imagery relating to the war, both during the period after France had entered the war in 1778 and after the final peace in 1783. I will begin by examining those images from the War of American Independence that are said to include an alternative to representations of America as the Indian - Brother Jonathan. I will then look at the ways in which the American-born painter John Trumbull attempted to produce a painting while staying in England in the mid-1780s, which represented the commanders of the rebels and the British army as brother officers united by a code of conduct that prescribed the display of humanity towards a fallen enemy. In this work Trumbull was not aiming at an accurate depiction of events, but rather at the delivery of a moral message through the noble behaviour of the officers. In particular he singled out the British Major Small's act of deflecting a British grenadier's bayonet

⁴ *The Laws respecting Women*, p. 28. Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers*. 3rd ed., vol. I, (London, 1765), entry for 'Consanguinity'.

⁵ Adrian Room, ed., *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase & Fable*, (London, 1999 (1959)), p. 172.

thrust with his bare hand, in order to honour the American General Warren whom the artist described as 'equally distinguished by acts of humanity and kindness to his enemies, as by bravery and fidelity to the cause he served.'⁶ Ultimately, such brotherly expressions of the Anglo-American relationship failed, probably because of the instability of the 'family quarrel' metaphor of the latter years of the war and its unsuitability for describing the relationship between the two independent countries in the immediate post-war period.

John Bull's Brother Jonathan?

We have seen how the brotherly family relationship was one of the ways in which contemporaries understood the civil war aspect of the War of American Independence, demonstrating a lack of difference between Britons in the colonies and those in Great Britain.⁷ It is possible that the term 'Brother Jonathan', which was used between the period of the American Revolution to that of the American Civil War to signify the general identity of the ordinary colonist/American in popular culture and political cartoons, had its origins in the family metaphors that are part of the focus of this thesis.⁸ Popular nineteenth-century folklore ascribed the term's invention and popularization to a reference by George Washington to Governor

⁶ John Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters of John Trumbull from 1756 to 1841*, (New York, New Haven & London, 1841), pp. 412-413.

⁷ *Thoughts on the Present War, With an Impartial Review of Lord North's Administration, in conducting the American, French, Spanish and Dutch War; and in The Management of Contracts, Taxes, the Public Money &c.*, (London, 1783), p. 4. Alexander Gerard, *Liberty the Cloke of Maliciousness, both in the American Rebellion, and in the Manners of the Times*. (Aberdeen, 1778), p. 13.

⁸ However, Brother Jonathan was most often used as a symbol of American identity between the period of the War of 1812 and the Civil War. Winifred Morgan, *An American Icon: Brother Jonathan and American Identity*, (Cranbury, New Jersey, London, & Mississauga, Ontario, 1988), p. 63.

Jonathan Trumbull of Connecticut, but its exact origins remain unknown.⁹ Jonathan was a popular New England name in the eighteenth century and it was most likely used as a term of both kinship and condescension by the British and loyalists in New England in the early part of the war.¹⁰

The first written appearance of the term is usually taken to be *The Yankie Doodles Intrenchments near Boston 1776* (*figure 8.1*), where one American rebel is saying to another: 'I swear its plaguy Cold Jonathan, I don't think They'll Attack us, Now you.'¹¹ Although Haines Halsey suggested an English origin for this print Edgar Richardson has since argued that this it was actually produced by New England Tories.¹² As he noted, the unmilitary appearance of the American militia, the inclusion of General Israel Putnam (the figure furthest to the right), and in particular the reference to Brother Jonathan would all have been of more concern to local loyalists than a London satirist. His view is supported by the fact that no other written reference to Brother Jonathan appeared in Britain before a comic opera written in 1785 by an officer who had served in the 46th Regiment of Foot in New England under William Howe, and who presumably brought knowledge of the term back with him after the war.¹³ However, the print's text makes no specific reference to the term 'brother', and the reference may simply be connected with the

⁹ Albert Matthews, 'Brother Jonathan', *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Transactions*, vol. 8 (1901), pp. 99-100.

¹⁰ Albert Matthews, 'Brother Jonathan Once More', *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Transactions*, vol. 32 (1935), pp. 374 & 380-383. David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas*, (Oxford, 2005), pp. 221-222.

¹¹ Matthews, 'Brother Jonathan Once More'. Morgan, *An American Icon*, Preface, [p. ii] & pp. 65-66.

¹² R. T. Haines, Halsey, 'Impolitical Prints'. *An Exhibition of Contemporary English Cartoons Relating to the American Revolution*, exh. cat., (New York 1939), p. 16.

¹³ E. P. Richardson, 'Four American Political Prints', *American Art Journal*, vol. VI, no. 2, (November 1974), pp. 40-42. Matthews, 'Brother Jonathan Once More'. The likeness of Putnam is taken from a British mezzotint published in London by C. Shepherd on 9th September 1775. See: John Chaloner Smith, *British Mezzotinto Portraits*, (London, 1883), pp. 1714-1716.

commonality of the Christian name in New England. This image in fact has little direct engagement therefore with the familial metaphors of the conflict.

The same is not true of the second image normally related to the Brother Jonathan personification – November 1778's *The English and American Discovery, Brother, Brother we are both in the wrong* (**figure 8.2**). The title of the engraving includes a quotation taken from John Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*, and the horizontally oriented oval frame contains an image of two gentlemen sitting opposite one another at a table and smoking pipes.¹⁴ From left to right the two men appear in the same order as in the title, with the Englishman wearing a wig, being dressed in a tricorn hat and holding a glass or cup, while the American has his hair loose, is depicted in plainer dress and wearing a round wide-brimmed hat. On the table between them are a bottle and another glass together with four pieces of paper with writing on them: 'Morning Post' and 'London Gazette GR' nearest the Englishman, and 'Boston Nov 5 78' (the 7 is reversed) and (probably) 'Congress' in the shadow nearest the America. The 'Boston' date is the same as in the publication line of the print, while the papers ally the figures with England and New England respectively, perhaps with the table standing in for the Atlantic Ocean that separated them geographically.

However, there is little reason to think that *The English and American Discovery* includes a Brother Jonathan figure. The subtitle's brotherly connection comes from a non-familial use in Gay, while there was in any case a strong prevailing engagement with familial metaphor to conceptualize and explain the relationship between the English and Americans as we have seen. Dorothy George's suggestion that the two

¹⁴ John Gay, *The Beggar's Opera*, ed. by Bryan Loughrey and T. O Treadwell, (Harmondsworth, 1986), p. 87, Act II. Scene 10.

figures are John Bull and Brother Jonathan, which seems to have been accepted without question, is normally justified anachronistically by looking at American images of the two published in connection with the War of 1812, and then projecting that period's satirical conventions onto this much earlier print.¹⁵ Although the dress of the American and the rotundity of the Englishman might seem to fit this suggestion, it seems to me too early to be these specific national types.¹⁶ I prefer to see them as representatives of the two sides in the then ongoing civil war, the use of the term 'brother' engaging with aspects of the conflict's 'family quarrel' metaphor.

Both the *Morning Post* and the *London Gazette* were pro-Ministry newspapers, with the latter actually being an official government publication, which supports the idea that this print refers to the peace commissioners under the Earl of Carlisle that Lord North had sent to America in 1778, and whose concessions Congress had refused to hear that Summer.¹⁷ In Gay's work, the character of Peachum who says these words to Lockit continues: 'for you know we have it in our Power to hang each other.' In fact, at the time he says this, each has his hands clasped tightly around the other's throat. The end of the scene comes with the suggestion that instead of trying to kill one another they ought to combine forces against the highwayman Macheath in the cause of mutual self-interest. Gay's *Beggar's Opera* was partially a satire on the corruption of politicians, and it seems most likely that it has some significance for

¹⁵ M. Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda*, (Oxford, 1959), p. 156. Morgan, *An American Icon*, pp. 67-71.

¹⁶ The anachronistic tendency for scholars to label any male representative of England as John Bull even where there is otherwise no reference to him has been noted in: Tamara L. Hunt, *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England*, (Aldershot, 2003), p. 146.

¹⁷ Solomon Lutnick, *The American Revolution and the British Press: 1775-1783*, (Columbia, Missouri, 1967), pp. 20-24. The print's conciliatory tone was noted in: John C. Riely, *The Age of Horace Walpole In Caricature: An Exhibition of Satirical Prints and Drawings from the Collection of W. S. Lewis*, with an introduction by Dale R. Roylance, exh. cat., (New Haven, Connecticut, 1973), no. 69.

the interpretation of this image.¹⁸ If the wrong that Britain has committed is the waging of war on its colonial subjects, and the failure to make concessions at an earlier stage of the conflict when they might have been received more favourably, then what is the wrong committed by America? In 1778, apart from its continued rebellion against the British government, as far as most Britons were concerned its wrong was the American alliance made with France, one of the 'ancient and inveterate enemies to the common liberties of Europe.'¹⁹ Perhaps the implication of the Gay quotation is that Britain and America ought to put aside their mutual differences, stop trying to kill one another in a pointless civil war and join forces against the French as some Britons certainly hoped they would.²⁰

Significantly, above and between the two figures in the print is a picture of two hands grasped in friendship, and a number of Britons felt that, in the face of the danger of American and French forces combining against the British, and with the impossibility of retaining the colonists as British subjects since the Declaration of Independence, the only hope left was 'to regain them as friends'.²¹ Thomas Jefferson's original draft of that Declaration itself contained the statement that Americans must: 'endeavour to forget our former love for them [their British brethren], and hold them as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends.'²² This print therefore seems to occupy an ambiguous space within family metaphor where the use of 'brother' as a signifier of blood relationship overlaps with

¹⁸ Act II. Scene 10 was interpreted by contemporaries as a reference to the deteriorating relationship between the then Prime Minister Robert Walpole and his political ally and brother-in-law Lord Townshend. Gay, *The Beggar's Opera*, 'Introduction', p. 27.

¹⁹ Day, *Reflections upon the Present State of England*, p. 33.

²⁰ *The Triumph of Liberty and Peace with America: a Poem. Inscribed to General Conway*, (London, 1782), p. 24.

²¹ [*Arguments in favour of recognizing the independence of the United States.*], (? , [1777?]), p. 2.

²² Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography*, published by The Thomas Jefferson Society, (Keswick, Virginia, 2000), p. 14.

its use as a friendly term of reference between independent equals.²³ Similarly, while the term ‘brother’ suggests the sameness of either a family or some other closely associated grouping, the image actually stresses the Englishman and Colonist’s differences in terms of costume, coiffure, and headwear, showing that even when the two sides were represented as white men, it was already possible to assign a separate identity to America.²⁴

The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker’s Hill

The same visible difference between the two sides appears in John Trumbull’s *The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker’s Hill* (**figure 7.4**).²⁵ This battle had been an attempt by the British under General Gage on 17th June 1775 to drive the American rebels from their fortifications (actually on Breed’s Hill not Bunker’s Hill), from which they would have been able to bombard Boston. Trumbull started work on his painting while in Britain in 1785 as the first of a series of pictures covering scenes from the American Revolution, a project probably passed on to him by his teacher Benjamin West, who had previously written twice in 1783 to another of his former pupils – Charles Willson Peale - outlining an idea to produce ‘a few pictures of the great events of the American contest’ with the intention of having

²³ On Friendship, kinship and family, see: Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), pp. 64-66.

²⁴ The hat worn by the American here seems to be a common feature of the few American prints produced in this period. William Murrell, *A History of American Graphic Humor, Volume 1 (1747-1865)*, (New York, 1933), p. 16.

²⁵ Warren was President of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, and although reports suggested he was in command of the American troops, he was in fact merely present as a volunteer, his commission as Major-General having not yet come into force. Trumbull describes his painting in: John Trumbull, *Catalogue of Paintings by Colonel Trumbull*, (New Haven, 1832), pp. 7-11.

them engraved.²⁶ Since the Continental Army with its blue and buff uniforms had yet to be properly established and equipped, this image shows the British army's redcoats finally attaining the brow of the hill and forcing the rebellious, and variously attired New Englanders to retreat. Although it clearly differentiates between the two sides, Trumbull's painting is probably in part a retrospective claim that Britons and Americans should be seen as military (and by implication political and national) equals. To achieve this it seems to reject the idea of the war as an intergenerational family quarrel, and engage instead with metaphors of sibling rivalry, presenting the British and American commanders as brother officers with a shared code of merciful and magnanimous conduct.

In Trumbull's canvas a number of identified figures participate in one of the climactic moments of the battle. In the centre foreground Major John Small steps over the body of Lieutenant-Colonel James Abercromby, as he tries to prevent a British soldier from thrusting his bayonet into the body of the already mortally wounded American Doctor Joseph Warren.²⁷ General Israel Putnam (who had been caricatured in *The Yankie Doodles Intrenchments near Boston 1776*) leads the American retreat on the extreme left, while Lieutenant Grosvenor and the freed slave

²⁶ Letters from Benjamin West in London to Charles Willson Peale dated 15th June and 4th August 1783. West failed to complete any paintings on the subject either because he did not have time or because his links to George III made the subject impolitic. Lillian B. Miller, ed., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume I. Charles Willson Peale. artist in revolutionary America, 1735-1791*, Sidney Hart, assistant ed., Toby A. Appel, research historian, (New Haven & London, 1983), pp. 391-394. Trumbull completed two of his projected works in London that centred around the heroic deaths of Generals in the midst of defeat during the battle of Bunker's Hill and the American attack on Quebec. The second was: John Trumbull, *The Death of General Montgomery in the Attack on Quebec, December 31, 1775*, Oil on canvas, 1786, 24 5/8" x 37" (62.5 x 94 cm), Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut, Trumbull Collection.

²⁷ Abercromby died of his wound a few days later on 24th June 1775 having been removed to Boston. H. G. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. I, (Oxford, 2004), p. 86.

Peter Salem depart the scene on the extreme right.²⁸ Salem was credited with firing the shot that had killed Major Pitcairn who falls dying into the arms of his son just to the right of Small.²⁹ It is the prominence of Small and his action that seem to have been included to help make an image of British victory at the moment of American death, retreat and defeat, acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic.

In his autobiography of 1841, Trumbull noted how he had regarded the death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker's Hill as one of the 'earliest important events' of the war. It had been his intention to pay tribute to the memory of eminent men who had given their lives for their country.³⁰ That there had been no clear-cut victory at the battle, allowing both sides to claim 'much honour' from it, may have been what suggested it to Trumbull as a subject that was potentially pleasing to both countries.³¹ As David Bindman has recently pointed out, Major Small's action is one of two incidents added to the composition that do not appear in Trumbull's preliminary drawings, the other being the death of Major Pitcairn.³² It was not therefore part of Trumbull's original intention, and Helen Cooper has noted how this

²⁸ Peter Salem had been freed by his owner in response to his desire to enlist in the provincial army, which did not accept slaves. He had also fought at the battles of Lexington and Concord. William E. Alt & Betty L. Alt, *Black Soldiers, White Wars: Black Warriors from Antiquity to the Present*, (Westport, Connecticut, & London, 2002), p. 18.

²⁹ It is generally agreed that Major Pitcairn died in his son's arms having just reached the American breast work. See for example: James Thacher, *A Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775 to 1783, describing interesting events and transactions of this period with numerous Historical Facts and Anecdotes, from the original Manuscript*, (Boston, 1823), p. 32. Salem Poor (another black soldier) was credited with firing the shot that was to kill Lieutenant-Colonel James Abercromby. Gail Buckley, *American Patriots: The Story of Blacks in the Military from the Revolution to Desert Storm*, (New York, 2001), pp. 11-12.

³⁰ Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters*, p. 93.

³¹ William Russell, *The History of America, from its Discovery by Columbus to the Conclusion of the Late War. With an Appendix containing an account of the Rise and Progress of the Present Unhappy Contest between Great Britain and her Colonies*. Vol. II, (London, 1778), p. 521. See also: James Murray, *An Impartial History of the present War in America; containing An Account of its Rise and Progress, The Political Springs thereof, with its various Successes and Disappointments, on Both Sides*, vol. I, (London, [1780?]), p. 465. *The History of the War in America, between Great Britain and Her Colonies, from Its Commencement to the end of the Year 1778*. Vol. I, (Dublin, 1779), p. 85.

change of plan shifts the focus from Warren's death (the subject of the painting according to its title) to Small's noble gesture.³³ The addition of Small and Pitcairn, provide British counterparts to Warren's self-sacrifice in the service of his country, and the courage of the unknown American who supports him with one arm while trying to fend off the British bayonet with the other.³⁴

Trumbull's decision to depict a British victory but also show them displaying humanity towards a noble fallen enemy was not an attempt to depict accurately the events of the day, but instead reveals his intention to convey a moral message through the noble behaviour of the officers.³⁵ According to one advice manual written in 1776 a mild and kind treatment of conquered enemies (rather than cruelty) was an essential part of the character of an officer, and hence Small's act of magnanimity was part of the public's expectations of the officer class.³⁶ West had previously used it as the subject of his *General Johnson Saving a Wounded French Officer from the Tomahawk of a North American Indian* (**figure 8.3**) which similarly shows a British officer protecting the wounded leader of the defeated French forces, Baron Ludwig August von Dieskau, from a vengeful attack after the British victory at Lake George in 1755.³⁷ Trumbull later returned to the subject in a painting of a scene from the Siege of Gibraltar (**figure 8.4**) where it is a Spaniard who is offered his life by British officers including General George Elliot, the garrison's

³² David Bindman, 'Americans in London: contemporary history painting revisited', on pp. 9-23 of: Christiana Payne and William Vaughan, eds., *English Accents: Interactions with British Art c. 1776-1855*, (Aldershot, 2004), p. 15.

³³ Helen A. Cooper, ed., *John Trumbull: The Hand and Spirit of a Painter*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1982), p. 48. See also: Ronald Paulson, 'John Trumbull and the Representation of the American Revolution', *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 21, no. 3, (Fall 1982), p. 351.

³⁴ Irma B. Jaffe, *John Trumbull: Patriot-Artist of the American Revolution*, (Boston, 1975), p. 88.

³⁵ Cooper, *John Trumbull*, p. 48.

³⁶ Letter 7 in: *Advice from a Father to a Son, just entered into the Army, and about to go Abroad into Action. In Seven Letters*, (London, 1776), p. 77.

commander.³⁸ Furthermore, he wrote in his autobiography that his *The Capture of the Hessians* was ‘a lesson to all living and future soldiers... to show mercy and kindness to a fallen enemy – their enemy no longer when wounded and in their power.’³⁹ The same lesson forms part of the moral narrative of his *Bunker’s Hill* painting, where Major Small is depicted setting a good example to others by sparing the life of his enemy.

Trumbull was not concerned so much with the outcome of the battle as with the behaviour of the participants, and in particular with the personal virtue of the officer class on both sides.⁴⁰ During the War of American Independence there was a general feeling in England that the rebel forces could not be considered a proper army, but were instead ‘a body of peasants’ - undisciplined, cowardly, disobedient, impatient, and ‘possessed of that spirit of levelling which admits of no order, subordination, rule, or government.’⁴¹ At the beginning of the war American officers were rarely referred to by military rank, and Joseph Warren was normally given his medical title of Doctor in reports of the battle, rather than the rank of General awarded him by Americans such as Trumbull.⁴² In part, this was because the American army was not recognized as such, nor was there any willingness initially to see it as a potentially equal force, and Trumbull’s painting must be seen as a response to British histories

³⁷ This image would have been well known to contemporaries. Helmut Von Erffa & Allen Staley, *The paintings of Benjamin West*, (New Haven & London, 1986), pp. 210-211.

³⁸ The painting is discussed in: Cooper, *John Trumbull*, pp. 56-62.

³⁹ Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters*, p. 420. John Trumbull, *The Capture of the Hessians at Trenton, December 26, 1776*, Oil on canvas, 1786-1828, 21 1/4" x 31 1/8" (54 x 79.1 cm), Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut, Trumbull Collection.

⁴⁰ Jaffe, *John Trumbull*, p. 88. Paulson, ‘John Trumbull and the Representation of the American Revolution’, p. 351.

⁴¹ The first quotation comes from: *The History of Lord North’s Administration, to the Dissolution of the Thirteenth Parliament of Great-Britain*. London, 1781, p. 208. The remainder from: *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, (14th July 1775).

⁴² While the British ‘Generals Howe, Burgoyne and Clinton’ are referred to by rank, Putnam is only referred to by his surname, while Warren is ‘Dr. Warren’ in, for example: *The History of Lord North’s Administration*, pp. 208-209.

that denied the Americans any right to a proper military standing. His keenness to achieve a balance between the deaths of Warren and Pitcairn, and between Small and the unknown American, is an attempt to represent both sides as retrospective equals in terms of their behaviour.

Although Trumbull watched the battle of Bunker's Hill through field-glasses, this was from his station at Roxbury some distance away, and the painting must therefore be derived from a mixture of research and artistic licence.⁴³ The clothes in which he has dressed Warren accord with contemporary reports that 'The Doctor's dress was a light-coloured coat, with a white satin waistcoat laced with silver, and white breeches with silver loops...'.⁴⁴ The pale colouring of his costume helped to distinguish him from the other figures and to emphasize his innocence and purity, especially when seen as a contrast to the vivid redcoats of the British army. However, there was much disagreement, both before and after the painting was produced, as to the exact circumstances of Doctor Warren's death. There is some agreement, particularly among his early biographers, that he was shot towards the end of the battle and died soon after from his wound.⁴⁵ Yet, none of these mention the incident of the bayonet,

⁴³ Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters*, p. 39.

⁴⁴ John Clarke, *An Impartial and Authentic Narrative of the Battle Fought on the 17th June 1775, between Her Britannic Majesty's Troops and the American Provincial Army, on Bunker's Hill, near Charles Town, in New England*. (London, 1775), p. 18. According to a letter from a leader in the Provincial Army to a friend in London dated 26th June, Warren was dressed 'like Lord Falkland, in his wedding suit', presumably a reference to a seventeenth-century portrait owned by Horace Walpole of Falkland dressed all in white. *Lloyd's Evening Post*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2827, (Wednesday 9th August to Friday 11th August 1775). Colonel Humphreys who had both seen the painting and been present at the battle it portrayed, confirmed in 1818 that General Putnam was depicted in the 'light blue and scarlet uniform he wore that day...'. Colonel James Humphreys, *An Essay on the Life of the Honourable Major General Israel Putnam*, (Boston, 1818), p. 98.

⁴⁵ Thacher, *A Military Journal*, p. 31. A Bostonian, *Biographical Sketch of Gen. Joseph Warren, embracing the Prominent events of his Life, and the Boston Orations of 1772 and 1775*, (Boston, 1857). Thomas J. Fleming, *Now We Are Enemies: The Story of Bunker's Hill*, (London, 1960), p. 298. John Cary, *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot*, (Urbana, Illinois, 1961), p. 221. See also: Major Gen. James Wilkinson's 'A rapid sketch of the Battle of Breed's Hill' published in 1816 and reprinted as an appendix to: William Abbott, ed., *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, (New York, 1901 (Boston, 1798)), p. 373.

which seems only to be found in the contemporary account of the battle written by Lieutenant John Clarke who had himself fought at Breed's Hill:

A report having prevailed, that Doctor Warren was not killed, I think it necessary to contradict it, as I saw a soldier, after the Doctor was wounded and lying in the trenches, going to run him through the body with his bayonet; on which the Doctor desired he would not kill him, for he was much wounded, and could not live a great while longer; on which the soldier swore that he would, for that he had done more mischief than any one else, and immediately run him through the body.⁴⁶

This then is the action that would be taking place if Small and the American were not attempting to intercede.

Histories of the battle from this period are repetitive, all deriving ultimately from the *Annual Register's* account of the battle, at the end of which the British soldiers: 'attacked the works with fixed bayonets, and irresistible fury, and forced them [the Americans] in every quarter.'⁴⁷ By this point in the eighteenth century the bayonet had become a sign of the redcoats' discipline and efficiency, partly due to the ruthless way they had been used during and after the battle of Culloden in 1746.⁴⁸ Both at the time and subsequently American defeat at Bunker's Hill has been at least partly attributed to their lack of bayonets, without which they were forced to use their rifles as clubs in close fighting as shown in Trumbull's picture.⁴⁹ Without the need to learn the complex drills necessary to use the bayonet, this lack meant the rebel

⁴⁶ Clarke, *An Impartial and Authentic Narrative*, p. 18.

⁴⁷ *The Annual Register, or a View of the History, Politics, and Literature, for the Year 1775*, 6th ed., vol. 18, (London, 1801), pp. 134-136.

⁴⁸ Charles ffoukes, 'Notes on the Bayonet', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, vol. 18, no. 72, (Winter 1939), p. 190. John K. Mahon, 'Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794', *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, (September 1958), p. 257.

⁴⁹ Murray, *An Impartial History of the present War in America*, p. 462. Harold L. Peterson, *Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783*, (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1956), pp. 198-200. Humphreys, *An Essay on the Life*, p. 96.

soldiers could also be regarded as undisciplined.⁵⁰ Early British accounts of the battle compare the two bodies of men by describing the British as disciplined, experienced, professional and regimented, and the Americans as peasant-like, inexperienced and amateurish.⁵¹

The impression given by contemporary British sources then is of a battle between unequals, with the Americans lacking the weaponry, discipline and leadership necessary to stand up to the professional regiments sent from Britain to subdue them. By the end of the war such deficiencies had been attended to however, and American victories at Trenton, Princeton, Saratoga and Yorktown had helped them to win the war and secure permanent independence, which enabled the Continental Army under George Washington to become a source of national American pride. In order to produce an image that would be marketable in both countries Trumbull had to negotiate between the different expectations that these factors would have created. He also had to provide Dr Warren with a noble heroic death, rather than an ignominious one on the end of a redcoat's bayonet, and represent the Americans as conducting themselves both properly and heroically, while negating any suggestion that the British were vengeful and inhumane.

⁵⁰ Samuel Swett, 'Historical and Topographical Sketch of Bunker Hill Battle', published as an appendix to: Colonel James Humphreys, *An Essay on the Life of the Honourable Major General Israel Putnam*, (Boston, 1818), pp. 193-194. Major Gen. Henry Dearborn's 'An account of the Battle of Bunker's Hill' published in 1818 and reprinted as an appendix to: Abbott, *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, pp. 376-377.

Brother Officers

The figure around whom Trumbull enacts narratives balancing issues of conduct, heroism, revenge and equality is that of Major John Small, who occupies the very centre of *The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker's Hill*. The initial battles of the war, when victory still seemed possible and the possibility of a swift conclusion could still be entertained, the British troops were praiseworthy figures, and even the lowest ranks of officers could be seen as part of a wider grouping of noble siblings: 'All *Bunker's Hill* burst full upon my Eyes; / There see, a Brother Ensign bleeding lies!⁵² The use of brother in this context suggests that the referents were of the same rank or profession; officers could be called 'brother ensigns' just as military doctors could be called 'brother surgeons'.⁵³ However, as we have seen there is little evidence to suggest that American commanders at the Battle of Bunker's Hill were also seen as brother officers. The purpose of Major Small's intervention is not only to present a moral example of merciful behaviour, but also to acknowledge Dr Warren as an opponent worthy of regard as an equal.

There were certain expectations about the way that officers behaved both on and off the battlefield. One advice manual, written in the format of seven letters from a father to a son whose regiment is about to leave Britain for North America, was essentially an extension of the normal educative process between the two.⁵⁴ As well as learning the correct way to behave, officers were expected to set a good example

⁵¹ An exception to this would be James Murray's statement that the Americans 'behaved like veterans, and troops of the greatest experience.' Murray, *An Impartial History of the present War in America*, p. 461 (see also: p. 463).

⁵² *The Tears of the Foot Guards, upon their Departure for America: written by an Ensign of the Provincial Army*, 2nd ed., (London, 1776), p. vii.

to others, both in life and in death, both on the battlefield and off it.⁵⁵ While the common soldiers might flee in the face of battle, the officers were expected to stand firm heroically, even at the cost of their own lives.⁵⁶ When this father advised his son that officers ought to respect and obey superior officers, veterans, and those who were older and of superior station, he was effectively drawing a parallel between the army and polite society as a whole.⁵⁷ Although not specifically a satire or polemic on the war itself, this manual was nevertheless informed by the 'family quarrel' metaphors of the conflict and written with the intention of supporting and maintaining the natural authority and hierarchy of contemporary society.⁵⁸ It comes as no surprise therefore that it uses familial relationship in referring to the son's fellow commanders as 'brother-officers'.⁵⁹ The sibling referent is used not to state that officers were equal in status, but by suggesting that they belonged to a brotherhood it referred to the common code of conduct set out in the manual which helped to bind the officer class together and set them apart from the common soldier.

Trumbull draws the Americans officers into this sibling arrangement through the figure of Small and his relationship with Warren. Born in Scotland in 1726, John Small had ended the Seven Years' War on half pay as a Captain in the 21st regiment.⁶⁰ On 14th June 1775, he received a commission from General Gage as a

⁵³ [Francis Grose], *Advice to the Officers of the British Army: With the Addition of some Hints to the Drummer and Private Soldier*, 5th Edition, London, 1783, p. 62.

⁵⁴ Letter 2 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son*, p. 12.

⁵⁵ Letters 2 & 3 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son*, pp. 16 & 23.

⁵⁶ Letter from Horace Walpole to Sir Horace Mann dated 28th August 1755 about the defeat of General Braddock's forces near Fort du Quesne (Pittsburgh). W. S. Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith & George L. Lam, eds., *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. XX, 'Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, 1748-1756', (New Haven & London, 1960), p. 495.

⁵⁷ Letter 6 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son*, p. 60.

⁵⁸ Letter 2 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son*, p. 19.

⁵⁹ Letter 6 of: *Advice from a Father to a Son*, p. 59.

⁶⁰ G. Murray Logan, *Scottish Highlanders and the American Revolution*, (Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1976), p. 7.

