Abstract

The years 1830-36 were decisive ones for the development of English graphic satire. They witnessed the rapid decline of the single sheet caricature print (as epitomised by the work of Gillray and Rowlandson), and the gradual absorption of satirical images by the periodical press. This trend would reach its culmination in 1841 with the birth of *Punch* - the archetypal Victorian satirical periodical. Therein was established a markedly different mode of satirical commentary, which eschewed the coarseness, vulgarity and physical exaggeration of Georgian caricature, replacing it with a restrained and broadly realistic form of illustration directly related to the wider growth of pictorial magazines and visual culture in the nineteenth century.

This study examines the transformation of graphic satire in the 1830s in relation to the growth of the periodical press, the various formats in which it was disseminated and the new reproductive technologies on which it relied. By focussing on the most important satirical publications of the period (such as *Figaro in London* and *The Looking Glass*), it demonstrates how the conventions of serial journalism were adopted as their primary focus, in contrast to the individually-issued, large-format, images which dominated the earlier period. It argues that the reduced scale and simplified graphic conventions of periodical-based caricature (alongside a new reliance on supporting texts to explain images) had a reductive effect on graphic satire as an art form. An increasing homogenisation of the format, content and style of satirical images, as well as a corresponding diminution of individual artistic identity, were all characteristic of the period. These phenomena can all be related to contemporary developments in periodical literature, which was reliant upon continuity of format, repetition of content and journalistic anonymity. Collectively, these factors effected a fundamental transformation in the nature of satirical imagery, bridging the gap between the decline of one tradition and the rise of the other.
# Contents

**Volume one (Text)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Abbreviations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Illustrations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction:</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The Changing Spirit of English Caricature&quot;; The Periodical Press and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Satire in the 1830s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Issues, Aims and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Creating the Canon; The Obscurity of the 1830s in the History of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth-Century Graphic Satire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter One:</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graphic Satire Trade in the 1830s; Geography and Social Status.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Two:</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, Format and Reproductive Technology, Part One; Lithography and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Changing Conventions of Satirical Illustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) New Print Technologies in the Early Nineteenth Century; Lithography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Wood Engraving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Lithography and Graphic satire in the 1830s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Three:</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, Format and Reproductive Technology, Part Two; Wood Engraving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Recycling of Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Wood Engraving, Authorship and Anonymity; The Constraints of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrated satirical Periodical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Collaboration and Plagiarism; the Recycling of Satirical Images.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Four:</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development of the Multi-Panel Print</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) &quot;For the Drawing-Room Table or&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five: Narrative and Thematic Continuity in the Multi-Panel Prints of C.J. Grant, 1832-35
i) Parody and the Periodical; The Satirical Frontispieces, 1832-33
ii) Fragmenting the Modern Experience; Every Body's Album, 1834-35.

Chapter Six: Figaro in London and the Conventions of the Penny Satirical Periodical in 1832.

Chapter Seven: 'Figaro-mania!'; The Imitators of Figaro in 1832
i) The Emulation of Formats in the Penny Satirical Press
ii) The Devil in London.

Chapter Eight: Print or Periodical? Radical Wood-Engraved Caricature and the Unstamped Press, 1832-36.

Conclusion: 240

Bibliography: 249

Volume Two (Illustrations)
Maps 1-3
Illustrations 1-133
Acknowledgments

I am deeply indebted to the following people for their advice, assistance and encouragement during the preparation of this dissertation; Fabrice Bensimon, David Bindman, Emma Chambers, Elizabeth Fairman, Anthony Griffiths, Nick Lazenby, Brian Maidment, Neil McWilliam, Sheila O'Connell, Angela Roche, Graham Saville, Mike Tregear, John Wardroper and Malcolm Warner.

And for their friendship, patience and support over the past four years an enormous debt of thanks is due to; Adrianna Bates, Stephen Bear, Maria Gherasimova, Iose Ravera (who arrived late), Tom Simpson, Rebecca Tough, Simon Turner and Eva Weisbrod. Bless 'em all.

Finally, I am especially grateful to Tom Gretton for his patient supervision and consistently astute observations.

I also acknowledge the financial assistance of the following bodies;

The British Academy, Arts and Humanities research Board (for a three year research studentship).
The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art (for the Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship at the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, CT).
The Department of Art History, University College London (for two departmental awards - The R.K. Bursary and the Catherine Lewis Bursary).

I dedicate this dissertation to my father.
List of Abbreviations

BM... ...followed by a number refers to an entry in the BMC (see below)


BUCOP The British Union Catalogue of Periodicals

VPN Victorian Periodicals Newsletter

VPR Victorian Periodicals Review
List of Illustrations

Introduction;

1. Robert Seymour  
   Noble Lords Opposing the Torrent of Reform (lithograph, The Looking Glass, No.22, 1st October 1831)

2. C.J. Grant  
   Every Body's Album No.5 (lithograph, 1st March, 1834)

3. Robert Seymour  
   The Political Comet! (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No.195, 29th August 1835)

4. Anon.  
   Envy, Hatred, Malice (wood engraving, Giovanni in London, No.6, 24th March 1832)

5. C.J. Grant  
   A Bundle of Guy Fawkes' (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.113, 1834)

6. C.J. Grant  
   Cabinet Makers Upon the Tramp (wood engraving, Cleave's Gazette of Variety, No.55, 15th June 1839)

7. Richard Newton  
   Treason! (etching, 1798)

8. John Tenniel  
   The Sunday Question (Wood engraving, Punch, 17th April, 1869)

9. Linley Sambourne  
   Royal Academy Banquet at Burlington House (wood engraving, Punch, 7th May, 1881)

10. John Doyle ('HB')  
    The Lame Leading the Blind (lithograph, Political Sketches, 1832)

Chapter One;

11. George Cruikshank  
    March (etching, The Comic Almanack, Vol.1, 1835)
List of Illustrations

12. C.J. Grant (?)  
   Ready Wit (lithograph, Tregear's Flights of Humour, No.13, 1833)

   Widow Welsh's Pills (lithograph, Hodgson's Genuine Patent Medicines, No.5, c.1834)

   The Good Temper'd Man (lithograph, Hodgson's Special Originals, No.3, c.1833-4)

15. C.J. Grant  
   Cleave's Picture Gallery of Grant's Comicalities (wood engravings, c.1836-7)

16. Joe Lisle  
   The World (etching and aquatint, c.1832-3)

17. Joe Lisle  
   A Designing Character (etching, c.1832-3)

Chapter Two;

18. Anon.  
   The Anti Reform Eruption (lithograph, 1831)

19. Anon.  
   The Homage (lithograph, 1830)

20. Anon.  
   The LOUVRE, Or the National Gallery of France - No. 100 PALL MALL, Or the National Gallery of England (lithograph, 1832)

21. C.J. Grant  
   A Correct View of the Conflagration of Both Houses of Parliament as Seen from the River at 8 'Clock in the Evening, Oct. 16th 1834 (lithograph, Oct 21st, 1834)

22. Robert Seymour  
   Memoranda of the French Revolution (lithograph, The Looking Glass, No.9, September 1830, p.1)

23. Roberts Seymour  
   Memoranda of the French Revolution (lithograph, The Looking Glass, No.9 September 1830, p.2)

24. John Doyle ('HB')  
   Caught Napping (lithograph, Political Sketches, 8th March 1832)

25. John Doyle ('HB')  
   Another Ominous Conjunction (lithograph,
List of Illustrations

Political Sketches, 14th July 1832)

26. John Doyle ('HB') Votaries at the Altar of Discord (lithograph, Political Sketches, 20th April 1832)
27. Robert Seymour John Bull’s Nightmare (etching, January 1828)
28. Robert Seymour A Pot-Walloper (lithograph, 14th July 1830)
29. C. J. Grant The Reform Bill HALTER’D ALITTLE (lithograph, April 1831)
30. William Heath Poor Mr. Bull in a Pretty Situation (etching, March 1830)
31. C.J. Grant & ‘Sharpshooter’ Going! Going! (lithograph, 12th November 1830)
32. Anon. The March of Silenus (lithograph, The Fly, No.1, 28th October, 1838)
33. Henry Heath The Political See-Saw! (lithograph, The Satirist, No.3, January 1838)
34. Anon. J. Liston As Figaro (lithograph, Figaro in London, No.275, 1838)

Chapter Three;

35. C.J. Grant A Perfect Fright, Or The Ogreman Duke in Ernest (lithograph, September 1832)
36. Robert Seymour The Royal Galloper (wood engraving, Asmodeus in London, No.31, September 29th, 1832)
37. C.J. Grant Carrion Crows in John Bull’s Cornfield (lithograph, July 1832)
38. C.J. Grant (?) Carrion Crows in John Bull’s Cornfield (wood engraving, The Weekly Show-Up, No.3, July 14th 1832)
39. C. J. Grant & G. Tregear Battle Royal Between the Whig National School Boys and the Tory Charity Crabs (lithograph, May 1832)
List of Illustrations

40. C. J. Grant (?)  Grand Battle Between the Union School Boys and the Tory Rabble (wood engraving, The Weekly Show-Up, No.3, July 14th 1832)

41. Robert Seymour  November (wood engraving, The Political Almanack for 1836)

42. Anon.  Sketches From The Church, No.II (wood engraving, proof copy)

43. Anon.  Sketches From the Church, No.II (wood engraving, The Ballot, November 1831)

44. Anon.  Scenes From "The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte" (wood engraving, The Penny Satirist, No.127, September 23rd 1839)

45. Robert Seymour  Figaro Vs. The Blue Devils (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No.17, 31st March 1832)

46. Robert Seymour  Strong Room for Improvement (wood engraving, The Comic Magazine, No.2, April 1832)

47. Robert Seymour  The Staff at Headquarters (wood engraving, The Comic Magazine, No. 2, April 1832)

48. Robert Seymour  Fac Simile (sic.) of the Late Mr. Seymour's Sketch for FIGARO (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No. 220, 30th April, 1836)

49. Robert Seymour  Seymour's Last Sketch (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No. 221, 7th May 1836)

50. William Heath & C.J. Grant  Drunkards on Parade (etching, May 1830)

51. C.J. Grant  The School of REFORM (lithograph, February 1831)

52. 'TF'  The School of REFORM (lithograph, c.February 1831)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>The School for Rory Tory Rogues</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td><em>Political Drama</em> No.109, 1834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Tommy Grey With the Tail of His Order</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>15th February 1831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>'TF'</td>
<td><em>Tommy Grey With the Tail of His Order</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>c. February 1831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>William Heath</td>
<td><em>Tommy Grey With the Tail of His Order</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>15th February 1831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Public Robbers Consulting Under Their Favourite Tree</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>'JCW' &amp; C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Public Robbers Consulting Under Their Favourite Tree</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Desperate Condition of the Tory Gang</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td>c. July 1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Kick'd Out, Or Billy Putting His Foot In It</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Kick'd Out, Or Billy Putting His Foot In It</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Taking the Boromongers Home</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td>c. June 1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Old Nick’s Gatherings</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td><em>John Bull’s Picture Gallery</em>, No.6, c. June 1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td><em>The Gatherings of Old Nick!</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>James Cope</td>
<td><em>Y Tories yn Cael en Cymerd Adref at eu Teulu</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td>c. June 1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Protecting the Sabbath</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td><em>Political Drama</em>, No.1, c. March 1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Protecting the Sabbath</em></td>
<td>lithograph</td>
<td><em>Political Drama</em>, No.7, March 1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>John Bull Or, An Englishman’s Fireside</em></td>
<td>wood engraving</td>
<td><em>Political Drama</em>, No.4,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Illustrations

c. April 1833)

69. C.J. Grant  John Bull Or, An Englishman’s Fireside (lithograph, Political Drama, No.8, April 1833)

70. C.J. Grant  The Modern Puritan (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.2, c. April 1833)

71. C.J. Grant  The Modern Puritan (lithograph, Political Drama, No.6, April 1833)

Chapter Four;

72. Matthew Darly  Title Page to Darly’s Comic Prints of Characters, Caricatures and Macaronies (engraving, 1776)

73. G.M. Woodward  Titlepiece to Tegg’s Caricature Magazine, Vol.1 (etching, 1807)

74. G.M. Woodward  Frontispiece to Tegg’s Caricature Magazine, Vol.1 (etching, 1808)

75. George Cruikshank  Wrapper for My Sketch Book Part One (etching, 1834)

75a. George Cruikshank  Folio from Scraps and Sketches Part One (etching, 20th May 1828)

76.  Wrapper for The Omnibus (1830)

77. Robert Seymour  Folio from The Omnibus (etching, 1830)

78. Henry Heath  Wrapper for The Art of Tormenting (lithograph, 1830)

79. Henry Heath  Folio from The Art of Tormenting (etching, 1830)

80. Various  Scrapbook Page (c.1835)

81. Various  Scrapbook Page (c.1835)

82. Various  Scrapbook Page (c.1835)

83. C.J. Grant  Title Page for The Caricaturist, No.2 (lithograph, September 1831)
List of Illustrations

84. C.J. Grant  
LITERARY REVIEW - The London Press,  
Or A File of Newspaper Readers  
(lithograph, The Caricaturist No.2,  
September 1831)

85. C.J. Grant  
Approaching Dissolution of Bell's Life  
(Blackguard’s Journal) (lithograph, The  
Caricaturist No.2, September 1831)

86. Anon.  
The gallery of 140 Comicalities Part One  
(wood engraving, 24th January 1831)

86a. C.J. Grant  
Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers  
and Every Body's Album No.1 (lithograph,  
15th January 1835)

87. William Heath  
Title Page for The Northern Looking Glass,  
No.1 (lithograph, 11th June 1825)

88. William Heath  
Advertisements (lithograph, The Northern  
Looking Glass, No.1, 11th June 1825)

89. William Heath  
The Northern Looking Glass No.6  
(lithograph, 20th August 1825)

90. William Heath  
Prospectus (Detail of fig.87)

91. William Heath  
Part of the Crypt Under the Chapter House  
and Choir of Glasgow Cathedral  
(lithograph, The Northern Looking Glass,  
No.7, 3rd September 1825)

92. William Heath  
Glasgow Fair (lithograph, The Northern  
Looking Glass, No.4, 23rd July, 1825)

93. William Heath  
Text Page from The Northern Looking  
Glass No.3 (lithograph, 9th July 1825)

94. William Heath  
My House in Town (etching, The Northern  
Looking Glass No.15, 23rd January 1826)

95. William Heath  
The Life of a Soldier (etching, The  
Northern Looking Glass, No.12, 12th  
December 1825)

96. William Heath  
The Life of a Soldier - Text (The Northern  
Looking Glass, No.12, 12th December
List of Illustrations

1825)

97. William Heath
Letterpress text from The Northern Looking Glass No.8 (17th September, 1825)

98. William Heath
Title Page for The Looking Glass No.1 (etching, 1st January 1830)

99. William Heath
The Looking Glass No.1, p.4 (etching, 1st January 1830)

100. Robert Seymour
Title Page for The Looking Glass No.8 (lithograph, 1st August 1830)

101. Robert Seymour
Title Page for The Looking Glass No.12, (lithograph, 1st December 1830)

102. Robert Seymour
The Looking Glass No.12, p.2 (lithograph, 1st December 1830)

103. Robert Seymour
The Colossus (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.22, 1st October 1832)

104. Robert Seymour
Returning From the North; Or, the Effects of Unco Gude Living (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.58, 1st October 1834)

105. Robert Seymour
A Well Known Antique (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures, No.70, 1st October 1835)

106. Henry Heath (?)
We’ll All Have Two Shots Apiece At’ em (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.81, 1st September 1836)

107. Henry Heath (?)
Title Page for McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.80, (lithograph, 1st August 1836)

108. Henry Heath
Detail from McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.82, p.2 (lithograph, 1st October 1836)

109. Henry Heath
The Patent Travelling Squirt (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.86, 1st November 1836)
List of Illustrations

110. Henry Heath

The London Lions (lithograph, McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.78, 1st June 1836)

Chapter Five;

111. C.J.Grant

The Penny Trumpeter (lithograph, 29th September 1832)

112. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece for the Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol.1 (lithograph, c.late 1832)

113. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece for the Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol.2 Lithograph, May 1833)

114. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece to the "Doctor" - The Lancet; Medical Gazette; Gazette of Health; &c. (lithograph, July 1833)

115. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece to the Cookery Books
(lithograph, September 1833)

116. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece to the Sporting Magazines
(lithograph, October 1833)

117. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece to Chambers's Information for the People The Edinburgh Journal & Historical Newspaper (lithograph, 21st June 1834)

118. C.J. Grant

Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.1 (lithograph, 1st January 1834)

119. C.J. Grant

A pair of Obstacles (detail of fig.118)

120. C.J. Grant

A Specimen of British Elections
(lithograph, Every Body's Album, No.26, 15th January 1835)

121. C.J. Grant

The Century of Invention. Anno Domini 2000. Or the March of Aerostation, Steam, Rail Roads, Moveable Houses & Perpetual Motion !!!! (lithograph, Every Body's Album, No.3, 1st February 1834)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration Number</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>The Cigar Mania</em> (lithograph, <em>Every Body’s Album</em>, No.12, 13th June 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>The Jolly Anglers in a High Wind</em> (lithograph, <em>Every Body’s Album</em>, No.18, 13th September 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine</em>, No.4 (lithograph, 11th February 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine</em>, No.8 (lithograph, 13th April 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em>, No.10 (lithograph, 15th May 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em> No.15 (lithograph, 1st August 1834) Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128a.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body's Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em> No.15 (lithograph, 1st August 1832) Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em> No.16 (lithograph, 15th August 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>C. J. Grant</td>
<td><em>A Dead Robbery</em> (lithograph, <em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em>, No.34, 15th May 1835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>The Suicide Club</em> (lithograph, <em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em>, No. 22, 15th November 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td><em>Monkeys in the State Conservatory</em> (lithograph, <em>Every Body’s Album &amp; Caricature Magazine</em>, No.33, 1st May 1835)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Illustrations

133. C.J. Grant

The Bridal Night! (lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.38, 10th August 1835)

134. C.J. Grant

Silhouetted vignettes from Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.2 (lithograph, 15th January 1834)

135. C.J. Grant

A Radical Cure (detail of fig.118)

136. George Cruikshank

London Going Out of town, Or The March of Bricks and Mortar (etching, My Sketch Book Part Two, 1829)

137. C.J. Grant

Adventures of the Buggins's to Gravesend. V. Margate & Back Again (lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.14, 15th July 1834)

138. C.J. Grant

Lawk What a Shocking Bad Hat (lithograph, Tregear's Flights of Humour, No.15, c.1833)

138a. Anon.

What's The Use of This Here Weatherglass? (lithograph, Funny Characters, No.16, c.1833-4)

139. Anon.

Sam Slick's Oddities No.1 (lithograph, c.1833-4)

139a. Anon.

Eccentricities No.1 (lithograph, C.1833-4)

139b. Anon.

Notions of the Agreeable No.90 (lithograph, c.1833-4)

139c. Anon.

Liberality! (lithograph, Funny Ideas, No.2, c.1833-4)

139d. C.J. Grant

Whim Whams No.4 (lithograph, 1835)

Chapter Six;

140. Figaro in London, No.2, (17th December 1831)

141. The Mirror of Literature, Amusement &
List of Illustrations

Instruction, No.220  (28th October, 1826)

142. Robert Seymour  Portraits of the Political Burkers! (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.3, 24th December 1831)

143. Robert Seymour  Grand Political Pantomime (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.4, 31st December 1831)

144. Robert Seymour  May Day (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.22, 1st May 1832)

145.  Advertisement for Figaro in London, (wood engraving, January 1832)

146. Robert Seymour  Untitled (wood engraving, Figaro in London, 30th August 1834)

147. Robert Seymour (?)  Figaro's first masthead (wood engraving, December 1831)

148. Robert Seymour (?)  Figaro's second masthead (wood engraving, January 1835)

149. Robert Seymour (?)  Figaro's third masthead (wood engraving, May 1835)

150. Robert Cruikshank  A Slap at the Times, No.1 (wood engraving, 1832)

151. Robert Cruikshank  The Life and Death Schedules A and B (wood engraving, A Slap at the Times, No.1, 1832)


153. Anon.  The Expulsion of Cumberland (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.291, 1st July 1837)


155. Anon.  Mr. W. Farren, as Father Matthias and Miss Pool, in Farinelli (wood engraving, Figaro
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration Number</th>
<th>Artist/Creator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>The Protesting Bishops’ Reception by a Gracious Sovereign and Court (wood engraving, <em>Figaro in London</em>, No.399, 27th July 1839)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Seven;**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration Number</th>
<th>Artist/Creator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Figaro in Sheffield</em> No.XXVI (8th June 1833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Figaro in Liverpool</em> No.1 (14th January 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The English Figaro No. (21st January 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Giovanni In London No.1 (18th February 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>Kenny Meadows</td>
<td>Titlepiece to <em>Punch in London</em> No.5 (wood engraving, 11th February 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Pages of <em>Punch in London</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 169.                | J.H. Jones     | Titlepiece and *Patrician Earwigs; Or, The Reptiles in Cumberland Gardens* (wood
List of Illustrations

engravings, *Punch in London* No.11, 24th March 1832)

170. C.J. Grant  *Every Man to his Post and Making a Deep Impression* (wood engravings, *Punch in London*, 28th April 1832)

171. Robert Cruikshank  *Hatching the Reform Egg!* (wood engraving, *Punchinello!,* No.6, 24th February 1832)

172. Robert Cruikshank  *Shaving A Duke* (wood engraving, *The Devil's Walk!,* No.1, 17th February 1832)


174. Robert Cruikshank  *John Bull by the Horns* (wood engraving, *Punchinello!,* No.9, 16th March 1832)

175. Robert Cruikshank  *General Cholera* (wood engraving, *The Devil's Walk!,* No.2, 24th February 1832)

176. Robert Seymour  Titlepiece to *The Devil in London* No.1 (wood engraving, 29th February 1832)

177. Robert Seymour  *The Devil's Register of "Want Places"* (wood engraving, *The Devil in London*, No.1, 29th February 1832)


179. Robert Seymour  *More "Want Places;"* or, *"Refuge for Destitute Tories," Second Series* (wood engraving, *Asmodeus; Or the Devil in London*, No.15, 9th June, 1832)

180. Robert Seymour  *As Coachman* (wood engraving, *The Tories' Political Advertiser for "Want Places",* April 1832)

181. Robert Seymour  Frontispiece to *The Tories' "Refuge for the Destitute," Or Political Advertiser* (wood engraving, c. June 1832)

182. Robert Seymour  *The Political Advertiser for "Want Places."*
List of Illustrations

(wood engraving, The Halfpenny Magazine, No.3, 19th May 1832)

183. Robert Seymour
Title Page to Asmodeus; Or, The Devil in London No.8 (wood engraving, 21st April 1832)

184. Kenny Meadows
Titlepiece to Asmodeus in London No.25 (wood engraving, 18th August 1832)

185. Kenny Meadows
Titlepiece to Asmodeus in London No.37 (wood engraving, 10th November 1832)

186. Robert Seymour (?)
Title Page to The Devil's Memorandum Book, for 1833 (wood engraving, c. December 1832)

Chapter Eight;

187. Anon.
View of Mr. Carlile's House, 52 Fleet Street, London (wood engraving, A Scourge, No.9, 29th November 1834)

188. Anon.
The Poor Man's Guardian No.35 (11th February 1832)

189. Anon.
The Contest (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, No.1, 1832)

189a Anon.
The Woman Wot Rides the Sovreign and Petticoat Government - England's New Ensign (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, No.1, 1832)