Major in the Royal Highland Emigrants, but before he could leave Boston to raise his battalion in Nova Scotia, he fought in the Battle of Bunker's Hill with the 38th and 43rd regiments.⁶¹ At the end of the War of American Independence Small was placed on half pay as a Lieutenant Colonel of the 84th regiment, before receiving his commission as Colonel in 1790.⁶² In 1793 he was appointed as Lieutenant Governor of Guernsey, and died on the island on 17th March 1796.⁶³

Trumbull's depiction of Major Small in his *Bunker's Hill* painting seems to have been taken from life based on a similarity in likeness with portraits of Small in the collections of the museum at Fort Ticonderoga and at the Musée du Chateau Ramezay in Montreal (*figures 8.5 & 8.6*), which both probably date from the 1790s.⁶⁴ This tallies with Trumbull's 1790 proposal for an engraving of his work, which states that Small is one of seven figures taken from portraits. Therefore, it seems most likely that the two had met before Trumbull settled on his final composition probably at the end of 1785.⁶⁵ His only reference to meeting Small comes from a letter he wrote to Daniel Putnam (the son of General Israel Putnam) dated 30th March 1818, in which he recounted how he had met Small in London in

⁶¹ Russell, *The History of America*, p. 520. During a second advance with these regiments Small is said to have taken a bullet in his sword arm, but shrugged it off shifting his weapon to his other hand and continued with the attack. Later he supposedly rushed to support General Howe when the latter was hit in the foot by a stray musket ball. Fleming, *Now We Are Enemies*, pp. 261, 267 & 293.

⁶² [War Office], *A List of the Officers of the Army, and Marines*, 33rd ed., [London, 1785], p. 309.

⁶³ For information on John Small, see: Sidney Lee, ed., *The Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. LII, (London, 1897), p. 382. H. G. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 50, (Oxford, 2004), p. 954.

⁶⁴ I have been unable to track down the likeness of John Small recorded in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* apparently by a P. Jean in the R. W. Norton Art Gallery of Shreveport Louisiana, which dates from the period c. 1783-87. Matthew and Harrison, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 50, p. 954.

⁶⁵ Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters*, p. 339. The likeness of Doctor Warren was probably taken from Benjamin West's portrait of him painted in 1770. Jaffe, *John Trumbull*, p. 317.

the summer of 1786 when the painting was nearing completion, and that Small had shared a number of anecdotes referring to the battle.⁶⁶

One of these anecdotes was a claim that his friend Dr Warren had died in his arms, something seldom given credence by subsequent historians.⁶⁷ Another referred to a point in the battle when Small alone of the British officers in one advance had survived to reach the Americans only to find that several were aiming their rifles at him. He recounted how he was only saved by the explicit intervention of his old friend Israel Putnam, who:

rushed forward, and striking up the muzzles of their pieces with his sword, cried out, 'For God's sakes, my lads, don't fire at that man – I love him as I do my own brother.' (...) He was obeyed; I bowed, thanked him, and walked away unmolested.⁶⁸

There seem to be some problems with Trumbull's memory of when this meeting took place, since Abigail Adams, the wife of the future second president of the United States - John Adams - referred to the picture in a letter dated 4th March 1786, suggesting that it was already complete at that time.⁶⁹ It may be that Trumbull misremembered the timing of his meeting, but although his reminiscence gives no clue as to how Small came to his attention, it does draw the Major into the genesis of the work and connect him with the ideas of both magnanimous conduct and of a

⁶⁶ Daniel Putnam, *A Letter to Major-General Dearborn, repelling his Unprovoked Attack on the Character of the Late Major-General Putnam; and containing some Anecdotes relating to the Battle on Bunker-Hill, not generally known*. (Boston, 1818), pp. 2 & 8.

⁶⁷ Abbott, *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, p. 389. Swett, 'Historical and Topographical Sketch of Bunker Hill Battle', p. 250. See also the entry on 'Joseph Warren' by Alexander H. Everett in: Jared Sparks, *the Library of American Biography, Volume X. Lives of Robert Fulton, Joseph Warren, Henry Hudson and Father Marquette*, (New York, [1888?]), p. 176.

⁶⁸ Abbott, *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, pp. 388-389.

⁶⁹ Letter from Abigail Adams to her sister Mrs Shaw, dated London 4th March 1786. Abigail Adams, *Letters of Mrs Adams, the wife of John Adams, with an Introductory Memoir by her Grandson, Charles Francis Adams*, 4th ed., (Boston, 1848), p. 277. The painting was certainly complete by July 1786 when Trumbull took it with him to Paris in search of suitable engraver.

brotherly relationship across enemy lines.⁷⁰ Small's second anecdote demonstrates that the American leaders displayed the proper military etiquette for the day, and offers a strange parallel action to that of Small's in the painting, whereby an officer on one side physically intervenes to prevent his soldiers from killing an enemy officer who was known to him.

While officers were expected to be in control of themselves and their actions, and to display magnanimity, the soldiers under their command were expected to require controlling. The action of the grenadier attempting to bayonet Doctor Warren, is normally interpreted as an act of revenge for the way the Americans had been 'intent on cutting down every officer they could distinguish in the British line'.⁷¹ This idea that the Americans had directed their aim particularly at British officers was commonly held at the time.⁷² For Horace Walpole it was a sign of the rebels' lack of 'breeding', while William Russell's *History of America* went further in accusing the Americans of 'deliberate murder' in using a tactic that he described as 'worthy of the savage Indians, from whom it seems to be borrowed'.⁷³ Small's act therefore serves to contradict these views, since Trumbull has chosen to depict him stepping over the body of one of those shot officers to prevent the vengeful bayoneting of Warren.

⁷⁰ Trumbull wrote to Daniel Putnam: 'Col. Small had the character of an honourable upright man, and could have no conceivable motive for deviating from the truth in relating these circumstances to me; I therefore believe them to be true.' Putnam, *A Letter to Major-General Dearborn*, p. 9. There were many who doubted the truth of Major Small's stories, arguing that they were illogical and inconsistent, that Small would not have been so close to the American lines at the head of his men, and that Putnam could not have prevented every single American from firing on him if he were. Francis J. Parker, *Colonel William Prescott, the Commander in the Battle of Bunker's Hill*, (Boston, 1875), p. 21. The contents of Trumbull's letter are discussed in: *An Enquiry into the Conduct of General Putnam, in relation to the Battle of Bunker, or Breed's Hill: and Remarks upon Mr S. Swett's Sketch of that Battle*, (Boston, 1819), pp. 31-34.

⁷¹ Dearborn 'An account of the Battle of Bunker's Hill', p. 382. Cooper, *John Trumbull*, p. 48.

⁷² This was supposedly confirmed by American prisoners held by the British in Boston. Clarke, *An Impartial and Authentic Narrative*, p. 15. Letter from Horace Walpole to Sir Horace Mann dated 3rd August 1775.

⁷³ Lewis, Smith & Lam, with Martz, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. XXIV, p. 120. Russell, *The History of America*, p. 520, n. *.

The body in question is that of Lieutenant-Colonel James Abercromby, who appears to be dead although he actually died of his wounds a few days later.⁷⁴ Between 1756 and 1760, both he and Small served together as officers in the 42nd regiment, also known as the Black Watch, and it seems likely therefore that the two Scotsmen would have known one another. If we could understand anyone seeking revenge for the death of a brother officer, and possibly a friend, it would be Small, but instead he acts to prevent this from taking place.

There may be another reason for the choice of Major Small to undertake this action. Not only was he probably a friend of both Warren and Abercromby, but according to John Trumbull's nephew-in-law Benjamin Silliman (who wrote an unpublished biography of the painter) the introduction of Small to the painting was a piece of poetic licence intended to honour him for 'his humanity and kindness to American prisoners'.⁷⁵ Small's reputation in America with regards to his treatment of prisoners, requires more research, but, if true, it may help to explain why he was chosen to undertake this action. It was only on 25th March 1782 that the British government passed a law designating captured Americans as prisoners of war, and allowing them to be detained, released or exchanged. Until then they were subject to poor-treatment as common criminals and under threat of revenge and reprisal, something that was a cause of irritation to colonists in general.⁷⁶

Part of the premise behind Trumbull's representation of the battle seems to be the mitigation of the behaviour of both sides as reported and repeated in accounts of the

⁷⁴ Matthew and Harrison, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. I, p. 86.

⁷⁵ Benjamin Silliman, 'Notebook', unpublished biographical sketch of John Trumbull, 1857, Yale, Trumbull Papers. See: pp. 65-67 of the typescript copy. Cited in: Jaffe, *John Trumbull*, p. 90.

battle from the summer of 1775 onwards. In pictorial terms, Major Small effectively unites the left and right hand sides of the composition, that is the British and American forces, and plays a significant role in highlighting the similar behaviours of military leaders on both sides. His act acknowledges Warren's status as a brother officer and hence demonstrates that the Americans have a right to be regarded as equal members of the officer class. For an American audience, he may also represent the acceptable face of the British officer, a humane man who did not indulge in cruel acts of revenge against helpless Americans. Furthermore his action effectively negates some suggestions that Warren died an ignominious death from a British bayonet. The fact that he has been allowed to approach so close to the American front line without being shot, despite the rifle pointed at him by Major Knowlton (standing directly behind Warren), counters British claims that their officers were particular targets of the rebel forces, despite the deaths of Pitcairn and Abercromby.

However, despite the painting's attempts to use metaphors of brotherhood to recast British and American relations as one of equals within the family, it ultimately failed precisely because of the sense of balance it tried to convey. Although, as a painting it was successful in its composition, scene and colouring, Trumbull's *Bunker's Hill* painting failed in making a name and fortune for the artist.⁷⁷ As Dorinda Evans has noted, the *Bunker's Hill* painting's element of compromise in attempting to show good on both sides may have seemed to widen the painting's appeal, but it also resulted in the decision by the American Congress, some years later, to reject the

⁷⁶ William R. Lindsey, *Treatment of American Prisoners of War During the Revolution*, (Kansas City, 1969), pp. 7-8.

⁷⁷ Cooper, *John Trumbull*, p. 50.

idea of commissioning official enlargements.⁷⁸ For the British, it fell short of showing an unequivocal victory, disguised the tactics of the Americans, and pushed to the fore an almost completely unknown military figure. For the Americans it showed one of their early defeats, and placed the British at the centre of the action even though the forward motion of Small's action draws attention to the death of Dr Warren.

Conclusion

Both *The English and American Discovery* and John Trumbull's *Bunker's Hill* painting reveal the problems in showing the British and Americans to be paradoxically both the same and yet different. As Linda Colley has noted, the British use of the subordinate native as a signifier of American identity was successful precisely because it presented a clearly defined view of colonists as different and (when armed) as a potential source of danger to British interests.⁷⁹ This polarized version of the issue could be contested, but at least provided a firm basis for doing so, showing how the more ambiguous nature of a brotherly construction might fail to satisfy. When the War of American Independence could be imagined as a civil war where brother was fighting brother, the suggestion that American Independence meant that those brothers were now equal and capable of working together in a common cause was always going to be open to suspicion. This was especially true in light of the world's new balance of power, since America had once stood as an

⁷⁸ Dorinda Evans, *Benjamin West and His American Students*, (Washington D.C., 1980), p. 90.

⁷⁹ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, (New Haven & London, 1992), pp. 134-135.

enemy to Britain alongside France and Spain.⁸⁰ In any case, while a fraternal model for the Anglo-American relationship might be suitable for the new Republic, it sat poorly with the more paternal model of British government in a constitutional monarchy.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Stephen Conway, 'From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. LIX, no. 1, (January 2002), p. 98.

⁸¹ On the way in which the United States could be should of as a civil fraternity, see: Pateman, Carole, *The Sexual Contract*, (Stanford, California, 1988), p. 78. The problems in reconciling the two have been noted in: Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1992), pp. 4-5.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

Thomas Hobbes argued in the mid-seventeenth century that mother-child semantics could only pertain when a colony had discharged itself of its subjection to the sovereign system that had created it, and that colonies which remained dependent on the metropole were still members of the body politic.¹ Conversely, this dissertation has argued how in the eighteenth century it was the relation of colony to metropole that was regarded as analogous to that between parent and child, and that although the American colonies were initially conceptualized as part of the mother country, they soon took on the form of a separate body politic. During the War of American Independence, images show a general trend away from the representation of the colonies as female and dependent on a parent figure to male and independent of any other body politic. This process of removing Americans from the corporeal and familial model and redefining them as foreigners was precipitated by their apparent willingness to ally themselves with Britain's enemies from 1778.²

In the period immediately following 1783 there was no commonly accepted vision of American identity, and there seems to be only one extant British satirical print from the remainder of the 1780s that includes a representation of the newly independent American body politic – 1785's *The Hibernian Attempt* (*figure 9.1*).³ Here America is depicted as a Negro with feathers in his hair, and carrying a striped flag in one

¹ Part 2, 'Of Commonwealth', Chapter XXIV, Section 14 of: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1996), p. 168.

² Stephen Conway, 'From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. LIX, no. 1, (January 2002), pp. 67 & 100.

³ The rapidity with which America and the loss of the colonies seems to have been excised from the British consciousness in the immediate aftermath of the war has been noted, for example, in: Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven & London, 2004), p. 262.

hand and half George III's crown in the other. The image is used to suggest that political inattention would soon see Ireland go the way of America, since William Pitt the younger, Lord Thurlow and George III are deep in conversation, oblivious to the Irishman riding atop a bucking bull who is using a crowbar to try to hook the other half of the King's crown.⁴ In part this absence from political satires shows how British political concerns had moved on from America (largely to India), but the use of the Negro (despite the headdress) in *The Hibernian Attempt* rather than the Indian of the previous two decades suggests an attempt to deconstruct American identity and further remove it from any suggestion of sameness. In the post-war years Britons were more ready to view Americans as foreigners rather than fellow-Britons, even though the idea of a continuing transatlantic British community was appealing enough for it to survive into the nineteenth century.

Similarly, this period saw a slow reconstruction of American identity in a United States that had rejected a place within the British transatlantic family. For example, the use of Brother Jonathan figures gained currency in the early nineteenth century, as a referent to the ordinary American imagining him as naïve and provincial. The fact that he was also seen as representative of a threat to the governing elites from those of more humble backgrounds, reveals his origins as a British term of condescension.⁵ Yet he was only one of a number of competing visual images of American identity in this period, which included the continued use of the native Indian, the African slave, the European-based Columbia, and the infant state as the

⁴ He is not twisting the tail of the bull (John Bull) as suggested in: Cresswell, Donald H., *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints. A Checklist of 1765-1790 in the Library of Congress*, (Washington D.C., 1975), p. 393.

⁵ On the character of Jonathan, see: Morgan, *An American Icon*, pp. 21-25.

infant Hercules, until Uncle Sam emerged during the War of 1812 and became firmly established with the advent of the American Civil War (1861-1865).⁶

The images examined in this thesis were produced in an eighteenth-century vernacular that altered with time but nevertheless relied on the same sources and traditions, and it is therefore difficult to say whether subsequent pictures replicated their imagery or merely continued in the same vein. However, it does appear that the interpretations of images covered by earlier chapters can help to add layers of meaning to subsequent imagery that engages with the same traditions or metaphors. Although this study is an examination of the visual field's engagement with the metaphorical conceptualizations of Anglo-American relationships and conflicts as physical divisions within the body politic or quarrels within the family, it is also in a sense an exploration of eighteenth century visual identities and relationships during a period of great change. This concluding chapter not only looks at the recreation of American identity in terms of its European heritage, and the effects of the War of American Independence's corporeal and familial metaphors on later image production, but also some of the ways in which they impacted on the continued visual relationship between Anglo-American well into the nineteenth century.

⁶ David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas*, (Oxford, 2005), pp. 137-144 & 234-236. Winfried Schleiner, 'The Infant Hercules: Franklin's Design for a Medal Commemorating American Liberty', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, (Winter 1976/77), pp. 235-244. Lester C. Olson, 'Benjamin Franklin's Commemorative Medal, *Libertas Americana*: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 76, no. 1, (February 1990), pp. 23-45. Morgan, *An American Icon*, pp. 27-28 & 33-34.

Emblems of America

The recognition of American Independence in 1783's Treaty of Paris did not immediately create a new visual identity for America that could be used by image makers to represent the new nation. Instead a number of competing national figures and symbols appeared in the remaining years of the eighteenth century both in Britain and America.⁷ The 1798 mezzotint *An Emblem of America* (**figure 9.2**) uses a variety of representational means to identify America and express a very particular type of relationship with Great Britain that is related to the familial metaphors of the War of American Independence.⁸ In this image the personification Columbia holds a sixteen-striped flag with a blue box containing an eagle, and points to a column with oval portraits connected in a family tree that reveals the chronological discovery, settlement and political leadership of British America from Columbus, through Vespucci, Sir Walter Raleigh and Benjamin Franklin, to its first two presidents George Washington and John Adams.⁹ The sixteen stripes represent the thirteen seceding colonies and three new additions - Vermont (1791), Kentucky (1792), and Tennessee (1796) – while, as early as 1778, America had been described as: 'a young eagle... trying her wings, and attempting her flight, longing for the day, that shall

⁷ The American search for a common vision of national identity has recently been dealt with in: Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom*, (Oxford, 2005), pp. 119-246.

⁸ Subsequently some related images were produced that extended this single print into a series of national representations. Anonymous, *An Emblem of England*, Mezzotint, 'London Published 3rd Novr 1800 by Haines & Son No 19; Rolls Buildings, Fetter Lane.', 32 x 24.7 cm. LWL – 800.11.3.1. Anonymous, *An Emblem of Wales*, Mezzotint, 'London Published 3rd Novr 1800 by Haines & Son No 19; Rolls Buildings, Fetter Lane.', 31.7 x 24.9 cm, LWL – 800.11.3.2.

⁹ Columbia was made popular by Philip Freneau's poem *American Liberty* which first appeared at the beginning of the American Revolution. Seymour I. Schwartz, *The Mismatching of America*, (Rochester, New York, 2003), p. 21. Washington was president from 1789 to 1797, and John Adams from 1797 to 1801.

emancipate her from a parent's care'.¹⁰ Beside Columbia stand two figures of smaller stature (possibly intended to reveal their relative youth or immaturity) whose skin colour and curly hair identifies them as Negro slaves, although their feather skirts, headdresses, tomahawk, bow and quiver belong more properly to American Indians. Here, Columbia, Franklin, Washington, Adams, the negro slave, the American Indian, the eagle and the striped flag, which might all separately have been used to represent the United States, fight for attention within the same frame, reflecting a confused and fragmented sense of visual identity, a problem not solved until the general acceptance of Uncle Sam in the late nineteenth century.¹¹

Even so, the emphasis in *An Emblem of America* is on the centrally placed female figure of Columbia. The independence rhetoric of the War of American Independence had focused on gender and age, with pro-Americans arguing that the colonies were both male and mature.¹² The argument had been successful on the surface in that the war had led to the establishment of a republic, which was seen by political theorists as a virile form of government requiring the cooperation of strong men to lead and defend it.¹³ The maturity entailment of 'family quarrel' metaphor, had then been reapplied to the expansion of the new country, whereby new colonies in the west were to be 'nurtured until they reached maturity' (defined as the

¹⁰ [William Poultene], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, London, 1778, p. 98. In 1782 the eagle was chosen to represent the country on its seal. *The Great Seal of the United States*, United States Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, ([Washington, D. C.], September 1996).

¹¹ Winifred Morgan, *An American Icon: Brother Jonathan and American Identity*, (Cranbury, New Jersey, London, & Mississauga, Ontario, 1988), p. 34. Although modern political cartoonists favour the use of politicians as stand-ins for national personifications, Uncle Sam still appears in British cartoons. See, for example: Steve Bell, *Erectile Dysfunction*, Pen, ink and watercolour on watercolour paper, 2000, 21 x 30 cm, Collection of the artist. Steve Bell, *Apes of Wrath*, (London, 2004), p. 23. An exception would be Riddell's use of Captain America to stand for the United States' militaristic nature. See: Chris Riddell, *Tribal Politics*, (London, 1999), p. 117.

¹² Thomas Pownall, *A Memorial Addressed to the Sovereigns of America*, (London, 1783), pp. 33-34.

¹³ Joel Schwartz, *The Sexual Politics of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, (Chicago & London, 1984), p. 46.

attainment of a population of 60,000 free inhabitants), when they were to be admitted into Congress on an equal footing with the founding States.¹⁴ Yet, in *An Emblem of America* it is the child-like figures on the left of Columbia who are male, while she herself is represented as a white fashionably dressed young woman. Columbia's age demonstrates that America is to be regarded as a country grown to maturity, while her skin colour distances the dominant white communities of America from the other races that inhabit her shores, and by whom she had traditionally been represented.¹⁵ Her complexion also highlights her European roots just as her age and gender mark her out to now be a potential equal of Britannia - that she is female is no longer an issue, since independence was now a *fait accompli* it was more important that she be represented on a par with longer established European bodies politic.¹⁶

The Recreation of the Child's Identity in the Image of the Parent

Ironically the use of Columbia in *An Emblem of America* means that Britain and America resemble one another more than they ever had when represented as mother and daughter between 1765 and 1783. Benjamin Franklin's declaration during the Seven Years' War that Americans were entitled to the rights and liberties of Englishmen, was effectively a paradoxical statement that what made Americans

¹⁴ On American imperial ambitions and encroachments on native territory created by the War of American Independence, see: Francis Jennings, *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 4 & 281. Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 281 & 288.

¹⁵ It is ironic that although native Americans fought on the side of the British and were used visually to represent the colonies as a whole, they were mostly ignored in the peace even though it was in some cases their territory that was being transferred to the new state. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, p. 273.

¹⁶ The irony of Columbia being based by newly independent Americans on Britannia has been noted in: Laura K. Mills, *American Allegorical Prints: Constructing an Identity*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1996), pp. 7-9.

American was a claim to be English.¹⁷ During the Stamp Act crisis, the colonists' cry of 'no taxation without representation' was not a demand to be treated differently, but a demand to be given equal consideration to their fellow Britons in the mother country. However, the metropole saw things rather differently, as the artistic use of the Indian between 1765 and 1783 reveals, with the representation of America as the daughter of Britannia suggesting that she was subordinate to the mother country, and that by implication so were her inhabitants. Although this was sometimes used to comment on governmental policy rather than express British public opinion, the visual record reveals the ambiguous and uncertain nature of the status of white colonists in America. Horace Walpole might well have felt that: 'The English in America are as much my countrymen as those born in the parish of St Martin's-in-the-Fields...', but the truth of the matter was that increasingly they were born several thousand miles distant from London and St Martin's.¹⁸ Although there was no single moment of change, this ambiguity was resolved in part by British defeat in the War of American Independence, which allowed Britons like the Reverend Thomas Clarkson to note how the Americans had become 'aliens' and that formerly 'kindred' colonies such as Virginia and Maryland were now '*foreign states*'.¹⁹

Across the Atlantic, colonists defined themselves in print as Americans from the 1770s, but still based their political ideas (for example those on liberty) on principles

¹⁷ John Bigelow, *The Life of Benjamin Franklin, Written By Himself*, (New York, 1904), extracted in: Martin R. Brown & Ralph A. Brown, eds., *Europeans Observe the American Revolution*, (New York, 1976), p. 22.

¹⁸ Letter from Horace Walpole to Lady Ossory dated 26th October 1781. W. S. Lewis and A. Doyle Wallace, eds., with the assistance of Edwine M. Martz, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, volume XXXIII: *Horace Walpole's Correspondence with the Countess of Upper Ossory, 1778-1787*, (New Haven & London, 1965), p. 302.

inherited from England, and indeed some in Britain saw America as having settled herself 'upon the throne of independence, as heiress arrived at maturity...'.²⁰ The issue of inheritance was central to the way the people understood relationships between spouses, parents, children, siblings and other kin, and was one of three mechanisms in the eighteenth century whereby property, title, power and independence could be transferred between family members.²¹ The other two (maturity and marriage) have already been dealt with insofar as they impacted on the familial metaphors of the War of American Independence, however, inheritance is an important factor in aiding our understanding of the tendency of the newly independent United States to recreate itself in its parent's image.

Ideas of inheritance and recreation can be detected in James Barry's etching *The Phoenix or the Resurrection of Freedom* (*figure 9.3*), which was produced in direct response to events in America and Britain and published in December 1776.²² In the right foreground the dead body of Britannia lies on a funeral byre, surrounded by a group of mourners that includes John Locke, John Milton, Andrew Marvell,

¹⁹ Clarkson is best known for his involvement in the anti-slavery campaigns of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Thomas Clarkson, *An Essay on the Impolicy of the African Slave Trade*, (London, 1788), pp. 28-30. Conway, 'From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners', pp. 65-67.

²⁰ Peggy K. Liss, *Atlantic Empires: The Network of Trade and Revolution, 1713-1826*, (Baltimore, Maryland, & London, 1983), p. 44. *Americans against Liberty: or an Essay on the Nature and Principles of True Freedom, shewing [sic] that the Designs and Conduct of the Americans tend only to Tyranny and Slavery*, (London, 1775), p. 24.

²¹ Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the family and political argument in England 1680-1714*, (Manchester and New York, 1999), pp. 25-27. Toby L. Ditz, 'Ownership and Obligation: Inheritance and Patriarchal Households in Connecticut', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, vol. XLVII, no. 2, (April 1990), pp. 243 & 249.

²² Inscribed in the margin, lower centre: 'The Phoenix or the Resurrection of Freedom / Respectfully dedicated to the present Minority in both Houses of Parliament, by an Artist / O Liberty thou Parent of whatever is truly Amiable & Illustrious, associated with Virtue, thou hatest the Luxurious & Intemperate & hast successively abandon'd thy lov'd residence of Greece, Italy & thy more favor'd England when they grew Corrupt & Worthless, thou hast given them over to chains & despondency & taken / thy flight to a new people of manners simple & untainted. Hallow'd & Venerable are thy footsteps, Time that best Arbiter shall distinguish & strew thy track with honours.'

Algernon Sydney, and Barry himself at the far right.²³ The figure in chains in front of the byre, from whose coat pocket a paper emerges with 'Hab^s Corp^s' written on it, has been tentatively identified as either John Wilkes or Edmund Burke.²⁴ Across a stretch of water is a domed temple of liberty, on top of which is a phoenix and a liberty figure identified by the *hasta* and *pileus* she holds in her right hand. The inscription on the frieze of the temple - 'LIBERT. AMERIC.' - makes it clear that the land across the water must be understood as a representation of the thirteen rebellious colonies. Simultaneously Barry's use of the phoenix connotes both inheritance and re-creation, while his themes of degeneration and regeneration are emphasized through the presence of a number of contrasts.

The foreground is in deep shadow, while the distance is bathed in light suggesting that America may be seen as an example of the Golden Age normally prescribed for the classical civilizations of the past. Here that view, sometimes attached to the natural state of its native inhabitants, is ascribed to the white American colonists instead.²⁵ After the war Dr Richard Price invoked this notion of a Golden Age, suggesting that the 'happiest state of man is the middle state between the savage and the refined, or between the wild and the luxurious state'. This, he believed, was to be found in a young, vigorous, fertile, and hard-working America that was inhabited by 'an independent and hardy yeomanry'.²⁶ In Barry's print this idealized image of America and Americans is presented through the classical temple, the ploughman

²³ This list of Whig heroes suggests this print may also contain a republican meaning, and Barry seems to have such political leanings. William Henry Curran, *Sketches of The Irish Bar; with Essays, Literary and Political*, vol. II, (London, 1855), pp. 334-5. William L. Pressly, *James Barry: The Artist as Hero*, (London, 1983), p. 74.

²⁴ For speculation on this figure, see: William L. Pressly, *The Life and Art of James Barry*, (New Haven & London, 1981), p. 214, n. 35. Pressly, *James Barry*, p. 75.

²⁵ Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*, (New York, 1978), p. 73.

²⁶ Richard Price, *Political Writings*, edited by D. O Thomas, (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 144-145.

and the courting couple. The plough with its connotations of sowing, fertility and new growth is also contrasted with the scythe (a tool of the harvest) held by Father time. In the left foreground this figure is sprinkling flowers over the remains of earlier civilizations – Athens, republican Rome, and renaissance Florence - in which liberty and the arts had jointly flourished, while the presence of the Three Graces dancing on the far shore and the reborn liberty figure suggest a continuation of this westward migration.²⁷ By placing the shore representing Britain in the foreground it is made to appear narrow and constricted, while the American land in the background seems extensive, the hills and mountains promising further territory beyond.

The implication is that while Britain is nearing its end, its American colonies are new and burgeoning, and that with the death of Britannia liberty has been reborn in British America.²⁸ *An Essay on Liberty* published in 1778, quoted Bolingbroke's *Idea of a Patriot King*'s analogy between the liberty of the people and the health of the body: 'Liberty is to the collective body, what health is to every individual body. Without health no pleasure can be tasted by man: without Liberty no happiness can be enjoyed by Society.'²⁹ In *The Phoenix* the corruption of the body politic has led to the demise of those political liberties formerly enjoyed by Britons everywhere, and so to the death of Britannia. In the 1770s Barry was a member of the dissenting club at St Paul's Coffee House, that also boasted Benjamin Franklin and the radical

²⁷ Pressly, *The Life and Art of James Barry*, pp. 78 & 214 n. 36. Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Discourse on Art*, ed. By Robert R. Wark, (New Haven & London, 1997 (1959)), 'Discourse I', p. 14, n. (a paragraph cut from the original edition). On the idea of the arts moving westward from Greece and reaching America at the end of the eighteenth century, see: Joseph J. Ellis, *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture*, (New York & London, 1979), pp. 5-10.

²⁸ This is supported by what can be read of the inscription on the base of the byre: 'This... Monument / to the Memory of... [Brit]ish Freedom / a Currup degene... [ra]te Nobility / & Gentry, dissipated... poor rapacious & / dependent upon the... Court.'

²⁹ *An Essay on Liberty*, (London, 1778), p. 49.