190. C.J. Grant (?)
Present State of John Bull (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, No.12, 1832)

191. Anon.
Cover to John Bull's Picture Gallery, Part One (wood engraving, c. late 1832)

192. Anon.
John Bull's Picture Gallery, No.1, Reprinted edition (wood engraving, c. late 1832)

193. Anon.
Phrenologists and Coronation of Ernest the First (wood engraving, The Political Stage No.IV, October 1835)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>Interior pages - <em>The Political Stage</em> (October 1835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant, <em>Church Reform; Or, the BISHOPS Cleansing Their Own Stable</em> (wood engraving, <em>Lloyd's Political Jokes</em>, No.5, c.1836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>Anon., <em>The Peoples' Penny Pictures No.1</em> (wood engraving, 8th December 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>&quot;Dank&quot; esq., <em>The Caricaturist No.1</em> (wood engraving, c.1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant &amp; Anon., <em>Does Adelaide Know He's Out?</em> (wood engraving, <em>Lloyd's Political Jokes</em>, No.8, 1836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant, <em>Reviewing the Blue Devils</em> (wood engraving, <em>Political Drama</em>, No.11, 1833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant, <em>The Four Factions, Which Distract the</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Illustrations

Country (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.12, 1833)

208. C.J.Grant
The Bench of Bishops in the House of Lords During a Debate Concerning the Church (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.16, 1833)

209. C.J. Grant
The Whig Radical 'Amended' Address to the House of Commons (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.77, 1834)

210. C.J. Grant
Popay the Spy Addressing a Political Meeting in the Garb of a Brother Mechanic (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.20, 1833)

211. Anon.
The Political Humourist (wood engraving, c. July 1832)

212. Anon.
The Unstamped Flooring the Stamped Press (wood engraving, The Political Stage, No.7, 31st October 1835)

213. C.J. Grant
Magisterial Justice - A Fact (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.14, 1833)

214. C.J. Grant
Whig Robbery and Destruction of the Property Under the Name of the Law (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.100, 1835)

Ro-buck's Attack on the Press, Or Information for the People (wood engraving, The Political Play Bill, No.12, c.1834)

216. Anon.
Cover to The Devil's Menagerie of Placemen, Sinecurists, Pensioners &c. (wood engraving, 1832)

217. Anon.
Present State of John Bull (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, 1832)

218. "Dank" esq.
All the Majesty of the British Empire!!! (wood engraving, The Caricaturist, No.1, c.1832)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220.</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>The Disorderly House; Or the Fighting Parliament (wood engraving, <em>The First Cut from the Barber's Razor</em>, c.1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>The Drunken Parliament Discussing the Prevention of Drunkennes Bill (wood engraving, <em>Political Drama</em>, No. 49, 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>Billy's Birth Day! (wood engraving, <em>Political Drama</em>, No.36, 1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>The Royal Mopstick Pro-Rogue-ing the Humbug Parliament, Or, Cross Reading the Speech (wood engraving, <em>Political Drama</em>, No.22, 1833)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Penny Satirist No.1 (22nd April, 1837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>A Trip to Margate (wood engraving, <em>Cleave's Gazette of Variety</em>, No.42, 3rd August 1839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>Lord Mayor's Day: Or, Aldermen Going to their Devotion! (wood engraving, <em>The Penny Satirist</em>, No.30, 11th November 1837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>C.J. Grant</td>
<td>Coronation of Queen Victoria (wood engraving, <em>The Penny Satirist</em>, No.63, 30th June 1838)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion;**

229. | 'Timothy Wasp Esq.' | The QUEEN BEE in Her HIVE!!! (etching, 29th August 1837) |
Introduction

“Since the commencement of the present century, and more especially during the last fifty years, a change has come over the spirit of English caricature. The fact is due to a variety of causes, amongst which must be reckoned the revolution in dress and manners; the extinction of the three-bottle men and topers; the change of thought, manners and habits consequent on the introduction of steam, railways, and the electric telegraph. The casual observer meeting, as he sometimes will, with a portfolio of etchings representing the men with red and bloated features, elephantine limbs, and huge paunches, who figure in the caricatures of the last and the early part of the present century, may well be excused if he doubt whether such figures of fun ever had an actual existence.”

- Graham Everitt, 1893

In general terms, the written history of pre-twentieth-century English graphic satire has been divided into two distinct chapters; the Georgian and the Victorian. The first of these - characterised by the colourful single sheet caricature prints of Gillray, Rowlandson and Cruikshank - is considered to have ended with the wave of disillusionment which followed the Great Reform Bill of June 1832. The second, however, does not take up the story until 1841, four years after Victoria’s accession to the throne, when Punch - the archetypal nineteenth-century satirical periodical -

---

1 Graham Everitt, *English Caricaturists and Graphic Humourists of the Nineteenth Century* (1893), p.2. Writing during the final decade of the Victorian era, Everitt was one of the first men to produce a lengthy account of the history of nineteenth-century English graphic satire. His account was, in many ways, a pioneering one, but, perhaps inevitably, it is coloured by the tastes and conventions of the era in which it was produced.
was born. However, such broad categorisations can never be entirely satisfactory. The evolution of any art form will inevitably be a gradual and continuous process of development, renewal and transformation, rather than a simple overnight transition from one epoch-defining tradition to another. But the tendency to break this process down into manageable sections is quite understandable in historical terms: scholars must, realistically, set themselves certain temporal and thematic limitations when dealing with any specific subject. And yet, while such limitations may seem quite logical in terms of the broader history of a particular period, the boundaries which they create can be artificial ones - in cultural terms especially - and there is always the danger that an important evolutionary stage between two adjacent, and easily differentiated, traditions will become obscured. For a number of reasons this has been the fate of the majority of graphic satire produced during the 1830s.

As the second part of this introduction will make clear, the opening quotation from Graham Everitt is typical of late nineteenth-century accounts of graphic satire in its determination to imagine pre-Victorian caricature as - almost literally - unimaginable. His characterisation of the transition between the two as a move from irrationality and exaggeration to rationality and realism was symptomatic of a prevailing desire to elevate the status of Victorian graphic satire (as an art form) in relation to that which had preceded it. This distinction between two very different traditions (the single sheet print and the satirical periodical - the Georgian and the Victorian) was certainly a very convenient starting point for this purpose, but it inevitably ignored the considerable diversity of material which appeared in the intervening period, and this is a situation which has only recently begun to be reversed. Like the seven brief years of William IV's reign, graphic satire of the 1830s has been eclipsed by what preceded and succeeded it.

However, the years between 1830 and 1836 were significant ones for the evolution of satirical illustration. They witnessed the breakdown of the old tradition and, in hindsight, can be seen as laying the foundations for the new. Most significantly of all, visual satire of the period saw an increasing emphasis on serialisation, the standardisation of formats, and the simplification of individual images. More than ever before, these were now designed to function in relation to others of a similar nature and format or to accompanying texts, be they brief captions or extended
explanatory articles. In other words, graphic satire was evolving alongside the expanding periodical press, and was adapting to the opportunities and constraints of serial journalism in order to create and maintain new niche markets in an increasingly competitive field. Roy Wiles places the beginnings of serial publication in the late seventeenth century, although it only became a significant presence from around 1725 onwards, existing alongside non-periodical text news (broadsheets etc.), which would only be fully eclipsed in the nineteenth century; "Publishers discovered that hundreds - even thousands - of people not previously interested in books would buy them if they could get them in inexpensive parts, piecemeal... publishing in numbers became both highly competitive and highly remunerative for the booksellers, if not the authors and compilers". Thus, by the 1830s, the practise was more than a century old, and was becoming increasingly competitive. As Margaret Beetham has pointed out;

"The success of the periodical in the nineteenth century, and since, is partly to be explained by its convenience for producers. In theory the consumer of the periodical is not so much satisfied as stimulated to return at regular intervals to buy the next number of the product... the periodical was designed both to ensure rapid turnover and to create a regular demand."  

The implications of this process were many and varied, especially for graphic satire, which had existed for more than a century as a more or less autonomous form of visual culture, unencumbered by the restrictive demands of an editorial voice or a rigidly-structured and time-regulated format.

But the 1820s had been the last decade in which graphic satire existed (and functioned) in anything like the form it had taken during its Golden Age. The few surviving artists who could be considered representative of the older tradition had produced their last important work by the middle years of the decade: Rowlandson

---


fell ill in 1825, and died two years later; Charles Williams produced few caricatures after 1824, his final print appearing in 1830; and George Cruikshank’s last significant contribution to the field of political caricature (in quantitative terms at least) came as early as 1823. Moreover, the pre-eminence of the older publishers was waning simultaneously. The likes of Samuel Fores, William Holland and Hannah Humphrey had given way to Thomas McLean as the dominant West End publisher by 1827, while John Fairburn (the most productive of the dealers further east) was supplanted in the early ‘30s by others less firmly established in the older conventions of the single sheet print.

Similarly, many of the new artists who came to prominence during the 1820s and early ‘30s were not so deeply rooted in the traditions of their predecessors. William Heath, who had published his first caricature print as early as 1809 (at the age of fourteen or fifteen), only began to focus his energies on political caricature in the early ‘20s and, despite a short period of pre-eminence around 1828-29, he still seemed to regard himself as much as a military painter and theatrical portraitist as he did a caricaturist. Henry Heath’s satirical work, which first appeared in 1824 (although he too was producing theatrical ‘Characters’ as early as 1822), ranged from politics to comic genre scenes, to puns and whimsical fantasy, and demonstrated no great preference for the single sheet format, or indeed for the world of politics as such. He was quick to follow Cruikshank’s lead into the less contentious field of social satire, while also producing many imitations of both HB’s *Political Sketches* and Seymour’s ‘Cockney Sportsmen’. Robert Cruikshank, like his brother, was slowly moving away from the field of political caricature. Although he worked for several weekly penny journals in the early ‘30s, he drew a large part of his income from the watercolour portraits he produced for private patrons.

---

4 Cruikshank produced a small number of political caricatures in 1832, but this was primarily in response to derogatory remarks made in the radical press (*The Ballot* in particular), which accused him of resting on his laurels and deliberately avoiding controversy of any sort whatsoever. See Robert Patten, *George Cruikshank’s Life, Times and Art*, Vol. 1 (1992), pp. 390-404 for details of his move away from political caricature in the 1830s.

5 From 1812 onwards he had produced portraits and ‘Character’ prints for West and Hodgson, the leading theatrical print-sellers of the period; he produced 52 plates for the series *Martial Achievements* between 1814-15, as well as the 32 plates to Syntax’s *Wars of Wellington*. More significantly, perhaps, a watercolour of 1819 (now in the British Museum) is signed, ‘William Heath Portrait and Military Painter’ - which can be read as a clear statement of his role as he perceived it at the time. In 1823 his *Life as a Soldier* (a set of etchings describing the life and career of an East India Cadet) was published by Sams of St. James’ street; and during a stay in Glasgow in 1826 he was able to make a living selling finished drawings of military subjects*BM*, Vol.X, pp.liv & xliv-xlvi. He is also supposed to have pursued a military career until around 1816, which can be traced in the Army Lists (*BM*, Vol.VIII, p.xoxix).
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John Doyle made his debut in 1827 with two aquatints, which owed something to the older conventions of caricature, but he quickly settled into the technique of lithography and the realistic style which would bring him fame as 'HB', and which - as will be seen - owed more to his parallel career as a portraitist than it did to the heritage of Gillray and Rowlandson. Similarly, Robert Seymour, whose earliest work also dates from 1827, was clearly at home in a number of different styles. While his earliest efforts remained firmly within the traditional conventions of the etched caricature print, he quickly adopted a range of styles and media, from crayon lithography in the HB manner, to the abbreviated vignettes of wood-engraved periodical illustration, the Cruikshankian 'scrapsheet', and the pen lithography of his *Humorous Sketches*.

Clearly, then, by the beginning of the 1830s, the role of the most prominent graphic satirists was not so clearly defined as it had been in preceding decades. The 1820s had been a relatively quiet period for political caricature (at least once the furore over the Queen Caroline affair had died down in early 1821). Radical politics had entered a period of decline, while the popularity of George IV had only increased after his coronation. Although he remained a target of the caricaturists, the vitriol of 1819-21 had largely disappeared, partly driven out by the repressive legislation of 1819. Without recourse to such obvious and rewarding targets, graphic satire gradually began to refocus its attentions on the world of social satire; the 'monstrosities' of fashion; the perils of omnibus travel; urban character types; and the 'March of Intellect'. The foundations were being laid for the broad combination of political and social satire which would characterise the 1830s, and which would be carried on into the Victorian era by *Punch*.

The 1830s was a transitional period. It was the final decade in which certain aspects of English graphic satire still existed autonomously outside the confines of the periodical press, although this situation was changing rapidly. The diverse

---

7 *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, 17th June 1832
8 See Joel Wiener, *The War of the Unstamped: The Movement to repeal the British Newspaper Tax, 1830-1836* (1969), pp. 4-6. The 'Six Acts', introduced in December 1819 by Viscount Castlereagh (the Home Secretary), were intended to suppress the journalistic outlets through which dissentionist views were being expressed following the 'Peterloo Massacre' earlier that year.
nature of the imagery produced during the period was directly related to the unstable conditions under which it was created and published: the changing socio-geographic location of the trade itself; the degree of autonomy and freedom of expression permitted by the working relationship between artist, editor and publisher; the application of different reproductive processes (in particular wood engraving and lithography); and the use of new and experimental formats.

All these factors contributed to this sense of instability, which is directly reflected in the diversity of formats which the period produced; from overtly radical wood-engraved single sheet prints, to illustrated weekly penny journals such as *Figaro in London* and expensive lithographed monthly sheets like *The Looking Glass*. While all these formats relied upon the conventions of serial journalism to some extent, they were varied in terms of price, style, content and format. But underlying this variety was a degree of uncertainty within the trade itself about how best to accommodate the tastes and expectations of an expanding (and increasingly diverse) public, and how to capture their ‘loyalty’ as consumers. With this in mind, many publishers were clearly eager to exploit the commercial advantages of periodicity and regularization of format. As Beetham has emphasised, “the regularity of a periodical’s appearance is matched by the continuities of format, shape and pattern of contents from number to number. The form is mixed and various but each individual periodical has to maintain a certain consistency of mixture. Every number is still ‘the same’ periodical. This consistency is necessary so that the reader keeps coming back to buy.”\(^9\) Thus, while the 1830s was a period of marked diversity and willingness to experiment, it also witnessed the rampant imitation of successful formats and the plagiarism of popular images. After this point, however, the periodical press (and *Punch* in particular) would gain a stranglehold on satirical imagery which would reduce it (with few exceptions) to a single archetypal form - albeit one which would allow its contributors to achieve a professional status undreamt of in the 1830s.

But the gradual absorption of graphic satire by the periodical press in the early-mid ‘30s led not only to a transformation of its style and method of dissemination (both of which will be discussed in subsequent chapters), but also to a fundamental change in its cultural status and perceived aesthetic value. In a sense, the greater part of graphic satire from the 1830s onwards has become marginalised by the

formats which it adopted. In terms of scholarship, the interrelationship of text and image on the periodical page has seen it move away from the field of 'pure' art history (which, of course, must also embrace wider socio-historical issues) and into an academic grey area which simultaneously encompasses social, cultural, political, media, literary and art history.\(^{10}\) The reputation of (and our knowledge of) graphic satire of the 1830s can be directly related to the changes which the trade was undergoing at the time. In combination with one another, they helped to create a range of products which could not achieve the kinds of aesthetic or formal cohesiveness which, in different ways, characterised both Georgian and Victorian graphic satire. Much of the material produced during the '30s remains obscure because it cannot be readily defined or classified, falling outside the basic 'single-sheet-to-periodical' progression generally presented in histories of the medium. The vast majority of the images discussed below do not come within the scope of the *British Museum Catalogue of Personal and Political Satires* (which terminated its survey with the year 1832)\(^{11}\) and have rarely been considered relevant to any discussion of the history of *Punch*, or of early Victorian visual culture in general.\(^{12}\)

The *BMC*'s terminal date of 1832 is one which has had important implications for subsequent interest in graphic satire of the 1830s. While its importance as a unified and cohesive body of reference material is unquestionable, it has tended to limit the range of those studies which followed its compilation. This is certainly the impression given by the majority of recent surveys of graphic satire, most of which have drawn extensively from the work of Stephens and George. The seven thematic studies published by Chadwyck-Healey in 1986 as parts of the series *The English Satirical Print, 1600-1832* were all limited in their scope by the dates set by

---

\(^{10}\) As Tom Gretton has recently suggested, "it is both possible and necessary to make the individual work of art a primary focus of art-historical study, but it is hard to imagine what the focal point might be when one studies a journal. Neither the article, the picture nor the page is an adequate representation of the journal; even the single issue is still not in any real sense 'the journal'." "Difference and Competition: the Imitation and Reproduction of Fine Art in a Nineteenth-Century Illustrated Periodical" in *The Oxford Art Journal*, Vol.23, No.2, 2000,pp.143-162 (pp.145-6).


\(^{12}\) In R.G.G. Price's *A History of Punch* (1957), for example, *Figaro* receives only two brief references, neither of which stretches beyond a single sentence (pp.21 & 39). Spielmann is a little more forthcoming, but even his account is limited by its desire to dismiss as inconsequential any satirical journal other than *Punch* itself. *op.cit.*, pp.11, 188, 236 & 273.
the BMC, while Diana Donald's comprehensive *The Age of Caricature* (1996) - which has quickly established itself as the standard work on graphic satire of the Georgian era - concludes with the prints inspired by the Peterloo Massacre of 1819. Herbert Atherton's *Political Prints in the Age of Hogarth* (1974) confines itself, as the title implies, to the period before 1764, while Vincent Carretta's *George III and the Satirists* (1990) and Nicholas Robinson's *Edmund Burke: a life in Caricature* (1996) similarly limit themselves to the lifetimes of their respective subjects. Each of these books has a specific historical and thematic agenda which embraces the field of graphic satire - either as its primary topic or as an evidential tool with which to explore a particular biographical or historical subject - but all conclude either with or before the year 1832, prior to the rise of serially-issued visual satire.\(^\text{13}\)

Thus, in terms of secondary source material, the literature relevant to the 1830s is sparse, consisting largely of texts which are only tangentially related to graphic satire as such. The journal *Victorian Periodical Newsletter* (later *Review*) has been a vital source of articles on the history and theory of periodical publishing, alongside collections of essays such as Jerry Don Vann and Rosemary VanArsdel's *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (1994) and John Shattock and Michael Wolff's *The Victorian Periodical Press; Samplings and Soundings* (1982). Likewise, studies such as Patricia Hollis' *The Pauper Press* (1970), Joel Wiener's *The War of the Unstamped* (1969), Patricia Anderson's *The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture* (1991), Brian Maidment's *Reading Popular Prints* (1996) and Louis James' *Fiction for the Working Man* and *Print and the People* (1963 and 1976) have all been useful in terms of placing the material discussed below within the wider context of the growth of literature and visual culture during the early nineteenth century.\(^\text{14}\) However, the only detailed study to deal (at least in part) with graphic satire of the period has been Celina Fox's 1974 Ph.D thesis *Graphic Journalism in England During the 1830s and 1840s*, which remains a key introduction to many issues relating to developments in illustrated journalism at the time.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{13}\) See bibliography for details.

\(^{14}\) See bibliography for details.

\(^{15}\) Fox's thesis was eventually published by Garland Publishing in 1988. While there is some overlapping of interests between Fox's work and the current study, my emphasis is on a more detailed survey of the impact which the changes in format and print media had upon the nature and appearance of graphic satire, rather than the role it played within the wider spectrum of illustrated journalism during the 1830s and 40s. My emphasis is on format and style rather than the actual content of the images discussed.
With this in mind, the purpose of this study is twofold. Firstly, it is intended as an introduction to the variety of styles and formats adopted by visual satirists and their publishers during a much-neglected period in the history of English graphic satire. Secondly, it aims to place these developments within the context of the rapidly-expanding illustrated periodical press, which was itself becoming one of the most important and pervasive aspects of nineteenth-century visual culture at the time.\footnote{As the introduction to Shatlock and Wolff's *The Victorian Periodical Press; Samplings and Soundings* (1982) put it, "nineteenth-century Britain was uniquely the age of the periodical" (p.7). Wolff, North and Deering (1978) identified 24,600 Victorian periodical titles, while North (1975) suggested another 20,000 waiting to be identified. Of these, around 300 have been classified as 'comic periodicals'. See Donald Gray, 'A List of Comic Periodicals in Great Britain, 1800-1900, with a Prefatory Essay' in VPN, No.15 (1972), pp.2-39. Other useful lists of this type include Ted R. Ellis, 'Victorian Comic Journals' in A. Sullivan, ed., *British Literary Magazines, Vol.III: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1911* (1984), pp.501-13, J. Don Vann, 'Comic Periodicals' in Don Vann & VanArsdel eds., *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (1994), pp. 278-90, and Jerold J. Savory, 'An Uncommon Collection: Humorous Victorian Periodicals in the Newberry Library' in VPN, No.17, (1984), pp.94-102.}

It is primarily a discussion of format, and by focussing on the various types of publication which appeared (and quickly disappeared) during these years, I hope to demonstrate the extent to which the graphic satire trade was shaped by the conventions of the periodical prior even to the establishment of *Punch* in 1841. In doing so, it will become apparent that a reliance upon the conventions of serial journalism effected a fundamental transformation in the nature of graphic satire, placing constraints upon image-making in terms of style, subject matter and the subjugation of images to accompanying texts. I have included a large number of illustrations (230 or so) in an attempt to convey a sense of the often repetitive nature of the material. The majority of these will be referred to only in passing, but certain images - or groups of images - will be discussed at length in order to emphasise specific points.

The three opening chapters will lay the ground for what follows by discussing issues of direct importance to the nature of the trade in the 1830s; its location(s) within the metropolis; the impact of new reproductive technologies; the recycling of images; and the changing relationship between artists and publishers (especially in terms of artistic anonymity and the diminution of an authorial voice).\footnote{As W.A. Coupe has emphasised, an understanding of political caricature (and, I would add, social graphic satire), "involves an understanding of caricature itself, the caricaturist, its publishers and audience, and the historical epoch and social structure within which the caricaturist operates." 'Observations on a Theory of Political Caricature' in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, XI (1969), pp.19-95 (p.78). The provision of this kind of background material is the purpose of the three opening chapters.}

Subsequent chapters will focus individually upon specific forms of satirical prints...
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and periodicals which can be considered characteristic of the period.

Chapter Four begins with a brief summary of the gradual move away from the single-image/single-sheet print which had dominated Golden Age caricature, and goes on to discuss the use of the 'multi-panel' format (which developed in direct response to text-based periodicals in the 1820s and '30s). It deals first with William Heath's short-lived series, *The Northern Looking Glass*, published in Scotland between 1825 and 1826, and continues with a detailed analysis of Heath, Seymour and McLean's London-based *Looking Glass* (1830-36, fig.1), focussing specifically on the changes in page layout which it underwent throughout the course of its life.

Chapter Five continues the examination of multi-panel sheets in relation to the work of one artist in particular - C.J. Grant, whose satirical 'frontispieces' were, once again, a response to the growth of the periodical press in the early 1830s. His use of the format between 1832 and 1835 was far more imaginative than that of the artists employed by McLean, especially in his fortnightly series *Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine* (1834-5), in which he employed a system of thematic and narrative continuity to present a thoroughly unique critique of 'modern' everyday life (fig.2).