Joseph Priestley among its members, and had the republican sympathiser Dr Richard Price as an occasional visitor and speaker.³⁰ Price's 1776 *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty* divided liberty into four categories: physical liberty (self-determination), moral liberty (the power of following one's own sense of right or wrong), religious liberty (following whatever religion each individual thinks best), and civil liberty (the power of a *Civil Society* or *State* to govern itself without being subject to any extraneous will or power).³¹ It is the latter, the only one applicable to society or community as a whole, which is the liberty that has been reborn in America.³²

The phoenix of myth was reborn from the ashes of its own funeral pyre but here its rebirth is relocated from Britannia's byre to the shores of America. Liberty was drawn into the rhetoric of Anglo-American conflicts, and was expressed in visual terms by having personifications of either Britain or America bear liberty's attributes.³³ Within the context of the 'family quarrel' metaphor of the period, the liberty that was such a part of British national identity could be transferred from

³⁰ Letter from James Barry to Charles James Fox dated 5th October 1800 in the Beinecke Library, Yale University. Quoted in: William L. Pressly, *The Life and Art of James Barry*, (New Haven & London, 1981), p. 81. British dissenters had long expected Americans to take up arms to defend their liberties. *An Address to the Protestant Dissenters of all Denominations, On the Approaching Election of Members of Parliament, With respect to the State of Public Liberty in General, and of American Affairs in Particular*, (London, 1774), pp. 5 & 12.

³¹ Dr Richard Price, *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1776), pp. 2-5. The book was extremely successful and Price's ideas must have been well-known, especially among those sympathetic to the American cause. A thousand copies were sold within two days of its publication and in total fourteen editions of over sixty thousand copies were produced. Jerome R Reich, *British Friends of the American Revolution*, (Armonk, New York, & London, 1998), p. 93.

³² Metaphorically the Phoenix could be used to show the passing of a political mantle from one person to another. Malcolm MacGregor [Pseudonym of William Mason], *An Epistle to Dr Shebbeare: to which is added an ode to Sir Fletcher Norton, in imitation of Horace, Ode VIII. Book IV*, (London, 1777), p. 13.

³³ See for example: 'Lord Camden's Speech on the declaratory Bill of the Sovereignty of Great Britain over the Colonies', *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle*, vol. XLIV (March 1774), pp. 117-118.

metropole to colony as if part of the natural inheritance of Britannia's daughter.³⁴ In *THE PRESENT STATE OF GREAT BRITAIN* (*figure 4.20*) this process of transfer is achieved by the male American Indian taking the liberty bonnet from the sleeping England. Since the Dutchman is picking the Englishman's pocket, it might be that America is stealing liberties to which it has no right. However, represented as a mature male, he may also be taking the patrimony he has thus far been denied. By the end of the war prints like *The Reconciliation between Britannia and her daughter America* (*figure 4.11*) portrayed America with the liberty bonnet as of right, showing how the process of recreating the new nation from the visual and cultural traditions of the old was at work even when the Indian was its usual personification.

The Traditions of Dismemberment

As Lester Olson has argued, one of the effects of using the family as a model within which to discuss imperial relationships, was that it could all too easily obscure the reality of the two sides' political differences, and recast the argument in terms of morality instead.³⁵ Similarly, questions of political rights and governance were dealt with rhetorically through metaphors of slavery and liberty.³⁶ However, while pro-Americans like James Barry could produce images claiming that traditional British civil liberties were more likely to flourish in America, those whose concerns were more moral than political took a more literal view of slavery-liberty metaphors

³⁴ The transfer of liberty symbolism from Britain to America has been dealt with by: Amelia Rauser, 'Death or Liberty: British Political Prints and the Struggle for Symbols in the American Revolution', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), pp. 151-171.

³⁵ Lester C. Olson, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Washington, D. C., 1991), pp. 192-195.

(though that did not necessarily mean they were also anti-American). The actuality of contemporary experience led them to note inconsistencies in American pro-revolutionary rhetoric. The ambiguities between metaphor and reality during the period leading up to and during the War of American Independence have received some attention from historians such as Bernard Bailyn, David Brion Davis and Patricia Bradley, but it is possible that the issues raised by these ambiguities together with the corporeal and familial imagery examined in this dissertation had some effect on abolitionist imagery.³⁷

Although the role of legal wrangles like the Somerset case in raising the profile of slavery and hence in helping to develop an anti-slavery movement has to be admitted, the growth of abolitionism in the 1780s must have been accelerated by the inconsistency of slavery metaphor used at the same time in Anglo-American imperial discourse.³⁸ A number of contemporaries noted that the use of liberty-slavery metaphors highlighted the fact that Americans: 'under pretences of superior Liberty, are imposing all about them the worst of Bondage.'³⁹ Similarly, Thomas Paine, who

³⁶ For the contexts of slavery rhetoric, see: J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832 Political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 249-257.

³⁷ Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, enlarged ed., (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1992 (1967)), pp. 232-246. Slavery is also metaphorically involved in economic and interpersonal relationships. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, (New York, 1998 (1966)), p. 30. Slavery was used less metaphorically according to: Patricia Bradley, *Slavery Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, (Jackson, Mississippi, 1998). pp. xvi, & 4-6.

³⁸ Wylie Sypher, *Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century*, (New York, 1969), p. 10. Duncan J. MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution*, (London & New York, 1974), p. 10. Roger Anstey, *The Atlantic Slave Trade and British Abolition, 1760-1810*, (London & Basingstoke, 1975), p. 153, n. 32. Benjamin Quarles, *The Negro in the Making of America*, (New York, 1996 (1964)), p. 69. This inconsistency also influenced the development and growth of the American anti-slavery movement. Roger Bruns, ed., *Am I Not A Man And A Brother. The Antislavery Crusade of Revolutionary America: 1688-1788*, (New York, 1977), p. xix. James D. Essig, *The Bonds of Wickedness: American Evangelicals Against Slavery, 1770-1808*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1982), p. 23.

³⁹ See the diary entry during the American campaign for 23rd July 1776 in: Edward H. Tatum, Jr., ed., *The American Journal of Ambrose Serle, Secretary to Lord Howe, 1776-1778*, (San Marino, California, 1940), p. 40; see also the entry for 14th September 1779 on p. 249. Rev. John Ramsay, *An*

wrote his pamphlet *Common Sense* in 1775 as an argument in support of American claims to liberty, had earlier written an *Essay on Slavery* that posed the question: 'With what consistency or decency they [Americans] complain so loudly of attempts to enslave them, while they hold so many hundred thousands in slavery...?'.⁴⁰ Later, in Great Britain, the formation of a Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade on 22nd May 1787 began a long campaign that would finally achieve its aims in 1807.

James Gillray's *Barbarities in the West Indies* (**figure 9.4**) refers to a speech made by the politician Philip Francis during the 18th April 1791 Commons' debate on William Wilberforce's motion for the abolition of the slave trade. The image is based on Francis's report of an act of cruelty whereby a young Negro slave, who was unable to work due to sickness, had been thrown into a vat of boiling cane juice, kept there for over three quarters of an hour, and then whipped.⁴¹ Gillray has shown the Negro's arms and legs flailing upwards, the fingers and toes flexed, while his head and torso is invisible, kept beneath the surface of the hot liquid by the overseer's scourge. Without the head and torso, all we can see are a collection of disembodied

Essay on the Treatment and Conversion of African Slaves in the British Sugar Colonies, (London, 1784), p.17, n. *. [David Cooper], *A Serious Address to the Rulers of America, on the Inconsistency of their Conduct respecting Slavery: Forming a Contrast between the Encroachments of England on American Liberty, and American Injustice in tolerating Slavery*, (Trenton, New Jersey, (reprinted, London, 1783)), p. 7. Letter from Richard Price to John Jay, dated 9th July 1785. W. Bernard Peach & D. O Thomas, eds., *The Correspondence of Richard Price. Volume 11: March 1778-February 1786*, (Durham, North Carolina, & Cardiff, 1991), p. 293.

⁴⁰ Paine believed that slavery ought to be abolished immediately, and that the growing crisis was a punishment for its continued existence in the colonies. Thomas Paine, *Essay on Slavery*, published in the *Pennsylvania Journal* on 8 March 1775, quoted in: Bruns, *Am I Not A Man And A Brother*, pp. 378-9. This inconsistency was not lost on American slaves either, particularly in New England, where there were a number of freedom suits in the courts from the 1760s onwards. Quarles, *The Negro in the Making of America*, p. 55-56. Sidney Kaplan, ed., *The Black Presence in the Era of the American Revolution, 1770-1800*, exh. cat., (Washington, D.C., 1973), pp. 12-13.

⁴¹ The slave took six months to recover from his injuries. *Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest period to the year 1803*, vol. XXIX, (London, 1817), column 289. Thomas Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade by the British Parliament*, vol. II, (London, 1968 (1808)), pp. 267-269.

body parts, those that are useful to the slave owner: the arms to work and carry, and the legs to move and bear.

Ronald Paulson has pointed out that this image is ambiguous in its relation to the debate, as it is neither clearly pro- nor anti-abolition.⁴² On the one hand it appeals to the spectator's sympathies by depicting an extreme case of the cruelties of slavery, while the conjunction of cane-juice and slave reminds us that the trades in sugar and bodies were intertwined (hence the widespread sugar boycott of 1791-92). On the other hand, the ears pinned to the wall above the overseer suggest that slaves are both unable to listen to reason, and easily capable of turning deaf ears to their masters, at a time when slave revolts were a constant source of fear and occurred more often in the West Indies than anywhere else.⁴³ As Marcus Wood has argued, late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century imagery was recycled in popular culture in such a way that it retained resonances of its earlier contexts and meanings.⁴⁴ Comparing Gillray's print to the images based on Franklin's Stamp Act cartoon (*figures 2.1 & 2.10-2.14*) we note that the barbarities of the West Indies are being visited upon what in *MAGNA Britannia* represented the metropole. The French Revolution had already produced a reminder of the dangers of political uprisings and social upheaval, while the slave rebellion and massacre in San Domingo on 23rd August 1791 would ultimately delay abolition until the first decade of the nineteenth century.⁴⁵ Both played into the hands of the campaign's opponents by increasing fears of

⁴² Ronald Paulson, *Representations of Revolution (1789-1820)*, (New Haven & London, 1983), pp. 204-205.

⁴³ Michael Craton, James Walvin, & David Wright, eds., *Slavery, Abolition and Emancipation: Black Slaves and the British Empire*, (London & New York, 1976), p. 130. On slave rebellions on the American mainland in the eighteenth century, see: Clark, *The Language of Liberty*, pp. 251-253.

⁴⁴ Marcus Wood, *Radical Satire and Print Culture, 1790-1822*, (Oxford, 1994), pp. 211-213. Marcus Wood, *Blind Memory: Visual representations of Slavery in England and America, 1780-1865*, (Manchester, 2000), p. 171.

insurrection, revolt and massacre.⁴⁶ Filtered through the lens of Æsop's fable of *The Belly and the Members*, Gillray's print is a visual reminder of the threat to the body politic of slave revolt, and should even perhaps be read as the potential of the issue of slavery itself to cause a further dismemberment of the British empire through the secession of the Caribbean colonies.⁴⁷

Conclusion

One element of this dissertation has been a study of the ways in which America was separated out visually from the British body politic through rebellion, maturity, marriage and dismemberment, and therefore about the process by which the identities of Americans and Britons began to diverge. Harry Ward has termed the political changes necessitated by and resultant to the War of American Independence as a process of 'Reinventing the body politic'.⁴⁸ As America constructed a new sense of self and national character, its visual identity shifted from one imposed by the mother country to others that reflected (and became part of) a shared culture.⁴⁹ Although the so-called 'Indian Princess' persisted in the decade after 1783, this was mainly in continental Europe.⁵⁰ In the English-speaking transatlantic world there

⁴⁵ Clarkson, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade*, vol. II, pp. 209-211 & 373-4.

⁴⁶ MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution*, p. 152-7.

⁴⁷ The fable continued to be used by political satirists in the 1790s. See: Sir John Ramsea, *The Head and Limbs, A Fable*, (London, 1794), Advertisement and pp. 2, 5 & 8. The importance of the West Indies to Britain in the immediate post-war period has been noted, for example, in: J. R. Ward, 'The British West Indies in the Age of Abolition, 1748-1815', in: P. J., Marshall, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, 5 vols., vol. II: *The Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2001, (1998)), p. 415.

⁴⁸ In the title to chapter two of: Harry S. Ward, *The War of Independence and the Transformation of American Society*, (London, 1999), p. 19.

⁴⁹ Brother Jonathan, for example, was quickly taken up in political cartoons in *Punch* in the years following its establishment in 1841. Morgan, *An American Icon*, pp. 86-87.

⁵⁰ E. McClung Fleming, 'From Indian Princess to Greek Goddess The American Image, 1783-1815', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. III, (1967), pp. 39-46.

were instead a number of competing representations of the new Republic in the thirty years following the war. However, the trend during this period remained the same: America became white, Western, civilized and an equal to Europeans or at least derived from European prototypes. With the Anglo-American War of 1812, a further trend in this development was completed as American identity also started to become fixed as male, first as Brother Jonathan and then as Uncle Sam.⁵¹

Although the use of 'brother' and 'uncle' in these personifications were concerned more with the individual's relationship to his fellow-Americans or the state, the family continued periodically to describe the relationship between Britain and America well into the nineteenth century. The American print *Intercourse or Impartial Dealings* (*figure 9.5*) satirizes President Thomas Jefferson's policies towards Britain and France during the Napoleonic wars. He is shown being held up and robbed by George III and Napoleon, the former threatening him with violence and the latter picking his pocket (a reference to the Louisiana purchase). The speech balloons engage with familial imagery: George calls the President by the diminutive 'Tommy' and refers to him as 'my boy', suggesting that an adult-child relationship is intended. Meanwhile, the diminutive figure of Napoleon refers to Jefferson as 'Mon Oncle'. The family is used here to describe a complex set of relationships within the family of nations, whereby, despite its independence, America remains the child of its mother country (albeit grown up), and the French Revolution is conceptualized as the nephew of the American Revolution. Similarly, political cartoons relating to the War of 1812, pitted John Bull against Brother Jonathan or depicted George III as a kind of estranged father figure, thereby demonstrating that something of the male

⁵¹ Fleming, 'From Indian Princess to Greek Goddess', p. 38. Morgan, *An American Icon*, pp. 17-34.

configuration of the 'family quarrel' survived in the American imagination into the early nineteenth century.⁵²

The visual legacy of eighteenth century 'body politic' or 'family quarrel' metaphors also had some effect on the imagery of the American Civil War, which revived revolutionary era symbols such as Franklin's *Join or Die* (*figure 2.6*).⁵³ In Great Britain this war was often presented in the cartoons of Sir John Tenniel in *Punch* as a family quarrel. His *Naughty Jonathan* from 18th January 1862 (*figure 9.6*) depicted the war as a squabble between two child-sized adults representing the North and South, being refereed with partiality by the motherly figure of Mrs Britannia with her Union Jack apron.⁵⁴ Tenniel even produced a cartoon entitled *Family Quarrel* (*figure 9.7*), which represented the war as a family dispute between husband and wife. In this image the North is personified as Abraham Lincoln wearing striped trousers and a starred shirt, while the South is his wife Columbia or Carolina with the Confederate circle of stars on her apron. The two have been having an argument during which they have torn a map of the United States in half and are clearly about to come to blows.

These nineteenth-century repetitions of the rhetorical frameworks used to deal with issues and questions of unity, division, subordination, obedience and division reveal

⁵² Mills, *American Allegorical Prints*, pp. 18-19. William Murrell, *A History of American Graphic Humor, Volume 1 (1747-1865)*, (New York, 1933), pp. 88-94. Roger Butterfield, *The American Past: A History of the United States from Concord to the Nuclear Age*, revised ed., (New York, 1957 (1947)), p. 59.

⁵³ A link between the two was tacitly acknowledged in: *Punch, or the London Charivari*, (10th January 1863). See: William S. Walsh, ed., *Abraham Lincoln and the London Punch: Cartoons, Comments and Poems, Published in the London Charivari, During the American Civil War (1861-1865)*, (New York, 1909), pp. 64, 66 & 69. Fischer, *Liberty and Freedom*, pp. 308-309.

⁵⁴ *Punch* was also wont to use 'Brother Jonathan' and the fraternal relationship to describe Anglo-American relations at this time. See, for example: 'Our Dear Brother Jonathan', *Punch, or the London Charivari*, vol. XLII, (18th January 1862), p. 29.

a different family dynamic from that of eighteenth-century images of Britannia and her daughter. In *Naughty Jonathan* the idea of civil war is expressed through the antagonism between the two children, who retain their right to independence through their depiction as mini-adults. In May 1861 the British had declared their neutrality in the war in a statement that had seemed to favour the Confederacy, and Britannia's involvement is not one of an authoritarian parent, but rather one of a parent who cannot help but be partial in her treatment of her wayward children.⁵⁵ Such images are provide further evidence of how the family is a fundamental model for explaining complex abstracts such as political relationships. In turn, the differences in what the family can be used to express reveal how the entailments of the model alter in line with social change.

Rhetorical visualizations of the family imbue it with a national and international significance.⁵⁶ Although historians have tended to suggest that a development in familiar make-up from the patriarchal to the domestic had already largely taken place by the time of the American War of Independence, it is clear from the way the various configurations of 'family quarrel' metaphor revolved around issues of subordination within the family and were drawn into political contestation that it was still an unsettled issue in the popular imagination.⁵⁷ As demonstrated by the way that the entry of France to the war eventually (rather than immediately) disrupted the

⁵⁵ Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion Politics, & The Triumphs of Anglo-America*, (New York, 1999), p. 629. British opinion was divided on the war, with many of the upper classes favouring the South and the working classes supporting the North. Asa Briggs, *The Age of Improvement, 1783-1867*, 2nd ed., (Harlow, Essex, 2000 (1959), p. 432.

⁵⁶ 'Feminine Figures: Nature Displayed', in: Ludmilla Jordanova, *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine, 1760-1820*, (Edinburgh, 1999), p. 29.

⁵⁷ Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978), pp. 119-120 & 287. Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1600-1800*, (New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco & London, 1977), pp. 7 & 653-658. Lawrence Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987*, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 45-46.

metaphor of the 'family quarrel', the entailments of metaphoric systems of conceptualization do not appear to progress exactly in step with society. If they seem slightly old-fashioned, this is because (like image-making) they rely heavily on tradition, rather than being at the cutting edge of societal change. It is the roles and hierarchies inherent within patriarchal social patterns that gave meaning to the issues of maturity, independence and subordination, which were played out in imagery engaging with the 'family quarrel' metaphor of the American War.⁵⁸ However, while relationships between family members were largely dependent on the parent-figure in traditional paternalistic family groups of the eighteenth century, a nineteenth-century context of a more modern household with its father-mother-children nucleus allowed for more complex internal relationships and interdependencies.⁵⁹

Draper Hill once referred to graphic satire as 'perishable' in the sense that it was created at and for a specific moment in time.⁶⁰ In this dissertation I have tried to draw out the particular contexts - cultural, social, political, biographical, and geographical, as well as artistic - that enable an interpretation of my eighteenth-century subject matter as contemporary conceptualizations of events. Both sides in the conflict had to morally justify their actions, something that was attempted

⁵⁸ I can therefore only partially agree with Olson's findings: Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004), p. 201.

⁵⁹ Jean-Louis Flandrin, *Families in Former Times: Kinship, household and sexuality*, translated by Richard Southern, (Cambridge, 1979 (1976)), p. 9. However, see the criticism of Flandrin's views on the pre-nineteenth century period in: Rosemary O'Day, *The Family and Family Relationships, 1500-1900: England, France and the United States of America*, (Basingstoke & London, 1994), especially p. 184.

⁶⁰ Draper Hill, 'School of London', a paper presented at the Boston Public Library on 5th May 1973, and reported in: Sinclair Hitchings, 'London's Images of Colonial America', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), p. 29.

through the use of propaganda, which ought not necessarily be taken at face value.⁶¹ Although I believe that much of the imagery of the period was used for justificatory purposes, I think that there is also probably a strong element of the explicatory in these metaphors: they not only argued for a particular viewpoint, but tried to explain it in a way that was familiar to the audience.

There is a progression to the ways in which these images, and the use of the analogies and metaphors on which they were based, developed during this period. Olson has noted how Benjamin Franklin's changing figurative references to America reveal a repudiation of the family model by 1778, and a steady move from representing America as separate pieces to representing it as one unified organic whole.⁶² Similarly, it might be possible to suggest that in the broader visual field the colonies went from being regarded as a part of the mother country, to becoming its dependent children, then went through a painful adolescence before emerging as young adults on the world stage. However, this would be to produce a rather circular argument in which the object of study becomes its own means of explanation. Nevertheless, it does appear that there was a shift from a debate informed by the mother-child analogy, to one more concerned with the wholeness of the body, that is from dependence to interdependence, probably reflecting anxieties about the future of Great Britain without its former colonies. Furthermore, since America was excluded from the body by the end of the war, this period also sees the emergence of that country as a separate body politic that was no longer physically or familiarly tied to any other.

⁶¹ Jennings, *The Creation of America*, p. 193.

⁶² Olson, *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community*, pp. 228-231.

It has not been possible to extend an already full dissertation into the Seven Years' War. However, it would appear that more research in this area is called for, since there are hints that many of the images and metaphors used from 1765 onwards have their basis in this earlier colonial war that had involved most of the same participants. Similarly, it would be interesting to look at the British and American relationship with the French Revolution within the same framework, to properly gauge its effects on the metaphors examined in this thesis. It was 1778's Franco-American treaties that formally acknowledged American maturity and independence by accepting its ability to negotiate treaties. The introduction of the French and Spanish to the 'family quarrel', as I have argued, disrupted the narratives of the 'family quarrel' metaphor because it could no longer satisfactorily explain events. Furthermore, that same disruption was also important for the process whereby Americans began to be regarded more as foreigners than fellow-nationals in the British consciousness. It is precisely because of the significance of the alteration of attitudes to both the War of American Independence and Americans themselves caused by the entry of France, that the comeuppance of the French Revolution was seen by Britons as a consequence of its support for the American Revolution. However, a study of the change of attitudes precipitated by events in France in 1789 will also have to wait its turn.

The use of personifications to take the place of nations or territories in political satires presented events in terms of a unity of action and attitude instead of contested and divided issues and areas. The rebellious colonies were several not one, and in 1775 there had been no certainty that all of them would even join the rebellion, while the colonists of European descent were themselves divided between patriots to the

revolutionary cause, loyalists to Great Britain and King George III and those who were neutral on the subject. In Britain too opinion was divided, but I would argue that political prints of the day do not represent this as a black-and-white, pro-Britain vs. pro-America divide. Although there were undoubtedly some for whom support for America was their paramount concern, others were unconcerned until the threat of French invasion in 1778, and more often the pro-American sentiment that has been detected in British prints was using the issue as a means of attacking the British government, something that is revealed, for example, in the assignment of agency in dismemberment images.⁶³

The War of American Independence caused a certain amount of self-reflection on what it meant to be British and in what terms to define self-nationhood.⁶⁴ However, I have taken as my central point of study the relationship between Britain and her American colonies, and the process by which the extraction of the United States impacted on the visualization of the unity of the British Community in the Atlantic world. I have tried to resist the temptation to try and make this dissertation a study of the early formation of the British Empire in the eighteenth century, since there was no general understanding of such a thing in the way that we understand it today, and visual material took a more specifically bilateral view in any case. Furthermore, although I have occasionally looked at comparative material, I have been concerned with the context of these issues within that Community, and principally Great Britain. There are a number of French, Dutch and German prints that also reflect on the War (especially from 1778 onwards), but these represent outside views and have

⁶³ For example: R. T. Haines Halsey, *'Impolitical Prints'. An Exhibition of Contemporary English Cartoons Relating to the American Revolution*, exh. cat., (New York 1939), p. 5.

⁶⁴ Eliga H. Gould, 'American Independence and Britain's Counter Revolution', *Past and Present*, no. 154, (February 1997), pp. 123 & 139-141.

therefore been of less interest, and to examine them would have been to alter the focus of this dissertation. It must be stated, however, that there is much of interest to be studied regarding material that originated in continental Europe, and I hope that someday it will be.

What my study of the interaction between literary and visual use of metaphors contributes to our understanding of eighteenth-century thought, is the way that the visual field's engagement with conceptualizations of events and the war makes explicit the concerns of contemporaries, helping to shed light on what must therefore be inferred in literary usage. I have argued that the gender of America was a contested issue for contemporaries, something made obvious by the use of both male and female personifications for the colonies. This in turn suggests that although the use of the feminine third person pronouns (she/her) is traditional and normative, the use of the male equivalent (he/his/him) must be regarded as a deliberate reaction, and in itself might be a guide to the political viewpoint of the user. Similarly, my dissertation reveals the charged nature that even a relatively common semantic term such as 'mother country' can assume when drawn into the rhetoric of political debate.

What this also reveals is that the consistency of metaphor, as I have argued earlier with regard to the rupture of the narrative of the 'family quarrel', was a potent factor in the power of figurative rhetoric to persuade. Inconsistencies in metaphorical argument afforded opponents an opportunity to challenge and refute the rhetorical basis of that argument. The arguments of men like Richard Price accepted the existing model as dominant, while offering an apparently more consistent framework within which to apply it in relation to the actual situation as they saw it. In Price's

case, he took the parent-child model and shifted it from mother-daughter to mother-son in order to be able to justify America's independence with claims of its maturity. At the same time, by trying to work within the dominant model, such arguments failed to settle the argument or move it on, allowing 'family quarrel' metaphor to persist right to the end of a war that had looked lost for some time by 1783.

Equally, 'family quarrel' metaphor persisted into the nineteenth century precisely because, for historical reasons, it was always possible to reduce the Anglo-American relationship to that of a familial model. Although the two nations became distinct and entirely separate political entities (bodies politic) after 1783, some aspects of the relationship between them remained explicable using familial metaphors that continue to colour our understanding of the so-called 'special relationship' between the United States and Great Britain and Northern Ireland today.⁶⁵ As John Dumbrell has recently noted, British anti-Americanism in particular 'reflects the complexities and hurt feelings associated with the process whereby children become more powerful than their parents.'⁶⁶ Although the existence of a shared culture between the Anglo elites of both countries has been accepted as a powerful factor in the persistence of this family relationship, it is past time that its origins in the figurative conceptualizations of the decades either side of the American Declaration of Independence were acknowledged.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ The tendency to both evoke and reinterpret the past in terms of defining this 'special relationship' has been noted in the conclusion to: Clark, *The Language of Liberty*, p. 383.

⁶⁶ John Dumbrell, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After*, (Basingstoke, Hampshire, & New York, 2001), p. 32.

⁶⁷ Dumbrell, *A Special Relationship*, pp. 10 & 21-24.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

Books and Collections of Documents:

An Account of Conferences held, and Treaties made, Between Major-general Sir William Johnson, Bart., and the Chief Sachems and Warriours [sic] of the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Senekas, Tuskaroras, Aughquageys, Skaniadaradighronos, Chugnuts, Mahickanders, Shawanese, Kanuskagos, Toderighronos, and Oghquargoes, Indian Nations in North America, At their Meetings on different Occasions at Fort Johnson in the County of Albany, in the Colony of New York, in the Years 1755 and 1756. (London, 1756).

Adair, James, *The History of the American Indians; particularly those Nations adjoining to the Mississippi, East and West Florida, Georgia, South and North Carolina, and Virginia*, (London, 1775).

Addison, Joseph, *Cato; a Tragedy, by Mr Addison*. (London, 1779).

An Address to the Protestant Dissenters of all Denominations, On the Approaching Election of Members of Parliament, With respect to the State of Public Liberty in General, and of American Affairs in Particular, (London, 1774).

An Address to the Rulers of the State: in which their conduct and measures, the principles and abilities of their opponents, and the real interest of England, with regard to America and her natural enemies are freely canvassed. By a Friend to Great Britain, (London, 1778).

The Adulteress, (London, 1773).

Advice from a Father to a Son, just entered into the Army, and about to go Abroad into Action. In Seven Letters, (London, 1776).

Aesop, Aesop's fables, with morals and reflections, as improved by Sir Roger L'Estrange, done into variety of English verse, 4th ed., (London, 1720).

Alanson, Edward Alanson, Practical Observations upon Amputation, and the After-Treatment, (London, 1779).

Americans against Liberty: or an Essay on the Nature and Principles of True Freedom, shewing [sic] that the Designs and Conduct of the Americans tend only to Tyranny and Slavery, (London, 1775).

Andrews, John, History of the War with America, France, Spain, and Holland; commencing in 1775 and ending in 1783, 4 vols., (London, 1785).

The Annals of Administration. Containing the Genuine History of Georgiana the Queen-Mother, and Prince Colonius her son. A Biographical Fragment.

Written about the year 1575. Inscribed, by the proprietor of the Authentic Papers, to Edmund Burke, Esq., (London, 1775).

An Answer to a Late Pamphlet entitled Taxation no Tyranny. (London, 1775).

An Apology for the Times: a Poem, Addressed to the King, (London, 1778).

Arbuthnot, John, The History of John Bull. And Poems on Several Occasions by Dr Jonathan Swift, with Several Miscellaneous Pieces by Dr Swift and Mr Pope, (London, 1750 (1712)).

[Arguments in favour of recognizing the independence of the United States.], (? , [1777?]).

An Artist, A Candid Review of the Exhibition (Being the Twelfth) of the Royal Academy, MDCCLXXX. (London, 1780).

[Atkins, Arabella], The Family Magazine: In Two Parts, 3rd ed., (London, 1757).

Authentic Memoirs of the Right Honourable the late Earl of Chatham. (London, 1778).

Battalier, Agricol, Dissertation sur les Questions suivantes: Lorsqu'une amputation a été reconnue indispensable, déterminer le moment le plus favorable pour la

pratiquer? Quel est le procédé le plus avantageux, pour obtenir promptement la cure radicale des amputés?, (Montpellier, 1819).

The Beauties of the English Stage: consisting of the most affecting and sentimental passages, ... in the English plays, ancient and modern. ... 3 vols., (London, 1756).

Behn, Aphra, *Oroonoko*, edited by Joanna Lipking, (New York & London, 1997).

Belisarius and Zariana, A Dialogue, (London, 1710).

Beloff, Max, ed., *The Debate of the American Revolution, 1761-1783. A Sourcebook*, (New York, 1960).

Bennet, Henry, Earl of Arlington, *The Right Honourable the Earl of Arlington's letter to Sir W. Temple, Bar. From July 1665. Being the first of his employments abroad*, 2 vols., (London, 1701).

Black, W., *An Historical Sketch of Medicine and Surgery, from their Origin to the Present Time; and of the Principal Authors, Discoveries, Improvements and Errors*, (London, 1782).