Chapter Six focusses on the development of the penny illustrated satirical periodical, with a discussion of the conventions of format established by Gilbert Abbott à Beckett's *Figaro in London* (1831-39, fig.3), one of the most significant precursors of *Punch*. Its success was immediate, and it spawned a host of emulative publications in the first half of 1832 (fig.4). The first section of Chapter Seven examines the extent to which the conventions established by *Figaro* were imitated, while the second discusses the one title which, for a short time, rivalled à Beckett;'s paper: Henry Mayhew's *The Devil in London*.

The eighth and final chapter is a discussion of the serially-issued wood engraved prints published by the radical pressmen of Lincoln's Inn Fields, Paternoster Row and Holywell Street between 1832 and 1836 (fig.5). While Fox focussed upon this area of the trade at length in her thesis, my intention is to examine these prints in relation to the wider impact of periodicity on the satirical print trade in general:
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how far, in other words, can they be defined as single sheet prints, and how far as periodicals? This chapter will focus on the extent to which the creators and publishers of these prints defined their work in relation to the unstamped press of 1830-36. After this point, radical caricature would find a temporary home in illustrated pro-Chartist broadsheets such as The Penny Satirist and The London Satirist (fig.6), but in such a context its role was (in most instances) a diminished one. While Fox also discussed these journals at length in her thesis, I have chosen to conclude the present study at a point prior to their beginnings - 1836 - and concentrate instead on material which has largely evaded analysis up to now. As such, I make no claims to it being a comprehensive survey. Several publications - The Comic Almanack, The Comic Magazine, The Gallery of Comicalities - are referred to only in passing, but I believe nevertheless that I have selected the most important and representative titles for discussion.

My conclusion will draw all these threads together, and highlight once again the extent to which the new importance placed upon periodicity - especially in regard to the standardisation of form (or forms) and the prominence of the publisher's name or the 'character' of a journal as a site of identification - had contributed to the anonymity of individual artists. By the late 1830s they had been drawn into a tradition of anonymous journalism stretching back a century or more, subject to an editorial voice and the regular format of a periodical, rather than their own inclinations and the relative freedom of expression permitted by the single sheet print. It was under these conditions that Punch would establish itself in the 1840s, cementing a tradition of visual satire wholly antithetical to what had gone before. The seeds of its eventual success, however, were laid in the early-mid '30s, and by drawing attention to the changes which took place during these years, we can gain some insight into the subsequent development of nineteenth-century illustrated satirical journalism as a whole.

With this in mind, it is worth prefacing what follows with a brief discussion of the status of graphic satire of the 1830s in the later nineteenth century. It was at this point that a tentative hierarchy of satirical imagery (from the Golden Age to the
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1890s) was first established and, although the origins of the Victorian satirical periodical can be situated in the reign of William IV, the artists of the period would receive scant notice from the commentators of the late Victorian era. This situation has had a considerable influence on the subsequent reputation of visual satire produced during these years.

II

Creating the Canon: The Obscurity of the 1830s in the History of Nineteenth-Century Graphic Satire

In the final years of the century, when George DuMaurier wrote, "And now for social pictorial satire considered as fine art" (in his ambitious, wide-ranging and optimistic treatise, Social Pictorial satire), he was giving voice to a prevailing view amongst the late nineteenth-century cognoscenti of English graphic satire that his profession had finally reached a maturity of sorts.¹⁹ There was a general sense that it had outgrown the 'youthful' vulgarity, scatology and gross physical exaggeration of Georgian caricature (as exemplified by a print such as Richard Newton's Treason of 1798 (fig.7)), and had settled instead into a comfortable adulthood, characterised by the responsible, respectable, and broadly realistic form of pictorial commentary established by Punch during the middle decades of the century (fig.8). This was the 'changing spirit' which Everitt had identified in 1893, and it can be related, at least in part, to the absorption of graphic satire by the periodical press, within which it had become for many a 'respectable' profession, characterised by visual restraint and journalistic responsibility, rather than personal abuse and scatological comedy. Thus, as the personal fortunes and social standing of the era's most prominent graphic satirists had risen (as epitomised by the knighthood of John Tenniel in 1893) there was an accompanying desire to distance themselves from the less 'respectable' elements of their professional heritage which, it was felt, were no longer commensurate with their newfound

¹⁹ George DuMaurier, Social Pictorial Satire (1898), p 135. With these words he opened his concluding chapter, a plea for the wider recognition of satirical illustration as a valid form of 'fine' art.
Although the aesthetic value of Gillray and Rowlandson's work was acknowledged, attempts were made again and again to dismiss the legacy of the broad mass of pre-Victorian graphic satire as a kind of youthful indiscretion - the adolescent scribblings of frustrated schoolboys. Even *Figaro in London*, which survived into the Victorian era and boasted the editorship of Gilbert Abbott à Beckett and Henry Mayhew (both of whom would eventually work for *Punch*) was tarred with the same brush of immaturity and scurrility by the end of the century. According to Everitt it had, "assumed from the outset a position which cannot fail to amuse the journalist and reader of the present day (1893)... the only excuse for this sort of thing is to be found in the fact that comic journalism, being then in its infancy, personal abuse was often mistaken for satire."  

Instead, the *Punch* circle warmly and enthusiastically embraced the world of the Academy, which had, at long last, opened its doors (socially, if not professionally) to its leading lights. And, as it did so, its contributors (and several of their peers working for rival journals) increasingly strove to define themselves in opposition to their predecessors. The world which they inhabited, wrote DuMaurier, was, "a very good world... a clean, honest, wholesome, innocent, intellectual, and most industrious British Bohemia, with lots of tobacco, lots of music, plenty of talk about literature and art, and not too much victuals or drink. Many of its denizens, that were, have become Royal Academicians or have risen to fame in other ways." 

---

20 As DuMaurier said of Leech, "In dress, bearing, manners and aspect, he was the the very type of the well-bred English gentleman and man of the world and good society... (he was) at home in the club, the drawing room, and the hunting-field, in Piccadilly and the park;... a normal Englishman of the upper middle classes. *op.cit.*, pp.27 & 32. This statement directly associates 'respectability' with financial and social advancement arising from one's chosen profession - the "pursuit of economically-rational behaviour" which FML Thompson identifies as one of the defining characteristics of 'respectable' Victorian society. See The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830-1900 (1988), p. 65. Walter Houghton has also noted that, "the struggle for money in the middle class was complemented, and to a considerable extent motivated, by the struggle for social advancement." (*The Victorian Frame of Mind*(1957) p.185), while Diana Sachko-Macleod has emphasised that,"Victorian art cannot be understood independently of its relationship to money. Money... held the symbol of a new cultural identity, while to the artist it represented freedom and equality." *Art and the Victorian Middle Classes; Money and the Making of Cultural Identity*(1996), p.1. As will become clear, such considerations were outside the experience of most graphic satirists of the 1830s.


will become clear, however, many of the satirists of the 1830s were more closely linked - both in spirit and in the milieu which they inhabited - to the world of metropolitan radicalism and grub street hackery than they were to the world of the Academy or the bohemian literati. And yet, by 1881, in Linley Sambourne’s cartoon (fig. 9) depicting that year’s R.A. banquet (more homage than parody in actual fact), Mr. Punch himself is conspicuously situated within the Academy, his image hanging on a wall directly behind the head of its president, Sir Frederick Leighton. He is present as both the figurehead of the magazine and the representative of its social circle. Henry Blackwood, however (who, as author of the annual Academy Notes, might have expected unhindered access), is reduced to peering at the proceedings from outside the doorway, under the watchful eye of the Metropolitan Police.

Everitt described the newfound ‘maturity’ of Victorian graphic satire in quite literal terms, equating it chronologically with the death of George IV and the accession of his brother William to the nation’s throne in 1830. It was as if the old ‘Dandy of Sixty’ - so closely associated with the Georgian tradition of caricature (as both connoisseur and victim) had taken all the vulgarity and lewdness with him to his grave, leaving the path clear for a more ‘worthy’ and temperate successor:

“As the century passed out of its infancy and attained the maturer age of thirty years, a gradual and almost imperceptible change came over the spirit of English graphic satire. The coarseness and suggestiveness of the old caricaturists gradually disappeared, until at length in 1830, an artist arose who was destined to work a complete revolution in the style and manner of English caricature. This artist was John Doyle - the celebrated H.B. He it was that discovered that pictures might be made mildly diverting without actual

---

24 The debt which Victorian graphic satire owes to the conventions of nineteenth-century academic painting is considerable, and worthy of a lengthy study in its own right. There is not room to expand upon the issue here, although the most cursory glance through the pages of the late Victorian Punch will make quite clear the distance between the genuinely caricatural mode of the Golden Age and the restrained realism of Tenniel, DuMaurier and others. As Michel Jouve has pointed out, it was precisely the exaggeration of caricature - its distance from the academic ideal - which made it so difficult to accept as a ‘legitimate’ art form. As he puts it, caricature, “pierces the screen of appearances and social or aesthetic conventions in order to reveal the ugliness which is more or less hidden beneath them.” L’Age D’Or de la Caricature Anglaise, (1983), p. 79. Jouve’s book remains a vital key to understanding the differences (and the links) between academic art and graphic satire. See especially pp.163-84. For a discussion of the role played by illustrated art magazines in shaping the taste of the Victorian public (and in familiarising them with the conventions of academic painting), see Helene E. Roberts, ‘Exhibition and Review: the Periodical Press and the Victorian Art Exhibition System’ in Shattock & Wolff eds., The Victorian Periodical Press (1992), pp. 79-107.
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coarseness or exaggeration; and when this fact was accepted, the art of caricaturing underwent a complete transition and assumed a new form.\textsuperscript{25} In other words, it was felt that caricature - if that term could still be applied to what became, in Doyle's hands, quite literal representations of the political figures of the day\textsuperscript{26} - suddenly achieved 'respectability' just at the moment when the government of the nation stood poised to pass from a corrupt, debauched, and self-interested ruling elite to an increasingly politically-conscious, literate and - more importantly - productive middle or lower-middle class. As the balance of power shifted, so too did the manner in which it should be represented - so ran the argument. Temperance, restraint, responsibility and realism would become the norm, rather than debauchery, scatology, libel and exaggeration. Unfortunately, this formulation reduced the entirety of 1830s graphic satire to the work of Doyle alone. And Doyle, it was emphasised, "While claiming for himself the character of a pictorial satirist... (was) all throughout anxious to impress upon you that he repudiated the notion of being considered a caricaturist in the Johnsonian meaning of the word."\textsuperscript{27} The work of other artists, however, is passed over - especially that which was more directly representative of contemporary radical culture.

Doyle was the first nineteenth-century visual satirist to deliberately divorce the caricatural mode from graphic satire, and to introduce a very conscious element of academic classicism into his figural compositions (\textit{fig.10}).\textsuperscript{28} His \textit{Political Sketches} (beginning in 1828) were undoubtedly the epitome of 'respectable' and responsible political commentary and, although deeply unfashionable today, his influence was felt throughout the nineteenth century, long after he himself was largely forgotten. And yet his was by no means the only mode of satirical imagery which emerged in the 1830s. The fact that it is often remembered as such is largely because it was a product of the dominant culture of the period. It was preserved and celebrated in the middle class press from the outset (\textit{The Times} in


\textsuperscript{26} As Ernst Kris and Ernst Gombrich have pointed out, "the caricaturist... does not seek the perfect \textit{form} but the perfect \textit{deformity}, thus penetrating through the mere outward appearance to the inner being in all its littleness or ugliness." See 'Principles of Caricature' in \textit{The British Journal of Medical Psychology}, No.17 (1938), pp.319-42 (p.322). With Doyle, however, it is all 'outward appearance'.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p.240.

\textsuperscript{28} For a useful overview of Doyle's work, see G.M. Trevelyan, \textit{The Seven Years of William IV; A Reign Caricatured by John Doyle} (1952).
particular devoting extensive space to describing each new batch of HB's prints), so its history was documented from a very early stage.29

This holds true even more so for the history of *Punch* and its contributors. The men who produced it were celebrities in their own right, enormously active in the social and cultural life of the metropolis (and, by extension, of the nation). Their biographies were written, and their reputations cemented, by their peers, who included such luminaries as Frith, Millais, Ruskin, John Martin, and Marion Spielmann, the last of whom, as editor of *The Magazine of Art*, was instrumental in establishing the perception of *Punch* as a national institution - a role he amply fulfilled with his monumental *History of Punch* in 1895.30 The *Strand Magazine* hailed Tenniel as "the greatest cartoonist the world has ever produced" and Charles Keene as "the greatest artist" ever to work for *Punch*31 (a compliment which placed him above even Millais, who had contributed two designs to the journal in the 1860s).32 Ruskin was even more effusive in his praise for Tenniel, who he claimed, "has much of the largeness and symbolic mastery of the imagination which belongs to the great leaders of classic art: in the shadowy masses and sweeping lines of his great compositions, there are tendencies which might have won his adoption into the school of Tintoret."33

However, work which existed (and defined itself) in opposition to the mode inaugurated by Doyle - aesthetically, formally and ideologically - was destined for a very different fate. The stylistic 'crudeness', density of text, and overtly anti-authoritarian stance which characterised the products of lower-class radical satire in particular (fig.5) meant that they could not hope to achieve the same level of cultural status as their middle class contemporaries (and almost certainly had no desire to do so). This work was simply too 'ugly' - too abrasive - for the middle class sensibility. For commentators such Thackeray, writing in the 1830s, these

29 BMC, Vol.XI, p.xlvi
30 Marion Spielmann, *The History of Punch* (1895)
31 J.Holt Schooling, 'A Peep into Punch' in *The Strand Magazine*, No.17 (1899), p.182 and no.18 (1899), p.376
33 John Ruskin, *The Art of England*, 2nd ed. (1887), p.195. Ruskin's praise for *Punch* and its artists was reciprocated by the magazine, which devoted considerable space to his achievements in the late nineteenth century. See Brian Malden, "Ruskin and 'Punch" in *VPW* Vol. XII, No.1, Spring 1979. Tastes have changed since Ruskin's time, however. As Tenniel's most recent biographer asked, "How could an artist capable of the vigour and inventiveness displayed in the illustrations to the Alice books also be responsible for reducing the vibrant tradition of Hogarth and Gillray to a cold, righteous Imperial Iconography?" Roger Simpson, *Sir John Tenniel; Aspects of His Work* (1994), p.9.
images were nothing more than "rude caricatures", suitable only for the semi-literate lower classes. Similarly, a moderate radical such as Francis Place was moved to voice his concern about the aggressive tone of C. J. Grant's illustrations for John Cleave's pro-Chartist broadsheet, *The London Satirist*, feeling that they lent the journal an air of disreputability which might be damaging to the movement's cause (fig.6). There was no-one to write the history of this material, nor that of the artists and wood engravers who produced it. A pioneer such as Charles Hindley, who collected and documented the publications of James Catnach (the notorious ballad seller of Seven Dials), was exceptional at the time, and must have appeared somewhat eccentric in his tastes, which, alas, did not extend to radical satirical prints, despite their occasional aesthetic and material similarities.

Even the biographies of the more prominent graphic satirists of the 1830s - in the years before the social clique of the *Punch* table was established - are lost to us. All we are left with are tantalising fragments and vague conjecture: C.J. Grant once lived near Gray's Inn Road; William Heath may have been a captain in the Dragoon Guards; Henry Heath may have been William's brother; 'Sharpshooter' may have been John Phillips; J. L. Marks was bribed by the Prince Regent to stop producing offensive prints; and so on. Of Robert Seymour we know a little more, although even his life is generally referred to only in relation to his suicide in 1836. Of all the artists active in the 1830s, only George Cruikshank's history has been traced in any detail.

---

36 Nevertheless, certain people were moved to preserve this type of material. The John Johnson Collection at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, contains several examples of radical caricature, while The British Museum owns a bound volume of 'Penny Political Prints'. This contains an almost complete run of Grant's *Political Drama*, and several series of a similar nature - some 220 prints in all. It seems reasonable to assume that they were collected by a single individual. For Hindley's work on Catnach, see Charles Hindley, *The Catnach Press*: A *Collection of the books and Woodcuts of James Catnach, Late of Seven Dials, Printer* (1869); *The Life and Times of James Catnach, Late of Seven Dials, Ballad- Monger* (1878); *The History of the Catnach Press, at Berwick-Upon-Tweed, Alnwick and Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, in Northumberland, and Seven Dials, London* (1866).
38 Henry G. Bohn, 'Biographical Notice' in *Seymour's Humorous Sketches* (1866).
39 The most recent (and comprehensive) account of Cruikshank's life being Robert Patten's monumental two volume study, cited in n.2.
On one level this lack of information is unimportant. We still have the work itself (or a considerable part of it) and this has to be of primary importance. But, from a very early stage, this biographical obscurity has been a barrier to any attempt at documenting the era’s visual satire. Doyle was already largely forgotten by the time of his death in 1868 (although his influence would endure), warranting only the briefest of obituaries in the *Times* - the paper which had so effusively celebrated each new batch of his *Political Sketches* in the ‘30s;*40* Grant was the subject of a single short notice in *Notes and Queries* in 1870, in which his obscurity was already the principal point of comment;*41* both Henry Heath and Marks seem to have evaded any critical or historical enquiry whatsoever until the final volumes of the *British Museum Catalogues* were prepared in the 1940s and ‘50s; and little, if anything, is known of the men who published their works beyond the addresses of their business premises.

But the reasons for the obscurity of graphic satire of the 1830s go further than biographical dead ends. It can be directly related to the new formats which were gradually being adopted during the period, and in particular the increasing emphasis on serialisation. This would have significant implications for the subsequent visibility of the material, and also for its perceived status as an area of visual culture. Quite apart from the opposing styles and tones which they adopted, the cultural status of both Georgian and Victorian graphic satire can be linked to the different formats which dominated in each respective period. The colourful, animated and visually stimulating tradition of Georgian caricature quickly established itself as part of an exclusive, connoisseurial print culture. Although single sheet satirical prints were frequently compiled and stored in albums by collectors, they also lent themselves well to prominent display in the context of a museum or gallery exhibition. This alone has given them a sense of permanence and legitimacy within the field of art history which the dusty, brittle and library-bound illustrated periodical has never been able to achieve, and has been one of the most important factors in the subsequent public reception and scholarly

---

*40* “The reputation of ‘the Political Sketches’ was... ephemeral, and considering their popularity and the eagerness with which they were brought up at the time, it is surprising how completely they have passed into oblivion. The name of HB, or of John Doyle, is now not only ‘caricature to the general’, but it is amazing how little until lately he was known to men not altogether ignorant on the subject of satirical art.” (Everitt, *op. cit.*, p.275.

*39* *Notes and Queries*, 4th series, v (1870), pp.209-10.
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treatment of these two distinct traditions.

From the late eighteenth century onwards, the single sheet print was exploited commercially as a colourful object of public display, attracting large crowds to the caricature exhibitions of Samuel Fores and William Holland, two of the leading caricature publishers of the day.42 But a periodical is a very different type of object, and presents specific difficulties in the context of museum display. This is especially so when a yearly or half-yearly sequence of a title has been bound into volumes (as was standard practice). While a single sheet print is easily framed and displayed in its entirety, a bound volume can only be placed in a case and opened at a single point, leaving the greater part of its contents invisible to the viewer. It can never be experienced as a whole.43 Thus, while binding undoubtedly preserves the individual issues, and redefines an ephemeral form into one with a greater degree of permanence, it reduces the status of the individual elements within each issue. As Beetham has pointed out, "a periodical, by definition, appears in single numbers separated by time. Putting several numbers into one bound volume changes all this, not least by suggesting that really the periodical is a kind of book and the numbers are incomplete sections of the whole. Putting covers round the pages has ensured that they survive, but the survival is bought at the price of the form of the text."44 This issue is especially significant when dealing with illustrated journals.

This was made quite apparent in 1889 - a century after the exhibitions of Fores and Holland - when a major exhibition entitled The Works of the English Humourists in Art opened in the West End at the Royal Institute of Painters in Watercolour on Piccadilly. The event itself was an important moment in the history of nineteenth-century graphic satire. As an end-of-the-century survey, its purpose was to define and establish an aesthetic hierarchy which would continue to influence responses to the artists it represented in the decades to follow. However, as is so often the case with such surveys, its bias was very much in favour of contemporary material - that which most immediately defined the era in which the exhibition took place. Its organising committee was a virtual 'who's who' of late Victorian graphic satirists.

---

42 Donald, op. cit., pp.3-4.
43 Indeed, exhibitions consisting solely of periodicals are very rare. The only exception to this rule in recent years has been Brian Maidment's small exhibition, Into the 1830's: Some Origins of Victorian Illustrated Journalism: Cheap Octavo Magazines and Their Influence, at Manchester Polytechnic Library in July 1992.
44 Beetham, loc.cit, p.23.
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and the same *cognoscenti* who were eager to elevate it to the status of a fine art (the title of the exhibition itself being a very conscious indication of this desire). It included men such as Marion Spielmann, F. C. Burnand, Fred Barnard, John Tenniel, Harry Furniss, James Sullivan, and Edward, George and Gilbert Dalziel (of the firm responsible for the wood-engravings in *Punch*). With this in mind, the choice of exhibits is inevitably revealing in terms of late nineteenth-century taste in graphic satire, and the very deliberate construction of hierarchies which characterised the period.

The exhibition was ambitious in scale, incorporating some 1400 exhibits, ranging from drawings and sketches, to prints, watercolours and oils, and it was accompanied by a lavish illustrated catalogue. The principal artists of *Punch* were, of course, very well represented, generally by more than fifty works each. These were mainly sketches and drawings, but also included some watercolours and, in the case of John Leech, several canvases from his 1862 Egyptian Hall exhibition, for which he had reworked a number of his most famous *Punch* cartoons into oil paintings. George Cruikshank, being the one artist who linked the Georgian and Victorian traditions - and whose long and enormously prolific career could not be ignored - was very well represented with over a hundred exhibits. However, Gillray and Rowlandson effectively became representative of the eighteenth-century tradition in its entirety. While they both warranted substantial displays, other major names such as Sayers and Townsend were passed over completely. The wider history of Golden Age satire was given scant notice, with Bunbury having only six exhibits, Isaac Cruikshank eight, and Newton only one. Even Hogarth - the father of English caricature - had only nine.

There is, however, another important point to stress about the choice of exhibits and what this suggested about the perceived value of the respective formats which

---

45 And for many other middle-class illustrated periodicals. For an account of the Dalzieles' contribution to expanding the parameters of Victorian visual culture, see George and Edward Dalziel, *The Brothers Dalziel: A Record of Fifty Years in Conjunction With Many of the Most Distinguished Artists of the Age* (1901)

46 *Exhibition of the English Humourists in Art*. Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours, Piccadilly, June 1889. The catalogue was sandwiched at either end by large advertisements for *The Art Journal*, the works of Ruskin, and several West End art dealers; a clear indication of the market for whom the organisers were expecting - or hoping - to cater.

47 See William Powell Frith, *John Leech: His Life and Work* (1891), Vol.II, pp.247-59, for a detailed account of Leech's efforts in oils and the public response to his Egyptian Hall exhibition. His own assessment of Leech's abilities in this respect is negative, and he concludes that, "I acknowledge myself to be one of those who thought the exhibition... did not increase Leech's reputation, though it happily did increase his own fortune." (p.251).
dominated satirical illustration in the Georgian and Victorian eras. While the artists of the Georgian era were represented almost entirely by printed works - single sheet prints - those of the nineteenth century, who made up by far the greatest part of the show, were conspicuously represented not by the actual print medium in which they established their reputations (the satirical periodical), but by drawings and watercolours. Even at this stage, then, a degree of reservation about the status of the periodical as an object of display was perceptible, despite the eulogistic claims being made about the artists whose work appeared within it. Thus, a pattern was established which effectively saw the periodical relegated to the world of the library or bookshelf, while the caricature print joined the legitimate ranks of the 'original' work of art. Paradoxically, therefore, while the format of the periodical had allowed the social and professional elevation of certain visual satirists, it had, at the same time, diminished and restricted the status of their work itself. It is perhaps inevitable, then, that the reputation of the 1830s - which even in the late nineteenth century was recognised as the period in which this transformation was effected - would suffer as a result. In fact, the entire decade was allotted a mere dozen exhibits in total: five each for Seymour and William Heath, and two for Robert Cruikshank. There was not a single work by Grant, Henry Heath, Marks or even - perhaps surprisingly - John Doyle. The period had effectively been erased from the history of graphic satire.

It is hoped that the present survey of satirical publications of the 1830s will go some way towards redressing this imbalance. The period is a fascinating one in terms of its transitional role in the development of English graphic satire, and has long deserved closer scrutiny. It has taken more than a century to do so, but at last we can examine this material afresh, and perhaps rethink the established notion that political caricature faded from view in 1832, and did not resurface until 1841. The creation of *Punch* was not an overnight phenomenon. Its success was made possible by a decade of experimentation and change within the trade, in which the conventions of satirical illustration had been slowly transformed by a developing relationship with the periodical press. The "Changing Spirit" of English caricature was related to format as much as it was to content.

48 In some ways, of course, it is wrong to talk about prints as 'original' works. However, within the connoisseurial world of print culture, notions of 'originality' can have different meanings. For a serious collector, there would be a world of difference between an 'original' Gillray print - one published by Hannah Humphrey immediately, or shortly after, it was completed (and before the artist's death in 1815) - and a re-edition of the same image, from the same plate, as published by Thomas McLean in 1830 or Henry Bohn in 1851. Such distinctions imply that an object's 'originality' is a relative, rather than an absolute, term.
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The Graphic Satire Trade in the 1830s; Geography and Social Status

The 1889 Royal Institute Exhibition can be seen as a symbolically significant event, as it resituated English graphic satire - as a profession, a commodity, and an art form - very firmly in the heart of London's West End. It took place a mere stone's throw from the Royal Academy's buildings at Burlington House, on one of the grandest thoroughfares of London's West End. This was the area of the metropolis which had dominated the caricature print trade during its Golden Age, when the publishing triumvirate of Humphrey, Fores and Holland was at its peak. Hannah Humphrey was based first in Bond Street, and later in St. James', William Holland moved westwards from Drury Lane to Oxford Street around 1782, and Samuel Fores had both a shop and a gallery on Piccadilly from about 1784 onwards.¹ The dominance of these shops during the late Georgian era followed on from caricature's development as a pastime associated with an aristocratic elite - the 'Grand Touring' classes - in the mid-eighteenth century.² Prior to this, the trade in satirical prints had been more firmly established in the old centres of the metropolitan printing and publishing industry around St. Paul's Churchyard and Fleet Street, many of whose shops had occupied the same sites since the seventeenth century. These premises had traditionally catered for the 'middling sort' - the tradesman and artisan classes - who occupied the same general area of the City, as opposed to the wealthier denizens of the West End who patronised the shops of Holland and Humphrey.

The move westwards, along the Strand, towards Westminster and the Court end of

¹ For a discussion of the geography of the trade in the golden Age, see Donald, op.cit., pp. 2-9, and Atherton, op.cit., pp. 2-24.
² At which point Matthew Darly had begun to etch and publish the earliest caricature drawings of George Townshend. Donald, op. cit., p.3; Herbert M. Atherton, 'George Townshend Revisited: The Politician as Caricaturist' in The Oxford Art Journal, 8:1, (1985), pp.3-19.
London signified a change in the role of, and principal audience for, graphic satire in the second half of the eighteenth century, and was instrumental in ushering in its Golden Age. The overtly political caricature print came to supplant the more broadly social satire of Laurie and Whittle's 'Drolls', Carrington Bowles' 'Postures' or the Darlys' 'Characters' and 'Macaronies' as the most important area of the expanding trade, both aesthetically and commercially. The old shops remained, of course, but the trade became more distinctly differentiated along socio-geographic lines. As one contemporary commentator put it, "Caricature shops are always besieged by the public, but it is only in Mrs. Humphrey's shop, where Gillray's works are sold, that you will find people of high rank, good taste and intelligence", thus directly associating the geographical location of the shop with the status of both product and audience. This was a differentiation which would continue well into the nineteenth century, when new retailers were still appearing in both areas, catering for very distinct markets. These ranged from Rudolph Ackermann's extraordinarily lavish 'Repository of Arts', which established itself on the Strand in 1798, selling (amongst many other things) the works of Rowlandson and Woodward, to Thomas Tegg's 'Apollo Library' on Cheapside which, in the early nineteenth century, issued cheap, poorly-coloured reissues from old, worn plates and reduced piracies of Gillray and others at half the price of the West End dealers.

By the 1830s, however, we find a direct reversal of this trend. The extension of the trade westwards (geographically) and upwards (socially) had reached its peak before the end of the Napoleonic wars and had given way to a gradual retraction, back towards St. Paul's, Chancery Lane and Cheapside. The 'old guard' of Golden Age publishers had all but died out by this stage. Fores issued a number of imitation HBs in the early '30's, but by 1832 even these had dwindled to a mere trickle, as he began to concentrate his efforts on sporting prints. George Humphrey issued his last caricature print around May 1831, his business finally being sold in 1835, prior to which he had been reduced to raising funds by selling off both Gillray's and Cruikshank's plates to Thomas McLean (although Marianne

5 As Donald points out, he also commissioned work from Rowlandson and Woodward, but these, "with their coarse humour and careless execution, are wholly distinguishable from the fine quality work which the same artists produced for Ackermann." op. cit., pp. 4-5. Tegg's activities are discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.
Humphrey continued to publish the occasional lithographic caricature well into the middle years of the decade from her shop in St. James' Street). Ackermann had long since turned his back on caricature, publishing a mere handful throughout the 1820s, while Holland and Hannah Humphrey were both long dead - the former passing away in 1816, the latter in 1818.

Before this time, as Eirewen Nicholson has pointed out at length, the conception of political caricature as a product of 'popular' culture did not reflect the reality of the trade as it existed at the time, and must be qualified; "Any delimitation of the publics of the political print must distinguish between the market and the larger public - the 'consumers' and 'spectators'." In other words, the consumption of what we think of as archetypal examples of Golden Age satire (from Gillray and Rowlandson to Newton and Woodward) - rather than the older tradition of the popular broadsheet - was limited to a social elite, with only a minority of the metropolitan public constituting the 'audience' at the print shop windows. By the 1830s, however, a thriving market for cheap illustrated literature of all descriptions had begun to develop. Although statistics are often unreliable and continuously debated by historians, it seems certain that literacy rates were increasing considerably during the early nineteenth century, and this was a trend which was

6 The BMC does not mention Marianne Humphrey, as she only appears to have begun issuing prints under her own name well after the British Museum Catalogues ended their survey. Nevertheless, the Prints and Drawings department of the BM possesses a number of prints she published in its collection of 'Supplementary Satires'.

7 She argues that this notion was based largely on the many (somewhat misleading) depictions and accounts of the social diversity of the crowds who gathered at print shop windows. Eirewen C. Nicholson, 'Consumers and Spectators: The Public of the Political Print in Eighteenth Century England' in *History*, 81/261 (1996), pp.5-21 (p.8).

8 Whether the term 'popular' is taken to indicate prevalence and approval amongst 'the people' (ie; the working classes), as E.P. Thompson or Richard Hoggart would have it, or whether it suggests a much broader public, being a term descriptive of size rather than social basis (for which 'mass' would seem more pertinent), the idea that Golden Age graphic satire was a 'popular' form is a spurious one. As Hoggart put it in *The Uses of Literacy* (1957), "I am inclined to think that books on popular culture often lose some of their force by not making sufficiently clear who is meant by 'the people'. And yet, with the average price for a coloured single sheet print being two shillings, we can see that its purchase was immediately restricted to a socio-economic elite, and not a 'popular' audience in any sense of the word. In deference to Hoggart, I will therefore state that whenever I use the term 'popular' (which will not be often), I am referring to a working-class audience. For further discussions of the terms 'popular' and 'mass', see Patricia Anderson, *op. cit.* (1991), pp.7-12 and Asa Briggs, "The Language of 'Mass' and 'Masses' in Nineteenth-Century England" in D.E. Thompson and D. Rubenstein eds., *Ideology and the Labour Movement* (1979), pp.62-83.
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The number of National Society schools alone had risen from 52 in 1812 to 3,670 by the beginning of the 1830s (bringing the number of pupils up from around eight and a half to three hundred and forty-six thousand). This factor, in combination with a slow but steady increase in disposable income amongst the lower classes, and the rapid growth of the printing industry in the early decade of the century, meant that the number of lower class 'consumers' was steadily increasing. Of course, the commodities they were buying bore little resemblance to those purchased by the middle and upper classes and, indeed, often defined themselves directly in opposition to them. As Patricia Anderson put it, "between 1830 and 1860, (the) growing (publishing) industry played a fundamental part in the first phase of a broad transformation: the unprecedented expansion of the cultural experience of the working people."13

The old style single sheet caricature print was dying out rapidly as the political climate of the nation itself entered a period of transition, although the resurgent radicalism of the early reform era saw the potential market for politically-motivated literature - including political caricature - expand rapidly. This coincided with the geographical movement of the trade away from the playground of the wealthy and

---

9 See R.K. Webb, 'Working Class Readers in Early Victorian England' in The English Historical Review, Vol.LXV (1950), pp. 333-51. He admits the difficulty in accurately estimating the size of the reading public, but says, "to equate illiteracy with ignorance, to mistake the lack of a habit of reading for the lack of an ability to read, are to make the upsurge in cheap popular literature and the deep concern over it to some degree smoke without fire." (p.334). "It would seem... that some degree of literacy must have been nearly universally diffused in the portion of the working class which made up the great political potential in England." (p.349). Barry Reay reaches a similar conclusion in 'The Context and Meaning of Popular Literacy: Some evidence from Nineteenth-Century Rural England' (in Past and Present No.131 (May 1991), pp.89-127). He argues that basing conclusions about 'literacy' solely on the ability to make one's mark can be misleading when trying to determine the actual number of working-class readers in the early nineteenth century. He stresses that many people who could not write could read. (pp.128-9). See also Patricia Anderson, "Factory Girl, Apprentice and Clerk": The Readership of Mass Market Magazines, 1830-60 in VPR, Vol.25 (1992), pp.64-72. For a good general overview of levels of literacy during the period, see Richard Attick, The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public (1957), esp. pp. 141-72.


11 Although, as F.M.L. Thompson has pointed out, the amount of disposable income - that which could be spent on leisure and entertainment - differed considerably between occupations. Nevertheless, by the 1820s and '30s, certain sections of the metropolitan industrial workforce were beginning to find the funds for seaside holidays. Similarly, the better-paid East End artisans and 'Cockney Clerks' were taking trips to Gravesend by paddle steamer in the '20s, and some were even making it as far as Margate by the following decade. op. cit., p.289.

12 In 1824 there were around 316 letterpress printers in London, while by 1850 there were about 500. The introduction of mechanised paper-making (in 1803), the steam-powered press (1814) and four-cylinder stereotype printing (1827) all contributed to the increase in illustrated periodical literature during the early nineteenth century. Louis James points out that the introduction of iron frame presses more than doubled the production rates of the old wooden presses, which had printed at best a hundred impressions an hour. op. cit. (1976), p.17; See also Michael Twyman, Printing, 1770-1970 (1970), pp.50-66

towards the domain of the aspirant lower and middle classes, who - it was thought at the time - stood poised to see their demands for the extension of the franchise and parliamentary reform realised. This shift itself took place alongside (and was, perhaps, to some extent facilitated by) contemporary developments in printing technology, which served both to stimulate and satisfy a demand for high circulation, economically-accessible products. It is therefore unsurprising that the radical press - which eagerly seized upon the rhetorical power and visual immediacy of satirical imagery - would be concentrated within the traditional centres of the old metropolitan print trade, in close proximity to its principal audience.

Dorothy George lists more than 80 printsellers who published satirical prints in one form or another between 1828 and 1832, but the vast majority of these issued only one or two caricatures as such (as far as we are now aware), and many had ceased activity entirely by 1830. The distribution of the most important printers and publishers of satirical imagery (whether print or periodical) during the 1830s is shown in Maps 1-3 at the beginning of Volume Two. Graphic satire, however, generally constituted only a single aspect of their wider commercial interests. The only publishers who continued to produce the traditional type of single sheet satirical prints (as opposed to illustrated periodicals or wood-engraved prints) in any quantity after this date were Fairburn, Gans, Humphrey, King, McLean, Marks and Tregear. In purely quantitative terms, McLean was far and away the most active of these, issuing close to three hundred prints between 1830 and 1832 (quite apart from the monthly issues of The Looking Glass, each of which consisted of four printed pages). His status during the 1830s led, at one stage, to a comparison with Philipon in Paris, although any similarities between the two are cursory at best. Like Philipon, McLean dominated the most prominent artists of the period (those, at least, whose audience was situated in the privileged middle classes); he was a pioneer of the satirical periodical; and he was quick to embrace lithography as the principal medium in which he published. Beyond that, however, the similarities cease. Both were, without question, enormously astute businessmen, but in ideological terms their differences were reflected quite

15 Ibid., pp.i-iii.
16 For a comprehensive account of Philipon's activities, see James Cuno, Charles Philipon and La Maison Aubert: The Business, Politics and Public of Caricature in Paris, 1820-1840 (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1985)
distinctly in the material they published. Philipon courted controversy throughout
the 1830s, waging a campaign in print against the repressive regime of Louis
Philippe, the intensity of which would see it characterised as “La Guerre de
Philipon à Philippe” - a phrase which spoke demonstrably of the perceived potency
of the printing press in terms analogous to those being used by the radical
unstamped press in England during the same period. McLean, however, could
not have been further removed from the world of the Unstamped, and - even
though Seymour provided designs for both Figaro and Asmodeus in London
during the same period in which he was illustrating McLean's Monthly Sheet of
Caricatures - he clearly kept a very tight rein on the material his artists created. He
even went to the extent of imposing his own identity on their work (see Chapter
Four), and maintained a resolutely non-partisan stance throughout the Reform
years and beyond.

No doubt McLean was conscious of the potential precariousness of his position.
As the market for satirical imagery broadened, and found homes in a variety of
different formats, lines of distinction were increasingly being drawn within the trade
along social and ideological lines. The very act of reading and looking at images
took on new patterns of association which publishers had to take into account.
The unstable domestic political situation (as well as the memory of the recent
revolutions in Europe), combined with the growth of the press and the reading
public in the early nineteenth century, created two distinct markets for political
satire: one decidedly conservative, the other overtly radical. Whereas Golden Age
satire had - generally speaking - been divided along party lines, while maintaining
its core audience within a single social group, that of the 1830s was increasingly
differentiated in terms of class - as well as political - orientation, a phenomenon
which finds expression in the geographical distribution of the trade at the time.

By 1830, McLean was the only important publisher of satirical prints still operating
in the West End. From his shop at the north end of Haymarket he sold illustrated
books, sporting prints, and the non-political portrait prints of John Doyle (who was
able to maintain two distinct creative identities - the other as HB - well into the

17 James, op.cit. (1976), pp.17-18. For details of the unstamped press see Chapters Six and Eight, Hollis
(op.cit.) and Wiener (op.cit.).
1930s, before the link between the two was discovered). His business was based upon a carefully considered combination of tradition and innovation. He maintained a sense of the old exclusivity of the West End dealers in the production and sale of his publications, but drastically tempered the visual exuberance and political partisanship of Golden Age caricature in favour of a broadly conservative, deliberately inoffensive, and aesthetically-restrained form of commentary. The purpose of this was to attract the widest possible audience within the sector of the market he was courting, and to sustain his claim that he enjoyed, "the patronage of the very highest classes of society". His pre-eminence within this particular market gave him access to the most prominent artists of the late 1820s and early '30s. William Heath, Doyle, Theodore Lane and Robert Seymour all published extensively with him, while even Grant - who would go on to become the most anti-authoritarian caricaturist of the 1830s - produced at least four single sheet prints for him in 1830-31. But McLean’s most significant contribution to graphic satire came in terms of the formats with which he experimented rather than their content as such.

After 1832, however, McLean’s position within the industry began to decline along with the traditions which he represented - a change which was broadly indicative of the wider movements within the industry as a whole. As stated earlier, the early 1830s has generally been perceived as a period of decline in the history of English graphic satire and, for those publishers (such as McLean) who represented the last remnants of the trade as it had existed in the Golden Age, this is quite accurate. By the mid-'30s the quality of his caricature prints - even those of HB - had declined perceptibly. Many of them appeared unsigned, and it seems that he may have been relying increasingly on amateurs (or, at least, people less familiar with the conventions of graphic satire). But a very definite distinction can be drawn between the older tradition and that which emerged in the 1830s, which, although removed both socially and geographically from Golden Age satire was, for a few


20 Thomas McLean, An Illustrative Key to the Political Sketches of H.B., Vol.II (1844). This statement would seem to be commensurate with his shop's location in the heart of the West End, but it should be remembered that, although a respectable business address, Haymarket was also one of the centres of metropolitan prostitution. Lynda Nead calls it, "The symbolic locus of London's midnight prostitution" (Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London (2000), pp.65, 98, 107-8). Hippolyte Taine commented on the incongruity of so many prostitutes working on such a grand street: "The deplorable procession in the shade of the monumental street is sickening... That is a plague-spot - the real plague-spot - of English Society." Cited in Francis Sheppard, London, 1808-1870; The Infernal Wen (1971), p. 367. See also James Winter, London's Teeming Streets, 1830-1914 (1983), p.115.
brief years, in the ascendant, and constituted a unique area of nineteenth-century print culture.

This new tradition was concentrated not in the exclusive print and bookshops of the West End, but formed a part of the rapidly expanding market for cheap literature which had its focus in the broad area stretching eastwards from Covent Garden and Lincoln's Inn Fields, along Holborn (to the north), and Fleet Street (to the south), towards the network of small streets and lanes surrounding St. Paul's Churchyard and Cheapside. Within this area could be found the principal publishers, printers and writers of the un stamped press, as well as many of the most important publishers of penny-issue fiction. James Catnach, leading light of the thriving trade in street literature - murder sheets, broadside ballads, and the occasional political print (including plagiarisms of William Heath) - was also based nearby, at Seven Dials, just north of Covent Garden, until his death in 1841.

Within this broad area, two locations had particular significance. The first of these was the area around St. Paul's Cathedral, and in particular the concentration of Strange, Steill and Dawson in Paternoster Row, Lacey in St. Paul's Churchyard itself, and Fairburn a short distance to the West on Ludgate Hill. William Strange had been a bookseller in the area since 1822 (at which point he was in partnership with George Cowie, who would go on to publish The Devil in London in 1832), and in the early '30s he was the publisher of several unstamped papers, chief amongst them being Figaro in London. Benjamin Steill had been the publisher of T.J.Wooler's famous radical journal The Black Dwarf in 1817, and moved to Paternoster Row in 1828, where he also published several unstamped journals, including The Caricaturist - an illustrated satirical folio sheet - in 1832. Thomas Dawson published a range of lithographic satirical prints in the mid-1830s (he was himself a lithographic printer) as parts of periodically-issued series such as The Reflector, Dawson's Magic and Whim-Whams (all 1835). In 1835 he moved to 54, Leicester Square, where he took over the business of John Kendrick after the

---

23 Much of the information about printers and publishers given over the next three pages was drawn from W. B. Todd, A Dictionary of Printers and Others in Allied Trades, London and Vicinity, 1800-1840 (1972)
24 Thackeray, for one, was particularly scathing about the kind of material available in Paternoster Row. In 'Half a Crown's Worth of Cheap Knowledge', he explicitly associated the area with the "radical spouters" who, throughout the 1830s, had produced unstamped periodicals, expressly critical of the government and the norms of 'respectable' middle class society. loc.cit., pp.305-6.
latter's death. Edward Lacey, of 76, St. Paul's Churchyard, published a number of lithographic caricature prints which bore some similarity to those of Dawson, who was operating just around the corner on Paternoster Row. And finally there was John Fairburn, who for some years had made a speciality of pornographic and strongly anti-clerical works (often obscene, many of which were translated from French or adapted from seventeenth-century texts), and had been one of the most active publishers of single sheet political prints throughout the 1820s. By 1831, however, his productivity in this area had dwindled considerably, although he still issued the occasional print by artists (such as Grant) who had clearly-defined radical sympathies. He was one of a family of printers, publishers and booksellers active in London in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The second area of importance stretched southwards from the western edge of Lincoln's Inn Fields to the eastern end of the Strand. It was here that the main publishers of the wood-engraved radical print series were based: George Drake in Clare Market; Edward Lloyd on Wych Street; and William Chubb in Holywell Street. Other publishers of similar material included John Duncombe, who had a shop on Little Queen Street, and Benjamin Cousins, who operated from premises on Duke Street. It is a wonderful piece of irony that the publishers of some of the most anti-authoritarian literature and imagery of the period should have been situated alongside two of the most potent symbolic sites of law and moral order in the country - the Law Courts and St. Paul's. And no doubt this was not lost on men such as Drake, Chubb and Strange, whose publications demonstrated an explicit desire to subvert precisely these authorities. Indeed, one of the key symbolic figure-types of radical satire since the time of Peterloo had been the clerical magistrate, in whom the functions of both law and religion were embodied, and Drake in particular published numerous attacks on their numbers - the most powerful of them by Grant - from his shop at the edge of Lincoln's Inn, which must have given him particular satisfaction.25

Drake's most important publication during the period was his long-lived series *The Political Drama* (illustrated for the most part by Grant), which ran for 131 issues between 1833 and 1835, although he published many other wood-engraved single sheets, all with pronounced radical sympathies. He was especially astute at

---

identifying any powerful images published by his contemporaries as single sheets and translating them into wood-engraved versions, sold at a penny a time. From 1835 onwards, Edward Lloyd was the most important publisher of cheap serial fiction, written specifically for the new lower class reading public, much of it provided by Thomas Peckett Prest, whose abilities as a general literary hack would establish Lloyd's fortune. 