[Blackburne, Rev. Francis]. *Memoirs of Thomas Hollis, Esq., F. R., and A. S. S.*, 2 vols., (London, 1780).

Bland, Humphrey, *A Treatise of Military Discipline; In Which is Laid Down and Explained the Duty of the Officer and Soldier, Thro' the several Branches of the Service*, 6th ed., (London, 1746).

Bollan, William, *Continued Corruption, standing armies, and popular discontents considered, and the establishment of the English colonies in America, with various subsequent proceedings and the Present Contest, examined with Intent to promote their cordial and Perpetual Union with their Mother-Country, for their Mutual Honour, Comfort, Strength, and Safety*, (London, 1768).

Bowles, Carington, *Carington Bowles's New and Enlarged Catalogue of Useful and Accurate Maps, Charts, and Plans; Curious and entertaining Engraved and Mezzotint Prints, Single or in Sets; including All the Branches of Penmanship: Black-Lines, Letter-File Maps, and Prints, School Pieces, Cards for Schools, &c. &c.*, (London, 1786).

Brickell, John, *The Natural History of North-Carolina*, (Dublin, 1743).

Britannia's Garland, Containing four excellent New Songs. ([Newcastle upon Tyne?, 1775?]).

Burton, Robert, [Pseudonym of Nathaniel Crouch], *The English empire in North America, or, A view of the dominions of the Crown of England in the West Indies*, (London, 1711).

[Blome, Richard], *The Present State of His Majesties Isles and Territories in America*. (London, 1687).

[Boydell, John], 1773. *A Catalogue of Prints, published by John Boydell, Engraver in Cheapside, London*. ([London, 1773]).

Burney, Frances, *Evelina*, introduction by Margaret Anne Doody, (London, 1994).

Burton, P., *Speculum Britannicum: or, a View of the miseries and calamities successively brought upon Great Britain by intestine divisions, in the last and present centuries. By an Englishman*, (London, 1778).

The Camp Guide: In a Series of Letters, from Ensign Tommy Toothpick, to Lady Sarah Toothpick, and from Miss Nelly Brisk, to Miss Gadabout, (London, 1778).

Carter, William, *A Genuine Detail of the Several Engagements, Positions, and Movements of the Royal American Armies, during the Years 1775 and 1776*; (London, 1784).

Cartwright, John, *American Independence. The Interest and Glory of Great-Britain. A New Edition*. (London, 1775).

A Catalogue of a Collection of Pictures, selected from the Roman, Florentine, Lombard, and other Schools. ([London, 1772]).

A Catalogue of the Books, Belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia,
(Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1789).

Catalogue of the Books belonging to the Loganian Library, (Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania, 1837).

A Catalogue of the Paintings, Sculptures, Architecture, Models, Drawings,
Engravings, &c. Now Exhibiting by the Free Society of Artists, Associated for
the Relief of their Distressed Brethren, their Widows and Children, at Mr
Christie's New Great Room, next Cumberland-House, Pall-Mall. ([London],
1769).

A Catalogue of the Pictures, Sculptures, Models, Designs in Architecture, Drawings,
Prints, &c. Exhibited at their New Room, near Exeter-Exchange, Strand, May
the Thirteenth, 1772, by the Society of Artists of Great-Britain. ([London],
1772).

A Catalogue of the Pictures, Sculptures, Models, Designs in Architecture, Prints, &c.
exhibited by the Royal Incorporated Society of Artists of Great Britain, at
their Academy, near Exeter Exchange, Strand, April the Eighteenth, 1776,
(London, 1776).

A Catalogue of the Pictures, Sculptures, Models, Drawings, Prints, &c. Exhibited by
the Society of Artists of Great Britain, at the Great Room in Spring Gardens,
Charing-Cross, May the Fourteenth, 1763. ([London], 1763).

[Chandler, Thomas Bradbury Chandler], *What think ye of the Congress Now? Or an Enquiry, how far The Americans are Bound To Abide by, and Execute the Decisions of, the late Continental Congress?* (London, 1775).

_____, *What think ye of the Congress Now? Or an Enquiry, how far The Americans are Bound To Abide by, and Execute the Decisions of, the late Congress?* (New York, 1775).

The Charter, Laws, and Catalogue of Books, of the Library Company of Philadelphia, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), 1764.

Civil War; A Poem. Written in the Year 1775, ([London, 1780?]).

A Civilian, [i.e. a civil lawyer], *Free Thoughts on Seduction, Adultery, and Divorce. With Reflections on the Gallantry of Princes, particularly those of the Blood-royal of England*, (London, 1771).

Clarke, John, *An Impartial and Authentic Narrative of the Battle Fought on the 17th June 1775, between Her Britannic Majesty's Troops and the American Provincial Army, on Bunker's Hill, near Charles Town, in New England*. (London, 1775).

Clarkson, Thomas, *An Essay on the Impolicy of the African Slave Trade*, (London, 1788).

_____, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade by the British Parliament*, 2 vols., (London, 1968 (1808)).

[Cockburn, William], *An Essay upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign Of Our Gracious Sovereign Anne, Queen of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith*, (London, 1710).

Cockburn, W., *The Nature and Cures of Fluxes*, (London, 1724).

Collier, Jeremy, *Miscellanies upon moral subjects*, (? , 1695).

[Colman, George], *The Connoisseur*, 6th ed., (Oxford, 1774).

The Comet: Or, Meteor of Mirth, consisting of Entire new Toasts, Sentiments, Hob-Nobs, Boozing Similes, High Thoughts and Fashionable Ideas, (London, 1772).

Common Sense: in Nine Conferences between a British Merchant and a Candid Merchant of America, in their private capacities as friends; tracing the several causes of the present contests between the mother country and her American subjects; the fallacy of their prepossessions, and the ingratitude and danger of them; the reciprocal benefits of the national friendship; and the moral obligations of individuals which enforce it with various anecdotes, and reasons drawn from facts, tending to conciliate all differences, and

establish a permanent union for the common happiness and glory of the British Empire, (London, 1775).

The Complaint: or, Britannia lamenting the loss of her children. An elegy. Inscribed to that learned philosopher and able statesman Benjamin Franklin, (London, [1776?]).

The Conquerors. A poem. Displaying the glorious campaigns of 1775, 1776, 1777, &c. &c., (London, [1778]).

Considerations on the Present State of the Intercourse between his Majesty's SUGAR COLONIES and the Dominions of the United States of America, ([?, 1784]).

Considerations upon the French and American War. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament, (London, 1779).

[David Cooper], *A Serious Address to the Rulers of America, On the Inconsistency of their Conduct respecting Slavery: Forming a contrast between the Encroachments of England on American Liberty and American Injustice in tolerating Slavery*, (London, [February] 1783).

The Court of Adultery: A Vision, (London, 1778).

Cowley, Charlotte, *The Ladies History of England; from the Descent of Julius Caesar to the Summer of 1780*, (London, 1780).

De Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St John, *Letters from an American Farmer*, edited with an introduction and notes by Susan Manning, (Oxford and New York, 1997).

[Croxall, S.], *Fables of Æsop and others. Newly done into English, With an Application to each Fable*. (London, 1731).

[Dalrymple, John], Earl of Stair, *An Address to the Public, on the Present Peace*, (London, 1783).

Day, Thomas, *Reflections upon the Present State of England and the Independence of America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1782).

[Defoe, Daniel], *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, (London, 1719).

The Desolation of America: A Poem, (London, 1777).

Dialogues Concerning the ladies. To which is added, An essay on the Antient [sic] Amazons, (London, 1785).

Dickson, William Steel, *Sermons on the following subjects. I. The advantages of national repentance. II. The ruinous effects of civil war. III. The coming of the Son of man, IV. The Hope of Meeting, Knowing, and rejoicing with virtuous Friends, in a future World*. (Belfast, [1778?]).

A Dictionary of Love. Or the Language of Gallantry, (London, 1787).

Downham, Hugh, *Tragedies*, (Exeter, 1792).

Dufresnoy, Nicolas Lenglet, *Chronological tables of universal history, sacred and profane, ecclesiastical and civil; from the creation of the world*, 2 vols., (London, 1762).

Edwards, Brian, *Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government, respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America*, 2nd ed., (London 1784).

Elsum, John, *A description of the celebrated pieces of paintings; of the most eminent masters ancient and modern, with reflections upon the foreign-schools of painting*, (London, 1704).

[Entick, John], *The Free Masons Pocket Companion*, (Glasgow, 1765).

An Essay on Liberty, (London, 1778).

An Essay on the Nature of the Colonies, and the Conduct of the Mother-Country towards them, (London, 1775).

The Essence of the Calm Observer, on the Subjects of the Concert of Princes, the Dismemberment of Poland, and the war with France, 2nd ed., (London, 1793).

[Essex, John], *The Young Ladies Conduct: or, Rules for Education Under several Heads; with Instructions upon Dress both before and after Marriage. And Advice to Young Wives*, (London, 1722).

The Family In-compact, Contrasted with the Family Compact, A Tale, From Real Life, (London, 1778).

A Father's Advice to his Daughters, (? , 1776).

The Favourite; a Character from the Life. (London, 1778).

The Female Congress; or, the Temple of Cotytto: a Mock Heroic Poem in four Cantos, (London, 1779).

Female Tuition; or, An Address to Mothers, on the Education of Daughters, (London 1784).

Fergusson, Adam, *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*, (Edinburgh, 1769).

Fielding, Sir John, *Extracts from such of the penal laws, as particularly relate to the peace and good order of this metropolis: with observations for the better Execution of some, and on the Defects of others. new ed.*, (London, 1768).

The Fine Gentleman's Etiquette; or Lord Chesterfield's Advice to His Son, Versified. By a Lady, (London, 1776).

Foote, Samuel, *The Devil Upon Two Sticks; A Comedy, in Three Acts*. (London, 1778).

Ford, Worthington Chauncey, *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, (34 vols., (Washington, D.C., 1904-1937).

Francklyn, G., *A Answer to the Rev. Mr Clarkson's Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species, particularly the Africans*, (London, 1789).

[Franklin, Benjamin], A Tradesman of Philadelphia, *Plain Truth: or, Serious Considerations On the Present State of the City of Philadelphia, and Province of Pennsylvania*. (Philadelphia, 1747).

John Gay, *The Beggar's Opera*, ed. by Bryan Loughrey and T. O Treadwell, (Harmondsworth, 1986).

The general history of the world, being an abridgement of Sir Walter Raleigh, With a continuation from the best historians to the present times, 2 vols, (London, 1708).

Gent, Thomas, *Divine Justice and Mercy displayed*. (York, 1772).

Gent, W. B., *Militia Discipline*. (London, 1717).

Gerard, Alexander, *Liberty the Cloke [sic] of Maliciousness, both in the American Rebellion, and in the Manners of the Times.* (Aberdeen, 1778).

Gibbon, Edward, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 7 vols., (Dublin, 1788).

Goldsmith, Oliver, *An History of the Earth, and Animated Nature*, 8 vols., (London, 1774).

_____, *An History of England, in a series of letters from a Nobleman to his Son*, 5th ed, 2 vols., (London, 1776).

Gordon, Patrick, *Geography Anatomiz'd: or, the Geographical Grammar. Being a short and Exact Analysis Of the whole Body of Modern Geography, After a New and Curious Method.* (London, 1754).

The Government of the Human Body. A Tale. Address'd to the Freeholders of Great Britain, Not Improper To be read before the Ensuing Elections, (London, 1741).

[Gray, Harrison], *A Few Remarks upon some of the Votes and Resolutions of the Continental Congress, Held at Philadelphia in September, and the Provincial Congress, Held at Cambridge in November 1774.* ([Boston?], 1775).

Grievous, Peter, [i.e. Francis Hopkinson], *A Pretty Story Written in the Year of our Lord 2774*, (Philadelphia?, 1774 (1970)).

[Grose, Francis], *Advice to the Officers of the British Army: With the Addition of some Hints to the Drummer and Private Soldier*, 5th ed., (London, 1783).

_____, *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue*, (Menston, Yorks., 1968 (1785)).

Grosley, Jean-Pierre, *A Tour to London; or, New Observations on England, and its Inhabitants*. 2 vols., (London, 1772).

Guthrie, G. J., *A Treatise on Gun-Shot Wounds, on Injuries of Nerves, and on Wounds of the Extremities requiring the different operations of Amputation*, (London, 1820).

Guthrie, William, *A general history of the world, from the creation to the present time*, 5 vols., (London, 1764-67).

Hancock, John, *Rules & Articles, for the better Government of the Troops raised, or to be raised, and kept in pay by and at the joint Expence of the Twelve United English Colonies of North-America*, (Philadelphia, 1775).

[Hanson, Alexander Contee Sr.], *Political Schemes and Calculations, Addressed to the Citizens of Maryland, by a Native Citizen and Servant of the State*, (Annapolis, Maryland, 1784).

Hartley, David, *Letters on the American war. addressed to the right worshipful the mayor and corporation, to the worshipful the wardens and corporation of the Trinity-House, and to the worthy burgesses of the town of Kingston upon Hull. by David Hartley, Esq.; member of Parliameant [sic] for the town of Kingston upon Hull*, 7th ed., (London, 1779).

_____, *Substance of a Speech in Parliament upon the State of the Nation and the present Civil War with America. Upon Monday, April 1, 1776. By David Hartley Esq.*, (London, 1776).

Hastings, Thomas, *The Tears of Britannia; A Poem, on the Much-Lamented Death of William Earl of Chatham*, (London, [1778]).

Hearne, Hearne, *Ductor historicus: or, a short system of universal history, and introduction to the study of it. The second edition*, 2 vols, (London, 1704-05).

Heister, Laurence, *A General System of Surgery in Three Parts*. (London, 1743).

The History of Lord North's Administration, to the Dissolution of the Thirteenth Parliament of Great-Britain. (London, 1781).

The History of the British Empire, from the year 1765, to the end of 1783.

(Philadelphia, 1798).

The History of the Old Fring'd Petticoat; a fragment: translated from the original

MS. Greek of Democritus. With an epistle and dedication to Lord N-,

(London, [10th November] 1775).

The History of the War in America, between Great Britain and Her Colonies, from

Its Commencement to the end of the Year 1778. 2 vols., (Dublin, 1779).

Hobbes, Thomas, *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic.* edited and with an

introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford & New York, 1994).

_____, *Leviathan*, edited and with an introduction by J. C. A. Gaskin, (Oxford &

New York, 1996).

Hollis, Thomas, *The True Sentiments of America: Contained in a Collection of*

Letters Sent from the House of Representatives of the Province of

Massachusetts Bay to Several Persons of High Rank in this Kingdom,

(London, [July] 1768).

Hume, David, *Essays and treatises on several subjects.* new ed., (London, 1758).

_____, *Political Writings*, edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Stuart D. Warner

& Donald W. Livingstone, (Indianapolis & Cambridge, 1994).

Hunter, John, *A Treatise on the Blood, Inflammation, and Gun-Shot Wounds*,
(London, 1794).

Hunter, William, *Anatomia Uteri Humani gravidi tabulis illustrata... The Anatomy
of the Human Gravid Uterus exhibited in figures*, (Birmingham, 1774).

*An Impartial History of the War in America, between Great Britain and Her
Colonies, from its Commencement to the end of the Year 1779*, (London,
1780).

*An Impartial Sketch of the Various Indulgences granted by Great-Britain to her
Colonies, upon which They have founded their Presumption of soaring
towards Independence. By an officer*, (London, 1778).

[Inglis, Charles], *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated, in certain
Strictures On a Pamphlet intituled Common Sense*, (Philadelphia, 1776).

Instructions for inlisting [sic] Men in the Service of Maryland, handwritten
manuscript and enlistment roll dated before February 13th 1776 in the
collection of the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland. MS
1814.

Ives, Edward, *A Voyage from England to India, in the Year MDCCLIV*, (London,
1773).

[Jerningham, Edward], *Yarico to Inkle, an Epistle*, (Springfield, Massachusetts, 1784, (1766)).

John and Susan; or the Intermeddler Rewarded: A Tale address'd to the French King, (Bath, 1778).

John the Painter's Ghost: How he appeared on the night of his Execution to Lord Temple; and how his Lordship did communicate the same at full court, to the astonishment of all present, now partially, and circumstantially related, (London, 1777).

Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English language: in which the words are deduced from their originals, and illustrated in their different significations by examples from the best writers*. 3rd ed., 2 vols., (London, 1765).

_____, *Taxation no Tyranny; An Answer to the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress*, (London, 1775).

[Kilner, Dorothy], *Letters from a Mother to her children on various important subjects*, (London, [1780?]).

[King, John Glen], *A Letter to his Excellency Count ***, on Poetry, Painting, and Sculpture*. (London, 1768).

The Laws respecting Women, as they regard their natural rights, or their connections and conduct; also, the obligations of parent and child, and the condition of minors, etc.. In Four Books, (London, 1777).

A Letter from a Member of the Long Parliament, to a Member of the Present, (London, 1778).

A Letter from an Officer Retired to his Son in Parliament, (London, 1776).

A Letter from Britannia to the King, (London, 1781).

A Letter to Doctor Tucker on his Proposal of a separation between Great Britain and her American Colonies, (London, 1774).

A Letter to My Lords, on occasion of the present Bill for the Preventing of Adultery, (London, 1779).

A Letter to My Lords the Bishops, on occasion of the present Bill for the Preventing of Adultery, (London, 1779).

A Letter to the Rev. Dr Richard Price, on his Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America, (London, [1776]).

Letters on Love, Marriage, and Adultery; addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Exeter, (London, 1789).

Lewis, P., *Miscellaneous Pieces in Verse; with Cursory Theatrical Remarks*.
(London, 1774).

A List of the Officers of the Army, and Marines, 33rd ed., ([London, 1785]).

Locke, John, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. with an introduction and notes by Peter Laslett, (Cambridge, 1988 (1960, 1967)).

Lofft, Capel, *Observations on Mrs Macaulay's History of England, (Lately Published) from the Revolution to the Resignation of Robert Walpole. In a Letter Addressed to that Lady*, (London, 1778).

Lovemore, Augustus, *A Letter from a Father to a Son, on his Marriage*, (London, 1778).

Lucas, Henry, *A Visit from the Shade, or Earl Chatham's Adieu to his Friend Lord Camden. To which is added and Epitaphial Inscription to the memory of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, and a proposed Sketch of a Monument suitable thereto*. ([London, 1778]).

Macaulay, Catharine, *An Address to the People of England, Scotland, and Ireland, on the present important crisis of Affairs*. 2nd ed., (London, 1775).

_____, *Observations on a Pamphlet entitled, Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, (London, 1770).

MacGregor, Malcolm [Pseudonym of William Mason], *An Epistle to Dr Shebbeare: to which is added an ode to Sir Fletcher Norton, in imitation of Horace, Ode VIII. Book IV*, (London, 1777).

Macpherson, James, *The Rights of Great Britain asserted against the claims of America: being an answer to the declaration of the General Congress. With additions*, (Glasgow, 1776).

Marcellus & Britannicus (Pseuds.), *Letters on the Present Disturbances in Great Britain and her American Provinces*, (London, 1777).

Marmontel, *Bélisaire, par M. Marmontel*, (Londres [i.e. Paris?], 1780).

Marmontel, *Belisarius*, 2nd ed., (London 1767).

[Markwell, Humphrey], *Medicina Denudata. Or, an Examination of some Reflections on Bleeding, Vomiting and Purging in the Beginning of Fevers, Small-Pox, Pleurisies, and other Acute Diseases*. (Dublin, 1727).

[Martial], *Epigrams of Martial, &c. with Mottos from Horace, &c. Translated, Imitated, Adapted, and Addressed to the Nobility, Clergy, and Gentry. With Notes Moral, Historical, Explanatory and Humorous.* (London, 1773).

Meilan, Mark Anthony, *The Dramatic Works of Mark Anthony Meilan; consisting of three tragedies, Emilia, Northumberland, The Friends.* (London, [1771?]).

Millar, John, *The Origin of the Distinction of Ranks: or, An Inquiry into the Circumstances which give rise to Influence and Authority, in the Different Members of Society.* 4th ed., (Edinburgh, 1806).

The Miseries of Dissention and Civil War, An Ode. [London?, 1780].

Moore, John, *A Sermon preached before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church of Westminster, on Thursday, January, 30, 1777: being the day appointed to be observed as the day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I,* (London, 1777).

Monsieur in a Mouse-Trap: or, the Parable of the Shark & Herring Pond, (London, 1691).

Morgan, Edmund S., ed., *Prologue to Revolution: Sources and Documents on the Stamp Act Crisis, 1764-1766,* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1959).

Morton, Perez, *A Oration, Delivered to the King's Chapel in Boston, April 8, 1776, Or the Re-Interment of the Remains of the late Most Worshipful Grand-Master Joseph Warren Esq.*, (Boston, 1776).

Murray, James, *An Impartial History of the present War in America; containing An Account of its Rise and Progress, The Political Springs thereof, with its various Successes and Disappointments, on Both Sides*, 2 vols., (London, [1780?]).

Nederman, Cary J., & Forhan, Kate Langdon, *Medieval Political Theory – A Reader. The Quest for the Body Politic, 1100-1400*, (London & New York, 1993).

A New Collection of Voyages, Discoveries and Travels: containing Whatever is worthy of Notice in Europe, Asia, Africa and America: In respect to the situation and Extent of Empires, Kingdoms, and Provinces; their climates, soil, produce, &c., (7 Vols, London, 1767).

The New English Bible, (London & Edinburgh, 1972 (1961, 1970)).

The New Foundling Hospital for Wit. Being a Collection of curious pieces in verse and prose, by Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, Earl of Chesterfield, Delaware, Hardwicke, Carlisle, Lords Lyttleton, Harvey, Capel, Lady M. W. Montague, T. Potter, C. Townshend, J. S. Hall, J. Wilkes, D. Garrick, B. Thornton, G. Colman, R. Lloyd &c. &c. Adorned with a Frontispiece. Part the Third, (London, 1771).

The New Foundling Hospital for Wit. Being a Collection of several curious pieces in verse and prose: written by Lord Chesterfield, Lord Hardwicke, Lord Lyttleton, Sir C. H. Williams, Mr Wilkes, Mr Churchill, Mr Garrick, Mr Potter, Dr Akenside, and other eminent persons, 2nd ed., (London, 1768).

The New Foundling Hospital for Wit. Being a Collection of several curious pieces in verse and prose. Many of which were never before Printed. Written by the Earl of Chesterfield, Earl of Carlisle, Earl of Delaware, Lord Lyttleton, Lord Harvey, Lord Capel, Lady M. W. Montague, Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, Sir Walter Raleigh, Rt. Hon. Ch. Townshend, John Wilkes Esq.; D. Garrick Esq.; B. Thornton Esq.; Mrs Lenox, Mr Rt. Lloyd, Mr W. Kennick, Mr J. Cunningham; and other Eminent Persons. Part the Third, (London, 1769).

Ode to Britannia. (For the Year 1780). Occasioned by Our late Successes, (Edinburgh, 1780).

Ogilby, John, *America: Being the latest and most Accurate Description of the New World; (London, 1671).*

[Oldmixon, John], *The British Empire In America*, 2 vols., (London, 1708).

_____, *The History of England During the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart*, (London, 1730).

Paine, Thomas, *Common Sense*, Gregory Tiertjen ed., (New York, 1995).

The Pamphlet entitled, "Taxation no Tyranny", candidly considered, and it's arguments, and pernicious doctrines, exposed and refuted. (London, [1775]).

Parker, G., *A View of Society and Manners in High and Low Life; being the Adventures in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, France, &c. of Mr G. Parker*, 2 vols., (London, 1781).

The Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest period to the year 1803, 36 vols., (London, 1806-20).

The Patriot Vision. A Poem. Dedicated to the Memory of the Earl of Chatham. (London, 1778).

Patriotic Perfidy, a Satire. (London, 1779).

The Patriots: or, an Evening Prospect on the Atlantic. In which some noted Political Characters are delineated; with strictures on those Ladies who have distinguished themselves in the Fashionable Modes of Gallantry, (London, 1777).

[Payen?], *No Rum! --- No Sugar! Or, The Voice of the Blood, being half an hour's conversation, between a Negro and an English Gentleman, shewing [sic] the Horrible nature of the Slave Trade, and pointing out an easy and effectual method of terminating it by an Act of the People*, (London, 1792).

[Peckard, Peter], *Am I Not a Man? And a Brother? With all humility addressed to the British Legislature*, (Cambridge, 1788).

Penn, William, *Fruits of a Father's Love: being the Advice of William Penn to his children, relating to their civil and religious conduct, etc.*, 6th ed., (London, 1778).

Philips, William, *Belisarius. A Tragedy*. (London, 1724).

_____, *Belisarius. A Tragedy*. (London, 1758).

Plutarch, *Plutarch's Lives, Volume I*, The Dryden translation, edited with a preface by Arthur Hugh Clough, introduction by James Atlas, (New York, 2001).

A Poem Addressed to J--- W---, Esq.; Late L-d M-r of the City of L-n, (London, 1775).

Political Dialogues Between the Celebrated Statues of Pasquin and Marforio at Rome, In which The Origin and Views of the late War, the Secret Mediation of the present Peace, and the genuine Conditions of it, are brought to light., (London, 1736).

[Poultney, William], *Plan of Re-Union between Great Britain and her Colonies*, (London, 1778).

Pownall, Thomas, *A Letter from Governor Pownall to Adam Smith, L.L.D. F.R.S*
being an Examination of Several Points of Doctrine laid down in his "Inquiry
into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.", (London, 1776).

_____, *A Memorial Addressed to the Sovereigns of America*, (London, 1783).

_____, *A Memorial, Most Humbly Addressed to the Sovereigns of Europe, on the*
Present State of Affairs, between the Old and New World, 2nd ed., (London,
 1780).

_____, *Two Memorials, not originally intended for publication, Now Published; with*
an Explanatory Preface; by Governor Pownall, (London 1782).

The Present State of the British Empire in Europe, America, Africa and Asia.
 (London, 1768).

Price, Cecil, ed., *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, 2 vols.,
 (Oxford, 1973).

Price, Dr Richard, *Additional Observations on the Nature and Value of Civil Liberty*
and the War with America: also observations on raising money by public
loans; an historical deduction and analysis of the national debt; and a brief
account of the debts and resources of France, (London, 1777).

_____, *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, 2nd ed., (London, 1776).

Punderson, Ebenezer, *The Narrative of Mr Ebenezer Punderson, Merchant; Who was drove away by the Rebels in America from his Family in Connecticut. Together with Some Letters and Clauses of Letters, wrote to his Family during his absence: Taken from his Epistolary Journal*, (London, 1776).

[Ramsay, Allan], *An Essay on the Constitution of England*, 2nd ed., (London, 1766).

_____, *Thoughts on the Origin and Nature of Government, Occasioned by The Late Disputes between Great Britain and her American Colonies*, (London, 1769).

Ramsay, James, *An Essay on the Treatment and Conversion of African Slaves in the British Sugar Colonies*, (London, 1784).

Ramsea, Sir John, *The Head and Limbs, A Fable*, (London, 1794).

Raymond, George Frederick, assisted by Alexander Gordon and Hugh Owen [and others], *A new, universal and impartial history of England, from the earliest authentic records, and most genuine historical evidence, to the year 1788. Containing a clear, authentic, candid, accurate, faithful, and circumstantial account of every memorable transaction, interesting event, and remarkable occurrence recorded in the annals of Great Britain.* ([London, 1787]).

Rebellion. A Poem. (London, 1775).

Reynolds, Sir Joshua, *Discourse on Art*, ed. By Robert R. Wark, (New Haven & London, 1997 (1959)).

Richardson, George, *Iconology: or, a Collection of Emblematical Figures Containing Four Hundred and Twenty Four Remarkable Subjects, Moral and Instructive; in Which Are Displayed the Beauty of Virtue and the Deformity of Vice*, 2 vols., (London, 1777-1779).

[Richardson, Joseph, and others], *The Rolliad, in two parts: Probationary Odes for the Laureatship; and Political Eclogues: with Criticisms and illustrations by the original authors*, 21st ed., (London, 1799).

Richer, Adrien, *Great Events from Little Causes. Or, A Selection of Interesting and Entertaining Stories, drawn from the Histories of different Nations.* (London, 1767).

_____, *The life of Belisarius, translated from the French; with some explanatory notes and observations*, (London, 1759).

Ripa, Cesare, *A Collection of Emblematical Figures*, (London, 1777 (1593)).

_____, *Iconologia*, (? , 1611 (1593)).

Robertson, William Robertson, *The History of America*, 2 vols., (London, [1796?]
(1777)).

Rochfort, Lieut.-Col. W. C., *The Invasion of the Island of Jersey, with the
Proceedings and Sentence of the Court-Martial, held on Major Corbet, the
Lieut.-Governor*, (Jersey, [1852]).

Roebuck, John. *An Enquiry whether the Guilt of The Present Civil War in America,
ought to be imputed to Great Britain or America*, (London, 1776).

Ross, Alexander, *The History of the World the Second Part, being a continuation of
the famous history of Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight*, (London, 1652).

*Rules and Articles for the better Government of our Horse and Foot-Guards, And all
other our [sic] Land-Forces in Our Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland,
and Dominions beyond the Seas*, (London 1722).

Russell, William, *The History of America, from its Discovery by Columbus to the
Conclusion of the Late War. With an Appendix containing an account of the
Rise and Progress of the Present Unhappy Contest between Great Britain
and her Colonies*. 2 vols., (London, 1778).

Rymer, James, *Observations and Remarks respecting the more effectual means of
preservation of wounded Seamen and Marines on board of His Majesty's
Ships in time of action*, (London, 1780).

[Seabury, Samuel], *A View of the Controversy Between Great-Britain and her Colonies: Including A Mode of Determining their present Disputes, Finally and Effectually; and of preventing All Future Contentions.* (London, 1775).

_____, *A View of the Controversy Between Great-Britain and her Colonies: Including A Mode of Determining their present Disputes, Finally and Effectually; and of preventing All Future Contentions.* (New York, 1774).

The Seducer's Distracted Confession, in a Poetical Rhapsody to a Brother of the Knife, (London, 1782).

Sharp, Granville, *A Declaration of the People's Natural Right to a Share in the Legislature; Which is the Fundamental Principle of the British Constitution of State,* (London, 1776).

_____, *The Law of Retribution; or a Serious Warning to Great Britain and her Colonies, Founded on unquestionable Examples of God's Temporal Vengeance against Tyrants, Slave-holders, and Oppressors.* (London, 1776).

[Shebbeare, John], *The Occasional Critic; or, the Decrees of the Scotch Tribunal in the Critical Review Rejudged,* (London, 1757).

[Sheffield, Lord], *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*, 2nd ed., (London, 1783).

A Sketch of the Times. A Satire, (London, 1780).

Smith, Adam, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*,
2 vols., (London, 1776).

_____, *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, R. L. Meek, D. D. Raphael, & P. G. Stein, eds.,
(Indianapolis, 1982).

_____, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, edited by J. C. Bryce, (Indianapolis,
Indiana, 1985).

Smith, Hugh, *The Family Physician. Being a Collection of Useful Family Remedies*.
(London, [1771?]).

Smith, Captain John, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the
Summer Isles, with the names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours
from their first beginning An^o: 1584 to this present 1624*. (London, 1624).

[Smollett, Tobias George Smollett], *The Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom*.
2nd ed., 2 vols., (London, 1771).

Sparks, Jared, ed., *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, 10 vols., (Boston, 1840).

Stanhope, Philip Dormer, *Lord Chesterfield's Advice to his Son, on Men and
Manners: or, a New system of education, in which the principles of*

politeness, the art of acquiring a knowledge of the world, with every instruction necessary to form a man of honour, virtue, taste, and fashion, are laid down ... The third edition. To which are now added, the Marchioness de Lambert's Advice to her Son, and Moral Reflections by the Duc de La Rochefoucault, 3rd ed., (London, 1777).

Stevens, Captain John, *The Government of a Wife; or Wholsom [sic] and Pleasant Advice for Married Men, In a Letter to a Friend*, (London, 1697).

Stevenson, John, *An Address to Brian Edwards, Esq., containing remarks on his Pamphlet, entitled, "Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government, respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America"*, (London, 1784).

[Stubbe, Henry], *A Justification of the Present War against the United Netherlands*. (London, 1672).

The Tears of the Foot Guards, upon their Departure for America: written by an Ensign of the Provincial Army, 2nd ed., (London, 1776).

Tempest, P[ierce], *Iconologia: or Moral Emblems, by Cesare Ripa*, (London, 1709).

Thicknesse, Philip, *Useful Hints to those who make The Tour of France, in a Series of Letters, written from that kingdom*. (London, 1768).

Thomas, D. O., ed., *Richard Price. Political Writings*, (Cambridge, 1991).

[Thompson, Edward], *The Soldier. A Poem*. (London, 1764).

Thomson, James, *The Works of James Thomson, with his last Corrections and Improvements. To which is prefixed, An Account of his Life and Writings*, 2 vols., (London, 1762).

Thoughts on the Present War, With an Impartial Review of Lord North's Administration, in conducting the American, French, Spanish and Dutch War; and in The Management of Contracts, Taxes, the Public Money &c., (London, 1783).

[Tod, Thomas], *Consolatory thoughts On American Independence. Shewing The great Advantages that will arise from it to the Manufacturers, the Agriculture, and commercial Interest of Britain And Ireland*, (Edinburgh 1782).

[Trenchard, John], *Cato's Letters: or Essays on Liberty, Civil and Religious, And other important Subjects*. 4 vols., (London, 1748).

Trials for Adultery. Or, the History of Divorces. Being Select Trials at Doctors Commons, for Adultery, Fornication, Cruelty, Impotence etc. From the Year 1760, to the Present Time. Including the whole of the Evidence on each cause, 8 vols., (London, 1779-85).

The Triumph of Liberty and Peace with America: a Poem. Inscribed to General Conway, (London, 1782).

Tucker, Dr Josiah, *A Brief Essay on the Advantages & Disadvantages which Respectively Attend France and Great-Britain, with regard to Trade.* (Dublin, 1787).

_____, *Cui bono?, or, An inquiry. what benefits can arise either to the English or the Americans, the French, Spaniards, or Dutch, from the greatest victories, or successes, in the present war, being a series of letters, addressed to Monsieur Necker, late controller general of the finances of France, (Gloucester, 1781).*

_____, *Dispassionate Thoughts on the American War; Addressed to the Moderate of All Parties, (London, 1780).*

_____, *Four letters on important national subjects, addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Shelburne, His Majesty's First Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, (London, [1783]).*

_____, *Four Tracts Together with Two Sermons, On Political and Commercial Subjects, (Gloucester, 1774).*

_____, *An Humble Address and Earnest Appeal to Those Respectable Personages in Great Britain and Ireland, who by their Great and Permanent Interest in landed Property, (Gloucester, 1775).*

_____, *A Letter from a Merchant in London to his Nephew in North America, relative to the Present Posture of Affairs in the Colonies*, (London, 1766).

_____, *Reflections of the Present Matters in Dispute between Great Britain and Ireland; and on the Means of converting these Articles into mutual Benefit to both kingdoms*, (London, 1785).

_____, *A Series of Answers to Certain Popular Objections, against Separating from the Rebellious Colonies, and Discarding Them Entirely; being the Concluding Tract of the Dean of Gloucester [sic], on the Subject of American Affairs*, (Glo[u]cester, 1776).

An Unconnected Whig's Address to the Public upon the Present Civil War, the State of Public Affairs, and the Real Course of the National Calamities, (London, 1777).

Unity and Public Spirit recommended in an Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster, to which are added two odes: viz. The Miseries of dissension and civil war, and The True Patriot, inscribed to Earl Cornwallis, and Sir George Brydges Rodney, Bart, (London, [1780]).

[Walpole, Horace], *An Account of the Giants Lately Discovered; In a Letter to a Friend in the Country*, (London [15th August] 1766).

[War Office], *A List of the Officers of the Army, and Marines*, 33rd ed., [London, 1785].

Wells, Rev. Charles, *Address to the Genius of America. A Poem.*, (Canterbury & Margate, 1781).

Wesley, John, *A Survey of the Wisdom of God in the Creation: or a Compendium of Natural Philosophy*, 2 vols, (Bristol, 1763).

_____, *Thoughts upon Slavery*, (London, 1774).

[Wilcocks, Joseph], *Roman Conversations; or Historical Exercises: Being some of the Principal Characters in the Roman History*, 2 vols., (London, 1763).

Wilkes, Wetenhall, *A Letter of Genteel and Moral Advice to a Young Lady. In which is digested a new and familiar Method, a system of RULES and INFORMATIONS, to qualify the FAIR SEX to be useful and happy in every State.* (Dublin, 1740).

Willcox, William B., ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, Vols. 15 onwards, (New Haven & London, 1972 onwards).

[Williamson, John], *The Elements of Military Arrangement, and of the Discipline of War; Adapted to the Practice of the British Infantry*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., (London, 1791).

Wilson, Andrew, *Medical Researches: Being an Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Hysterics in the Female Constitution, and into the Distinction between that Disease and Hypochondriac or Nervous Disorders*, (London, 1777).

[Wynne, John Huddleston], *A General History of the British Empire in America: Containing An Historical, Political, and Commercial View of the English Settlements; Including All the Countries in North-America and the West-Indies, ceded to Great-Britain at the Peace of Paris*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., (London, 1776 (1770)).

Correspondence, Diaries, Memoirs and Autobiographies

Abbott, William, ed., *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, (New York, 1901 (Boston, 1798)).

Abbott, W. W., and Twohig, Dorothy, eds., *The Papers of George Washington. Colonial Series. Volume 7. January 1761-June 1767*. Philander D. Chase and Beverley H. Runge, associate eds., (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1990).

Adams, Abigail, *Letters of Mrs Adams, the wife of John Adams, with an Introductory Memoir by her Grandson, Charles Francis Adams*, 4th ed., (Boston, 1848).

- Adams, Charles Francis, Jones, Guernsey, & Ford, Worthington Chauncey, eds.,
Letters & Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739-1776,
 (Boston, 1914).
- Angelsey, the Marquess of, *One-Leg: The Life and Letters of Henry William Paget*,
First Marquess of Anglesey, K. G., 1768-1854, (London, 1961).
- Aspinall-Oglander, Brigadier-General Cecil, *Admiral's Widow*, (London, 1943).
- Austin, Brigadier-General H. H., 'Old Stick-Leg', *Extracts from the Diaries of Major*
Thomas Austin, (London, 1926).
- Brown, Martin R., & Brown, Ralph A., eds., *Europeans Observe the American*
Revolution, (New York, 1976).
- Burke, Edmund, *On the American Revolution: Selected Speeches and Letters*, Elliott
 Robert Barkan, ed., (New York, 1966).
- _____, *Selected Works of Edmund Burke*, Francis Canavan ed., 3 vols., (Indianapolis,
 Indiana, 2000).
- Butterfield, L. H., Friedlaender, Marc, & Kline, Mary-Jo, eds., *The Book of Abigail*
& John. Selected Letters of the Adams Family, 1762-1784, with a foreword
 by David McCullough, (Boston, 2002 (1975)).

Cozens-Hardy, Basil, *The Diary of Syllas Neville, 1767-1788*, (London, 1950).

Curran, William Henry, *Sketches of The Irish Bar; with Essays, Literary and Political*, 2 vols., (London, 1855).

Dearborn, Henry, *An Account of the Battle of Bunker's Hill*, (Boston, 1818).

Dibdin, Rev. Thomas Frognall, *Reminiscences of a Literary Life*; (London, 1836).

Dickerson, Oliver Morton, ed., *Boston under Military Rule [1768-1769] as revealed in a Journal of the Times*, (Boston, 1936).

Ellis, Annie Raine, ed., *The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768-1778. With a selection from her correspondence and from the journals of her sisters Susan and Charlotte Burney*, 2 vols., (London, 1907).

Finer, Ann, and Savage, George, eds., *The Selected Letters of Josiah Wedgwood*, (London, 1965).

Gibbon, Edward, *Memoirs of My Life and Writings*, edited by A. O. J. Cockshut and Stephen Constantine, (Keele University, 1994 (1776)).

J. Y. T. Greig, ed., *The Letters of David Hume*, 2 volumes, (Oxford, 1932).

Humphreys, Colonel James, *An Essay on the Life of the Honourable Major General Israel Putnam*, (Boston, 1818).

Jefferson, Thomas, *Autobiography*, published by The Thomas Jefferson Society, (Keswick, Virginia, 2000).

Labaree, Leonard W., ed., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vols. 1-14, (New Haven & London, 1959-1970).

Laughton, Sir John Knox, ed., *Letters and Papers of Charles, Lord Barham, Admiral of the Red Squadron, 1758-1813*, 3 vols., (London, 1907).

Lewis, W. S., ed., *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, 48 vols., (New Haven & London, 1937-1983).

Marchand, Jean, ed., *A Frenchman in England 1784. Being the Mélanges sur l'Angleterre of François de la Rochefoucauld*, translation and notes by S. C. Roberts, (Cambridge, 1933).

Marmontel, Jean-François, *Mémoires*, Jean-Pierre Guicciardi & Gilles Thiernet, eds., (Paris, 1999).

Miller, Lillian B., ed., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume 1. Charles Willson Peale. artist in revolutionary America, 1735-*

1791, Sidney Hart, assistant ed., Toby A. Appel, research historian, (New Haven & London, 1983).

Miller, Lillian B. (1923-1997), & Hart, Sidney, eds., *The Selected papers of Charles Willson Peale and his family - Volume 5. The Autobiography of Charles Willson Peale*, David C. Ward, senior associate ed., Lauren E. Brown, ed. assistant, Sara C. Hale, ed. assistant, (New Haven & London, 2000).

Moore, Dennis D., ed., *More Letters from the American Farmer: An Edition of the Essays in English left Unpublished by Crèvecoeur*, (Athens, Georgia, & London, 1995).

Norton, J. E., ed., *The Letters of Edward Gibbon*, 3 vols., (London, 1956).

Peach, W. Bernard, & Thomas, D. O, eds., *The Correspondence of Richard Price. Volume 1: July 1748 - March 1778*, (Durham, North Carolina, & Cardiff, 1983).

_____, *The Correspondence of Richard Price. Volume II: March 1778-February 1786*, (Durham, North Carolina, & Cardiff, 1991).

Price, Cecil, ed., *The Letters of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, 3 vols., (Oxford, 1966).

Robson, Eric, ed., *Letters from America, 1773 to 1780. Being the letters of a Scots officer Sir James Murray to his home during the War of American Independence*, (Manchester, 1951).

Sizer, Theodore, ed., *The Autobiography of Colonel John Trumbull Patriot-Artist, 1756-1843*, (New Haven, 1953).

Tatum, Edward H., Jr., ed., *The American Journal of Ambrose Serle, Secretary to Lord Howe, 1776-1778*, (San Marino, California, 1940).

Thacher, James, *A Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775 to 1783, describing interesting events and transactions of this period with numerous Historical Facts and Anecdotes, from the original Manuscript*, (Boston, 1823).

Trumbull, John, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters of John Trumbull from 1756 to 1841*, (New York, New Haven & London, 1841).

Newspapers and Periodicals:

The Annual Register

The British Magazine and General Review of the Literature, Employment & Amusements of the Times

*The Convivial Magazine, and Polite Intelligencer; or a Real Representation of the
Characters and Sentiments of the Times*

The Critical Review: or, Annals of Literature,

The Daily Advertiser

The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser

The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle

Lloyd's Evening Post

The London Chronicle

The London Gazette

The London Magazine, or Gentleman's Monthly Intelligencer

The Monthly Review; or Literary Journal

The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser

The Morning Post, and Daily Advertiser

The Morning Herald, and Daily Advertiser

The Pennsylvania Magazine: or American Monthly Museum

The Political Register, and Impartial Review of New Books

Punch, or the London Charivari

The Rambler

The Spectator

St James Chronicle

The Town and Country Magazine, or Universal Repository of Knowledge,

Instruction and Entertainment

The Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure

The Virginia Historical Register

The Westminster Magazine

Secondary Sources:

Books:

Agnew, John Philip, *Richard Price and the American Revolution, An Abstract of a thesis*, (Urbana, Illinois, 1949).

The American War of Independence 1775-1783, exh. cat., (London, 1975).

Amory, Martha Babcock, *The Domestic and Artistic Life of John Singleton Copley, R.A. With Notices of his Works and Reminiscences of his Son, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain*, (Boston, New York & Cambridge, 1882).

Amussen, Susan Dwyer, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, 1988).

Anderson, Fred, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*, (New York, 2001 (2000)).

Ankerfeldt, Carl, *Romerske Spottefugle: De talende statuer*, (København, 1965).

Anstey, Roger, *The Atlantic Slave Trade and British Abolition, 1760-1810*, (London & Basingstoke, 1975).

Ashcroft, Richard, *Political Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, (Princeton, New Jersey, 1986).

Atherton, Herbert M., *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth. A Study of the Ideographic Representation of Politics*, (Oxford, 1974).

Avery, Emmett L., ed., *The London Stage 1660-1800. A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces, Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment*, 2 vols., (Carbondale, Illinois, 1960).

de Baecque, Antoine, *The Body Politic: Corporeal Metaphor in Revolutionary France, 1770-1800*, translated by Charlotte Mandell, (Stanford, California, 1997 (1993)).

Bailyn, Bernard, *Faces of Revolution: Personalities and Themes in the Struggle for American Independence*, (New York, 1990).

_____, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, enlarged ed., (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1992 (1967)).

_____, *To Begin the World Anew: The Genius and Ambiguities of the American Founders*, (New York, 2003).

Baker, Keith Michael, *Inventing the French Revolution Essays on French Political Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1990).

Baker, Malcolm, *Figured in Marble: The Making and Viewing of Eighteenth-Century Sculpture*, (London, 2000).

Barkan, Leonard, *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World*, (New Haven & London, 1975).

Barker, Virgil, *American Painting: History and Interpretation*, (New York, 1950).

Bartholomew, John, *The Survey Gazetteer of the British Isles, including a summary of the 1931 census and reference atlas*, 8th ed., (Edinburgh, 1932).

Bates, Catherine, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*, (Cambridge, 1992).

de Beer, Sir Gavin, *Gibbon and his World*, (London, 1968).

Bell, Steve, *Apes of Wrath*, (London, 2004).

Bénézit, E., *Dictionnaire critique et documentaire Des Peintres, Sculpteurs, Dessinateurs, et Graveurs*, 14 vols., (Paris, 1999 (1911-1923)).

Berger, Carl, *Broadsides & Bayonets: The Propaganda War of the American Revolution*, revised ed., (San Rafael, California, 1976 (1961)).

Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*, (New York, 1978).

Bevis, Richard, *English Drama: Restoration and Eighteenth Century, 1660-1789*, (London & New York, 1988).

Bindman, David, *Ape to Apollo: Aesthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18th Century*, (London, 2002).

Bindman, David, Ekserdijan, David, and Palin, Will, eds., *Hogarth's Election Entertainment: Artists at the Hustings*, exh. cat., (London, 2001).

Black, Jeremy, *Culloden and the '45*, (Stroud, 1990).

_____, *Maps and Politics*, (London, 2000 (1997)).

_____, *Pitt the Elder: The Great Commoner*, (Stroud, 1999 (1992)).

_____, *War for America: The Fight for Independence, 1775-1783*, (Stroud, 1998 (1992)).

Blumenberg, Hans, *Shipwreck with Spectator: Paradigm of a Metaphor for Existence*, translated by Steven Rendall, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1997).

_____, *Work on Myth*, translated by Robert M. Wallace, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1985 (1979)).

Boas, Frederick, *An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama 1700-1780*, (Oxford, 1953).

Boime, Albert, *Art in an Age of Revolution, 1750-1800*, (Chicago and London, 1987).

_____, *The Art of Exclusion: Representing Blacks in the Nineteenth Century*, (London, 1990).

Bond, W. H., *Thomas Hollis of Lincoln's Inn: A Whig and his Books*, (Cambridge, 1990).

A Bostonian, *Biographical Sketch of Gen. Joseph Warren, embracing the Prominent events of his Life, and the Boston Orations of 1772 and 1775*, (Boston, 1857).

Bradley, Patricia, *Slavery Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, (Jackson, Mississippi, 1998).

Bradshaw, Peter, *Bow Porcelain Figures circa 1748-1774*, (London, 1992).

_____, *Derby Porcelain Figures, 1750-1848*, (London, 1990).

_____, *Eighteenth-Century English Porcelain Figures, 1745-1795*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1981).

Braverman, Richard, *Plots and Counterplots: Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660-1730*, (Cambridge, 1993).

Brewer, John, *The Pleasures of the Imagination English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, (London 1997).

Brigham, Clarence S., *Paul Revere's Engravings*, revised ed., (New York, 1969).

A British Account of the Battle of Lexington; and the Last Meeting in the Dowse Library at No. 30 Tremont St., Boston, ([London], [1897?]).

Briggs, Asa, *The Age of Improvement, 1783-1867*, 2nd ed., (Harlow, Essex, 2000 (1959)).

The British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, (Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1979 (1904, 1911)).

Brooks, Charles, *Best Editorial Cartoons of the Year: 2004 Edition*, (Gretna, Louisiana, 2004).

Brown, Jared, *The Theatre in America during the Revolution*, (Cambridge 1995).

Brown, Terry, *English Martial Arts*, (Norfolk, 1997).

Bruns, Roger, ed., *Am I Not A Man And A Brother. The Antislavery Crusade of Revolutionary America: 1688-1788*, (New York, 1977).

Bryan, Michael, revised by George C. Williamson, ed., *Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, 5 vols., (Port Washington, New York, 1964 (1816)).

Burke, Trevor J., *Family Matters: A Socio-Historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians*, (London & New York, 2003).

Butterfield, Roger, *The American Past: A History of the United States from Concord to the Nuclear Age*, revised ed., (New York, 1957 (1947)).

Calloway, Colin G., *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, (Cambridge, 1995).

Cannon-Brookes, Peter, ed., *The painted word. British history painting, 1750-1830*, exh. cat., (London, 1991).

Caricatures, Drawn & Etched by those Celebrated Artists Gillray, Rowlandson, Cruickshank, &c. ([London?, 1836?]).

Carlucci, April, and Barber, Peter, eds., *Lie of the Land: The Secret Life of Maps*, exh. cat., (London, 2001).

Carroll, Frances Laverne, & Meachum, Mary, *The Library at Mount Vernon*,
(Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1977).

Carter, David G., ed., *The Painter and the New World*, exh. cat., (Montreal, 1967).

Cary, John, *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot*, (Urbana, Illinois, 1961).

Castle, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilization. The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*, (London, 1986).

Chartrand, René, *Ticonderoga 1758: Montcalm's victory against all odds*, (Oxford, 2000).

Christie, Ian R., & Labaree, Benjamin W., *Empire or Independence, 1760-1776: A British-American Dialogue on the Coming of the American Revolution*,
(Oxford, 1976).

Clark, Dora Mae, *British Opinion and the American Revolution*, (New Haven & London 1930).

Clark, J. C. D., *English Society, 1660-1832*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge, 2000 (1985)).

_____, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832 Political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world*, (Cambridge, 1994).

- Clery, E. J., *The Feminization Debate in Eighteenth-Century England: Literature, Commerce and Luxury*, (Basingstoke, 2004).
- Clinton-Baddeley, V. C., *The Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre After 1660*, (London 1952).
- Clowes, William Laird, *The Royal Navy: A History from the Earliest Times to the Present*, 7 vols., (New York, 1966 (London, 1898)).
- Coffin, Charles, *History of the Battle of Breed's Hill, by Major-Generals William Heath, Henry Lee, James Wilkinson and Henry Dearborn*, (Portland, Maine, 1835).
- Cohen, Michèle, *Fashioning Masculinity: national identity and language in the eighteenth century*, (London & New York, 1996).
- Cohen, Sheldon S., *British Supporters of the American Revolution, 1775-1783: The Role of the 'Middling Level' Activists*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2004).
- Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, (New Haven & London, 1992).
- _____, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850*, (London, 2003).

Conway, Stephen, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence*, (Oxford, 2000).

_____, *The War of American Independence, 1775-1783*, (London, 1995).

Cooper, Helen A., ed., *John Trumbull: The Hand and Spirit of a Painter*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1982).

Cornog, Evan, 'Come all you Gallant Heroes' *The World of the Revolutionary Soldier*, foreword by Richard L. Bushman, exh. cat., (New York, 1991).

Cox, Richard J., & Sullivan, Larry E., *Guide to the Research Collections of the Maryland Historical Society*, (Baltimore, Maryland, 1981).

Craft-Fairchild, Catherine, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women*, (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1993).

Craton, Michael, *Sinews of Empire: A Short History of British Slavery*, (London, 1974).

Craton, Michael, Walvin, James, & Wright, David, eds., *Slavery, Abolition and Emancipation: Black Slaves and the British Empire*, (London & New York, 1976).

- Craven, Wayne, *Colonial American Portraiture. The Economic, Religious, Social, Cultural, Philosophical, Scientific, and Aesthetic Foundations*, (Cambridge, 1986).
- Craven, Wesley Frank, *White, Red, and Black: the seventeenth-century Virginian*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1971).
- Creighton-Williamson, Donald, *The York and Lancaster Regiment (65th and 84th Regiments of Foot)*, (London, 1968).
- Cresswell, Donald H., *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints. A Checklist of 1765-1790 in the Library of Congress*, (Washington D.C., 1975).
- Culler, Jonathan, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*, (London, 1992 (1981)).
- Cummings, Frederick, & Staley, Allen, *Romantic Art in Britain, Paintings and Drawings 1760-1860*, exh. cat., (Philadelphia, 1968).
- Davis, David Brion, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, (New York, 1998 (1966)).
- Demaria, Robert, *British Literature, 1640-1789, An Anthology*, 2nd ed., (Malden, Massachusetts, & Oxford, 2001 (1996)).

Derry, John, *English Politics and the American Revolution*, (London, 1976).

D'Oench, Ellen D., *'Copper into Gold': Prints by John Raphael Smith 1751-1812*,
(New Haven & London, 1999).

_____, *Prodigal Son Narratives, 1480-1980*, exh. cat., (New Haven & Middletown,
Connecticut, 1995).

Dolmetsch, Joan D., *Rebellion and Reconciliation: Satirical Prints on the Revolution
at Williamsburg*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1976).

Donald, Diana, *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III*,
(New Haven & London, 1996).

Van Doren, Carl, *Benjamin Franklin*, 3 vols., (New York, 1938).

Douglas, Mary, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, (London, 1990).

Douglas, Roy, Harte, Liam, & O'Hara, Jim, *Drawing Conclusions: A Cartoon
History of Anglo-Irish Relations, 1798-1998*, (Belfast, 1998).

Duffy, Christopher, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*, (London, 1987).

Duffy, Michael, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: The Englishman and the
Foreigner*, (Cambridge, 1986).

Dull, Jonathan, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*, (New Haven & London 1985).

Dumbrell, John, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After*, (Basingstoke, Hampshire, & New York, 2001).

Dunlap, William, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*, 3 vols., (Boston, 1918).

Dunn, Susan, *Sister Revolutions: French Lightning, American Light*, (New York, 1999).

Eddy, George Simpson, *Dr. Benjamin Franklin's Library*, (Worcester, Massachusetts, 1925).

Ellis, George E., *History of the Battle of Bunker's [Breed's] Hill, on June 17, 1775*. (Boston, 1875).

Ellis, Joseph J., *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture*, (New York & London, 1979).

An Enquiry into the Conduct of General Putnam, in relation to the Battle of Bunker, or Breed's Hill: and Remarks upon Mr S. Swett's Sketch of that Battle, (Boston, 1819).

Essig, James D., *The Bonds of Wickedness: American Evangelicals Against Slavery, 1770-1808*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1982).

Evans, Dorinda, *Benjamin West and His American Students*, (Washington D.C., 1980).

Evans, R. D. C., *A Bibliography of the Bayonet*, (Shipley, 2000).

Fairman, Elizabeth, *Wilde America: Discovery and Exploration of the New World*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 2001).

Fidler, David P., & Welsh, Jennifer M., eds., *Empire and Community: Edmund Burke's Writings and Speeches on International Relations*, (Oxford & Boulder, Colorado, 1999).

Finberg, Melinda, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Women Dramatists*, (Oxford, 2001).

Finkelstein, Andrea, *Harmony and the Balance: An Intellectual History of Seventeenth-Century English Economic Thought*, (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2000).

Fischer, David Hackett, *Liberty and Freedom: A Visual History of America's Founding Ideas*, (Oxford, 2005).

_____, *Paul Revere's Ride*, (New York & Oxford, 1994).

- Flandrin, Jean-Louis, *Families in Former Times: Kinship, household and sexuality*, translated by Richard Southern, (Cambridge, 1979 (1976)).
- Fleming, Thomas, ed., *The Founding Fathers. Benjamin Franklin: A Biography in His Own Words*, (New York, 1972).
- _____, *Now We Are Enemies: The Story of Bunker's Hill*, (London, 1960).
- Fliegelmann, Jay, *Prodigals and Pilgrims. The American revolution against patriarchal authority, 1750-1800*, (Cambridge, 1982).
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated from the French by Alan Sheridan, (London, 1977 (1975)).
- Fowble, E. McSherry, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880 A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1987).
- Galt, John, *The Life and Studies of Benjamin West, Esq.*, (Philadelphia, 1816).
- Garratt, John G., *The Four Indian Kings*, with assistance from Bruce Robertson, exh. cat., (Ottawa, Canada, 1985).
- Garstang, Donald, ed., *The British Face. A View of Portraiture, 1625-1850*, exh. cat., (London, 1986).

George Romney as a Painter of Children, with an introduction by Brian Allen exhibit, (London, 1984).

George, Mary Dorothy, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires, Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. V: (1771-1783), (London, 1935).

_____, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires, Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. VI: (1784-1792), (London, 1938).

_____, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires, Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, vol. (1792-1800), (London, 1942).

_____, *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda*, (Oxford, 1959).

Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr., *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, (Cambridge, 1994).

Godechot, Jacques, *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799*, (London, 1965).

Gonzalez, Elena, *British Political and Social Cartoons, 1655-1832. A Checklist compiled by Elena Gonzalez of the Cartoons in the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress which are not in the published Catalogs of the British Museum (London), (2 vols, [Washington], 1968).*

Goodman, Norman, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*, (Indianapolis, Indiana, & Cambridge, 1976).

[Gowing, T.], *A Soldier's Experience. Things not generally known. Showing the Price of War in Blood and Treasure.* (Colchester, 1883).

Granger, Bruce Ingham, *Political Satire in the American Revolution, 1763-1783*, (New York, 1960).

Grant, Alfred, *Our American Brethren: A History of Letters in the British Press During the American Revolution, 1775-1781*, (Jefferson, North Carolina, & London, 1995).

Gravlee, G. Jack, & Irvine, James R., eds., *Pamphlets and the American Revolution. Rhetoric, Politics, Literature and the Popular Press*, (New York, 1976).

The Great Seal of the United States, United States Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, ([Washington, D. C.], September 1996).

Green, James, *Poor Richard's Books. An Exhibition of Books owned by Benjamin Franklin Now on the Shelves of the Library Company of Philadelphia*, exh. cat., (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1990).

Grigsby, Darcy Grimaldo, *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post Revolutionary France*, (New Haven & London, 2002).

Grindle, Donald A., Jr., & Johnson, Bruce E., *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*, (Los Angeles, 1991).

Grueber, Herbert A., *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, 3 vols., (London 1970 (1910)).

_____, *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland in the British Museum*, revised by J. P. C. Kent, L. H. Stewart, P. Finn & H. W. A. Linecar, (London, 1970 (1899)).

Hale, David George, *The Body Politic: A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature*, (The Hague & Paris, 1971).

Hallett, Mark, *The Spectacle of Difference: Graphic Satire in the Age of Hogarth*, (New Haven & London, 1999).

Halliday, Paul D., *Dismembering the Body Politic: Partisan Politics in England's Towns, 1650-1730*, (Cambridge, 1998).