"Strongly imbued with liberal opinions" from the age of fourteen, he made a number of attempts at launching unstamped periodicals, but was soon stopped in his tracks by the stamp office. In 1836, though, he managed to publish several issues of *Lloyd's Political Jokes*, a series of wood-engraved caricature prints, similar in spirit and format to Drake's *Political Drama*. Likewise, Chubb, a "quasi-pornographic grub street entrepreneur" branched out from his wider interests to become another of the most important publishers of wood-engraved penny prints, including the eighteen issues of *John Bull's Picture Gallery* which appeared in 1832. He combined his publishing interests with a printing business at 46, Holywell Street - an area which, by the 1830s, had become synonymous with the trade in pornographic literature - from which he produced books, pamphlets, catalogues, bills, cards and other ephemera. In November 1830, Francis Place wrote to John Cam Hobhouse about, "a fellow named Chubb, a vagabond pamphlet-seller in Holywell Street (who) knows as well as any man can know how the vulgarity feel; he is acquainted with a magnitude of vagabonds who are fit for any mischief." This is an evocative description, which emphasises just how far removed this sector of the printing industry was from the more rarefied world of McLean and Doyle. Their *Political Sketches* were based on the notion that the pseudonymous 'HB' had some degree of 'inside' knowledge of Parliament, whereas the publishers and artists of the penny prints were far more likely to emphasise their complete exclusion from the political process.

Benjamin Cousins was yet another of the printers and publishers of the Unstamped who turned, at some point during their careers, to publishing satirical imagery of one kind or another. Between 1832 and 1848 he occupied his shop on Duke

---

27 McCallman, op cit., p. 165.
28 ibid., pp. 217-18. See also Lynda Nead, op.cit., for a detailed history of the street and its association with the trade in pornography. She emphasises that, "for Victorian London, Holywell Street and obscenity were synonymous", and quotes several contemporary accounts; one describing it as, "a narrow, dirty lane... occupied chiefly by old clothesmen and the vendors of low publications", another as, "the most vile street in the civilised world, every shop almost teeming with the most indecent publications and prints. (p.105).
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Street, from which he issued a number of penny prints in the mid-'30s. But his principal contribution to the field of graphic satire would come rather later. After the almost complete collapse of the unstamped press in June 1836, he was one of several publishers who turned to the broadsheet format, with his pro-Chartist Penny Satirist (also illustrated in part by Grant), which survived from 1837 to 1846. His association with Grant led to a brief revival of The Political Drama, a new series of which he began to publish in 1841, although this incarnation was not as successful as Drake's, apparently lasting for only two dozen issues or so. Unsurprisingly, the two publishers seem to have known one another well, with Cousins acting as witness for Drake when he registered his press under the Seditious Societies Act in 1832.

John Duncombe, of Little Queen Street, was an important publisher of the new sensationalistic 'bon ton' or 'crim. con' periodicals characteristic of the period (his Quizzical Gazette ran from 1831-2), the most famous of which was Renton Nicholson's The Town (1837-42). He also published numerous sixpenny 'songsters' - collections of bawdy songs - and an enormous number of scripts from the popular theatre and melodrama. He had been a prominent publisher of single sheet satire throughout the 1820s, and his Comical Fits and Fancies (1831) was one of the earliest attempts at serially-issued single sheet satire in the '30s. However, Duncombe's most significant contribution to the world of graphic satire during this period came after he met the young Douglas Jerrold in the late 1820s. He hired him as a hack writer and introduced him to Laman Blanchard and Kenny Meadows, together with whom Jerrold edited and wrote for the short-lived

30 See Wiener, op. cit., pp.260-277. The stamp tax was reduced to a penny In June 1836, but this apparent concession was accompanied by much stricter powers of control, as well as widening the definition of 'newspapers' to include pamphlets and tracts. The mere possession of an unstamped paper became a prosecutable offence. These conditions made it virtually impossible for the Unstamped to continue, and the majority of such titles disappeared almost overnight.

31 The survival of The Penny Satirist - which, selling at a penny, was still an unstamped paper - implies that it was able to define itself outside outside the realm of the statute, and was not classified as a 'newspaper' as such.

32 Todd, op. cit., p.60.

33 Nicholson (1809-1861) was an intriguing figure in the publishing trade during the 1830s who, unfortunately, is only peripherally related to this study. Known as the 'Lord Chief Baron', he was a colourful figure on the metropolitan scene, best known as founder of the 'Judge and Jury Society' in 1841, which held mock trials. Nicholson himself would take the role of judge, with a mixture of MPs, peers, poets, statesmen and actors making up the jury. The Town survived from 1837 to 1842, and was notorious for its 'scandalous' content. He also published a short-lived series entitled Cockney Adventures and Tales of London Life, which reprinted the 'racy' stories from The Town, with illustrations by Grant. The best accounts of his activities can be found in Celina Fox, op. cit., pp. 140-44 and Donald Gray, 'Early Victorian Scandalous Journalism: Renton Nicholson's The Town' (1837-42) in Shattock & Wolff eds. (1982), pp.317-4 although he also produced his own account - The Lord Chief Baron: An Autobiography - in 1860.
periodical *Punch in London* (of which Duncombe published sixteen issues in 1832), the first of the many responses to the success of *Figaro in London* (see Chapter Seven). Duncombe himself was a prominent member of the metropolitan literary bohemian life from which *Punch* would eventually emerge in the early 1840s, which included men such as Thomas and Henry Mayhew, George Augustus Sala, Henry Vizetelly and Blanchard Jerrold. The clubbish, homo-social nature of this branch of the community was one of the most significant characteristics of the trade during the period and would remain resistant to any feminine 'interference' for the greater part of the Victorian era.

The broad area in which this element of the caricature trade was based was bordered at its eastern and western extremities by the shops of Gabriel Shire Tregear (at 123 Cheapside - “Where Caricatures are Pubd. at half price!”) and S. Gans (on Southampton Street, between Covent Garden and the Strand). Between them, they dominated the trade in single sheet caricatures in the area during the period 1830-32. Grant, 'Sharpshooter', and Henry Heath worked for both of them extensively throughout these years. Gans was also one of the most prolific publishers of imitations of the ‘Paul Pry’ prints which William Heath had produced for McLean in the late 1820s, but he disappears from view after 1832. Tregear, on the other hand, went on to become one of the main publishers of serially-issued single sheet prints in the middle years of the decade, including a lithographic version of Grant’s *Political Drama* (1833-35), which was being published concurrently by Drake in its longer-lived wood engraved version.

Charles Tilt's shop was situated almost exactly mid-way between Tregear and Gans, at 86 Fleet street. Although he published many illustrated books, almanacks

---

35 Who in 1832 edited *Asmodeus in London*, another of the imitations of *Figaro*, published by George Cowie at 312, the Strand, not far from Holywell Street.
36 Indeed, the only significant attempt by a woman to produce a comic periodical during the 1830s was *The Comic Offering; Or Ladies' Melange of Mirth* (1831-35), by Louisa Henrietta Sheridan. Despite its genteel, inoffensive, and thoroughly 'Proper' content, the publication suffered considerable resistance from the middle class press, largely as a result of Sheridan's gender, with frequent aspersions being cast about her propriety. Humour, it was felt, was an inappropriate genre for a lady to pursue: Tamara L. Hunt, 'Louisa Henrietta Sheridan's *Comic Offering* and the Critics: Gender and Humor in the Early Victorian Era' in *VPR*, Vol.29 (1996), pp.124-45. For another account of the (often Diminished) role played by women in the world of Victorian graphic satire, see David Kujvle, 'Maria Duval and Ally Sloper' in *History Workshop Journal* No. 21 (1986), pp. 132-40.
37 As emphasised on several of the prints he published in 1833; a clear indication of the market he was serving.
and "Works connected with Fine Arts &c.», he was most notable for being George Cruikshank's principal publisher for much of the decade, as well as for importing prints, including many caricatures, from France. He also published a number of Henry Heath's 'Scrapshell' collections and important illustrated annuals such as _Hood's Comic Annual_ (1831-34) and _The Comic Almanack_ (1835-53, the very first plate of which contains a depiction of both shop and proprietor by Cruikshank, (fig.11)). The broad range of his activities during the '30s is representative of the expansion of graphic satire beyond the confines of the single sheet print.

Based just around the corner from Tilt's shop, Edward King of Chancery Lane was another specialist in copies of Heath's 'Paul Pry' prints (as well as some of his more recent works), but is more noteworthy for his publication of _The Caricaturist_, an early imitation of _The Looking Glass_ illustrated by C.J. Grant. Costing only half the price of its model, however (1s.6d plain), it was explicitly marketed - in direct contrast to McLean's ideals - as "the cheapest work of the kind" and is illustrative of the way in which established formats were increasingly being adapted to satisfy the expectations of different audiences.

Perhaps more important in this regard was John Kendrick, the one publisher who - geographically - falls outside the established pattern. His shop in Leicester Square was closer to the exclusive dealers of the West End than it was to the centres of radicalism and cheap fiction further east (being almost literally just around the corner from McLean's shop on Haymarket). His publications constituted a kind of mid-point between the two, demonstrating moderate radical tendencies and imitating popular forms such as novelty almamacks. His chief contribution to the period was _Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine_ (1834-5), another multi-panel lithographic periodical in _The Looking Glass_ mould (again by Grant) which survived for 39 fortnightly issues. Kendrick, however, was only able to publish the first twenty-four issues before he died in December 1834, at which point his stock and the greater part of his business interests were taken over by Dawson, who had previously been based in Paternoster Row.

The area in which the graphic satire trade now had its focus was - significantly - also one of the principal centres of metropolitan radicalism (the other being Finsbury to the north). Having been in decline throughout the 1820s, radical

---

38 As stated in a list of publications appended to a copy of _Hood's Comic Annual_, 1831.
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culture was being actively revived in the early ‘30s by the prospect of electoral reform, and would be carried on to the end of the decade by the emergence of the Chartist movement, before the focus of radical activity shifted decisively to the industrial centres of the north.\(^{39}\) Many of the most prominent figures of radical society operated in this milieu: Robert Weddeburn held profane mock services at his ‘Infidel Chapel’ in White’s Alley, just off Chancery Lane;\(^{40}\) Henry Hetherington was based in Kingsgate, Holborn;\(^{41}\) John Cleave, the prominent Chartist publisher, had a bookshop in Shoe Lane, between Fleet Street and Holborn; William Benbow, one of the most extreme members of the National Union of the Working Classes had a bookshop on Castle Street, adjacent to Leicester Square, and a coffee shop at Temple Bar; while the Rotunda was located close to Blackfriars Bridge, just south of the point where Fleet Street meets Ludgate Hill.\(^{42}\) Described as, “one of the great theatres of popular radicalism in the early 1830s,”\(^{43}\) it was here that Benjamin Cousins and many other young pressmen of the Unstamped served their political apprenticeships, while Hetherington and James Watson used it as a base to organize the NUWC. The notorious republican, atheist, and radical printer Richard Carlile preached infidel sermons there with the Rev. Robert Taylor,\(^{44}\) and Eliza Macaulay and Eliza Sharples regularly used it as a forum for their lectures on feminism.

It was in this milieu that many of the period’s graphic satirists and publishers were moving. The publications of Drake, Chubb and others directly reflect the influence of this area of radical culture and society, which often had a direct relationship to the images they produced. As will be seen in Chapter Eight, radical caricature - especially during the mid 1830s, when the ‘War of the Unstamped’ was at its peak -


\(^{40}\) An ex-Methodist and one of the most notorious Spencean radicals, who styled himself as ‘the Devil’s Chaplain’ and ‘Primate of All Hell’.

\(^{41}\) Founder of \textit{The Poor Man’s Guardian}, (1831-35) one of the most important of the unstamped papers, and a rallying point for the cause of press freedom.

\(^{42}\) The symbolic centre point of radical and republican activity in the period between the July Revolution of 1830 and the Great Reform Bill of 1832.

\(^{43}\) McCalman, \textit{op. cit.}, p.231

\(^{44}\) Taylor was one of numerous Spenceans, deists, republicans and freethinkers who made an impact in metropolitan radical circles: he was a former Anglican vicar, who lost his faith (although he did not share Carlile’s atheism), and began to organise theological and political discussions, criticisms and blasphemous ‘services’ at the Rotunda amongst other places. Along with Carlile he was imprisoned for his activities in 1831, after which they quarrelled and Taylor allied himself with Benbow, who became his publisher. Gareth Stedman Jones, \textit{Radical Artisans in England and France, 1830-1870} (1997), pp.254-5
developed a strongly self-referential character, both as a source for emotive and powerfully resonant subject matter, but also as a means of fostering a sense of community within radical society itself.\footnote{Celina Fox has drawn attention to this aspect of radical satire in her article, 'Political Caricature and the Freedom of the Press' in G. Boyce, J. Curran and P. Wingate eds., \textit{Newspaper History} (1978), pp.226-46.} The representation of real events, and the frequent references to familiar publications, lent a renewed sense of veracity to this form of graphic satire, and linked it directly to the publishers of the Unstamped.

Several publishers within this milieu also formed a link between the worlds of popular radicalism and pornographic literature. While the majority of 'respectable radicals' - foremost among them being Francis Place - condemned the publication of pornography, several prominent publishers of obscene and scandalous works also issued political prints in the years around the Great Reform Bill. Some of these had been active in the radical press for a decade or more, having been important players in the drama surrounding the Queen Caroline affair of 1820-21. Fairburn, Duncombe and Chubb, in particular, were instrumental in carrying on the tradition of scandalous and titillating literature which had thrived during the Regency period and the 1820s, publishing numerous shilling editions of prurient 'memoirs' of courtesans (generally either plagiarised or fictitious).\footnote{McCalman, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 205-6, 222.} A number of young radical printers and publishers of the '20s were agents for the numerous bawdy and sensationalistic 'bon ton' and 'crim. con.' periodicals, which carried the tradition of scurrilous radical journalism of the Regency period into the early Victorian era.\footnote{\textit{Ibid}, pp. 219-221.} Chief amongst these were Strange and Cousins, the first of whom was especially prone to issuing obscene works, and as late as 1857 was prosecuted for selling prurient periodicals such as \textit{Women of London} and the latest incarnation of \textit{Paul Pry} (works which the presiding judge, Lord Campbell, described as "obscene and disgusting.").\footnote{\textit{Ibid}, p. 221.} Similarly, men such as Jack 'Mad' Mitford (the gin-soaked down-and-out radical intellectual, hack writer, and Regency-era pornographic journalist), J. L. Marks and William Benbow, lived and worked in the area well into the 1830s.\footnote{Marks having moved his premises from Covent Garden to Long Lane, Smithfield, in 1832, while Benbow kept a bookshop in Castle Street from 1822 onwards. For Marks' and Benbow's pornographic publications see McCalman, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.166-69, 205-11 & 115-17.}

Marks (whose earliest prints date from 1814) had been one of the most interesting
radical caricaturists of the 1820s until his temporary disappearance from the field in 1826. He re-emerged during the 'Days of May' in 1832 to self-publish several series of penny prints - etched, lithographed and wood-engraved (such as The Chronologist, Marks's New Caricaturist and Marks's New Comic Scraps) from his premises in Long Lane, Smithfield. This was another area with strong associations in the history of metropolitan radicalism, having been the scene of looting and rioting in 1816, as well as hosting one of the largest of the political rallies addressed by Henry Hunt in 1819. This event had been depicted in a print by Charles Williams - The Smithfield Parliament - which portrayed Hunt as an ass, and the Smithfield radicals as a crowd of cows, pigs, sheep and horses, in a derogatory allusion to the proximity of the capital's largest cattle market.50

Thus, from a certain point of view, the social and professional character of this milieu - or at least certain aspects of it - could carry with it associations of disreputability, and a sense of distance from the cultural experience of the middle classes. As Thackeray pointed out, "An English gentleman knows as much about the people of Lapland or California as he does of the aborigines of Seven Dials or the natives of Wapping."

This sense of distance was exacerbated by the fact that the worlds of graphic satire, radical literature and pornography often existed in such close proximity to one another. The boundaries between them could become somewhat obscured, with publishers working quite happily in all three areas at any given time. The reappearance of Marks - who fulfilled all these roles at different points in his career - is a particularly vivid reminder of the links which had existed between them during the Regency period.

However, the trade in the 1830s operated on several levels, and its artists' work was not necessarily limited to one particular audience. Several artists worked for numerous publishers, adapting their styles to suit the tastes for which they were working. Seymour, for example, worked concurrently for McLean (on McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures) and for both Strange and Cowie (on Figaro and Asmodeus in London); William Heath worked for McLean and later for Gans; 'Sharpshooter' was published by Fairburn, Gans, King, Humphrey and Knight; and Grant, over the course of the decade, worked for almost twenty different publishers,

50 BM 13252.
from conservatives\textsuperscript{52} such as McLean and Humphrey, through the middle ground of Tregear, Gans, Kendrick and Dawson, to the radical end of the trade, and men such as Drake, Lloyd, Fairburn, Duncombe and Cousins. He also worked for the publishers of sensationalistic journalism (illustrating Nicholson's \textit{Cockney Adventures and Tales of London Life} between 1838 and '39) and cheap serial fiction (in his collaborations with T. P. Prest).\textsuperscript{53} Such widespread activity was, most likely, the simple result of financial necessity. The trade was, more than ever before, an unstable vocation for an artist, and many would take whatever work was available. But the very fact that the work of individual artists could be spread throughout such a diversity of publishers and formats is suggestive of the fractured nature of the trade during the period; the desperate search for new formats and gimmicks with which to capture the public's imagination, on however temporary a basis.

One manner in which the publishers of satirical prints attempted to do this was by issuing sequentially-numbered series of single sheet prints under a title which bore their own name rather than that of the artists who illustrated them, thus creating a regular site of identification for their audience. This sub-category of graphic satire was one of the most characteristic developments of the decade and can be seen as analogous to the growth of the periodical press. Tregear was one of the first to adopt the format in the early 1830s, when he united the work of several different artists (most of whom worked anonymously, although Grant was certainly one of them)\textsuperscript{54} in a single series, under titles such as \textit{Tregear's Flights of Humour}, \textit{Tregear's Rum Jokes}, and \textit{Tregear's Black Jokes} (fig. 12). The former was one of the longest-running of these series. It began sometime in early 1833 and survived for at least eighty (most likely weekly) issues, taking it well into 1835.

It is certainly possible that Grant produced the great majority of the early issues, as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[I] I use the term to describe their political ideology, but also in regard to the style of the prints they issued. Neither used graphic satire as a means of expressing the need for change of any kind.
\item[Prest was the author of several of the many plagiarisms of Dickens which appeared during the 1830s, generally adopting the pseudonym 'Bos'. Grant was the illustrator for a number of these, including \textit{The Penny Pickwick}, \textit{The Sketch Book} by 'Bos', Olivier Twiss and Nicholas Nickelbery. Louis James, op.cit. (1963), p. 59.
\item[On the first issue of his 1834 series, \textit{Grant's Oddities}, also published by Tregear, he identified himself as "author of the chief part of Tregear's Flights Of Humour", although apart from one example, his signature does not appear on any parts of the series. The only other signed issue of the series which I have been able to locate bears the name of W. Summers, otherwise unknown in the field of graphic satire. But the generic nature of these series meant that they frequently employed a similar style of illustration, making it difficult to distinguish between them or to attribute authorship to any one particular artist.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
he maintained a prolific working relationship with Tregear until at least April 1833, at which point they apparently quarrelled and ceased all contact with one another. Just as McLean and Heath appear to have fallen out in 1830 over the dominant role of the publisher, it seems equally possible that Grant and Tregear's disagreement arose out of the latter's imposition of his own identity over 'his' artist's work. With the exception of some of his work for the radical press, Grant tended to make a great issue about the authorship of his work (as evinced by the claim about Tregear's Flights of Humour) and it seems plausible that he was increasingly frustrated by Tregear's apparent refusal to give him his due. Certainly, by July that year he had transferred his services to Kendrick in Leicester Square, who would remain Grant's principal publisher until his death at the end of 1834, when his business was taken over by Dawson.

Dawson himself entered the field in 1835 with Dawson's Magic; William Spooner produced Spooner's Magic; and Orlando Hodgson offered Hodgson's Genuine Patent Medicines and Hodgson's Special Originals (figs.13-14). The generic nature of all these series is indicative of the extent to which certain innovations were quickly adopted throughout the industry, and implies that they were, at least briefly, quite successful. In terms of style, subject matter and material characteristics, there is little to distinguish any one from the others (the only significant element of differentiation between them being the name of the publisher), which emphasises the paradox at the heart of graphic satire of the 1830s: that the expansion of the trade, while increasing access to satirical images, could also limit the range of their style and content.

55 The brief notice in Notes and Queries (see Chapter One, n.39) records that, "Mr Tregear published many coloured caricatures for him (Grant). They quarrelled somehow, and I recollect of a very personal correspondence between them." (p.209). In The Political Drama No. 110, Grant specifically states that, "C.J.G. takes this opportunity of informing the inhabitants of Paris, and its vicinity, that he has no connexion (sic) in his capacity of artist with one Gabriel Shire Tregear, publisher of London, for some time past, and solemnly hopes he never may again". The allusion to Paris is tantalising in light of Grant's interest in French caricature (see Pound, op.cit., pp. 46-53), but remains inconclusive. Nevertheless, the reference to Tregear makes quite clear the extent of their antipathy by the final months of 1834 (when this print would have been published).

56 Spooner was a publisher and printseller, who established his business in 1831. He was also one of the most prolific producers of prints with scrapbook themes during the '30s. The business he began would endure until the early years of the twentieth-century. Hodgson operated between 1833 and 1845 as a book and printseller. He also published numerous prints with theatrical, juvenile and scrapbook themes. See Alistair Allen and Joan Hoverstadt, The History of Printed Scraps (1983), pp. 141 & 153, and Critchett's London Directory, 1831, pp.198 & 373.

57 Patricia Anderson, op.cit, p.4.
This trend appears to have been symptomatic of a general recognition within the trade that things were changing. The growth of the cheap periodical press was providing strong competition within the lower end of the print trade, and to some extent these developments reflect an attempt to mimic the conventions on which periodicals based their appeal - in particular the creation of a unifying and consistent identity from issue to issue. For publishers who had built up a strong commercial identity through the products they sold, the most expedient way to construct a market for a new publication was to lend it their name. Thus, when Edward Lloyd branched out from the world of popular fiction to take advantage of the demand for radical political satire, he christened his new venture *Lloyd's Political Jokes* (1836), while John Cleave, one of the most prominent figures in radical society in the 1830s, exploited his own name in several publications, from *Cleave's London Satirist* (which survived from 1837 to 1846 under a variety of titles, all of which retained Cleave's name at the top of the masthead) to *Cleave's Illustrated Metropolitan Police Act* (1839). Even *Cleave's Picture Gallery of Grant's Comicalities* (1836), despite giving recognition to Grant's contribution, still gives precedence to Cleave's name as the principal site of identification (fig. 15).

Thus, it is clear that many of the artists of the period saw their creative identities obscured by those of their publishers. This raises questions about their own professional status within a trade which was focussing ever more upon graphic satire as a conventionalised commodity, rather than a valid form of artistic expression. It is difficult to say how far this was a bone of contention within the trade as a whole, but some intimation of the social status of the men who worked for the middle-ground publishers can be gleaned from a remarkable print by the otherwise obscure Joseph (Joe) Lisle. Lisle produced a number of unusual aquatints - satirical character studies of social stereotypes, with titles such as *The Idler, The Man of Taste, The Adventurer, The Connoisseur* etc. - for both Gans and Tregear in 1830 (fig. 16). They were competent comic prints, well designed and delicately-coloured, but more worthy of note is a single etching entitled *A Designing Character* - undated, put presumably from a similar period - which appears to be a self-portrait of the artist in his garret (fig. 17). The title itself suggests a punning reference to Lisle's own career as someone who, quite literally, *designed characters* for a living. This print, however, is very different from the work he produced for other publishers; it is a straight portrait rather than a
caricature, and seems to have been intended as a virtuoso display of his skill at creating chiaroscuro effects through dense layers of cross-hatching. He depicts a well-dressed figure in a garret (symbolically equipped as an artist's studio, with an easel, a portfolio open on the floor, a portrait-bust on a shelf by the window), carefully holding a palette and brush in his hand. He gazes directly at the spectator with an expression of resigned melancholy, as if fully aware of the futility of his aspirations, which are evoked by the objects surrounding him. The garret itself, sparsely lit by a skylight, is a picture of the kind of poverty - if not actual destitution - from which it was very difficult to climb, an impression which the cell-like confines of the room further accentuate. Thus, Lisle contrasts his own perception of himself as an intelligent, respectable, creative, ambitious and talented individual, with the reality of his condition as a typical prisoner of the trade, wholly subservient to the facile demands of his publishers and their audience. His emphatic statement that the print was "Drawn, Etched & Published by Joe Lisle" can thus be interpreted as a refutation of his position, and an attempt to reclaim some sense of his own artistic identity.