- Halsey, R. T. Haines, *'Impolitical Prints'. An Exhibition of Contemporary English Cartoons Relating to the American Revolution*, exh. cat., (New York 1939).
- Harries, Elizabeth Wanning, *The Unfinished Manner: Essays on the Fragment in the Later Eighteenth Century*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, & London 1994).
- Harrington, Peter, *British Artists and War: The Face of Battle in Paintings and Prints, 1700-1914*, (London & Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, 1993).
- Harvey, Robert, *A Few Bloody Noses: The American War of Independence*, (London, 2001).
- Haskell, Francis, and Penny, Nicholas, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900*, (New Haven & London, 1981).
- Haslam, Fiona, *From Hogarth to Rowlandson: Medicine in Art in Eighteenth Century Britain*, (Liverpool, 1996).
- Haslem, John, *The Old Derby China Factory: The Workmen and their Productions*, with a forward by A. L. Thorpe, (East Ardsley, Wakefield, 1973 (1876)).
- Hausman, Carl R., *Metaphor and Art: Interactionism and Reference in the Verbal and Nonverbal Arts*, (Cambridge, 1989).
- Hawkes, Terence, *Metaphor*, (London, 1972).

- Hazen, Allen T., *A Catalogue of Walpole's Library*, vol. II: nos. 1609-3177, (New Haven & London, 1969).
- Hecht, J. Jean, *The Domestic Class in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1956).
- Hill, Draper, *Mr. Gillray the Caricaturist*, (London, 1965).
- Hinks, Roger, *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, (London, 1939).
- Hoad, T. F., ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, (Oxford, 1986).
- Hogan, Charles Beecher, *The London Stage 1660-1800. A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment. Part 5: 1776-1800*, (Carbondale, Illinois, 1968).
- Holdsworth, Sara, and Crossley, Joan, *Innocence and Experience: Images of Children in British Art from 1600 to the Present*, exh. cat., (Manchester, 1992).
- Holton, Woody, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves & the making of the American Revolution in Virginia*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, & London, 1999).
- Honour, Hugh, *The European Vision of America*, exh. cat., (Cleveland, Ohio, 1975).

_____, *The Image of the Black in Western Art. IV: From the American Revolution to World War I*, 4 vols., (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1989).

_____, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time*, (New York, 1975).

Houlding, J. A., *Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795*, (Oxford, 1981).

Huddleston, Lee Eldridge, *The Origins of the American Indians, European Concepts, 1492-1729*, (Austin, Texas, & London, 1967).

Hull, Anthony H., *Charles III and the Revival of Spain*, (Washington D.C., 1981).

Hull, Suzanne W., *Women according to Men. The World of Tudor-Stuart Women*, (Walnut Creek, California, London & New Delhi, 1996).

Hulme, Peter, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the native Caribbean, 1492-1797*, (London & New York, 1986).

Hunt, Lynn, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1992).

Hunt, Tamara L., *Defining John Bull: Political Caricature and National Identity in Late Georgian England*, (Aldershot, 2003).

Isham, Samuel, *The History of American Painting*, new ed., (New York, 1927 (1905)).

Jaffe, Irma B., *John Trumbull: Patriot-Artist of the American Revolution*, (Boston, 1975).

James, Sydney V., *A People Among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1963).

Jennings, Francis, *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire*, (Cambridge, 2000).

Jordan, Winthrop D., & Skemp, Sheila L., eds., *Race and Family in the Colonial South*, (Jackson, Mississippi, & London, 1987).

Jordanova, Ludmilla, *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits 1660-2000*, (London, 2000).

_____, *Nature Displayed: Gender, Science and Medicine, 1760-1820*, (Edinburgh, 1999).

Kaplan, Sidney, ed., *The Black Presence in the Era of the American Revolution, 1770-1800*, exh. cat., (Washington, D.C., 1973).

Kann, Mark E., *The Gendering of American Politics: Founding Mothers, Founding Fathers, and Political Patriarchy*, (Westport, Connecticut, & London, 1999).

_____, *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics*, (New York & London, 1998).

Kantorowicz, Ernst, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, (Princeton, New Jersey, 1957).

Kavanagh, Peter, *The Irish Theatre*, (Tralee, 1946).

Kemp, Peter, *The British Sailor: A Social History of the Lower Deck*, (London, 1970).

Kent, Susan Kingsley, *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640-1990*, (London & New York, 1999).

Kidson, Alex, *George Romney, 1734-1802*, exh. cat., (London, 2002).

Klein, Christopher M., *Maps in Eighteenth-Century British Magazines. A Checklist.*, (Chicago, 1989).

Kolodny, Annette, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in American Life and Letters*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1975).

- Kraemer, Ruth S., *Drawings by Benjamin West and his son Raphael Lamar West*, (New York, 1975).
- Kulikoff, Allan, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, & London, 1986).
- Lakoff, George, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*, (Chicago, 1987).
- Lakoff, George, & Johnson, Mark, *Metaphors We Live By*, (Chicago & London, 1981).
- _____, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, (New York, 1999).
- Lakoff, George, & Turner, Mark, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, (Chicago & London, 1989).
- Landes, Joan B., *Women in the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, (Ithaca, New York, & London, 1988).
- Langford, Eric, *The Allegorical Mr Pitt: A Bicentennial Biography*, [Montross, Virginia, 1976?].

Langford, Paul, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1989).

Lascelles, E. C. P., *Granville Sharp and the Freedom of Slaves in England*, (London, 1928).

Lawrence, Christopher, *Medicine in the Making of Modern Britain, 1700-1920*, (London & New York, 1994).

Lawson, Cecil C. P., *A History of the Uniforms of the British Army*, 5 vols., (London, 1940-1967).

Lee, Jae Num, *Swift and Scatological Satire*, (Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1971).

Lee, Sir Stephen, and Lee, Sir Sidney, eds., *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 Vols., Oxford, 1949-50.

Lewis, Benjamin M., *A Guide to Engravings in American Magazines, 1741-1810*, (New York, 1959).

Lincoln, Margarete, *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750-1815*, (Aldershot, 2002).

Lindsey, William R., *Treatment of American Prisoners of War During the Revolution*, (Kansas City, 1969).

Liss, Peggy K., *Atlantic Empires: The Network of Trade and Revolution, 1713-1826*, (Baltimore, Maryland, & London, 1983).

Livy, *The Early History of Rome*, translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt, with an introduction by R. M. Ogilvie, (London, 1960, 1971).

Logan, G. Murray, *Scottish Highlanders and the American Revolution*, (Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1976).

Lutnick, Solomon, *The American Revolution and the British Press: 1775-1783*, (Columbia, Missouri, 1967).

Lynch, John, *Bourbon Spain, 1700-1808*, (Oxford, 1989).

Mackesy, Piers, *The War For America 1775-1783*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964).

MacLeod, Catherine, & Alexander, Julia Marciari, ed., *Painted Ladies: Women at the Court of Charles II*, exh. cat., (New Haven & London, 2001).

MacLeod, Duncan J., *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution*, (London & New York, 1974).

Magner, Lois N., *A History of Medicine*, (New York, 1992).

- Mancall, Rosamond, Research Editor, (compiled by), *A Catalogue of English Satirical Prints and Drawings, 1734-1801, in the United States of America, not in the British Museum Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires, Based on the catalogue cards in the Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington, Conn. U.S.A.*, (Farmington, Connecticut, 1975).
- Marshall, Dorothy, *Eighteenth Century England*, (Harlow, Essex, 1962).
- Marston, Daniel, *The American Revolution, 1774-1783*, (Oxford, 2002).
- Matthew, H. G. G., and Harrison, Brian, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 vols., (Oxford, 2004).
- Maza, Sarah, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, 1993).
- McCauley, Lois B., *Maryland Historical Prints, 1752-1889*, (Baltimore, Maryland, 1975).
- McElroy, Guy C., *Facing History: The Black Image in American Art 1710-1940*, exh. cat., (San Francisco, 1990).
- McIntosh, Carey, *Common Courtly Language. The Stylistics of Social Class in Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1986).

McNairn, Alan, *Behold the Hero: General Wolfe & The Arts in the Eighteenth Century*, (Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo, 1997).

McNeilly, F. S., *The Anatomy of Leviathan*, (London, Melbourne & Toronto, 1968).

Meade, Richard Hardaway, *An Introduction to the History of General Surgery*, (Philadelphia, London & Toronto, 1968).

Merritt, Richard L., *Symbols of American Community, 1735-1775*, (New Haven & London, 1966).

Miles, Ellen G., *American Paintings of the Eighteenth Century*, with contributions by Patricia Burda, Cynthia J. Mills, Leslie Kaye Reinhardt, (New York & Oxford, 1995).

Millar, Oliver, *Rubens: The Whitehall Ceiling*, (London, 1958).

Miller, Charles A., *Ship of State: The Nautical Metaphors of Thomas Jefferson, With Numerous Examples by Other Writers From Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (New York & Oxford, 2003).

Miller, C. William, *Benjamin's Franklin's Philadelphia Printing, 1728-1766: A Descriptive Bibliography*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1974).

Miller, John, Anderle, Donald, & van Schick, Julia, *The American Idea – Discovery and Settlement, Revolution and Independence – An Exhibition Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Founding of the United States of America (March 16 – July 7, 1976)*, exh. cat., (New York, 1976).

Miller, Lillian B., *'The Dye Is Now Cast' – The Road to American Independence, 1774-1776*, (Washington, D.C., 1975).

Mills, Laura K., *American Allegorical Prints: Constructing an Identity*, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1996).

Mojetta, Angelo, *Sharks: History and Biology of the Lords of the Sea*, (Shrewsbury, 1997 (Milan, 1997)).

Montgomery, Charles F., and Kane, Patricia E., eds., *American art, 1750-1800 : towards Independence*, exh., cat., (Boston, Massachusetts, 1976).

Morgan, David T., *The Devious Dr. Franklin, Colonial Agent: Benjamin Franklin's Years in London*, (Macon, Georgia, 1996).

Morgan, John Hill, *Paintings by John Trumbull at Yale University of Historic Scenes and Personages Prominent in the American Revolution*, (New Haven, 1926).

Morgan, Winifred, *An American Icon: Brother Jonathan and American Identity*, (Cranbury, New Jersey, London, & Mississauga, Ontario, 1988).

Mosley, Charles, *A Century of Emblems: An Introductory Anthology*, (Aldershot, 1989).

Murrell, William, *A History of American Graphic Humor, Volume 1 (1747-1865)*, (New York, 1933).

Namier, Sir Lewis, and Brooke, John, *Charles Townshend*, (London, 1964).

Naughtie, James, *Accidental American: Tony Blair and the Presidency*, (London, 2004).

Neff, Emily Ballew, ed., *John Singleton Copley In England*, exh. cat., (London, 1995).

Neubecker, Ottfried, *Heraldry: Sources, Symbols and Meaning*, (London, 1988 (1976)).

Newark, Tim, *Brassey's Book of Uniforms*, (London, 1998).

Newby, Evelyn, *William Hoare of Bath R. A., 1707-1792*, exh. cat., (Bath, 1990).

Newman, Eric P., *The Early Paper Money of America*, (Racine, Wisconsin, 1967).

Nightingale, J. E., *Contributions towards the History of Early English Porcelain, from contemporary sources*, (Salisbury, 1881).

Nochlin, Linda, *The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity*, (London, 1994).

Norton, Mary-Beth, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England: 1774-1789*, (London, 1974).

O'Connell, Sheila, *The Popular Print in England 1550-1850*, exh. cat., (London, 1990).

O'Day, Rosemary, *The Family and Family Relationships, 1500-1900: England, France and the United States of America*, (Basingstoke & London, 1994).

O'Donnell III, James, *Southern Indians in the American Revolution*, (Knoxville, Tennessee, 1973).

Olson, Lester C., *Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 2004).

_____, *Emblems of American Community in the Revolutionary Era: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, (Washington, D. C., 1991).

O'Neill, John, *Five Bodies: Re-figuring Relationships*, (London, 2004).

Oules, Philippe Jean, *The Death of Major Frs. Peirson, 6th January, 1781. Being an Account of the Battle of Jersey with an Appendix of Historical Documents Illustrated by Ph. Jn. Oules*. ([St Helier], Jersey, 1881).

Outram, Dorinda, *The Body and the French Revolution: Sex, Class and political Culture*, (New Haven & London, 1989).

Parker, Francis J., *Colonel William Prescott, the Commander in the Battle of Bunker's Hill*, (Boston, 1875).

Parry, Ellwood, *The Image of the Indian and the Black man in American Art, 1590-1900*, (New York, 1974).

Pateman, Carole, *The Sexual Contract*, (Stanford, California, 1988).

Paulson, Ronald, *Hogarth. Volume 3: Art and Politics, 1750-1764*, (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1993).

_____, *Representations of Revolution (1789-1820)*, (New Haven & London, 1983).

Peach, Bernard, ed., *Richard Price and the Ethical Foundations of the American Revolution*, (Durham, N. C., 1979).

Pearsall, Judy, ed., *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, (Oxford, 1998).

Pearson, Kenneth, & Connor, Patricia, 1776: *The British Story of the American Revolution*, exh. cat., (London, 1976).

Pearson, Michael, *Those Damned Rebels: The American Revolution as seen through British Eyes*, (New York, 1972).

Peck, Harry Thurston, ed., *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities*, (London, 1897).

Pedley, Avril J. M., *The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society*, (Baltimore, Maryland, 1968).

Penny, Nicholas, ed., *Reynolds*, exh. cat., (London, 1986).

Perry, Keith, *British Politics and the American Revolution*, (Basingstoke & London, 1990).

Peters, Marie, *The Elder Pitt*, (London and New York, 1998).

Peterson, Harold L., *Arms and Armor in Colonial America, 1526-1783*, (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1956).

Phillips, Kevin, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion Politics, & The Triumphs of Anglo-America*, (New York, 1999).

Phillips, P. Lee, *The Rare Map of Virginia and Maryland by Augustine Herrman
First Lord of Bohemia Manor Maryland*, (Washington, D.C., 1911).

Plomer, H. R., Bushnell, G. H., & McDix, E. R., *A Dictionary of the Printers and
Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland, and Ireland from 1726
to 1775*, (Oxford, 1932 (for 1930)).

Polanyi, Michael, *The Tacit Dimension*, (London, 1967 (1966)).

Poole, Julia, *Plagiarism Personified? European Pottery and Porcelain Figures*,
exh. cat., (Cambridge 1986).

Porter, Roy, *Bodies Politic: Disease, Death and Doctors in Britain, 1650-1900*,
(London, 2001).

Postle, Martin, *Angels and Urchins: The Fancy Picture in 18th-Century British Art*,
exh. cat., (London 1988).

Powers, Deborah Stanley, *Revolutionary America*, exh. cat., (Bloomington, Indiana,
1976).

Pressly, William L., *James Barry: The Artist as Hero*, exh. cat., (London, 1983).

_____, *The Life and Art of James Barry*, (New Haven & London, 1981).

Price, Jacob M., *Tobacco in Atlantic Trade: The Chesapeake, London and Glasgow, 1675-1775*, (Aldershot, 1995).

Price, Dr Richard, *Political Writings*, edited by D. O Thomas, (Cambridge, 1991).

Prown, Jules David, *John Singleton Copley. 1738-1815*, exh. cat., (New York, N. Y., & Boston, Massachusetts, 1965).

_____, *John Singleton Copley. Volume I. In America 1738-1774*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966).

_____, *John Singleton Copley. Volume II. In England, 1774-1815*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966).

Putnam, Daniel, *A Letter to Major-General Dearborn, repelling his Unprovoked Attack on the Character of the Late Major-General Putnam; and containing some Anecdotes relating to the Battle on Bunker-Hill, not generally known.* (Boston, 1818).

Quarles, Benjamin, *The Negro in the Making of America*, (New York, 1996 (1964)).

Raikes, Major G. A., *Roll of the Officers of the York and Lancaster Regiment*, London, 1885).

Rajnai, Dr M., (with the help of Miss Marion Spencer), *Paintings by Henry Walton, 1746-1813*, (Norwich, 1963).

Rea, Robert R., *The English Press in Politics, 1760-1774*, (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1963).

Reich, Jerome R., *British Friends of the American Revolution*, (Armonk, New York, & London, 1998).

Reid, Stuart, *Eighteenth-Century Highlanders*, (Oxford, 1993).

_____, *Redcoat Officer, 1740-1815*, (Oxford, 2002).

Reilly, Bernard F., Jr., *American Political Prints, 1766-1876. A Catalog of the Collections in the Library of Congress*, (Boston, 1991).

Ribeiro, Aileen, *The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France 1750-1820*, (New Haven & London, 1995).

_____, *Dress and Morality*, (London, 1986).

_____, *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe, 1715-1789*, 2nd ed., (New Haven & London, 2002).

Rice, Laura, *Maryland History in Prints, 1743-1900*, (Baltimore, Maryland, 2002).

Richards, I. A., *The Rhetoric of Metaphor*, (New York, 1936).

Richardson, E. P., *An Exhibition of English Conversation Pieces of the Eighteenth Century*, exh. cat., (Detroit, 1948).

Richardson, Edgar P., Hindle, Brooke, & Miller, Lillian B., *Charles Willson Peale and His World*, with a foreword by Charles Coleman Sellers, (New York, 1982).

Riddell, Chris, *Tribal Politics*, (London, 1999).

Riely, John C., *The Age of Horace Walpole In Caricature: An Exhibition of Satirical Prints and Drawings from the Collection of W. S. Lewis*, with an introduction by Dale R. Roylance, exh. cat., (New Haven, 1973).

Ristow, Walter R., *American Maps and Mapmakers: Commercial Cartography in the Nineteenth Century*, (Detroit, 1985).

Ritcheson, Charles, R., *British Politics and the American Revolution*, (Norman, Oklahoma, 1954).

Roach, Joseph, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, (New York, 1996).

Robbins, Caroline, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959).

Roberts, K. B., & Tomlinson, J. D. W., *The Fabric of the Body: European Traditions of Anatomical Illustration*, (Oxford, 1992).

Robinson, Charles Napier, *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction. The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor's Life*, Introduction by John Leyland, (London & New York, 1909).

Rogers, Colonel H. C. B., *The British Army of the Eighteenth Century*, (New York, 1977).

Room, Adrian, ed., *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase & Fable*, (London, 1999 (1959)).

Rudé, George, *Hanoverian London*, (Stroud, 2003 (1971)).

Russell, Gillian, *The Theatres of War: Performance, Politics and Society, 1793-1815*, (Oxford, 1995).

Sanford, Rhonda Lemke, *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England. A Sense of Place*, (New York & Basingstoke 2002).

Scarry, Elaine, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (New York & Oxford, 1985).

Schenider, Ben Ross, Jr., , *Index to the London Stage 1660-1800*, forward by George Winchester Stone, Jr., (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois, 1979).

Schutz, John A., *Thomas Paine, British Defender of American Liberty. A Study of Anglo-American Relations in the Eighteenth-Century*. (Glendale, California, 1951).

Schwartz, Joel, *The Sexual Politics of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, (Chicago & London, 1984).

Schwartz, Seymour I., *The Mismatching of America*, (Rochester, New York, 2003).

Scott, John Anthony, *Trumpet of a Prophecy: Revolutionary America, 1763-1783*, (New York, 1969).

Seavey, Ormond, *Becoming Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography and the Life*, (University Park, Pennsylvania, & London, 1988).

Sellers, Charles Coleman, *Charles Willson Peale*, (New York, 1969).

Shapiro, Hyman, *John Wilkes and Parliament*, (London, 1972).

Shefrin, Jill, *Neatly Dissected for the Instruction of Young Ladies and Gentlemen in the Knowledge of Geography. John Spilsbury and Early Dissected Puzzles*, (Los Angeles, 1999).

Shipley, Joseph T., *The Origins of English Words: A Discursive Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, (Baltimore and London, 1984).

Short, John Rennie, *Representing the Republic. Mapping the United States 1600-1900*, (London, 2001).

Silverman, Kenneth, *A Cultural History of the American Revolution: Painting, Music, Literature, and the Theatre in the Colonies and the United States from the Treaty of Paris to the Inauguration of George Washington, 1763-1789*, (New York, 1987 (1976)).

Simpson, Roger, *Sir John Tenniel: Aspects of His Work*, (Cranbury, New Jersey, London & Ontario, 1994).

Sizer, Theodore, ed., *The Works of Colonel John Trumbull: Artist of the American Revolution*, revised ed., (New Haven & London, 1967 (1950)).

Slotkin, J. S., ed., *Readings in Early Anthropology*, (London, 1965).

Smart, Alastair, *Allan Ramsay, 1713-1784*, exh. cat., (Edinburgh, 1992).

_____, *Allan Ramsay: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings*, edited by John Ingamells, (New Haven & London, 1999).

_____, *Allan Ramsay, Painter, Essayist and Man of the Enlightenment*, (New Haven & London 1992).

Smith, John Chaloner, *British Mezzotinto Portraits*, (London, 1883).

Smith, John Raphael, *A Complete Catalogue of Plates Published by Him. Giving Titles, Exact Sizes, and Names of the Artists and Engravers*, (facsimile) (London, 1914).

Smout, C. F. V., *The Story of the Progress of Medicine*, (Bristol, 1964).

Snyder, Martin P., *City of Independence: Views of Philadelphia Before 1800*, (New York, 1975).

Sparks, Jared, *The Library of American Biography, Volume X. Lives of Robert Fulton, Joseph Warren, Henry Hudson and Father Marquette*, (New York, [1888?]).

Stafford, Barbara Maria, *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1991).

Stark, Suzanne J., *Female Tars: Women Aboard Ship in the Age of Sail*, (London, 1998 (1996)).

Stephens, F. G., *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vol. III, part 1: (1734-1750), (London, 1877).

_____, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vol. III, part 2: (1750-1760), (London, 1877).

_____, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vol. IV, part 1: (1761-1763), (London, 1883).

_____, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, vol. IV, part 2: (1764-1770), (London, 1883).

Steward, James Christen, *The New Child. British Art and the Origins of Modern Childhood, 1730-1830*, exh. cat., (Berkeley, California, 1995).

Stewart, Robert G., *Robert Edge Pine: A British Portrait Painter in America, 1784-1788*, exh. cat., (Washington, 1979).

Stinchcombe, William C., *The American Revolution and the French Revolution*, (Syracuse, New York, 1969).

Stone, George Winchester, Jr., ed., *The London Stage 1660-1800. A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces, Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment*, 3 vols., (Carbondale, Illinois, 1962).

Stone, Lawrence, *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1600-1800*, (New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco & London, 1977).

_____, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987*, (Oxford, 1990).

Stout, Neil R., *The Royal Navy in America, 1760-1775*, (Annapolis, Maryland, 1973).

Stuebe, Isabel Combs, *The Life and Works of William Hodges*, (New York and London, 1979).

Sunderland, John, 'John Hamilton Mortimer: His Life and Works', *Walpole Society*, vol. LII, (1986, 1988).

Swain, Joseph Ward, *Edward Gibbon The Historian*, (New York and London, 1966).

Sypher, Wylie, *Guinea's Captive Kings: British Anti-Slavery Literature of the XVIIIth Century*, (New York, 1969).

Syrett, David, *The Royal Navy in American Waters 1775-1783*, (Aldershot, 1989).

_____, *The Royal Navy in European Waters during the American Revolutionary War*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 1998).

Syvret, Marguerite, 'The Death of Major Peirson': *The story of the picture*, ([?], [1988]).

Syvret, Marguerite, & Stevens, Joan, *Balleine's History of Jersey*, (Chichester, Sussex, 1981 (1950)).

Tadmor, Naomi, *Family & Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*, (Cambridge, 2001).

Tanner, Tony, *Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*, (Baltimore, Maryland, & London), 1979.

Taverniers, Miriam, *Metaphor and Metaphorology. A selective genealogy of philosophical and linguistic conceptions of metaphor from Aristotle to the 1990s*, (Ghent, 2002).

Thane, Elswyth, *The Family Quarrel: A Journey Through the Years of the Revolution*, (London, 1960).

Thomas, David, ed., *Theatre in Europe: a documentary history. Restoration and Georgian England 1660-1788*, compiled and introduced by David Thomas & Arnold Hare, (Cambridge, 1989).

Thomas Hollis And Other Friends of America, 1760-1784, exh. cat., (Providence, Rhode Island, 1973).

Thomas, Hugh, *The Slave Trade. The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870*, (New York, 1997).

Thomas, Isaiah, *The History of Printing in America, with a Biography of Printers, and an Account of Newspapers*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., (Albany, New York, 1874).

Thomas, Peter D. G., *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: The American Revolution*, (Cambridge, 1986).

_____, *John Wilkes: A Friend to Liberty*, (Oxford, 1996).

Thornton, John L., and Reeves, Carole, *Medical Book Illustration: A Short History*, (Cambridge and New York, 1983).

Tilley, Christopher, *Metaphor and Material Culture*, (Oxford, 1999).

Tilley, John A., *The British Navy and the American Revolution*, ([Columbia], South Carolina, 1987).

Toohey, Robert E., *Liberty and Empire: British Radical Solutions in the American Problem, 1774-1776*, (Lexington, Kentucky, 1978).

- Trumbach, Randolph, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, San Francisco & London, 1978).
- Trumbull, John, *Catalogue of Paintings by Colonel Trumbull*, (New Haven, 1832).
- Tuchman, Barbara, *The First Salute: A View of the American Revolution*, (London, 1988).
- Turner, E. S., *What the Butler Saw: Two Hundred and Fifty Years of the Servant Problem*, (London, 2001 (1962)).
- Turner, Mark, *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*, (Christchurch, New Zealand, 2000).
- Turner, V. W., *Dramas, fields and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*, (Ithaca, New York, 1974).
- Vickery, Amanda, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*, (New Haven & London, 1998).
- Von Erffa, Helmut, & Staley, Allen, *The paintings of Benjamin West*, (New Haven & London, 1986).

Wagner, Peter, *Eros Revived: Erotica of the Enlightenment in England and America*, (London, 1990 (1988)).

Wahrman, Dror, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven & London, 2004).

Waldo, Lewis P., *The French Drama in America in the Eighteenth Century and its Influence on the American Drama of that Period, 1701-1800*, (Baltimore, Maryland, 1942).

Walsh, William S., ed., *Abraham Lincoln and the London Punch: Cartoons, Comments and Poems, Published in the London Charivari, During the American Civil War (1861-1865)*, (New York, 1909).

Walvin, James, *Britain's Slave Empire*, (Stroud, Gloucestershire, & Charleston, South Carolina, 2000).

Wangensteen, Owen H., & Wangenstein, Sarah D., *The Rise of Surgery From Empiric Craft to Scientific Discipline*, (Folkestone, 1978).

Ward, Harry S., *The War of Independence and the Transformation of American Society*, (London, 1999).

Warner, Marina, *Monuments & Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form*, (London, 1985).

Waterhouse, Ellis Kirkham, *Three Decades of British Art, 1740-1770*, (Philadelphia, 1965).

Webster, J. Clarence, *Sir Brook Watson: Friend of the Loyalists, First Agent of New Brunswick in London*, (Sackville, New Brunswick, 1927).

Weil, Rachel, *Political Passions: Gender, the family and political argument in England 1680-1714*, (Manchester and New York, 1999).

Western, J. R., *The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century: The Story of a Political Issue, 1660-1802*, (London & Toronto, 1965).

Wheeler, Susan, *Five Hundred Years of Medicine in Art. An Illustrated Catalogue of Prints and Drawings from the Clements C. Fray Collection in the Harvey Cushing/ John Hay Whitney Medical Library at Yale University*, (Aldershot, & Burlington, Vermont, 2001).

White, Christopher, *Peter Paul Rubens: Man & Artist*, (New Haven & London, 1987).

Whitfield, Peter, *New Found Lands. Maps in the History of Exploration*, (New York, 1998).

Wilkinson, Clive, *The British Navy and the State in the Eighteenth Century*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, and Rochester, New York, 2004).

Williams, David J., *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, (Peabody, Massachusetts, 1999).

Wolff, Hans ed., *America. Early Maps of the New World*, exh. cat. (Munich, 1992).

Wood, Marcus, *Blind Memory: Visual representations of Slavery in England and America, 1780-1865*, (Manchester, 2000).

_____, *Radical Satire and Print Culture, 1790-1822*, (Oxford, 1994).

Wyllie, Colonel H. C., *The York and Lancaster Regiment. The Territorial and Service Battalions, 1758-1919*, 2 vols., ([London], 1930).

Wynne-Jones, Michael, *The Cartoon History of the American Revolution*, (New York, 1975).

Yellin, Jean Fagan, *Women & Sisters: The Antislavery Feminists in American Culture*, (New Haven & London, 1989).

York, Neil Longley, *Turning the World Upside Down: The War of American Independence and the Problem of Empire*, (Westport, Connecticut, & London, 2003).

Young, Alfred F., *Masquerade: The Life and Times of Deborah Sampson, Continental Soldier*, (New York, 2004).

Young, Alfred F., and Fife, Terry J., with Janzen, Mary E., *We the People: Voices and Images of the New Nation*, exh. cat. (Philadelphia, 1993).

Zinman, Michael, *18th Century Engravings from American Magazines*, in the collection of Michael Zinman, (New York, 1994). A typescript work using as a source: Lewis, Benjamin M., *A Guide to Engravings in American Magazines, 1741-1810*, (New York, 1959). This annotated copy is in the collection of the Library Company of Philadelphia.

Essays:

Alverson, Hoyt, 'Metaphor and Experience: Looking Over the Notion of Image Schema', in: James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, (Stanford, California, 1991), pp. 94-117.

Basker, James, 'Coming of Age in Johnson's England: Adolescence in *The Rambler*', in: Soupal, Serge ed., *Les Ages de la Vie en Grande-Bretagne en XVIIIe Siècle*, (Paris, 1995), pp. 197-212.

Berg, Maxine, 'New Commodities, luxuries and their consumers in eighteenth-century England', in: Berg, Maxine, and Clifford, Helen, eds., *Consumers and luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe, 1650-1850*, (Manchester & New York, 1999), pp. 63-85.

Bindman, David, 'Americans in London: contemporary history painting revisited',

in: Payne, Christiana, and Vaughan, William, eds., *English Accents:*

Interactions with British Art c. 1776-1855, (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 9-23.

Black, Jeannette D., 'Maps and the Revolution', in: Moore, Donald K., ed., *Liberty's*

Impact: The World Views 1776, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976),

pp. 19-26.

Black, Max, 'More about metaphor', in: Ortony, Andrew, ed., *Metaphor and*

Thought, (Cambridge, 1993 (1979)), pp. 19-41.

Blumenberg, Hans, 'Prospect for a Theory of Nonconceptuality', in: Blumenberg,

Hans, *Shipwreck with Spectator: Paradigm of a Metaphor for Existence*,

translated by Steven Rendall, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1997),

pp. 81-102.

_____, 'Shipwreck with Spectator', in: Blumenberg, Hans, *Shipwreck with*

Spectator: Paradigm of a Metaphor for Existence, translated by Steven

Rendall, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London, 1997), pp. 7-79.

Bradley, James E., 'The British Public and the American Revolution: Ideology,

Interest and Opinion', in: Dickinson, H. T., ed., *Britain and the American*

Revolution, (Harlow, Essex, 1998), pp. 124-154.

Burnham, Patricia M., 'John Trumbull Historian: The Case of the Battle of Bunker's Hill', in: Burnham, Patricia M., & Giese, Lucretia Hoover, eds., *Redefining American History Painting*, (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 37-53.

Carter, Philip, 'Men about town: representations of foppery and masculinity in early eighteenth-century urban society', in: Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, eds., *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, (London and New York, 1997), pp. 31-57.

Chantrill, Patricia A., & Mio, Jeffery Scott, 'Metonymy in Political Discourse', in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1996), pp. 171-184.

R. Chartier, 'The World Turned Upside-Down', in: *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, translated by L. G. Cochrane, (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 115-126.

Cohen, Michèle, 'Manliness, effeminacy and the French: gender and the construction of national character in eighteenth-century England', in: Hitchcock, Tim, and Cohen, Michèle, eds., *English Masculinities 1660-1800*, (Harlow, Essex, 1999), pp. 44-61.

Colin, Susi, 'Woodcutters and Cannibals. Brazilian Indians as Seen on Early Maps', in: Wolff, Hans, ed., *America. Early Maps of the New World*, exh. cat., (Munich, 1992), pp. 175-181.

Conway, Stephen, 'British Governments and the Conduct of the American War', in:

Dickinson, H. T., ed. *Britain and the American Revolution*, (Harlow, Essex, 1998), pp. 155-179.

Cope, Sir Zachary, 'The Influence of the Royal College of Surgeons upon the

Evolution of Medical Practice in Britain', in: F. N. L. Poynter, ed., *The Evolution of Medical Practice in Britain*, (London, 1961), pp. 47-55.

Crossley, Joan, 'A Sense of Identity', in: Sara Holdsworth and Joan Crossley, eds.,

Innocence and Experience: Images of Children in British Art from 1600 to the Present, with an essay by Christina Hardyment, (Manchester, 1992) pp. 31-36.

Dodds, Sir Charles, & Payne, L. M., 'The Influence of the Royal College of

Physicians on the Evolution of Medical Practice in Great Britain', in: F. N. L. Poynter, ed., *The Evolution of Medical Practice in Britain*, (London, 1961), pp. 35-46.

Dolmetsch, Joan, 'Political Satires at Colonial Williamsburg', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch,

ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), pp. 175-196.

_____, 'Prints in Colonial America. Supply and Demand in the Mid-Eighteenth

Century', in: John D. Morse, ed., *Prints in and of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 53-74.

Dresser, Madge, 'Britannia', in: Samuel, Raphael, ed., *Patriotism: the Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, 3 vols., volume III: *National Fictions*, (London & New York, 1989), pp. 26-49.

Echeverria, Durand, 'The Colonies before 1776: The View from Continental Europe', in: Donald K. Moore, ed., *Liberty's Impact: The World Views 1776*, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976), pp. 3-10.

Gergen, Kenneth J., 'Metaphor, metatheory, and the social world', in: Leary, David E., ed., *Metaphors in the History of Psychology*, (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 267-299.

Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr., 'Process and products in making sense of tropes', in: Ortony, Andrew, ed., *Metaphor and Thought*, (Cambridge, 1993 (1979)), pp. 252-276.

Gombrich, E. H., 'Magic, Myth and Metaphor: Reflections on Pictorial Satire', in: E. H. Gombrich, *The Uses of Images: Studies in the Social Function of Art and Visual Communication*, (London, 1999), pp. 184-211.

_____, 'Visual Metaphors of Value in Art', in: *Mediations on a Hobby Horse: And other essays on the theory of art*, 4th ed., (London & New York, 1985 (1963)), pp. 12-29.

- Hardyment, Christina, 'Looking at Children', in: Sara Holdsworth and Joan Crossley, eds., *Innocence and Experience: Images of Children in British Art from 1600 to the Present*, with an essay by Christina Hardyment, (Manchester, 1992), pp. 81-95.
- Hart, Sidney, 'A Graphic Case of Transatlantic Republicanism', in: Miller, Lillian B., and Ward, David C., eds., *New Perspectives on Charles Willson Peale: A 250th Anniversary Celebration*, (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 73-82.
- Hitchings, Sinclair, 'The Graphic Arts in Colonial New England', in: John D. Morse, ed., *Prints in and of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 75-110.
- _____, 'London's Images of Colonial America', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), pp. 11-32.
- Holdsworth, Sara, 'The Family', in: Sara Holdsworth and Joan Crossley, eds., *Innocence and Experience: Images of Children in British Art from 1600 to the Present*, with an essay by Christina Hardyment, (Manchester, 1992), pp. 7-28.
- Holman, Peter B., 'Seventeenth-Century American Prints', in: John D. Morse, ed., *Prints in and of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 23-52.

Jones, Rhett S., “‘Trifling Patriots and a Freeborn People’: Revolutionary Ideology and Afro-Americans’, in: Donald K. Moore, ed., *Liberty’s Impact: The World Views 1776*, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976), pp. 27-34.

Kaltwasser, Franz Georg, ‘The Acquisition of Martin Waldseemüller’s 1507 Globe Gores by the Bavarian State Library’, in: Hans Wolff ed., *America. Early Maps of the New World*, exh. cat., (Munich, 1992), pp. 7-9.

Lakoff, George, ‘The contemporary theory of metaphor’, in: Ortony, Andrew, ed., *Metaphor and Thought*, (Cambridge, 1993 (1979)) pp. 202-251.

Lamoine, Georges, ‘La loi et les âge de la vie’, in: Serge Soupal, ed., *Les Ages de la Vie en Grande-Bretagne en XVIIIe Siècle*, (Paris, 1995), pp. 67-76.

Linebaugh, Peter, ‘The Tyburn Riot Against the Surgeons’, in: Douglas Hay, Peter Linebaugh, John G. Rule, E. P. Thompson, Cal Winslow, eds., *Albion’s Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*, (London, 1975), pp. 65-117.

Le Goff, Jacques, ‘Head or Heart? The Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages’, in: Michel Feher ed., *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, 3 vols., volume III, (New York, 1989), pp. 12-27.

Leary, David E., 'Psyche's muse: the role of metaphor in the history of psychology', in: David E. Leary ed., *Metaphors in the History of Psychology*, (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 1-78.

Loftis, John, 'Political and Social Thought in the Drama', in: Robert D. Hume, ed., *The London Theatre World, 1660-1800*, (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois, 1980), pp. 253-285.

Marshall, P. J., 'Introduction', in: P. J., Marshall, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, 5 vols., vol. II: *The Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2001, (1998)), pp. 1-27.

Merrell, James H, "'The Customes of Our Country': Indians and Colonists in Early America', in: Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan , eds., *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, & London, 1991), pp. 117-156.

Miller, Lillian B., 'Charles Willson Peale: A Life of Harmony and Purpose', in: Edgar P. Richardson, Brooke Hindle & Lillian B. Miller, *Charles Willson Peale and His World*, with a foreword by Charles Coleman Sellers, (New York, 1982), pp. 170-233.

Mio, Jeffery Scott, 'Metaphor, Politics, and Persuasion', in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1996), pp. 127-146.

- Morgan, Philip, 'Three Planters and Their Slaves: Perspectives on Slavery in Virginia, South Carolina, and Jamaica, 1750-1790', in: Winthrop D. Jordan & Sheila L. Skemp, eds., *Race and Family in the Colonial South*, (Jackson, Mississippi, & London, 1987), pp. 37-79.
- Mulford, Carla, 'Benjamin Franklin, Native Americans, and the Commerce of Civility', in: W. M. Verhoeven ed., *Revolutionary Histories: Transatlantic Cultural Nationalism, 1775-1815*, (Basingstoke & New York, 2002), pp. 48-61.
- Neff, Emily Ballew, 'The History Theater: Production and Spectatorship in Copley's *The Death of Major Peirson*', in: Emily Ballew Neff, ed., *John Singleton Copley In England*, with an essay by William L. Pressly, exh. cat., (London, 1995), pp. 60-90.
- Neumann, Fritz Wilhelm, 'Computing the Semantic Network of Age in Early Eighteenth-Century Political Writing', in: Serge Soupal, ed., *Les Ages de la Vie en Grande-Bretagne en XVIIIe Siècle*, (Paris, 1995), pp. 129-138.
- Newman, Charles, 'The Influence of Medical Education on the Evolution of Medical Practice in Britain', in: F. N. L. Poynter ed., *The Evolution of Medical Practice in Britain*, (London, 1961), pp. 17-34.

O’Gorman, Frank, ‘The Parliamentary Opposition to the Government’s American Policy 1760-1782’, in: H. T. Dickinson, ed. *Britain and the American Revolution*, (Harlow, 1998), pp. 97-123.

Ortony, Andrew, ‘Metaphor, language and thought’, in: Ortony, Andrew, ed., *Metaphor and Thought*, (Cambridge, 1993 (1979)), pp. 1-18.

Palmer, R. R., ‘The Impact of the American Revolution Abroad’, in: *The Impact of the American Revolution Abroad*, (Washington, D. C., 1976), pp. 5-19.

Panofsky, Erwin, ‘Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art’, in: Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, (London, 1993 (1955)).

Plumb, J. H., ‘America and England: 1720-1820. The Fusion of Cultures’, in: Charles F. Montgomery and Patricia E. Kane , eds., *American art, 1750-1800 : towards Independence*, (Boston, Massachusetts, 1976), pp. 14-21.

_____, ‘The Impact of the American Revolution on Great Britain’, in: *The Impact of the American Revolution Abroad*, (Washington, D. C., 1976), pp. 65-79.

Pollio, Howard R., ‘Boundaries in Humor and Metaphor’, in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, Mahwah, (New Jersey, 1996), pp. 231-253.

Porter, Roy, 'William Hunter: a surgeon and a gentleman', in: W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter, eds., *William Hunter and the eighteenth-century medical world*, (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 7-34.

Pressley, William L., 'The Challenge of New Horizons', in: Emily Ballew Neff, ed., *John Singleton Copley In England*, exh. cat., (London, 1995), pp. 23-58.

Price, Jacob M., 'Who Cared about the Colonies? The Impact of the Thirteen Colonies on British Society and Politics, circa 1714-1775', in: Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, & London, 1991), pp. 395-436.

Prown, Jules, 'Charles Willson Peale in London', in: Lillian B. Miller and David C. Ward, eds., *New Perspectives on Charles Willson Peale: A 250th Anniversary Celebration*, (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 29-50.

Quilley, Geoff, 'Questions of loyalty: the representation of the British West Indian colonies during the American revolutionary war', in: John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, eds., *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830*, (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 115-138.

Quinn, Naomi, 'The Cultural Basis of Metaphor', in: James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, (Stanford, California, 1991), pp. 56-93.

Scott, H. M., 'Britain as a Great Power in the Age of the American Revolution', in:
H. T. Dickinson, ed. *Britain and the American Revolution*, (Harlow, 1998),
pp. 180-204.

Shadwell, Wendy, 'The Portrait Engravings of Charles Willson Peale', in: Joan D.
Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate
and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), pp. 123-144.

Shoemaker, Nancy, 'The Body as a Source of Sameness and Difference in
Eighteenth-Century American Indian Diplomacy East of the Mississippi', in:
Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter , eds., *A Centre of Wonders:
The Body in Early America*, (Ithaca and London, 2001), pp. 211-222.

Smith, Daniel Blake, 'In Search of the Family in the Colonial South', in: Winthrop
D. Jordan & Sheila L. Skemp , eds., *Race and Family in the Colonial South*,
(Jackson, Mississippi, & London, 1987), pp. 21-36.

Sommer, Frank H., 'The Metamorphosis of Britannia', in: Charles F. Montgomery
and Patricia E. Kane , eds., *American art, 1750-1800 : towards
Independence*, (Boston, Massachusetts, 1976), pp. 40-49.

_____, 'Thomas Hollis and the Arts of Dissent', in: John D. Morse ed., *Prints in and
of America to 1850*, (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1970), pp. 111-160.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer, "'Always at Variance": Politics of Eighteenth-Century Adolescence', in: *A Distant Prospect: Eighteenth-Century Views of Childhood*, (Los Angeles, 1982), pp. 1-24.

Stein, Roger B., 'Copley's *Watson and the Shark* and Aesthetics in the 1770s', in: Calvin Israel, ed., *Discoveries and Considerations: Essays on Early American Literature and Aesthetics Presented to Harold Jantz*, (Albany, New York, 1976), pp. 85-130.

Surel, Jeannine, 'John Bull', in: Samuel, Raphael, ed., *Patriotism: the Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, 3 vols., volume III: *National Fictions*, (London & New York, 1989), pp. 3-25.

Thompson, Seth, 'Politics without Metaphors is Like a Fish without Water', in: Jeffery Scott Mio, & Albert N. Katz, eds., *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1996), pp. 185-201.

Tucker, Bruce, 'Symbols of the Revolution', in: Donald K. Moore, ed., *Liberty's Impact: The World Views 1776*, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976), pp. 43-50.

Underdown, David, 'A Hope, a Refuge, and a Model', in: Donald K. Moore, ed., *Liberty's Impact: The World Views 1776*, (Providence, Rhode Island, 1975-1976), pp. 11-18.

- Waldstreicher, David, 'The Long Arm of Benjamin Franklin', in: Katherine Ott, David Serlin and Stephen Mihm, eds., *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives: Modern Histories of Prosthetics*, (New York and London, 2002), pp. 300-326.
- Ward, J. R., 'The British West Indies in the Age of Abolition, 1748-1815', in: P. J., Marshall, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, 5 vols., vol. II: *The Eighteenth Century*, (Oxford, 2001, (1998)), pp. 415-439.
- Wind, Edgar, 'The revolution of history painting', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, volume 2, 1938, pp. 116-27. (Reprinted in: Jaynie Anderson, ed., Edgar Wind, *Hume and the Heroic Portrait*, (Oxford, 1986), pp. 88-99.)
- Wolf, Edwin, 2nd, 'The Prodigal Son in England and America: A Century of Change', in: Joan D. Dolmetsch, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate*, (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1979), pp. 145-174.
- Wolff, Hans, 'America – Early Images of the New World', in: Hans Wolff ed., *America. Early Maps of the New World*, exh. cat., (Munich, 1992), pp. 16-102.

Zuckerman, Michael, 'Identity in British America: Unease in Eden', in: Canny, Nicholas, & Pagden, Anthony, ed., *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, (Princeton, 1987), pp. 115-157.

Articles:

Abrams, Ann Uhry, 'Politics, Prints, and John Singleton Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. LXI, no. 2, (June 1979), pp. 265-276.

Adair, Douglass, 'The Stamp Act in Contemporary English Cartoons', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. X, no. 4, (October 1953), pp. 538-542.

Allard, Joseph, 'West, Copley and Eighteenth-Century American Provincialism', *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3., (December 1983), pp. 391-416.

Andrews, Donna T., "'Adultery à-la-Mode': Privilege, the Law and Attitudes to Adultery 1770-1809', *History*, vol. 82, no. 265, (January 1997), pp. 5-23.

Avery, Margaret E., 'Toryism in the age of the American Revolution: John Lind and John Shebbeare', *Historical Studies (Australia)*, vol. 18, no. 70, (April 1978), pp. 24-36.

Bannet, Eve Tavor, 'The Marriage Act of 1753 'A most cruel law for the Fair Sex'', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 30, no. 3, (1997), pp. 233-254.

Bell, Evelyne, 'The Life and Work of Henry Walton', *Gainsborough's House*

Review 1998/99, pp. 39-104.

Bendersky, Gordon, 'The Original "Jaws" Attack', *Perspectives in Biology and*

Medicine, vol. 45, no. 3 (Summer 2002), pp. 426-432.

Bickham, Troy O., 'Sympathizing with Sedition? George Washington, the British

Press, and British Attitudes during the American War of Independence',

William And Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, vol. LIX, no. 1, (January 2002),

pp. 101-122.

Bindman, David, 'Am I not a man and a brother?: British art and slavery in the

eighteenth century', *Res*, no. 26, (Autumn, 1994), pp. 68-82.

_____, 'How the French became Frogs: English caricature and a national stereotype',

Apollo, vol. CLVIII, no. 498 (new series) (August 2003), pp. 15-20.

Block, Sharon, 'Rape Without Women: Print Culture and the Politicization of Rape,

1765-1815', *The Journal of American History*, vol. 89, no 3, (December

2002), pp. 849-868.

Boime, Albert, 'Blacks in Shark-Infested Waters: *Visual Encodings of Racism in*

Copley and Homer', *Smithsonian Studies in American Art*, vol. 3, no. 1,

(Winter 1989), pp. 19-48.

_____, 'Marmontel's *Bélisaire* and the Pre-Revolutionary progressivism of David',
Art History, vol. 3, no. 1, (March 1980), pp. 81-101.

Breen, T. H., 'The Meaning of "Likenes": American portrait painting in an
 eighteenth-century consumer society', *Word & Image*, vol. 6, no. 4, (October-
 December 1990), pp. 325-350.

Brooks, Christopher, 'Controlling the Metaphor: Language and Self-Definition in
 Revolutionary America', *Clio*, vol. 23, no. 3, (Spring 1996), pp. 233-254.

Bumsted, J. M., "'Things in the Womb of Time": Ideas of American Independence,
 1633 to 1763', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. XXXI, 3rd series, no. 4,
 (October 1974), pp. 533-564.

Butler, Joseph T., 'The American Way With Art', *Connoisseur*, vol. 184, (September
 1973), pp. 55-60.

Calvert, Karin, 'Children in American Family Portraiture', *The William and Mary
 Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XXXIX, no. 1 (January 1982), pp. 87-113.

Cassidy, John, 'The Health of the Nation: Medicine, money and patients in
 eighteenth-century England', *Ancestors*, issue 27, (November 2004),
 pp. 22-27.

Clive, John, & Bailyn, Bernard, 'England's Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XI, no. 2, (April 1954), pp. 200-213.

Colley, Linda, 'The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760-1820', *Past and Present*, no. 102, (February 1984), pp. 94-129.

Conway, Stephen, 'British Army Officers and the American War for Independence', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XLI, no. 2, (April 1984), pp. 265-276.

_____, 'British Mobilization in the War of American Independence', *Historical Research*, vol. 72, no. 177, (February 1999), pp. 58-76.

_____, 'From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. LIX, no. 1, (January 2002), pp. 65-100.

_____, "'The Great Mischief Complain'd of': Reflections on the Misconduct of British Soldiers in the Revolutionary War', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XLVII, no. 3, (July 1990), pp. 370-390.

_____, 'The Politics of British Military and Naval Mobilization, 1775-83', *The English Historical Review*, vol. CXII, no. 449, (November 1997), pp. 1179-1201.

- _____, 'To Subdue America: British Army Officers and the Conduct of the Revolutionary War', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XLIII, no. 3, July 1986, pp. 381-407.
- Coutu, Joan, 'The Rodney Monument in Jamaica and an Empire coming of Age', *The Sculpture Journal*, vol. 2, (1998), pp. 46-57.
- Crossland, John, 'The Keppel Affair', *History Today*, vol. 46, no. 1, (January 1996), pp. 42-48.
- Cunningham, Hugh, 'The Language of Patriotism, 1750-1914', *History Workshop*, issue 12, (Autumn 1981), pp. 8-22.
- Davidson, Philip G., 'Whig Propagandists of the American Revolution', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 39, no. 3, (April 1934), pp. 442-453.
- Ditz, Toby L., 'Ownership and Obligation: Inheritance and Patriarchal Households in Connecticut', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XLVII, no. 2, (April 1990), pp. 235-265.
- D'Oench, Ellen G., 'Prodigal Sons and Fair Penitents: Transformations in Eighteenth-Century Popular Prints', *Art History*, vol. 13, no. 3, (September 1990), pp. 318-343.

Einberg, Elizabeth, 'Milton, St John, and the importance of 'Bottom': Another look at Hogarth's *March of the Guards to Finchley*', *The British Art Journal*, vol. V, no. 3, (Winter 2004), pp. 27-34.

Evans, Mark L., 'Paintings, Prints and Politics during the American War: Henry Walton's *A Girl Buying a Ballad*', *Print Quarterly*, vol. XIX, no. 1, (2002), pp. 12-24.

Fagerstrom, Delphy I., 'Scottish Opinion and the American Revolution', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XI, no. 2, (April 1954), pp. 252-275.

Ffoukes, Charles, 'Notes on the Bayonet', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, vol. 18, no. 72, (Winter 1939), pp. 190-198.

Fleming, E. McClung, 'From Indian Princess to Greek Goddess The American Image, 1783-1815', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. III, (1967), pp. 37-66.

_____, 'The American Image as Indian Princess, 1765-1783', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. II, (1965), pp. 65-81.

Frasca, Ralph, 'Benjamin Franklin's Printing Network and the Stamp Act', *Pennsylvania History*, vol. 71, no. 4, (Autumn 2004), pp. 403-419.

George, M D, 'America in English Satirical Prints', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. X, no. 4, (October 1953), pp. 511-537.

- Gordon, Scott Paul, 'Reading Patriotic Art: James Barry's *King Lear* (1786-87)', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 36, no. 4, (Summer 2003), pp. 491-509.
- Gould, Eliga H., 'American Independence and Britain's Counter Revolution', *Past and Present*, no. 154, (February 1997), pp. 107-141.
- Grubb, Farley, 'Fatherless and Friendless: Factors Influencing the Flow of English Emigrant Servants', *The Journal of Economic History*, vol. 52, no. 1, (March 1992), pp. 85-108.
- Halsey, R. T. H., 'English Sympathy with Boston During the American Revolution', *Old-Time New England*, vol. XLVI, no. 4, (Spring 1956), no. 164, pp. 85-95.
- Hamilton, Milton W., 'Joseph Brant – "The Most Painted Indian"', *New York History*, vol. XXXIX, no. 2, (April 1958), pp. 119-132.
- Harris, Bob, '"American Idols": Empire, War and the Middling Sort in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, no. 150, pp. 110-141.
- Higham, John, 'Indian Princess and Roman Goddess: The First Female Symbols of America', *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, vol. 100, part 1, (1990), pp. 45-79.

Hinderaker, Eric, 'The "Four Indian Kings" and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 53, no. 3, *Indians and Others in Early America*, (July 1996), pp. 487-526.

Hyde, James H., 'The Four Parts of the World as Represented in Old-Time Pageants and Ballets. Part 1', *Apollo*, vol. IV, (July-December 1926), pp. 232-238.

Jenner, Mark S. R., 'Body, Image, Text in Early Modern Europe', *Social History of Medicine*, vol. 12, no. 1, (April 1999), pp. 143-154.

Jensen, J. Vernon, 'British Voices on the Eve of the American Revolution: Trapped by the Family Metaphor', *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 63, no. 1, (February 1977), pp. 43-50.

Johnson, David, 'Britannia Roused: Political Caricature and the Fall of the Fox-North Coalition', *History Today*, vol. 51, no. 6, (June 2001), pp. 22-28.

Jones, Matt B., 'The Early Massachusetts Bay Seals', *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, new series, vol. 44, (April 18, 1934), pp. 13-44.

Jordan, Winthrop D., 'Familial Politics: Thomas Paine and the Killing of the King, 1776', *Journal of American History*, vol. LX, no. 2, (September 1973), pp. 294-308.

Kemp, Martin, 'Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 62, no. 4, (December 1980), p. 647.

Kennedy, Victor, 'Mystery! Unravelling Edward Gorey's Tangled Web of Visual Metaphor', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 3, (1993), pp. 181-193.

Kennedy, Victor, and Kennedy, John, 'A Special Issue: Metaphor and Visual Rhetoric', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 3, (1993), pp. 149-151.

Kerber, Linda K., 'The Abolitionist Perception of the Indian', *Journal of American History*, vol. LXII, no. 2, (September 1975), pp. 271-295.

Kirkland, Frederic R., 'An Unknown Franklin Cartoon', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 73, (January 1949), pp. 76-79.

Kulka, Edward, 'Treatment of a Pastel Portrait', *CCI Newsletter*, no. 31, (June 2003) (available on line at: [www. Cci-icc.gc.ca/whats-new/news21/pastelportrait_e.shtml](http://www.Cci-icc.gc.ca/whats-new/news21/pastelportrait_e.shtml)).

Lakoff, George, 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 1 of 2)', *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 3, (November, 1991). Available on line at: <http://lists.village.virginia.edu/>

sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/ScholarlyLakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html.

(unpaginated).

_____, 'Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf (Part 2 of 2)', *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 3, (November, 1991). Available on line at: http://lists.village.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/Scholarly/Lakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_2.html.
(unpaginated).

LeGates, Marlene, 'The Cult of Womanhood in Eighteenth-Century Thought', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, (Fall 1976), pp. 21-39.

Lemay, J. A. Leo, 'The American Aesthetic of Franklin's Visual Creations', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 465-500.

Lovell, Margaretta M., 'Reading Eighteenth-Century American Family Portraits, Social Images and Self-Images', *Winterthur Portfolio*, vol. 22, no. 4, (Winter 1987), pp. 243-264.

Mahon, John K., 'Anglo-American Methods of Indian Warfare, 1676-1794', *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, (September 1958), pp. 254-275.

Marks, Arthur S., 'Benjamin West and the American Revolution', *The American Art Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, (November 1974), pp. 15-35.

Marsden, Jonathan, and Hardy, John, "'O Fair Britannia Hail": The 'most superb' State Coach', *Apollo*, vol. CLIII, (February 2001), pp. 3-12.

Marshall, P. J., 'Eighteenth-Century Britain and its Empire', *The Historian*, no. 68, (Winter 2000), pp. 12-17.

Matthews, Albert, 'Brother Jonathan', *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Transactions*, vol. 8 (1901), pp. 94-126.

_____, 'Brother Jonathan Once More', *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Transactions*, vol. 32 (1935), pp. 374-386.

McGowen, Randall, 'The Body and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 59, no. 4, (December 1987), pp. 651-679.

McGuire, John Michael, 'Pictorial Metaphors: A Reply to Sedivy', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 14, no. 4, (1999), pp. 293-302.

McLaren, Anne, 'The Quest for a King: Gender, Marriage, and Succession in Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 41, no. 3, (July 2002), pp. 259-290.

McWilliams, John, 'Lexington, Concord, and the "Hinge of the Future"', *American Literary History*, vol. 5, no. 1, (Spring 1993), pp. 1-29.

Merrick, Jeffrey, 'Patriarchalism and Constitutionalism in Eighteenth-Century Parliamentary Discourse', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, vol. 20 (1990) pp. 317-330.

Meyer, Arline, 'Re-dressing Classical Statuary: The Eighteenth-Century "Hand-in-Waistcoat" Portrait', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. LXXVII, no. 1, (March 1995), pp. 45-63.

Miles, Ellen G., 'Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. 142, no. 1, (January 1993), pp. 162-171.

Mio, Jeffery Scott, 'Metaphor and Politics', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1997), pp. 113-133.

Mitchell, Charles, 'Benjamin West's "Death of Wolfe" and the Popular History Piece', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 7, (1944), pp. 20-33.

Molovinsky, Lemuel, 'Maryland and the American West at Independence', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. 72, no. 3, (Fall 1977), pp. 353-360.

Monty, Jeanne R., 'The Myth of Belisarius in Eighteenth Century France', *Romance Notes*, vol. 4, no. 2, (Spring 1963), pp. 127-131.

Morris, Ray, 'Visual Rhetoric in Political Cartoons: A Structuralist Approach', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 3, (1993), pp. 195-210.

Neff, Emily Ballew, 'Copley in England', *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. CXLVIII, no. 4, (October 1995), pp. 514-525.

O'Shaughnessy, Andrew Jackson, 'The Other Road to Yorktown: The St Eustatius Affair and the American Revolution', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. 97, no. 1, (Spring 2002), pp. 33-59.

Olson, Lester C., 'The American Colonies Portrayed as an Indian: Race and Gender in Eighteenth-Century British Caricatures', *Imprint*, vol. 17, no. 2, (Autumn 1992), pp. 2-13.

_____, 'Benjamin Franklin's Commemorative Medal', *Libertas Americana: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology*, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 76, no. 1, (February 1990), pp. 23-45.

_____, 'Benjamin Franklin's Pictorial Representations of the British Colonies in America: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 73, no. 1, (February 1987), pp. 18-42.

- Page, Anthony, "“Liberty has an Asylum”: John Jebb, British Radicalism and the American Revolution’, *History*, vol. 87, no. 286, (April 2002), pp. 204-226.
- Palumbo, Anne Cannon, ‘Prints into Paint: The Influence of Prints on Eighteenth-Century American Painting’, *Imprint*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 13-20.
- Pancake, Ann S., ‘Taken by Storm: The Exploitation of Metaphor in the Persian Gulf War’, *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 8, no. 4, (1993), pp. 281-295.
- Paulson, Ronald, ‘John Trumbull and the Representation of the American Revolution’, *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 21, no. 3, (Fall 1982), pp. 341-356.
- Pocock, J. G. A., ‘Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall* and the World View of the Late Enlightenment’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, (Spring 1977), pp. 287–303.
- Pratt, Stephanie, ‘Reynolds’ ‘King of the Cherokees’ and Other Mistaken Identities in the Portraiture of Native American Delegations, 1710-1762’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), pp. 133-150.
- Rausser, Amelia, ‘Death or Liberty: British Political Prints and the Struggle for Symbols in the American Revolution’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), pp. 151-171.