This vivid image of frustrated ambition is a wonderfully evocative portrayal of the professional status of the graphic satirist in the 1830s, and fits well with what little we know about the artists who worked within the industry during the period. From the most successful downwards, there appears to have been a genuine crisis of identity within the community resulting from the decline in status of graphic satire from its heyday twenty, thirty or forty years earlier. This was made all the more acute by the increasing necessity of meeting the demands of publishers whose prime concern (especially after 1832) was to provide simple, inoffensive jokes and puns which would appeal to as large an audience as possible. Some, such as Grant, adapted well, although even he, when advertising in a trade directory in 1839, described himself as a "lithographic printer", a description which offers no intimation of his career as a caricaturist. William Heath, as mentioned earlier, had always maintained a distinct career as a military illustrator, portraitist and topographer, and for a time obscured his identity as a caricaturist behind his 'Paul Pry' signature, just as John Doyle the portraitist maintained a separate professional identity from 'HB' the graphic satirist. Henry Heath, although an able caricaturist,

---

58 Robson's Directory and Court Guide, 1839, p. 516. It is not known to what extent - or even if - he was actually active in this capacity. Although the idea seems quite conceivable, no prints have come to light which bear his mark as printer rather than artist.
was an opportunistic imitator of both styles and formats, becoming the leading imitator of HB in the early 30s, and even adopting a signature - 'HH' - which obscured his own identity in favour of the one he was imitating. Whether this was by choice or at the instigation of his publishers is uncertain, but the latter seems more probable, and it seems conceivable that his eventual emigration to Australia\textsuperscript{59} was at least partly an attempt to escape the lack of prospects offered by an industry in decline, in which artistic identity was increasingly constrained by commercial considerations. Robert Seymour struggled for nine years to find a suitable vehicle for his undoubted talents, but was continually forced to compromise his individual style (\textit{The Ballot}, for example, revealingly remarked in 1832 that, "Mr. Seymour is we fear doing a great deal too much to allow of his doing anything well").\textsuperscript{60} First he became subject to McLean, for whom he produced imitations of HB's prints and Cruikshank's 'Scrap Sheets', as well as working anonymously for six years on \textit{McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures}. Then his work was constrained by the penny political press - \textit{Figaro} and \textit{Asmodeus} - in which his designs were limited to a space of three inches square, and were wholly reliant upon the skill of the jobbing wood-engravers who cut them (most of them also appearing unsigned). And finally his identity was overshadowed in his collaboration with Dickens, whose descriptive prose so far outstripped Seymour's images that the \textit{Pickwick Papers} - originally conceived as Seymour's own enterprise - was quickly wrested from him, with the artist being made subservient to the writer almost overnight.\textsuperscript{61} Even Robert Cruikshank, experiencing "one of his recurrent periods of low water" in the early 30s,\textsuperscript{62} produced a considerable part of his work under pseudonyms such as 'Don Juan', 'R. Bottlenose' and 'Phelim O'Cruikshank'. And 'Sharpshooter', one of the most prolific satirists of the Reform

\textsuperscript{59} Spielmann, \textit{op.cit.}, p.452.
\textsuperscript{60} \textit{The Ballot}, No.38 (April 1832).
\textsuperscript{61} Traditionally, it has been recorded that Seymour originated the idea of \textit{Pickwick} in the autumn of 1835, as a series of sketches of sporting life, which he would illustrate, while paying a writer to provide an accompanying text. Dickens, having recently published two volumes of \textit{Sketches by 'Boz'}, was suggested by Chapman & Hall, the publishers of the venture, and was deemed acceptable by Seymour, who produced four etchings for the first number. With the introduction of his own characters, however (in particular the phenomenally popular Sam Weller in the fourth part), it quickly became evident that Dickens was the driving force behind the success of the series, and thereafter Seymour would have been obliged to work around the text rather than vice-versa. He took his own life on April 20th1836. His suicide may have been unrelated to his professional situation, but somehow this seems unlikely. Alfred Crowquill, \textit{Introduction to Seymour's Humorous Sketches} (1868), pp.vii-xii
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{BMC}, Vol. XI, p.1
years, never seems to have revealed his identity at all a fact which attests to the
importance he placed on his anonymity, and his success at maintaining it.

This anonymity, combined with the general move - both geographically and
professionally - towards the sphere of metropolitan journalism, are two of the most
characteristic developments in the trade during the 1830s, and the effects these
factors had in shaping graphic satire during the period will be seen in subsequent
chapters. The diminution of authorial identity, increasing anonymity, frequent
collaboration between artists, the primacy of the publishers' names in their
publications, and the standardization of format can all be considered as by­
products of the new emphasis on 'periodical-ness'. And this held true throughout
the trade; from Holywell Street and Paternoster Row, to Lincoln's Inn and Leicester
Square. These issues will be discussed at greater length in Chapters Two and
Three, as part of a discussion of the other major factor which shaped the
appearance of satirical imagery during the period - the decline of etching and the
adoption of lithography and wood engraving.

63 Dorothy George's suggestion of John Phillips remaining tentative at best. Ibid., p.xiv. A single letter from
'Sharpshooter' is known to exist, which would give some clue to his identity, were it not for the fact that the
signature is entirely illegible, defying all attempts to interpret it. I am grateful to Andrew Edmunds for
bringing this to my attention.
Chapter Two

Style, Format and Reproductive Technology, Part One: Lithography and the Changing Conventions of Satirical Illustration

New Print Technologies in the Early Nineteenth Century: Lithography and Wood Engraving

"There is a clear connection between the methods of printmaking, particularly the classical methods - woodcut, engraving, and etching - and the general image the print creates. The print image in its widest sense, not only the picture or arrangement of lines and tones, but also and especially the mood, the social or psychological comment, the state of mind revealed or appealed to, the print image so understood reflects closely the print methods. Psychological and even philosophical questions arise: Do the methods create the effect, or does the effect, pre-existent, somehow, in the mind of the artist, choose the method?... The connection is inescapable. The very language bears witness to it."1

The transformation of English graphic satire in the early 1830s has, in the past, been explained in terms which draw an analogy between the opposing styles which predominated in the Georgian and early Victorian periods and the different reproductive processes which prevailed in either era. A particular distinction has been drawn between the different aesthetic effects which may be achieved in etching and lithography. The different styles to which each technique was suited have been related both to the physical characteristics of the reproductive media themselves and to the techniques involved in actually drawing the image which is
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intended to be reproduced. Etching, for example, has been characterised as the **sharper**, **more incisive**, and - quite literally - **more biting** medium, largely because of a linguistic coincidence between the technical terminology of the process itself and the manner in which it was applied in the field of satirical imagery:

"The etcher's tool is the **needle** and we needle a person by speaking of his imperfections... The **acid** used by the etcher also describes a state of mind, 'sharp, biting, contemptuous'... **Mordant** is the specific name for etcher's acid, and **mordant** again is a type of intellect and a point of view, biting, sarcastic, caustic... **Bite** itself... is also the technical term for the controlled corrosion of metal by acid which is the heart of the etching process."  

In contrast, lithography can be seen as having **softened** or **blunted** the impact of graphic satire, because it requires no incision into the surface of the print medium as such: "There is no resistance to (the artist's) drawing instrument. The internal problem of lithography has been therefore... the search for an identity - identity, or character, being established in art much as in life chiefly by limitations imposed, recognized, explored, contested, turned to account, and, occasionally, conquered."  

The reasoning behind this formulation is perhaps understandable if one compares the finest etchings of Golden Age graphic satire with the insipid, 'vaporous' quality of HB's *Political Sketches*. In this context, it is certainly a convenient analogy, and one which could conceivably be extended to the wood-engraved 'cuts' which illustrated satirical periodicals from the 1830s onwards: "**Cut** is the basic action in preparing a block of wood to print a picture, and the word has become the generic name for an illustration; 'cut' is also an insult or a snub, even a wound." In theory, then, this could account for the sharp, incisive power of so many of the radical wood-engraved prints which emerged from metropolitan presses in the middle years of the decade.

---

2 Getlein, *op. cit.*, p. 12. See also Maidment, *op. cit.*, pp.62-3 for a more recent treatment of these ideas: "(The) loss of vigour (of golden age caricature) is also to be remarked technically - the bite of the copper engraved or etched line giving way to the less well defined, dispersed, crayon-like effects of lithography. Equally, the compacted and energetic compositions of Gillray and Rowlandson in Doyle's prints are dispersed into awkward and stiff figure groupings."

3 Getlein, *op. cit.*, p.22.

But no analogy is watertight, and this one in particular is riddled with holes, however persuasive it may seem at first glance. It could just as easily be suggested, for example, that the laborious process of slowly and carefully carving an image into a piece of hard, solid boxwood could inevitably produce nothing but the rigid, static, and lifeless images which dominated Victorian satirical illustration. But where would we then situate Grant’s cuts for *The Political Drama*? Furthermore, such an analogy does not allow for the virtuoso lithographic caricature being produced in Paris at precisely the same time as the work of HB in London. While the technique of lithography itself may not have offered any ‘resistance’ to the printmaker, the political climate in France during the period created a great deal. It was in opposition to this that Daumier, Delacroix and others developed such a striking tradition of lithographic caricature, as opposed to McLean, who quite consciously wanted to produce images of the most unoppositional and inoffensive nature; “Entirely free from whatever could offend the most scrupulous, or wound the most susceptible.”

This was a period of transformation within the field, and no such hard and fast rules should be applied. The etching/lithography analogy is, once again, the result of a simplification which reduces the development of English graphic satire to a smooth transition from one easily-definable tradition (Gillray and Golden Age caricature) to another (HB and the early Victorian age). It does not take into account the broader traditions in which lithography and wood engraving existed, and how these traditions influenced the manner in which both were applied to the production of satirical imagery. As will become clear, lithography was employed in a variety of different ways by graphic satirists - both to replicate the sharp, incisive line of an etching and to create more ‘painterly’ effects entirely new to satirical illustration - and cannot simply be reduced to the ‘HB’ manner. And it would be equally wrong to think of wood-engraved satirical illustration solely in terms of the archetypal *Punch* cartoon. The style of lithographic satire was not simply a product of the technique itself, but of a more complex interrelationship between the individual sensibilities of the artists who used the medium, the expectations of their audiences, and the history of the medium’s use in both England and France during the early nineteenth century. Similarly, the *Punch*-style cartoon was not simply the product of the wood-engraving process, but of the conventional manner in which it

---

was applied in periodical illustration in general during the Victorian era. In the 1830s in particular, it was often used in a striking and aesthetically forceful manner very much at odds with the later Victorian tradition characterised by *Punch*.

Both lithography and wood engraving increased the potential circulation of satirical imagery to a considerable extent, but there remained a marked socio-economic divide between the two media quite apart from - but also inherently related to - the obvious differences in the type of images they were used to create. This in turn was (at least partly) responsible for determining the principal audience for each technique, and the manner in which they were used. Before going any further, it would be useful to summarise the technical aspects of both processes, and to consider the implications which they had for the production and dissemination of satirical images.

Lithography was originally developed in Munich by the Prague-born Alois Senefelder in the final years of the eighteenth century, but it was not until the 1820s that its use became widespread throughout Europe. Based on the chemical antipathy between grease and water, the technique differs from etching, engraving or woodcut, in that no incision has to be made into the printing surface, and so it is known as a 'surface' or 'planographic' process. In basic terms, the technique in its earliest years involved the drawing of an image onto the surface of a piece of flat stone with a greasy substance (lithography literally means 'stone drawing'). The surface of the stone first had to be ground with abrasives to create an entirely grease-free surface, which could either be smooth or coarse depending on the type

---

6 Indeed, the tone and appearance of the classic nineteenth-century *Punch* cartoon owes as much to the lithographic prints of Doyle as it does to wider developments in Victorian visual culture and its dissemination in the art journals.


8 As opposed to etching and engraving, which are known as 'intaglio' processes, and woodcut, which is defined as a 'relief' process. See Anthony Griffiths, *Prints and Printmaking* (1980) for a summary of the different techniques involved in creating prints of all types.

9 Traditionally, Bavarian limestone was used for this purpose, as it had the ideal porous texture required for the process. As early as 1801, in his original patent application, Senefelder mentioned the possibility of using plates made from zinc in a similar manner to lithographic stone. Zinc, however, was not in common commercial usage in Britain until the mid-1840s, at which point 'zincographs' began to be more common. An exceptionally early use of the technique exists in the oeuvre of C.J. Grant, however. His *Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers & Every Body's Album* was published in January 1835, specifically stating that it was, "done on zinc" (fig.86a).
of image desired. A polished stone could be used to achieve smooth and unbroken lines, ideal for simulating the style of a pen drawing, while a roughened, textured surface was required to give the granular, disrupted, chalk-like effects which allowed the creation of more subtle tonal nuances. Once the image was drawn, the stone was treated with a mixture of acid and gum arabic in order to bond the greasy constituents to the stone. The surface was then dampened with water, which would settle only on the unmarked areas of the stone, since it would be repelled by the greasy drawing medium. A roller covered with greasy printing ink was then rolled across the stone, the ink now adhering only to the drawn marks, as the water would repel the ink from the rest of the dampened surface. Finally, the image could be printed by running both paper and stone together through a flat bed scraper press.\(^{10}\)

This was a time-consuming and laborious process and, prior to the introduction of the first powered lithographic press in 1851, lithography had its greatest disadvantage at the printing stage. Although it was much cheaper and faster to draw an image directly onto stone than it was to engrave a woodblock, to actually print it with a hand press took considerably longer due to the necessity of damping the stone before each impression and then pulling it through the press under pressure. Generally speaking, a lithographic printer could expect to produce no more than a hundred impressions an hour of even the simplest ink drawings.\(^{11}\) This had obvious implications for the potential circulation of an image, and is one of the principal reasons why lithography was not widely used for the production of periodicals - especially those which were predominantly text-based. While *The Looking Glass*, an entirely pictorial monthly publication, had plenty of time for the printing of each issue’s run, the production of a weekly periodical of any reasonable circulation would have presented greater difficulties. Dawson and Grant claimed in 1835 that their fortnightly lithographic sheet, *Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine*, had a circulation of 30,000 copies.\(^{12}\) This seems somewhat improbable (and could well have been simple exaggeration), although it

\(^{10}\) Griffiths, *op. cit.*, pp.100-108.

\(^{11}\) Michael Twyman: *The Lithographic Hand Press, 1796-1850* in *Journal of the Printing Historical Society*, iii (1967), pp. 41-50. By 1854, powered lithographic presses could print 800-1000 sheets per hour. Twyman, *Printing* (1970), p.52. It should be emphasised, though, that even a hundred impressions an hour is still around three times faster than could be expected when pulling an intaglio print (an etching or an engraving), which required a much greater degree of skill at the printing stage. In this sense, a hundred impressions an hour is quite productive, although not productive enough for any journal with a large circulation.

\(^{12}\) *Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine*, No. 25, January 1st 1835.
would certainly have been possible under certain circumstances. To achieve such a circulation, however, would have required a single press to be manned virtually twenty-four hours a day for the entire two weeks between each and every issue.\textsuperscript{13} If more than one press had been available, however, this problem could be overcome by the process of 'offsetting' the image. This was quite easily achieved by duplicating the greasy image onto another stone with an offset roller, so that two or more presses could be set to work printing the same image simultaneously, thus considerably reducing the time involved in printing an edition. This was the method which Philipon used to print the lithographic sections of \textit{Le Charivari} and \textit{Le Caricature}, employing teams of printers to work day and night to meet the daily and weekly deadlines, but it inevitably required both increased manpower and sufficient funds to acquire two or more presses.\textsuperscript{14}

The demands of the periodical press were much more readily met by wood engraving, the basic principle of which was the carving of an image into a block of wood (generally boxwood, cut across, rather than along, the grain), which could then be inked and printed, much like a woodcut.\textsuperscript{15} The use of endgrain boxwood provided an especially hard and durable surface on which to work (and from which to print), but had the considerable drawback of restricting the size of that surface to only a few square inches because the trunk of the box tree was so narrow.\textsuperscript{16} However, by working against the grain, it was possible for the skilled engraver to execute extremely fine work within the confines of this space. He could achieve this by using a variety of tools, closely related to those used by metal-engravers, of

\textsuperscript{13}The exact number of presses which Dawson operated at his Leicester Square premises, where \textit{Every Body's Album} was printed, is uncertain, but it was certainly more than one, which implies that this circulation figure was possible. W.B. Todd lists him as owning "presses" without specifying how many. A \textit{Dictionary of Printers and Others in Allied Trades, London and Vicinity, 1800-1840} (1972).


\textsuperscript{15}From the early nineteenth century onwards, several descriptive texts on wood engraving have been published. The most comprehensive include: William Andrew Chatto and John Jackson, \textit{ATreatise on Wood Engraving} (1839); William James Linton, \textit{The Masters of Wood Engraving} (1889); Douglas Percy Bliss, \textit{A History of Wood Engraving} (1928); Kenneth Lindley, \textit{The Woodblock Engravers} (1970); Albert Garrett, \textit{A History of Wood Engraving} (1978); E.de Mare, \textit{The Victorian Woodblock Illustrators} (1980). Also of enormous use is Rodney Engen's, \textit{Dictionary of Victorian Wood Engravers} (1985).

\textsuperscript{16}In order to execute larger images, several separate blocks would have to be joined together. In the early nineteenth century, tongue-and-grooved blocks, glued or screwed together, were used. But in the middle years of the century, the bolted block was introduced, consisting of several blocks held together by nuts and bolts located in grooves cut into the backs of the individual blocks. Under pressure of deadlines, these individual blocks could be shared out amongst a workshop, with individual engravers being responsible for a specific section of the design. They could then be bolted together, allowing the master engraver to finish off the edge of each block, thus unifying them into a coherent whole. However, glued blocks continued to be used until the end of the century for particularly fine work, especially that which had the luxury of a long deadline.
which there were four main types: gravers or burins; tint tools; gouges or scoopers; and flat tools or chisels; all of which came in varying sizes.\textsuperscript{17} The areas which had to be cut away were defined by the lines of the image intended for engraving, which could either be drawn directly on to the block or traced onto it from a pre-existing drawing. Lines, textures and spaces could be created by cutting into the wood with the engraving tools. When the block was inked, the ink would settle on its surface, rather than in the fine incisions, so when printed, the lines would appear as white on the print itself. Alternatively the engraver could imitate the ‘black line’ syntax of a pen drawing by removing all the wood from around the lines drawn on the surface of the block, which would remain as raised ridges which could then be inked and printed, more in the manner of a woodcut. This latter method was the one more commonly used by commercial wood-engravers. The former - considered by purists to be the more ‘natural’ way of creating a wood-engraving - was most often favoured by artist-engravers, who conceived their own images in terms of ‘white line’ from the very beginning. In practice, however, it is relatively common to see both ‘white’ and ‘black’ lines used in the same wood-engraved image, although for a number of reasons the penny satirical press in the 1830s relied primarily on a black line syntax. This was largely because the illustrations they contained were relatively simple reproductions of the pen and ink drawings of the artists who drew the original designs. As we shall see, these were, for the most part, fairly rudimentary schematic sketches, containing a minimum of background detail and tonal variation, and only the most basic characterisation. Such images simply did not require the kind of densely-worked surfaces which characterised the finest examples of wood-engraved illustration.

Unlike lithography, the benefits of wood engraving were felt most obviously in the printing process itself. Woodblocks are much more durable than copper plates, with the potential to produce hundreds of thousands of impressions, as opposed to only one or two thousand (at the very most) from a copper plate.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, unlike the impressions taken from a copper plate, those pulled from woodblocks

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] See Chatto & Jackson, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 653-57, for a useful descriptive account of the variety of tools used by wood engravers.
\item[18] Thomas Bewick, the single most important figure in the history of wood engraving at the beginning of the nineteenth century, testified to the fact that one of his cuts - used as the titlepiece to a provincial newspaper - had printed close to 1,000,000 impressions, and was still in use, without any discernible deterioration in the image. He did, however, emphasise that such a figure was only attainable if the block was, “carefully adjusted to the height of the type, and kept out of the hands of rude pressmen.” Iain Bain ed., \textit{A Memoir of Thomas Bewick, Written by Himself} (1975), p.191.
\end{footnotes}
retained a more or less consistent quality rather than steadily losing clarity and
definition as the print run increased. Woodblocks were also much cheaper to
produce, and were conventionally supplied 'type high' so that they could be locked
into a printing press alongside letterpress text, thus making them ideal for the
illustration of periodicals. 19 Whereas any publication which combined letterpress
text with lithographic illustration, such as Philipon's Le Charivari, had to go through
two separate press runs (first to print the images, then to print the text), the printers
of Figaro, The Penny Magazine or Punch were able to make do with only one.
Moreover, with the introduction of mechanical presses, the potential print run for a
weekly periodical increased considerably. It was estimated that the old hand
presses, which predominated in the early years of the century, could produce at
most a thousand copies of a periodical per day with one press worked by two men -
a considerable amount of labour. With the same two men operating two machine
presses, however, this figure could increase to around 16,000. 20

As a means of making printable images, wood engraving had been in use since
the seventeenth century, but it was only in the late eighteenth that it became firmly
established as a process distinct from the woodcut as such via the technically
brilliant work of the Newcastle engraver Thomas Bewick. 21 As with lithography,
use of the technique spread slowly at first, only gradually being adopted

---

19 Another advantage was that wood-engraved blocks - and even whole typeset pages - could be 'stereotyped'. This was a process which involved making a mould of the printing forme, so that several presses could be set to work printing the same page or image. Also, stereotypes could be stored and used for reprinting an edition whenever required, removing the necessity of re-setting the type (a time-consuming and expensive process). The 'plaster of paris' method of stereotyping was used from the 1820s onwards. See Twyman, Printing (1970), p.22.

20 Charles Knight, The Old Printer and the Modern Press (1854), pp. 253-6. Knight's figures - although published in 1854 - relate to the period around 1830, when he was starting out in the publishing trade. By the 1850s, even 16,000 copies a day would seem very low compared to the most productive presses. New iron framed presses had been introduced with the Stanhope press in 1800, followed by the Colombien press in 1817 and the Albion in 1822. These were quicker and easier to work than the old standard presses, and had a significant impact on the growth of the periodical press. The steam powered press was introduced in 1810 in Germany (by Friedrich Koenig), and The Times was being printed 'by steam' from 1814 onwards. In 1820, however, there were still only eight steam powered presses in London, although this number began to increase rapidly in the '30s. For a fuller account of the development of printing presses in the early nineteenth century, see Twyman, Printing (1970), pp.51-2.