Redford, Bruce, 'Defying Our Master: The Appropriation of Milton in Johnson's Political Tracts', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, vol. 20, (1990), pp. 81-91.

Renwick, John, 'Marmontel, Voltaire and the *Bélisaire* affair', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, vol. CXXI, (1974).

Richardson, E. P., 'A Life Drawing of Jefferson by John Trumbull', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. 70, (1975), pp. 363-371.

_____, 'Four American Political Prints', *American Art Journal*, vol. VI, no. 2, (November 1974), pp. 36-44.

_____, 'Stamp Act Cartoons in the Colonies', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. XCVI, no. 3, (July 1972), pp. 275-297.

Riss, Arthur, 'The Belly Politic: Coriolanus and the Revolt of Language', *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 1, (Spring 1992), pp. 53-75.

Robbins, Caroline, 'Algernon Sidney's *Discourses Concerning Government*: Textbook of Revolution', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. IV, no. 3, (July 1947), pp. 267-296.

_____, 'The Strenuous Whig: Thomas Hollis of Lincoln's Inn', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. VII, (1950), pp. 406-453.

- _____, 'When It Is That Colonies May Turn Independent: An Analysis of the Environment and Politics of Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746)', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. XI, (1954), pp. 214-251.
- Robinson, W. Stitt, 'Conflicting Views on Landholding: Lord Baltimore and the Experiences of Colonial Maryland with Native Americans', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. 83, no. 2, (Summer 1988), pp. 85-97.
- Rohrer, Tim Rohrer, 'The Metaphorical Logic of (Political Rape: The New Wor(l)d Order', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 10, no. 2, (1995), pp. 115-137.
- Rutledge, Anna Wells, 'Portraits Painted Before 1900 in the Collection of the Maryland Historical Society', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. XLI, (1946), pp. 11-50.
- Saunders, Richard H., 'Genius and Glory: John Singleton Copley's *The Death of Major Peirson*', *American Art Journal*, vol. 22, no. 3, (1990), pp. 4-39.
- Schleiner, Winfried, 'The Infant Hercules: Franklin's Design for a Medal Commemorating American Liberty', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, (Winter 1976/77), pp. 235-244.
- Sedivy, Sonia, 'Metaphoric Pictures, Pulsars, Platypuses', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1997), pp. 95-112.

Sellers, Charles Coleman, 'Charles Willson Peale as Sculptor', *American Art Journal*, vol. II, no. 2, (Fall 1970), pp. 5-12.

Semmes, Raphael, 'Vignettes of Maryland History from the Society's Collection of Broad­sides', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. XL, (1945), pp. 24-53.

Shannon, Timothy J., 'Dressing for Success on the Mohawk Frontier: Hendrick, William Johnson, and the Indian Fashion', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 53, no. 1, (January 1996), pp. 13-42.

Shipley, John, 'Franklin Attends a Book Function', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. LXXX, no. 1, (January 1956), pp. 37-45.

Smith, Anthony D., 'The Suffering Hero, Belisarius and Oedipus in Late 18th Century French and British Art', *RSA Journal*, vol. CXXXVII, no. 5398, (September 1989), pp. 634-640.

Snapp, J. Russell, 'An Enlightened Empire: Scottish and Irish Imperial Reformers in the Age of the American Revolution', *Albion*, vol. 33, no. 3, (Fall 2001), pp. 388-408.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer, 'Ev'ry Woman is at Heart a Rake', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, (Fall 1974), pp. 27-46.

- Strand, Ginger, 'The Many Deaths of Montgomery: Audiences and Pamphlet Plays of the Revolution', *American Literary History*, vol. 9, no. 1, (Spring 1997), pp. 1-20.
- Stuebe, Isabel, 'William Hodges and Warren Hastings: A study in eighteenth-century patronage', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. CXV, no. 847, (October 1973), pp. 658-666.
- Taylor, Miles, 'John Bull and the Iconography of Public Opinion in England c. 1712-1929', *Past & Present*, no. 134, (February 1992), pp. 93-128.
- Thompson, Tommy R., 'Personal Indebtedness and the American Revolution in Maryland', *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vol. 73, no. 1, (Spring 1978), pp. 13-29.
- Troyen, Carol, 'John Singleton Copley and the heroes of the American Revolution', *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. CXLVIII, no. 1, (July 1995), pp. 84-93.
- Vendryes, Margaret Rose, 'The Fashionably Dressed Sailor: Another Look at the Black Figure in John Singleton Copley's *Watson and the Shark*', *Athanas*, vol. XI, (1992), pp. 42-49.
- Vervaeke, John, and Kennedy, John M., 'Metaphors in Language and Thought: Falsification and Multiple Meanings', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 11, no. 4, 1996, pp. 273-284.

Voss, James F., Kennet, Joel, Wiley, Jennifer, and Schooler, Tonya Y. E., 'Experts at Debate: The Use of Metaphor in the U.S. Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 7, nos. 3 & 4, (1992), pp. 197-214.

Wahrman, Dror, 'The English Problem of Identity in the American Revolution', *American Historical Review*, vol. 106, no. 4, (October 2001), pp. 1236-1262.

Walzer, Michael, 'On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 82, no. 2 (June 1967), pp. 191-204.

Wead, Eunice, 'British Public Opinion of the Peace with America in 1782', *The American Historical Review*, vol. XXXIV, no. 3, (April 1929), pp. 513-531.

Wilson, David, 'A bust of Thomas Hollis by Joseph Wilton RA: Sitter and artist revisited', *The British Art Journal*, vol. V, no. 3, (Winter 2004), pp. 4-26.

Wolf, Edwin, 'Benjamin Franklin's Stamp Act Cartoon', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 99, no. 6, (December 1955), pp. 388-396.

Wright, Esmond, "'The Fine and Noble China Vase, The British Empire": Benjamin Franklin's "Love-Hate" View of England', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. CXI, no. 4, (October 1987), pp. 435-464.

Wright, Colonel John W., 'Notes on the Continental Army', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2nd series, vol. XII, no. 2, (April 1932), pp. 79-103.

Dissertations:

Adams, Randolph Green, 'Political Ideas of the American Revolution: Britannic-American Contribution to the Problem of Imperial Organization, 1765-1775', Trinity College, Durham, North Carolina, Ph.D., (1922), History.

Bekta, James Anthony, 'The Ideology and Rhetoric of Thomas Paine: Political Justification through Metaphor', Tugers University, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, Ph.D., (1975), Political Science.

Cooper, Lorna Gayle, 'The Olive Branch Petition to the King, 1775', College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, M.A., (May 1767), History.

Stead, Margaret, 'Responses to the American Revolution in Contemporary British Media', Leeds University, Ph.D. (1997), History.

List Of Illustrations:

Abbreviations:

AAS – American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts.

BL – British Library, London.

BM – British Museum, London.

CWF – Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

DM&AG - Derby Museum and Art Gallery.

FT - Collection of the Fort Ticonderoga Museum, Ticonderoga, New York.

HSP – Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

HU – Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts.

LC – Library of Congress, Washington, D. C..

LCP – Library Company of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LWL – Lewis Walpole Library, Farmington, Connecticut.

MMA - The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

NAC – National Archives of Canada.

NGAW – National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C..

NGC – National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa.

SML – Sterling Memorial Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

TATE – Tate Britain Gallery, London.

WT – Wellcome Trust, The Wellcome Library, London.

YCBA – Yale Centre for British Art, New Haven, Connecticut.

YUAG - Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut.

2. The Body Politic

2.1 [Benjamin Franklin?],

MAGNA Britania: her Colonies REDUC'D,

Etching printed on card, [c.1766], 4 $\frac{1}{8}$ " x 5 $\frac{7}{8}$ ", LCP - 395.F.5.

2.2 Robert Strange after Jan Van Rymsdyck,

*Foetus in utero, prout a natura positus, rescifis omnino parte uteri anteriori,
ac Placenta, ei adherente,*

Engraving, c. 1774, 'J. M. Rymsdyk delin^t... R. Strange Sculp.', Image: 53.2
x 43 cm, [Plate VI of: William Hunter, *Anatomia Uteri Humani gravidi
tabulis illustrata... The Anatomy of the Human Gravid Uterus exhibited in
figures*, (Birmingham, 1774).

2.3 Unknown,

Pasquino,

[Identified by Michelangelo as possibly a statue of Patroclus.]

Marble, date and dimensions unknown, corner of the Palazzo Braschi, Rome.

2.4 Jan Roettier,

Charles II Halfpenny

Copper, 1672, Obverse: 'CAROLVS . A . CAROLO', Reverse:

'BRITANNIA', Weight: 10.01 g.

2.5 F. Bartolozzi, after a design by John Baptist Cipriani,

Britannia-Libertas,

Etching, before 1768, 9 ¼" x 8", LC – in: E211 .B68.

Frontispiece to: William Bollan, *Continued Corruption, standing armies, and popular discontents considered, and the establishment of the English colonies in America, with various subsequent proceedings and the Present Contest, examined with Intent to promote their cordial and Perpetual Union with their Mother-Country, for their Mutual Honour, Comfort, Strength, and Safety*, (London, 1768).

2.6 [Benjamin Franklin],

JOIN or DIE,

Woodcut, taken from *Pennsylvania Gazette*, (9th May 1754), 2" x 2 7/8", LC.

2.7 Unknown,

Title page to: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, (London, 1651),

Engraving, c. 1651, 240 x 155 mm, BL.

2.8 Unknown, [Benjamin Franklin?],

Hercules and the Wagoneer,

Woodcut, 1747, 6.2 x 7.7 cm, Frontispiece to: [Benjamin Franklin], A

Tradesman of Philadelphia, *Plain Truth: or, Serious Considerations On the Present State of the City of Philadelphia, and Province of Pennsylvania*.

(Philadelphia, 1747).

2.9 Robert Strange, after Salvator Rosa,

Belisarius,

exact date unknown, inscribed 'Salvator Rosa Pinx^t. Rob^{tus} Strange delin^t. Et Sculp^t. Londini. / From the Original painting of Salvator Rosa, in the Collection of the Right Hon^{ble} the Lord Viscount Townshend. / Sold at the Golden Head in Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.', engraving, image 44.8 x 32.7 cm, YCBA.

2.10 Unknown, after [Benjamin Franklin?],

MAGNA Britania her Colonies REDUC'D,

c.1767-69, Engraving, sheet: 14 $\frac{7}{8}$ " x 9 $\frac{13}{16}$ ", *fleur-de-lys* watermarked paper. LCP - 395-FA. Originally in one of Pierre Eugene du Simitière's folio scrapbooks and annotated as being 'Engraved in Philadelphia'.

2.11 Unknown, after [Benjamin Franklin?],

The Colonies Reduced. And Its Companion.

Frontispiece to *The Political Register*, (August 1768), engraving, 2 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ " and 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ ", BM 4183.

2.12 Unknown,

BRITTANNIA MUTILATED: or the Horrid (but true) Picture of Great Brittain. When Depriv'd of her Limbs BY HER ENEMIES,

Engraving, 'Pubd. accorg to Act Novr 1774 by MDarly, 39 Strand,', plate: 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 13 $\frac{3}{4}$ "; sheet: 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". LCP – 8366.F.9.

2.13 Unknown [French?],

MAGNA Britannia her Colonies REDUC'D,

Etching, c. 1775, 3 $\frac{5}{8}$ " x 5", HSP.

2.14 Unknown [Dutch?],

La Grande Bretagne mutilé – Das verstümmelte Britanien,

Engraving, c. 1780, 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ", LC.

3. The Family Quarrel – Britannia and her Daughter

3.1 Anonymous,

Goody Bull or the Second Part of the Repeal,

Etching, 1766 (between March and July), image: 15.8 x 23.7 cm, BM 4142.

3.2 Anonymous,

Bunker's Hill or the Blessed Effects of Family Quarrels,

Engraving, c.1775, 5 $\frac{5}{8}$ " x 3 $\frac{9}{16}$ " (14.3 x 9.1 cm), LWL – 775.0.1.

3.3 [W. Hamilton del.] E. M[alpas],

America,

Mixed method print, 'Published as the Act directs Novr. 23d. 1776',

4" x 3 $\frac{1}{8}$ ", published in: Ripa, Cesare, *A Collection of Emblematical Figures*,
(London, 1777 (1593)), figure 60.

3.4 Robert Vaughan,

Ould Virginia,

Engraving (4th state), 1624, 10 ¹¹/₁₆" x 13 ¹⁵/₁₆", published as the title page to:
 Captain John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and
 the Summer Isles, with the names of the Adventurers, Planters, and
 Governours from their first beginning An^o: 1584 to this present 1624.*
 (London, 1624).

- 3.5 John Foster,
Seal of the Massachusetts Bay Colony,
 Woodcut, 1675, 2 ¹/₂" x 2 ¹/₄", AAS.

- 3.6 [William Faden and Thomas Jefferys],
*Plan of the City of New York, In North America: Surveyed in the Years 1766
 & 1767,*
 Etching, 'Publishd according to Act of Parliament, Jany 12, 1776: by Jeffreys
 & Faden, Corner of St Martins Lane Charing Cross.', cartouche: 8 ¹/₂" x 6 ³/₄",
 see: no. 20-21 in: William Faden, *North American Atlas*, (London, 1777).

- 3.7 Anonymous,
Edmund Gomonds Best York Sweet Scented Tobacco Bristol,
 Woodcut, 17th century, 3 ¹/₂" x 4 ¹/₂", CWF 1980-165,5.

- 3.8 Anonymous,
Charles Parker Tamworth,
 Woodcut, 18th century, 5 ¹/₂" x 3 ¹/₈", CWF 1980-165,41.

- 3.9 Anonymous,
THE COMMISSIONERS,
Etching, 'Pubd April 3 1778 by M Darly 39 Strand', 10" x 14" (25.4 x 35.6 cm), CWF 1960-63.
- 3.10 Anonymous,
The Female Combatants, or Who Shall,
Coloured engraving, published 26th January 1776, image: 6 ¾" x 5 13/16" in.,
LWL: 776.1.26.1.
- 3.11 Anonymous,
Britania And Her Daughter,
Etching, published 8 March 1780 by I. Mills, No. 1 Ratcliffe Row, image:
6 3/8" x 9", BM 5647.
- 3.12 Thomas Colley,
A Political Concert; the Vocal Parts By - 1. Miss America, 2 Franklin, 3. F-x, 4. Kepp-ll, 5. Mrs Britania, 6. Shelb-n, 7. Dun-i-g, 8. Benedick Ratle Snake,
Engraving, 'Colley Ingrad. Pub by W Richardson Feb: 18, 1783 near Surry St: Strand.', 9 ¾" x 14" in, LC - PC 1-6173.
- 3.13 Anonymous,
America in Flames,

Woodcut, [1 January 1775], from: *The Town and Country Magazine*,
(December 1774), p. 659, 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 3 $\frac{5}{8}$ ", (14.5 x 9.2 cms), BM 5282. (The
image was republished in: *The Hibernian Magazine*, (January 1775), p. 52.)

3.14 Anonymous,

The Parricide. A Sketch of Modern Patriotism,

Mixed method, [1 May 1776], from: *The Westminster Magazine*, (April
1776), p. 216, 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{8}$ ", BM 5334.

4. The Prodigal Son – Declarations of Independence

4.1 Anonymous,

A Picturesque View of the State of the Nation for February 1778,

Mixed method, [1 March 1778], from: *The Westminster Magazine*, (February
1778), p. 66, 1 March 1778, 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ", BM 5472.

4.2 Anonymous,

Poor old England endeavouring to reclaim his wicked American Children,

Etching, published by Matthew Darly, September 1777, 13 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ ", LC –
PC- 1-5397.

4.3 Anonymous,

Britannia's Ruin,

Hand-coloured etching, 'Pub by Mary Darly 29 Strand 17 Dec 1779', 7 x 9 $\frac{3}{4}$
in., LC – PC 3-1779.

4.4 Anonymous,

General P-s, or Peace,

Hand-coloured etching, 'Pub'd by J. Barrow Jany. 16th 1783, White Lyon

Bull Stairs Surry Side Black Friars Bridge.', image: 14.4 x 13.9 cm, LC – 3-1783.

4.5 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son Recieves his Patrimony,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, YCBA - B1977.14.11004.

4.6 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son Taking Leave,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, LCP – 7904.F.2

4.7 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son in Excess,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, YCBA - B1977.14.11005.

4.8 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son in Misery,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, YCBA - B1977.14.11006.

4.9 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son Returns Reclaim'd,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, YCBA - B1977.14.11007.

4.10 John Raphael Smith,

[History of the Prodigal Son], The Prodigal Son Feasted on his Return,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 1775, c. 25.5 x 35.3 cm, YCBA - B1977.14.11008.

4.11 Thomas Colley (attributed),

The Reconciliation between Britannia and her daughter America,

Etching, Pub by T. Colley No. 5 Acorn Court Rolls Buildings Feters Lane

Old England Pub by W Richardson May 11, 1782, N. 68 High Holborn,

image: 8 $\frac{1}{16}$ " x 12 $\frac{7}{8}$ ", LC – PC 1-5989.

4.12 Anonymous,

Wonders Wonders Wonders & Wonders,

Etching, 'Sold by W Humphrey, 1783', (later impression of a print first

published in November 1782), 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", LC – PC 1-6162.

4.13 T. Colley,

The Belligerent Plenipo's,

Hand-coloured, mixed method engraving, 'Pub by W Richardson N68 High

Holborn, Decr. 1782 as the Act Directs', 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 12 $\frac{3}{4}$ ", LC – PC 1-6051.

4.14 Louis Pierre Boitard,

Britain's Rights maintaind: or French Ambition dismantled.

Engraving, 11th August 1755, 8 ¾" x 12 ⅞" (22.2 x 32.8 cms), CWF – 1960-31.

4.15 Anonymous,

The STATE of the NATION An: Dom. 1765 &c.,

Etching, [late 1765], 12 ¾" x 8 ½", BM 4130.

4.16 Charles Willson Peale,

Worthy of Liberty, Mr Pitt scorns to invade the Liberties of other People,

Mezzotint engraving with minimal burin work, c. 1768, 'Cha^s. Willson Peale.

pinx. et fecit', image size: 23 ½" x 15 ¼", frame size: 26 ⅛" x 18 ¼", CWF – 1953-747.

4.17 Anonymous,

The Whitehall Pump,

Mixed method, [1 May 1774], from: *The Westminster Magazine*, (April 1774), opposite p. 168, 4" x 5 ¾" (10.2 x 14.6 cm), CWF - 1960-46.

4.18 Anonymous,

[Emblematical Print Adapted to the Times],

Mixed method, [1 September 1778], from: *The London Magazine*, (August 1778), opposite p. 339, 3 ⅞" x 6 ⅜", BM 5486.

4.19 Anonymous,

THE HORSE AMERICA, throwing his Master,

Mixed method, 'Pubd as the Act directs, Augst. 1st, 1779 by Wm. White,
Angel Court, Westminster', 7 ½" x 11 ½", LC – PC 1-5549.

4.20 J. Phillips,

THE PRESENT STATE OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Etching, 'Pubd by W. Humphrey. N^o 227 Strand', [1779], 10 ½" x 16", LC –
PC 1-5579.

4.21 Attributed to James Gillray,

BRITANIA'S ASSASSINATION, or --- The Republican Amusement,

Etching, 10th May 1782, published by E. D'Archery, St James Street,
London, 10" x 14 ¼", LWL – 782.5.10.1.

4.22 [James Gillray],

The Dutchman in the Dumps,

Engraving, 'Pub^d April 9th 1781, by W. Humphrey No 227 Strand', 7 15/16" x
7", BM - 5837.

4.23 John Bacon the Elder,

Britannia Protecting Jamaica,

Bas relief pedestal of *Monument to Admiral Lord Rodney*, 1789, dimensions
unknown, Spanish Town, Jamaica.

5. The Balance of Power

5.1 Nathaniel Parr, ['Vanlot inventit', 'Nathaniel Parr sculptit',].

F----H Pacification or the Q---N of H-----Y Stript,

Engraving, 8th February 1741/42, 9 ⁵/₈" x 7 ¹/₄", BM - 2515.

5.2 Anonymous,

My Lord Tip-Toe. Just Arrived from Monkey Land,

Etching, 'Pub^d according to Act of Parl^t. Nov^r. 5th. 1771 by M Darly 39

Strand', 3 ³/₄" x 5 ¹/₂", BM - 4686.

5.3 Anonymous,

[Britannia toe] Amer[eye]ca,

Etching, published by M Darly The Strand, 6 May 1778, 13 ³/₄" x 9 ³/₄", LC –

PC 1-5474A.

5.4 Verney 'delint.',

Qualifying for a Campaign,

Engraving, 'Printed for R. Sayer & J. Bennett, Map & Printsellers, No. 53

Fleet Street, 4th June 1777.', 8 ³/₄" x 13 ³/₄" in, LWL - 777.6.4.2.

5.5 Anonymous,

The Family Compact,

Engraving, 'Publish'd Nov^r 1. 1779 whether by Act or Order is not Material

Provided it Sells', 6 ¹³/₁₆" x 9", BM - 5567.

5.6 'I. M. Inv.' [possibly by J. Mortimer],

A Trip to Cocks Heath,

Engraving, 'Pub. Oct. 28. 1778 by W. Humphrey.', 9 ¼" x 13 7/16", BM – 5523.

5.7 'U. H. Bunbury delin^t 'Watson & Dickinson Excud^t,

Recruits,

Line and stipple engraving, 'London. Publish'd Jany. 1780, by Watson and Dickinson No. 158. New Bond Street', Plate: 11 ¾" x 11", CWF – 1930-465.

5.8 Anonymous,

The Ballance [sic] of Power,

Mixed method, Published 17 January 1781 [by R. Wilkinson, at No. 58 in Cornhill], 9 ¾" x 12 ¾", BM - 5827.

5.9 Anonymous,

JACK ENGLAND Fighting the Four CONFEDERATES,

Mixed method, 'Printed for Jno. Smith No. 35 Cheapside, Robt. Sayer & Jno. Bennett No. 53 Fleet Street, Jany. 20; 1781', Image: 6 ½" x 8", LC – PC 1-5828.

6. The Dismemberment of Britannia

6.1 J. Lodge sculp.,

The Polish Plumb Cake,

Engraving, from: *The Westminster Magazine*, vol. II, (1774), p. 416,

1 September 1774, 6 ¼" x 4 ¼", LWL - 774.8.0.1.

6.2 Anonymous,

The Englishman In Paris,

Etching, published [1777-78] by C. Sheppard, Lambeth Hill, Doctors

Commons, 8 $\frac{5}{8}$ " x 13 $\frac{1}{8}$ ", BM – 5477.

6.3 Henry Walton,

A Girl Plucking a Turkey,

Oil on canvas, 1776, 72.4 x 61 cm, TATE – N02870.

6.4 Anonymous,

The Wise Men of Gotham,

Mezzotint, published 16th February 1776 by W. Humphrey, Gerrard Street,

Soho, 10" x 13", LC – PC 1-5326/7.

6.5 Anonymous,

The Bull Roasted: or the Political Cooks Serving their Customers,

Engraving, published 12th February 1780 by I. Harris, Sweetings Alley,

Cornhill, London, 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 13 $\frac{3}{4}$ ", LC – PC 1-5636.

6.6 John Singleton Copley,

Watson and the Shark,

Oil on canvas, signed and dated 'JS Copley. P. 1778', 71 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 90 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", (182.1 x 229.7 cm), NGAW – Ferdinand Lamot Belin Fund, 1963.6.1.

6.7 George Bickham, Jr.,

*The Conduct, of the two B*****rs,*

Engraving, 1749, 10 ¼" x 7 ¼", BM – 3069.

6.8 Anonymous,

The English Lion Dismember'd,

Hand-coloured engraving, 'Publish'd according to Act of Parliament 1756.

Sold by the Printsellers of London & Westminster', 9 ¾" x 13 ¾", LWL – 756.0.6.

6.9 [T. Colley?],

The English Lion Dismember'd. Or the Voice of the Public for an Enquiry into the Public Expenditure,

Line engraving, Published 12th March 1780, by E. Hedges, No. 2, Under the Royal Exchange, Cornhill, 9 ⅛" x 13 ⅜", LC – PC 1-5649.

6.10 Anonymous,

By His Majesty's Royal Letters Patent. The New Invented Method of Punishing State Criminals.

Etching, published by J. Russell, No.7 Blewets Buildings Fetter Lane, London, 12th October 1780, Image: 7 ¾" x 10 ½", LWL – 780.10.12.1.

6.11 Anonymous,

Forearm and leg amputations,

Line Engraving with etching, Illustration opposite p. 350 of: Laurence Heister, *A General System of Surgery in Three Parts*. (London, 1743),
 platemark: 30.7 x 20.1 cm, WT – 16852.

- 6.12 John Simpson,
THE BOTCHING TAYLOR Cutting His Cloth To Cover A Button,
 Etching and mezzotint, 'Publish'd by James Tomlinson Oxford Street Decr
 27th 1779', Image: 9 $\frac{7}{8}$ " x 11 $\frac{7}{8}$ ", LC – PC 1-5573.

7. Britannia's Blood

- 7.1 Anonymous,
The Thistle Reel,
 Etching, [1st March 1775], published in *The London Magazine* (February
 1775), p.56, 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ", LC – PC 1-5285.
- 7.2 Benjamin West,
The Death of Wolfe,
 Oil on canvas, inscribed lower right: *B. West PINXIT | 1770*, 59 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 84"
 (151 x 213.5 cm), NGC – 8007.
- 7.3 John Singleton Copley,
The Death of Major Peirson,
 Oil on canvas, 1782-1784, 97" x 144" (246.4 x 365.8 cm), TATE - N00733.

7.4 John Trumbull,

The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker's Hill, June 17, 1775,

Oil on canvas, inscribed, lower centre: *Jn^o. Trumbull. | 1786, 25" x 34"* (63.5 x 80.4 cm), Trumbull Collection, YUAG.

7.5 Anonymous,

The European Diligence,

Mixed method, sold by W Humphrey No. 227 Strand, [5th October 1779],

7" x 9 ½", (17.8 x 24.1 cm), LC – PC – 1-5557.

7.6 [James Gillray],

The Nabob Rumbled, or a Lord Advocates Amusement,

Hand-coloured engraving, 21st January 1783, 6 7/8" x 8", – LWL – 783.1.21.1.

7.7 [James Gillray],

A New Administration; or The State Quacks Administering,

Hand-coloured engraving, 'Pub^d April 1st 1783, by W. Humphrey N^o 227

Strand', 8 13/16" X 12 7/8", LWL – 783.4.1.2+.

7.8 Anonymous,

Prattle The Political Apothecary,

Engraving, ['Pub by M Darly 39 Strand Augt 12 1779.'], image: 17.8 x 13.6

cm, LWL - 779.8.12.1.

7.9 Anonymous,

The able Doctor, or America Swallowing the Bitter Draught,

Mixed method, 1st May 1774, from: *The London Magazine* for April 1774,

p. 184, 3 ¼" x 5 7/8", LWL – 774.4.0.0.

7.10 Attributed to Philip Dawe,

The Bostonians Paying the Excise-man or Tarring & Feathering,

Mezzotint, published for Robert Sayer & J. Bennet, 31 October 1774,

13 ¾" x 10 ¼" (34.9 x 26 cm), LC – PC 1-5232B.

7.11 Anonymous,

The CONGRESS or THE NECESSARY POLITICIANS,

Engraving, [1775?], 6⁹/₁₆" x 8 1/8", BM – 5297.

8. Sibling Rivalries

8.1 Anonymous [American?],

The Yankie Doodles Intrenchments near Boston 1776,

Engraving, [1776], 8" x 9 5/8", BM – 5329.

8.2 Anonymous,

The English and American Discovery, Brother, Brother we are both in the wrong.

Engraving, Published 5th November 1778, M. Darly, Strand. image: 12.8 x

18 cm, LWL - 778.11.5.1.

- 8.3 Benjamin West,
General Johnson Saving a Wounded French Officer from the Tomahawk of a North American Indian,
 Oil on canvas, c. 1764-1768, 51" x 42" (129.5 x 106.5 cm), DM&AG.
- 8.4 John Trumbull,
The Sortie Made by the Garrison of Gibraltar,
 Oil on canvas, 1789, 70 ½" x 106" (179.1 x 269.2 cm), MMA – 1976.332.
- 8.5 Anonymous [Sometimes attributed to John Singleton Copley],
Major-General John Small,
 Miniature, dimensions unknown, c.1790, present whereabouts unknown [NAC?].
- 8.6 Anonymous,
Major-General John Small,
 Miniature, dimensions unknown, c.1790, FT.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 Anonymous,
The Hibernian Attempt,
 Mixed method, from *The Rambler's Magazine* (April 1785) p. 141, 4" x 6 ½", LC – in: AP3. R3.

9.2 Anonymous,

An Emblem of America,

Hand-coloured mezzotint, 'Published 4th Sept 1798, by John Fairburn. 146, Minories, London', 31 x 24.8 cm, LWL - 798.9.4.1.

9.3 James Barry,

The Phoenix or the Resurrection of Freedom,

Etching and aquatint (brown ink), 'Published by J. Almon according to Act of Parliament December 1776', 17" x 24 ⁵/₈", (432 x 613 mm), BM.

9.4 [James Gillray],

Barbarities in the West Indies,

Hand-coloured engraving, 'Pubd April 23d 1791. By H. Humphrey, N. 18. Old Bond Street.', sheet: 25.3 x 35.0 cm, LWL - 791.4.23.1.

9.5 Peter Pencil [Pseud.]

Intercourse or Impartial Dealings,

Etching and stipple with sepia ink, 1809, dimensions unknown, HU.

9.6 Sir John Tenniel,

Naughty Jonathan,

From: *Punch, or the London Charivari*, vol. XLII, (18th January 1862), p. 25, 19.8 x 24.8 cm.

9.7 Sir John Tenniel,

The Family Quarrel,

From: *Punch, or the London Charivari*, vol. XLI, (28th September 1861),

p. 127, 19.8 x 24.8 cm.