21 The literature on Bewick since the 1830s has been extensive, but some of the most useful accounts of his life and work include: D.C. Thompson, The Life and Works of Thomas Bewick (1882); Austin Dobson, Thomas Bewick and his Pupils (1884); Robert Robinson, Thomas Bewick, His Life and Times (1887); Graham Reynolds, Thomas Bewick: A Resume of his Life and Work (1949); Montgomery Weakley, Thomas Bewick (1953); Iain Bain, Thomas Bewick: An Illustrated Record of his Life and Works (1979). Also of interest is Bewick's own memoir. The original manuscript is now preserved in the British Library (Add. MS 41,481). The first published edition appeared in 1862, followed by a further five up to 1961, all of which amended the original text to some extent. The most accurate and comprehensive transcription of the original manuscript is Iain Bain, ed., A Memoir of Thomas Bewick, Written by himself (1975), which also include a more comprehensive Bewick bibliography.
commercially - for the illustration of books in particular - during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. But with the advent of the cheap press in the early 1830s and '40s it secured a dominant position as the principal reproductive process used by publishers throughout Europe which it would maintain for half a century. Only after the introduction of the photo-mechanical line-block in the 1870s, and the half-tone plate in the 1890s, was it rendered obsolete as a commercial reproductive process.  

From this time on it was used primarily by artist-engravers, who cut their own designs rather than relying on others, and in the illustration of private press books. It gradually became a firmly established part of the graphic arts, with the teaching of the process being centred in the art schools.  

Prior to this, however, one of the most important distinctions between wood engraving and lithography was that the former was used almost exclusively as a reproductive process rather than for the execution of original designs by artists themselves. Therefore, an artist's work was inevitably mediated by a number of factors, most obviously the abilities of each individual engraver. The majority of these were of the artisan classes, trained via a system of several years' apprenticeship, and so the technique retained a strongly craft-based element as opposed to the use of lithography which, as a result of its autographic quality, was (at least potentially) a technique more suited to the 'fine art' community.

Between them, these two reproductive techniques dominated satirical imagery in the 1830s. The use of etching within the field of graphic satire had effectively ceased by 1832, and while occasional exceptions such as the aquatints of Joe Lisle can be found, no other print techniques made a significant impact upon it for several decades. This chapter, and that which follows it, are interrelated, discussing in turn the various ways in which lithography and wood engraving were employed by the satirical press. They look at the styles and formats to which each was best suited, and in which each was most widely used. The main focus is on the various restrictions which both techniques imposed upon satirical illustration, and the extent to which graphic satirists either accepted or overcame them. Where

---

22 Griffiths, op. cit., pp.121-23.
23 As early as 1893 Auguste Lepère and Pierre Gusman had founded the Société des Gravures sur Bois Original, while in England the Society of Wood Engravers was established in 1920, closely followed by the English Wood Engraving Society in 1923.
lithography was concerned, any constraints were largely a result of the rigidly traditional and conventional manner in which the medium was employed within a predominantly conservative, middle class market. With wood engraving, however, the principal problem derived from a more complex combination of the inherent restrictions of the reproductive process itself, the format in which it was most often employed (the penny periodical), and the diminished expectations about the role of illustration within the cheap press itself. With wood engraving in particular, the constraints on the artist in terms of authorship and anonymity were considerable, and must be regarded as having had a fundamentally reductive effect on both the nature and the subsequent reputation of satirical imagery of the 1830s, especially in comparison with that of the Golden Age.

II
Lithography and Graphic Satire in the 1830s

The widespread use of lithography for the production of satirical imagery in England was actually limited to a relatively brief period, beginning with the first part of HB's *Political Sketches* in 1828, and gradually starting to fade out towards the end of the 1830s. The years between 1828 and 1832 saw the rapid rise of lithographic satire as an aspect of the metropolitan print trade, and it would remain a significant presence in one form or another until around 1836. Prior to 1827 there were only three lithographic printers in London who produced material which could be classified as satirical in nature, all of whose output was minimal. As far as we know, Charles Hullmandel produced a single satirical print in 1821, George Lee of Mitre Square produced one in 1825, and N. Chater of Fleet Street produced three between 1823 and 1825. However, with the advent of HB's work (pre-*Political Sketches*) in 1827, and McLean's subsequent preference for lithography, this situation changed rapidly. Between 1828 and 1832 the number of lithographic printers who worked for publishers of graphic satire had risen to twenty-two - many of them Frenchmen who had come to England to capitalise on the experience they had gained in the Parisian printing milieu. 25 Although the majority of these produced only a handful of works, some firms such as Maguire & Lemercier and Meifred & Lemercier of Leicester Square were more prolific, largely due to their

role as printers of *The Looking Glass*. Most prolific of all, though, were the firms of A. Ducoté of St. Martin's Lane and C. Motte, another of the numerous lithographic printers who occupied premises on Leicester Square. Between them, they printed the greater part of McLean's output from 1829 onwards, a partnership facilitated by their proximity to his shop on Haymarket. In a similar way, Tregear relied to a great extent on the services of a single firm located close to his own premises - that of Dean and Munday of Threadneedle Street, not far from his shop on Cheapside.26 Other publishers of lithographic caricature, such as Kendrick and Dawson, had their own lithographic presses, and could thus combine the roles of printer and publisher.

After the mid-1830s, however, the prevalence of the technique began to decline considerably. Although examples of lithographic satirical prints continued to appear well into the 1840s, their frequency became increasingly intermittent and their quality was generally quite indifferent, a decline which, by this stage, can be largely attributed to the dominance of the satirical periodical.27 As stated earlier, lithography was never widely used by the periodical press, and so was mostly limited to the single sheet format, which had effectively been made redundant by the early 1840s, having begun its slow decline almost a decade beforehand. The death knell of the lithographic single sheet was eventually sounded by the final part of *The Political Sketches* (the 917th), which appeared in 1851.28 Well before this time, however, the failure of English graphic satirists to adapt to the technique in a convincing manner had been recognised.

In 1839, during the course of a lengthy discussion of Parisian caricature, William Thackeray drew an important distinction between the manner in which lithography had been used by graphic satirists - and by artists in general - in England and France over the preceding decade:

26 Maria Anne Dean and Anna Maria Munday were booksellers and printers, with premises at 35 Threadneedle Street from 1814 until 1837. Todd, *op. cit.*, p. 56. Their imprint appears frequently on Tregear's prints.

27 The British Museum's collection of post-1832 'Supplementary Satires' consists largely of lithographs of various descriptions, but these mostly date from before 1844. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, the use of Chromolithography provided *Vanity Fair* with some of the most distinctive caricatures of the Victorian era, although these were very different in conception from the lithographs of the 1830s.

28 Their frequency had begun to decline long before this, however, starting to taper off as early as 1836. Throughout the 1830s, *The Times* had greeted each new batch of *The Political Sketches* as an event, but between 1843 and 1851, they merited only two passing comments. By 1848, Doyle's productivity had slowed to only eleven prints a year. None at all appeared in 1850, and only one - the last - in 1851. *BMC*, Vol. XI, p. xvi.
Chapter Two

"Now, looking, for instance, at H.B.'s slim vapoury figures, they have struck us as excellent likenesses of men and women, but no more: the bodies want spirit, action and individuality. George Cruikshank, as a humourist, has quite as much genius, but he does not know the art of "effect" so well as Monsieur Daumier... who, though he executes very carelessly, knows well what he would express, indicates perfectly the attitude and identity of his figure, and is quite aware, beforehand, of the effect which he intends to produce." 29

His main contention was that two very distinct lithographic traditions had developed in either country, which had important implications for the manner in which each nation's satirists made use of the medium: "With ourselves", he felt, "among whom money is plenty, enterprise so great, and everything [a] matter of commercial speculation, Lithography has not been so much practised as wood or steel engraving; which, by the aid of great original capital and spread of sale, are able more than to compete with the art of drawing on stone. The two former may be called art done by machinery. We confess to a prejudice in favour of the honest work of hand, in matters of art, and prefer the rough workmanship of the painter to the smooth copies of his performances which are produced, for the most part, on the wood-block or the steel plate." 30

For Thackeray, then, the distinction between French and English caricature of the 1830s was that between art and simple illustration, between expression and literal representation: "the loisirs of men of genius, not the finikin performances of laboured mediocrity, as with us." 31 His explanation for this was, quite simply, that the French (and the Germans as well) had cultivated a greater sense of taste as a result of the widespread use of lithography amongst their 'fine' art communities. Moreover, they had taken advantage of the technique to achieve a wider distribution of printed images in general amongst the middle and lower classes


30 Ibid., p. 143.

31 Ibid.
than was the case in England. English artists, he said, did not know how to take advantage of the expressive potential offered by lithography, as evinced by the fact that its use had been largely restricted to the purely commercial enterprises of metropolitan print and book dealers. The power of a Daumier print, in Thackeray's terms, stemmed from its 'careless' quality - its expressiveness - as opposed to an adherence to the realistic, literal mode of representation which defined the work of HB. To explain the reasons for the differences between English and French lithographic satire, apparent as they are, is no easy matter. But Thackeray's point is a valid one, and is borne out to some extent by the history of the technique's use in both countries during the early decades of the nineteenth century.

The early history of lithography in England was, from its very beginning, more closely related to the routine demands of commercial illustration. This situation was exacerbated by the influence of the two men who most actively promoted the commercial use of the technique in England. The first of these was the entrepreneurial publisher, inventor and self-publicist, Rudolph Ackermann, while the second was the artist-printer Charles Hullmandel, both of whom had established their own lithographic presses in London (in 1816 and 1819 respectively). Significantly, both men were more interested in the process of lithography itself (and its commercial possibilities) than in its application in the field of fine art. Although Ackermann gave a demonstration to the Society of Arts in 1819, in which he recommended that Senefelder be awarded their gold medal for his invention, he emphatically stressed that the technique was, "of value to

---

32 Ibid., pp. 143-45. He even extends this argument to the lower classes, who had access to such imagery via its display in cafes and restaurants. For a more recent historical discussion of this issue - which actually bears out Thackeray's contention to a large extent - see the introduction to Petra Ten-Doesschate Chu & Gabriel P. Weisberg eds., The Popularization of the Image: Visual Culture Under the July Monarchy (1994), pp.3-9.
33 A glaring exception to this rule might be Daumier's Rue Transnonain Le 15 Avril 1834, which derives its impact quite emphatically from a realistic, literal representation of events, but this print - famous as it is - is not typical of the work he was producing for Philipon at the time.
35 The only notable exception to this trend in the first decade of the century was the series Specimens of Polyautography, which Philippe André, Senefelder's London agent, published between 1805 and 1807. He persuaded several Royal Academicians - including Benjamin West, Thomas Stothard and James Barry - to contribute drawings in lithography (or 'Polyautography' as it was known at the time), which he published in parts at half a guinea each. Even Gillray contributed a single drawing on stone, although, like the others, he never progressed beyond this initial experiment. In total, the series consisted of only 36 prints, and the technique was subsequently largely ignored by academic artists. Twyman, op.cit., pp.27-9.
36 Ibid., p. 39. Ackermann published the first translation of Senefelder's treatise, A Complete Course in Lithography, in 1819 as well as Hullmandel's The Art of Drawing on Stone in 1824.
merchants as well as to the artist. 37 Both he and Hullmandel concentrated their printing and publishing efforts almost exclusively in the areas of landscape and topographical illustration, maps, music and book illustration, and by the 1820s lithography had largely supplanted aquatint as the preferred medium for the type of luxurious colour-plate books in which Ackermann in particular specialised. 38 The tradition which they epitomised, therefore, effectively established the use of lithography as an inherently commercial - rather than ‘artistic’ - enterprise.

In France, however, the history of the technique was rather different. Although introduced at about the same time as it had been in England, it was much slower to take root. As in England, the technique’s early use was largely restricted to the printing of circulars, books, music and the drawings of amateurs, but Engelmann was quick to bring the process to the notice of the Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts. However, while Ackermann had stressed the commercial potential of the technique to the Society of Arts, Engelmann drew more particular attention to its autographic quality - its ability to retain the authorial identity of the individual artist. The Académie set up a commission to examine the process in 1816, the findings of which were published that same year. Their report was universally positive, and included a specific recommendation to painters, with particular recognition being given to the technique’s retention of the qualities of an original drawing. 39 The Académie’s seal of approval proved decisive in establishing lithography as a technique favoured by painters, and within a few years artists were flocking to Engelmann’s press, as well as the many others which had appeared in France since 1816. By 1822 there were as many as eighteen lithographic presses in Paris, and twenty-six in the provinces, and from 1817 onwards lithographic prints were regularly being submitted to the Salon. 40 By the mid ‘20s, Géricault and Delacroix were producing some of the earliest masterpieces of the medium, while Goya, then in exile in the South of France, was exploring its expressive possibilities.

37 Ford, op.cit., p. 38.
38 It was also frequently used to illustrate his monthly magazine, The Repository of Arts. John Ford, ibid., pp.63-7.
40 The earliest selection, submitted by Laysterie, included works by Carle Vernet and Thienon. In 1819 Engelmann submitted prints by Bourgeois, Bouton, Baltard, Vernet, and others. Twyman, Lithography, p. 56.
in dazzling prints such as his famous series *The Bulls of Bordeaux*.\(^{41}\) Philipon and Daumier - both of whom had trained as lithographic printers in the 1820s - must have been acutely aware of this tradition, and this must be seen as accounting to a great extent for the kind of work they produced for *Le Charivari* and *La Caricature* in the following decade.\(^{42}\)

The 1820s, then, was a decisive period for lithography in both England and France. In the former, it was applied predominantly in areas of visual culture - landscape, topography, architectural illustration, portraiture - which required a strong degree of literal, realistic, representation. In the latter, however, although also widely used in the field of commercial illustration, its potential as a means of individual artistic expression had been recognised and promoted by the foremost 'fine art' institution in the nation, and had thereby become a regular presence in the annual exhibition system. The extent to which the former tradition prevailed in the print and bookshops of London's West End is reflected in the type of satirical lithographs to which McLean (who was very much a part of that milieu) gave preference throughout the 1830s. From the earliest prints of HB, and Seymour's work on *The Looking Glass*, to the dozens of anonymous imitations which he published over the following decade, his output was characterised by a 'house style' which placed great emphasis on a realistic mode of representation similar to that of commercial lithographic illustration.

Many of the ostensibly satirical prints which he and other West End dealers published throughout the decade relied to a great extent upon this tradition. The success of a print such as *The Anti-Reform Eruption* (fig. 18),\(^{43}\) for instance, was

---


\(^{42}\) *Farwell*, op. cit., p.7. Daumier was apprenticed between 1825 and 1830 to the Parisian publisher and printer Zepherin Belliard, for whom he prepared stones and carried out other menial tasks. Although Belliard himself was a respectable bourgeois portraitist, and apparently had little influence on his pupil's artistic development, Daumier was a natural autodidact and eagerly familiarised himself with the work of contemporary artists via their lithographic prints and his frequent visits to galleries. In particular, his early works show the direct influence of prints made by Charlet, Raffet and Delacroix in the 1820s. Bruce Laughton, *Honoré Daumier* (1996), pp.6-7. Similarly, Philipon was apprenticed to the Parisian book and print trade throughout the 1820s, producing many lithographic vignettes and caricatures, and familiarising himself with lithographic works ranging from those of Carle Vernet to those by Delacroix and Géricault. James Cuno, 'Violence, Satire, and Social Types in the Graphic Art of the July Monarchy' in Chu & Weisberg eds., op. cit., pp.10 &21.

\(^{43}\) BM 16803.
largely based upon its application of the basic conventions of realistic topographical illustration in the Ackermann/Hullmandel tradition, and the many painted views of Mount Vesuvius which had proven so popular amongst Grand Tourists in the eighteenth century. Situated within this tradition, the print immediately (and deliberately) presents a realistic, documentary facade, which at first obscures its satirical intent, and which is reinforced by the (apparently) literally descriptive caption:

"First Discovered, Saturday Morning Oct.r 8th 1831...
But from observations recently taken, it has been ascertained that even the most prominent heads of the VOLCANO are rapidly Declining and according to the course of Nature cannot be kept above water for any length of time, it is therefore generally believed it will all end up in SMOKE."

Only gradually does it reveal its satirical element, thus making sense of the allusive emphasis of the caption: the upturned profiles of Peel and Wellington are disguised amongst the clouds, their mouths issuing torrents of thick smoke, in which are concealed the heads of peers who voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill.44

Similarly, prints such as The Homage (fig.19)45 and THE LOUVRE, or the National Gallery of France. No. 100, PALL MALL, or the National Gallery of England (fig.20),46 are first and foremost examples of large scale architectural drawing, treading a fine line between documentary image-making and satire. In visual terms, images such as these correspond to the tradition of aquatint and lithographic 'views' of London which proliferated in the print and bookshops of the West End in the early nineteenth century (the most famous of which was Rowlandson and Pugin's Microcosm of London, published by Ackermann between 1808 and

44 The heads of Cumberland, Eldon and Londonderry are all identifiable. For details of the defeat of the bill in October 1831, and the popular reaction in the major cities, see Michael Brock, The Great Reform Act (1976), pp. 243-53.
45 BM 16778.
46 BM 17388.
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As opposed to the overt visual comedy of the caricatural tradition, prints such as these relied instead upon a drily ironic juxtaposition of caption and image. While both words and image were literally descriptive when considered separately, their satirical intent only became clear when read in conjunction with one another.

The suitability of lithography for documentary image-making was quickly realised by other artists and publishers of satirical imagery. Grant produced a striking image of the Houses of Parliament in flames in 1834, unusual in its degree of realism for this most caricatural of 1830s satirists (fig. 21). Similarly, Seymour extended its use to his work for The Looking Glass soon after Heath's departure from the series. The issue for September 1830 - only the second which Seymour had drawn himself - devoted three full pages to a chronological account of the French revolution, which relied entirely upon a realistic, ostensibly literal depiction of the events (figs. 22-3). Under the general title 'Memoranda of the French Revolution', the issue featured a series of scenes depicting the key moments of July 1830, with two lines of descriptive text accompanying each image, again contributing to the sense of documentary reportage suggested by the 'realistic' style of the images. In effect, these images used the inherent qualities of the technique to present themselves as a series of realistic narrative 'history paintings' in lithographic form. In doing so they create a direct contrast to the older conventions of satirical (and especially caricatural) imagery. Indeed, they cannot truly be considered satirical at all. That they could take up two-thirds of an ostensibly satirical publication, and yet not seem out of place, emphasises the

See Donald J. Gray, 'Views and Sketches of London in the Nineteenth Century', in Nadel & Schwarzbach eds., Victorian Artists and the City (1980), p.43. Prints such as these seem determined to capture the grandiosity of the 'modern' city, as opposed to the sketchier, more intimate work of Cruikshank or Grant, who tended to focus at closer range upon smaller corners of the metropolis (and their inhabitants). Such images are far from seem to attempt to capture the 'sublime' effects of 'power', 'vastness', 'light and dark', and so on, which had shaped the visions of late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century architects working in London. See Nicholas Taylor, 'The Awful Sublimity of the Victorian City' in Dyos & Wolff eds., The Victorian City, Vol.1 (1973), pp.431-447 (p.437). For a discussion of topographical views of London, see Will Vaughan, 'London Topographers and Urban Change' in Nadel & Schwarzbach eds., op.cit. pp.59-77.

A Correct View of the Conflagration of Both Houses of Parliament as Seen from the River at 8 O'Clock in the Evening, Oct. 16th 1834 (21st October 1834). A reduced version of the image - with a similar title - also appeared in Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine No.20, dated October 15th (a day before the fire).

Albeit in varying degrees, as the format of this sort of publication generally demanded a more concentrated and abbreviated type of image-making, with individual panels often being as small as two or three square inches. For a fuller discussion of The Looking Glass, see Chapter Four.

The Looking Glass, No.9, September 1st 1830. McLean and Seymour's response was as swift as it could have been under the circumstances. By the time the revolution had taken place, in late July, the August issue (No.8) would have been completely drawn and well into the printing stage, which meant that the report had to wait until the September issue, at which point, considering the magnitude of the event, it would still be topical enough to warrant lengthy coverage.
extent to which the English tradition of lithographic illustration - especially when used in the context of a periodical (thus functioning as a form of 'newspaper', reliant upon documentary veracity) - had transformed the nature of graphic satire as an aspect of journalistic commentary. 51

Doyle, who was already employing lithography for the portrait prints with which he established his initial reputation, can also be seen as emerging from this same tradition of literal representation. 52 However, his unwillingness to adapt to the caricatural mode may be attributed as much to his personality as to the conventions of his profession. His obituary notice in *The Art Journal* noted that he had always been a man of "the highest and purest ameliorative Conservative principles," 53 and this is evident in more than just his politics (which were staunchly pro-Tory). His very manner smacks of conservative cultural values, and forms a marked contrast to the products of radical print culture discussed in later chapters. The defining quality of the style he established was a striving for a sense of realism. As a professional portraitist this must have been largely instinctive, and even the title of his series - *The Political Sketches* - implies that the prints were drawn from life rather than from the imagination. Indeed, this was more often than not the case, as Doyle was a frequent presence in the visitors' gallery of the House of Commons, where he faithfully recorded the events and personalities which he witnessed. 54

Prints such as *Caught Napping* or *Another Ominous Conjunction* (figs. 24-5) 55 function directly via the impression of believable intimacy which they create, which in turn persuades the viewer that he is seeing a literal account of a real event.

The primary conceit - and the principal innovation - of Doyle's style was its suggestion of documentary veracity, a quality to which crayon lithography implicitly contributed via its ability to reproduce the effects of a pencil study or sketch. This is

51 The extent to which *The Looking Glass* was directly based upon the format of a journal or newspaper is discussed in Chapter Four.
52 Doyle's reputation as a portraitist was considerable, and his lithographs of public characters (such as *George IV at Ascot* or *Princess Victoria in her Pony Phaeton*) were well known. In April 1831 his name appeared in a list of "the most eminent lithographic artists in portrait", in which he was described as, "J. Doyle whose full length sketches of public characters are admirable for *vraisemblance*, and whose style of lithography is well known by his popular sketches." "A View of the Present State of Lithography in England" in *Library of the Fine Arts*, i, 1831, p.212.
54 "He became a quiet, silent, unsuspected frequenter of the lobby and gallery... and H.B. came into existence." *The Art Journal* (1868) p.47.
55 *Political Sketches*, 8th February 1832 and 14th July 1831.
not to imply that a 'realistic' image was not attainable in etching, simply that the
tonal, rather than linear, emphasis of crayon lithography increased the artist's
ability to suggest depth and form, thus contributing to an impression of realistic
representation. Therefore, the idea of veracity could be inherent in the technique
itself when it was used in a particular manner, even when it was extended to an
obviously imaginary situation, as in a print such as *Votaries at the Altar of Discord*
(fig. 26),\(^{56}\) which, despite its fantastic and implausible setting, appeals to the
notion that what we are witnessing has at least some basis in reality.

The pattern established by Doyle proved enormously influential and undoubtedly
had a formative influence on graphic satire. A comparison of two prints by
Seymour, produced two years apart, but both published by McLean, illustrates this
point very clearly. An etching such as *John Bull's Night Mare* (c. January 1828
(fig. 27))\(^{57}\) retains the recognisable iconographic patterns of eighteenth-century
graphic satire and the exaggerated caricatural mode of the Golden Age. It reduces
its subject to a set of conventional symbols, providing its own inbuilt interpretive
key in the form of the labels generously distributed throughout the image. It is a
quite consciously unrealistic image, relying on that quality which today we might
describe as 'cartoonish', although the scene itself is contextualised via a densely-
composed mass of background detail. The surface of the copper plate has been
worked in its entirety, leaving no empty space whatsoever, adding to the sense of
animation, confusion and disorder so characteristic of this type of caricatural image.
Only two years later, however, Seymour's style had been utterly transformed. An
image such as *A Pot-Walloon* (July 1830 (fig. 28)) represents the triumph of the
HB manner, and is a typical example of the use of crayon lithography. Human
figures have been returned to their correct proportions, physiognomies are
realistically rendered, and the overall composition has been drastically simplified.
Background detail is non-existent, thus focussing the emphasis on the figures
alone, rather than on any more complex structure of incidental or symbolic detail,
which in turn renders any explanatory labels redundant. The soft, 'vaporous'
quality to which Thackeray drew attention is created as much by the large areas of
blank white space as by the soft, tonal quality of crayon lithography as such - a
characteristic of many of HB's prints in particular.

---

\(^{56}\) *Political Sketches*, 20th April 1831.

\(^{57}\) BM 15497. The print is a depiction of the state of the nation, with John Bull, as was so often the case,
assailed by the perils which threatened the ordinary subject: an oppressive ministry, radical reformers,
Catholic demands and economic depression.
However, as mentioned earlier, it would be wrong to reduce English lithographic satire solely to the HB tradition (just as it would be wrong to assume that every print published by Philipon in Paris had the power of a Daumier). While Doyle and McLean were certainly instrumental in establishing lithography as a technique which could be successfully applied to satirical imagery, once its use became more widespread within the field of graphic satire, it quickly developed in a number of different directions. While the crayon (or chalk) technique was used to make images which simulated the tonal qualities of an original drawing, sketch or even a painting (effects entirely new to printed satirical imagery), pen lithography was more frequently used to replicate the more traditional linear manner of etched single sheet caricature. It was used most extensively in the early part of the decade, in particular between 1830-'32, during the period when the old-style single sheet print was in decline, while etching itself was still being used occasionally.

In conventional terms there is little to distinguish between the appearance of an etched single sheet and a pen lithograph (compare (figs.29-30)). Both retain the same linear style, the same caricatural mode of representation and the same material characteristics - from the type of paper on which they were printed, to the arrangement of borders, titles, captions and publishing line. Similarly, both types of print seem to have been more commonly sold coloured, whereas prints in the HB manner survive mostly in uncoloured impressions.

For a brief period in the early 1830s, pen and crayon lithography were used alongside one another by graphic satirists and their publishers. While McLean gave preference to the crayon manner, the pen technique was more widely used by publishers such as Tregear, Gans, Duncombe and King, who, rather than making a complete switch from one technique to the other, diversified their output to incorporate both types of print. What this effectively offered to artists, publishers and public alike, was a choice between the old tradition and the new. While some artists, such as Seymour, quickly adapted to the HB style for their own single sheet prints, more established figures such as 'Sharpshooter' and William Heath - who were perhaps too firmly rooted in the older conventions - were more resistant to any change in their style, and restricted their output to the kind of pen lithographs

58 Grant's *The Reform Bill HALTED A LITTLE* (22nd April 1831) is a lithograph, while William Heath's *Poor Mr. Bull In A Pretty Situation* (March 28th 1830) is an etching.
which retained the qualities of their earlier etchings (fig.31). Others used both techniques interchangeably, apparently influenced by the preference of their various publishers. Henry Heath, for example, produced pen lithographs, very much in the manner of his earlier etchings, for Gans, but adapted his style to imitate Doyle’s manner in the prints he produced for Fores, who specialised in imitation HBs.

As will be seen in Chapters Four and Five, lithography was the medium most commonly used in the serially-issued ‘multi-panel’ prints of the early ‘30s, but only a small number of text-based satirical periodicals flirted with the use of tipped-in lithographs during the decade. These were intended as an incentive to purchasers, but their experiments were wholly undistinguished in comparison with those being published in Paris, and included in publications such as *Le Charivari* and *La Caricature*. *The Fly* (1838-40) offered a lithograph with each of its weekly issues. These began as a rigid and uninspiring form of allegorical political satire (fig.32), but soon transformed into a series of ‘portraits’ of young women, with vaguely suggestive or sentimental captions, which Dorothy George has compared to a “degraded book of beauty”. In January 1838, Barnard Gregory’s *The Satirist* (1831-49) began giving an HB style print ‘gratis’ each week. These were routinely conventional imitations of *The Political Sketches* (entitled *Sketches of Satire*) by Henry Heath (fig.33). And finally, *Figaro*, towards the end of its life, briefly experimented with a series of lithographic ‘character’ portraits of the leading actors of the day in their most famous roles (fig.34).

The main distinction of this particular use of lithography within the periodical press was the retention of a sense of *separateness* between the image and the periodical itself. The lithographs were printed on a heavier paper than the text, incorporated no letterpress text, and were blank on the verso. Thus, the material characteristics

---

59 Grant/Sharpshooter; *Going! Going!*. Published by Gans on 12th November 1830.

60 In the first issue, it was stated that, “a feature of our work will be "THE FLY PICTURE GALLERY", to consist of portraits, sketches, views, and every thing that can in any way interest the public at large.” (*The Fly*, No.1, October 28th 1838). This effectively meant portraits of actors, politicians or other “popular personages. The series also included a very occasional wood engraving.

61 Such as “Make Haste Love!” and “I wish I had a comforter”.


63 The first of these appeared in No. 267 (January 14th 1837) and was an occasional feature until No. 284. The series included Charles Kemble, John Liston, Charles Matthews and Madame Vestris, amongst others. They were designed to imitate the appearance of stipple engravings, an illusion increased by the one example to carry a signature, which read, “Drawn by R. Page, Engraved by W.T. Page”.
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of these images implied that they were not an integral part of the main body of the periodical itself, but were intended to be detached and displayed, or collected in a separate volume, giving them a status quite distinct from the journal itself. As Tom Gretton has pointed out, the inclusion of an image which is blank on its verso within a text-based publication otherwise published on both recto and verso represents, "a clear invitation to extract the image from its immediate dependence on textual referents... Their specialness emphasises the 'normality' of the framing presence of text, page and brochure." This sense of 'separateness' was further emphasised by the nature of the images which these periodicals incorporated as lithographs. While Heath's Sketches were routine examples of the lithographic caricature of the period, those given with Figaro (and most of those which appeared in The Fly) were not satirical in any sense. Thus, their lithographic element was quite distinct from the primary purpose of the magazines. Both titles were ostensibly satirical, but the prints they gave away were related to their secondary content (their coverage of literature, theatre, music, and so on), thereby implying that lithography was better suited to a more 'realistic' form of representation, as opposed to the caricatural mode which characterised the majority of wood engraved images spread throughout the rest of the journal.

But, nevertheless, lithography still played a significant role in serially-issued graphic satire in the 1830s, albeit not within text-based publications. The very existence of The Looking Glass, Every Body's Album, the sequential series of Tregear and Dawson, and even The Political Sketches (all of which were lithographed) was founded on the conventions of periodicity; consistency of format, sequential numbering, and regular publication. The multi-panel prints in particular could be quite unlike the single sheet lithographs which appeared during the period, creating conventions of visual representation unique to themselves, and far more diverse in character than the prevailing mode established by Doyle. These prints will be examined in subsequent chapters, but first it is necessary to consider the more wide-reaching implications (and constraints) of the technique which would dominate periodical illustration throughout the mid-Victorian era: wood engraving.

Chapter Three

Style, Format and Reproductive Technology, Part Two; Wood Engraving and the Recycling of Images

I

Wood Engraving, Authorship and Anonymity; The Constraints of the Illustrated Satirical Periodical

"O woodman spare that block,
O gash not anyhow!
It took ten days by clock
I'd fain protect it now.

Chorus: Wild laughter from Dalziel's workshop"

- Dante Gabriel Rossetti

This short rhyme, composed by a figure whose reputation as one of the quintessential Victorian painters and illustrators has remained intact for well over a century, is indicative of the often ambivalent attitude which prevailed towards reproductive wood engraving in the nineteenth century. It was an attitude which could be felt even amongst the brightest stars of the Victorian art world, and even in regard to the largest and most successful engraving shop in the capital. The issue which provoked Rossetti (and others) to comment was the frequently roughshod manner in which the drawings they provided for book or periodical illustrations were translated into a reproducible form by wood-engravers. Hubert Von

1 From a letter to W.Bell-Scott, quoted in the introduction to the V&A catalogue An Exhibition of Modern Illustration (1901). The comment was made in reference to the troubles he experienced with the Dalziel brothers over his illustrations for Tennyson's In Memoriam. He wrote that he had, "designed five blocks for Tennyson, save seven which are still cutting and maiming. It is a thankless task, after a fortnight's work my block goes to the engraver, like Agag, and is hewn to pieces before the Lord Harry."
Herkomer spoke for many of his contemporaries when he lamented that, "in too many cases the creed of the (engraver) was 'cut through that shower of lines, never mind what the artist drew,' with the result that we could barely recognise our own work." Such claims were often overstated - and ignored the extraordinary craftsmanship of the finest reproductive wood engravers - but they remained a constant presence throughout much of the nineteenth century. The issue was, at heart, one of authorship, and it would remain a point of contention throughout much of the Victorian art world until the introduction of photomechanical reproduction rendered wood engraving redundant as a means of reproduction towards the end of the century.

Thus, the implications of the widespread use of wood engraving were significant, even in the often anonymous context of the weekly penny press, where the issue of authorship and artistic identity took an emphatic second place to the more immediate commercial necessities of meeting a weekly deadline and providing a commodity which was defined first and foremost by its 'cheapness'. The extent to which such issues were important for the men who worked within this fundamentally commercial milieu is questionable, but from the evidence of the material alone it is possible to demonstrate the extent to which the medium of wood engraving effected a profound change upon satirical imagery in the 1830s.

The first point to stress is the frequently indifferent quality of much of the engraving found in the pages of cheap periodicals. This was an inevitable consequence of the market economics which drove the penny press in particular. By the 1850s, the large family firms of the Dalziels, Swains and Whympers were providing engravings for many of the most prominent Victorian periodicals, *Punch* included, but in the 1830s the political press was much more reliant upon the less-skilled end

---


3 Cruikshank was the only prominent caricaturist active during the 1830s who repeatedly took steps to emphasise his status as the originator of the works he created, and to ensure that his name was prominently appended to them, and to deny any involvement with the many imitative works which opportunistically carried his name or a subtle variation thereof. See Patten, *op.cit.*, Vol.I, pp. 300-01 for Cruikshank's acrimonious battle with the publisher of *Bell's Life in London* over the plagiarism of his *Phrenological Illustrations*.

4 For details of the business founded by the Dalziels, and their work for the periodical press, see George and Edward Dalziel, *op.cit.* Spielmann (*op.cit.*, pp.247-53) includes an extended account of Joseph Swain's wood engraving duties on *Punch*. 

of the metropolitan engraving community. At the time, this consisted of around a hundred engravers, including men such as W. C. Walker, Joseph Welch and George Armstrong, who worked for Figaro in London and The Devil in London, James March, who worked for Punch in London, and William Calvert, who worked for The Penny Satirist, as well as producing many of the cuts for Lloyd's cheap serial fiction. These men remain obscure, any mention of their names generally being restricted to the trade directories of the period. George Augustus Sala, however, recalled that Calvert (with whom he had trained in his youth) had been, "exclusively employed in preparing the blocks for the illustration of a number of cheap, and it must be admitted, vulgar weekly publications," which he, "engraved, or rather chopped," with a distinct lack of finesse.

Even the venerable institution of Punch was not immune to the constraints of wood engraving, especially in its earliest years. Marion Spielmann recalled that, in its early years, the journal's weekly full-page cartoons were often "roughly drawn and hastily cut" in order to meet the weekly deadline. But it is only from the 1840s onwards - when the artists who worked for the magazine began to experience an increase in their social and professional status - that we find any suggestion of genuine dissatisfaction with the effects of reproductive - or facsimile - wood engraving. Spielmann, for example, noted that, "it (has) often been quoted of Leech that after he had shown a drawing on the wood to any friend who might be with him, he would add with a sigh - "But wait until next week and see how the

---

5 Like much of the metropolitan printing trade in the early nineteenth century, the wood-engraving community existed within a closely-knit milieu. It was concentrated in broadly the same area inhabited by the publishing industry, as described in Chapter One, with the engraving premises themselves often located in overcrowded, claustrophobic, converted houses in the numerous narrow yards and courts which spread out between the major thoroughfares of the city. Despite the containment of the community within this milieu, however, there remained considerable social and professional distinctions between its upper and lower echelons. While master engravers, such as the Dalziel brothers, became men of prestige and considerable social standing, the lower end of the trade - the 'peckers' as they were known - had declined considerably in status since Bewick's time, not least as a result of their ambivalent position in the world of political journalism. Fox, op.cit., pp. 70-1. Fox estimates that the social standing of men such as the Dalziels was equal to that of the most successful factory owners in the north of England. She devotes an entire chapter to a lengthy discussion of the wood engraving profession in the 1830s and '40s (pp. 26-72).

6 William Chester Walker (fl. 1826-48) was based at 15, Guildford Place, Spitalfields; Joseph Welch at 6 Francis Street, White Conduit Fields; and James March at 15 Cobourg Place, Borough Road (between 1832-4). Calvert is not mentioned by Engen, although he may be related to Edward Calvert (1799-1883), who was noted for his influential series of Arcadian views, and who exhibited at the RA between 1825-36. Engen, op.cit., pp. 40-41, 272 &278.

7 See Robson's and Pigot's Directories for these years in particular.
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engraver will spoil it!"10 George DuMaurier similarly recalled that Leech, “drew straight on the wood block with a lead pencil; his delicate grey lines had to be translated into the uncompromising coarse black lines of printers’ ink - a ruinous process; and what was lost in this way is only to be estimated by those who know.”11

The perceived value of the original drawing, and its destruction at the hands of the wood-engraver, was the principal argument put forward by John Ruskin for the acquisition, and preservation for the nation, of the original sketches for Leech’s Punch cartoons. Some years after the artist’s death (in 1864), a committee was established to raise funds for just this purpose and Ruskin, as its most prominent member, provided an extended introductory letter, laying out its aims and intentions, which was distributed to potential contributors.12 Sections of this letter are worth quoting at length for what they reveal about the attitude towards wood-engraved periodical illustration in general, but also about the constraining effect which the technique could have on graphic satire in particular:

“It cannot be necessary for me, or anyone now to praise the work of John Leech. Admittedly it contains the finest definition and natural history of the classes of our society, the kindest and subtlest analysis of its foibles, the tenderest flattery of its pretty and well-bred ways, with which the modesty of subservient genius ever amused or immortalised careless masters. But it is not generally known how much more valuable, as art, the first sketches for the woodcuts were than the finished drawings, even before those drawings sustained any loss in engraving.”

Thus, Ruskin immediately constructs a kind of ‘hierarchy of authenticity’, based on degrees of spontaneity, in which the first sketch is more valuable than the finished drawing, which in turn is more valuable than the final engraving. This spontaneity, in other words, was the essential prerequisite for the kind of social satire for which Leech was renowned. In this formulation, authorial identity is situated most firmly in the act of spontaneous and intuitive creation, and is diluted by the labour involved in translating those first impulsive sketches into a reproducible form - first

10 Spielmann, op.cit. p. 252.
11 George DuMaurier, op.cit., p. 23.
12 A printed copy of this letter is pasted into the front of a volume of Leech’s drawings now located in the rare books department of the Yale Center for British Art in New Haven (accession no. B1977.14.3104-3127). The following quotations are all drawn from this copy.
by a finished drawing, and finally by an engraving of that drawing in the pages of a
periodical. Just as Thackeray had contrasted the ‘art’ of Parisian lithographic
caricature with the ‘mechanical craft’ of English periodical illustration, so does
Ruskin draw a distinction in terms of artistic value between the sketch, the drawing
and - lowest of the low - the reproductive engraving.13

But it was not only the engraving process itself which restricted the work of graphic
satirists who worked within the periodical press. Wood engraving was most widely
used in the penny quarto-sized weekly periodicals, such as Figaro in London, in
which it was used to reproduce the illustrations which appeared (generally
speaking) on the title page of each issue, as an accompaniment to the leading
article. Typically, the size of these images (defined by the dimensions of the piece
of boxwood on which the design was drawn) was no more than three or four inches
square - or about one seventh of the page as a whole. The constraints of working
within such a space were considerable, especially when one considers that the
standard size of a single sheet print at the time was about ten by fifteen inches.
Graphic satire had always reduced complex ideas to conventional symbols,14 but
within the confines of such a small space this process of simplification was, of
necessity, also extended to the manner of representation. Character was
abstracted even further, features were frequently simplified and delineated with as
few lines as possible, while background settings were schematised or even non­
existent. This inevitably influenced the manner in which a theme or a visual
concept could be treated. The impact of a single sheet lithograph such as Grant’s
A Perfect Fright (fig.35), for example, was considerably reduced when its subject
was confined to a wood engraving approximately one seventh of its original size,

13 Of course, this argument could work both ways. While Bewick had been both designer and engraver of his
own images, thus retaining full control over their interpretation, the vast majority of those who came after him
were employed to translate the designs of others on to wood and, perhaps inevitably, the question of how far
they should be free to interpret these designs according to their own inclinations could also arise. William
Linton, in his treatise, Masters of Wood Engraving (1889), lamented the detrimental effect which he felt the
slavish adherence to a pre-existing design - especially one drawn on wood, in which the engraver simply cut
around the draughtsman’s lines - was having on the art of engraving itself: "that such drawing well suited the
hasty sketches needed in Hone’s Political Tracts and Punch, that as sketches they satisfied the special
occasion, that there is a chain in this loose free handling, that they were quickly drawn and easily - only too
easily engraved, that they were satisfactorily cheap to publishers - is true; yet no less were they detrimental
to the art of engraving." (p.205) Again, the primary characteristic of satirical imagery is here defined in terms
of its spontaneity - the “loose free handling” which is lost in the engraving process. But Linton turns this point
around and argues that the imitation of such a style by engravers was damaging to the ‘art’ of wood­
engraving itself. The implication of this is that the highest achievements of the technique were realised in
precisely the kind of highly-skilled, labour-intensive and time-consuming work on which the satirical press
could not afford to rely, and which was wholly antithetical to the notion of ‘spontaneity’ which Ruskin felt
characterised the finest examples of humorous or satirical illustration.

as was the case when Seymour re-used the theme in an issue of Asmodeus (fig.38). Nevertheless, even images of this restricted size played an important role in breaking the monotony of a large area of concentrated text.

We can see this again in several issues of The Weekly Show-Up, one of many short-lived quarto penny periodicals which appeared in the wake of Figaro in London in the first half of 1832 (see Chapter Seven). During its short life it published reduced translations of several lithographic prints which had originated in the shops around St. Paul's, especially those of Tregear. A print such as Grant's Carrion Crows in John Bull's Cornfield (fig.37), for example, was copied and published under the same title almost immediately after it was first published. (fig.38). The composition is similar to the original, although the image itself is much smaller. The principal difference is that the frame of the image is narrower, focussing the attention more firmly upon the clerical 'crows'. The background details are quite basic in both versions, but - especially in comparison with a coloured impression of the lithograph - the second appears more sparse and schematised. This is not so much related to the composition as to the reproductive medium. Wood engraving, in conjunction with letterpress text, somehow retains a 'typographic' element which gives an impression of greater simplicity.

A more complex image was inevitably subject to a greater simplification in compositional terms. The Grant-Treagar collaboration, Battle Royal Between the Whig National School Boys and the Tory Charity Crabs (fig.39) reappeared in the journal under the title Grand Battle Between the Union School Boys and the Tory Rabble), and was reduced to only its central vignette (fig.40). Thus, much of the impact of the original print - with its frenetic mass of bodies in motion, flags and banners waving, objects flying through the air, and disordered detritus discarded in the foreground - is lost in the engraving. The scene is reduced to just

---

15 Asmodeus in London, No. 31, September 29th, 1832, p.123.
16 And it also made the laborious process of typesetting each issue that much quicker and cheaper.
17 The lithograph is dated July 1832, while the copy appeared in The Weekly Show Up. No.3, dated July 14th. Logically, the original can have been current for no more than a fortnight before the 'plagiarism' was published. As such periodicals relied to a great extent upon their topicality, it seems reasonable to assume that it appeared as soon after the original as was humanly possible.
18 The lithograph is dated May, 1832, the wood engraving appeared in No.3, July 14th. The abbreviation of the title also removes the allusion to state intervention in the educational system in the early 1830s, obscuring the reference to Charity and National Schools. See Altick, op.cit., pp.141-6; P. McCann ed., Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century (1977); and Pamela & Harold Silver, The Education of the Poor: The History of a National School, 1824-1974 (1974), p..35-73.
seven figures, and the overall sense of animation is lost. The characters seem stiff in comparison, and all the background detail - which added to the intended atmosphere of confusion in the original - is lost.

The reason for the more common use of a basic type of image was two-fold. Firstly, it was a matter of finance. The radical political press was in a very precarious position throughout the 1830s. Its fortunes were unpredictable, and its leading writers, editors, printers and publishers were prone to prosecution, fines and bankruptcy. They simply could not afford the regular services of the most skilled and reliable craftsmen (of whom there were at most two dozen at the time of Bewick’s death in 1828).

Recalling the work of George Armstrong who, despite having been a pupil of Bewick at one time, had been reduced to working for the penny weeklies by the 1830s, Sala remarked that, “Poor old Mr. Armstrong, who in his day had executed work of the highest kind, was fain to be... a “scauper” and a slasher because the engraver could not afford to pay him a sufficient sum for really artistic work.”

Secondly, it was a matter of the deadlines involved in publishing a weekly periodical. The penny political press was founded to a great extent upon its topicality, demanding at the very least a relevant weekly cut to illustrate its lead article, and so expediency of production was of primary concern. As Fox has pointed out, the finest wood-engravers of the period were not only expensive, but they worked slowly, and so could not necessarily be relied upon to meet a weekly deadline. More suitable for the purposes of the penny weeklies was a stark black-line image, with much of the surface of the block simply - and quickly - scraped away to leave large areas of white space. Moreover, the legibility of a densely-

---

19 James Grant recalled that authors and editors were particularly common in London’s debtor prisons during the 1830s (Sketches in London, 1838, pp. 79-80), while The Town, when describing an inhabitant of the Queen’s Bench prison also made him a writer (The Town, No.3, June 17th 1837). See also R. Nicholson, An Autobiography (1860), p. 136. Both Gilbert a’ Beckett, editor of Figaro, and Henry Mayhew (of Asmodeus) were declared bankrupt at various periods, (the former in 1834, the latter in 1846); Celina Fox, op.cit., p. 37.


21 Celina Fox, op.cit., p. 43.

22 Sala, op.cit., pp. 208-10. The ‘engraver’ referred to was Calvert, to whom Armstrong was then acting as an assistant.

23 It was here that the skill of the engraver could come into its own, given the right circumstances. To recreate convincingly the line of a pen drawing in a black-line wood engraving is a very difficult task. If the engraver was talented, he might be able to give some sense of the swift stroke of the pen, and this was often attempted. But inevitably (given the restrictions on time) the fluidity of an original drawing was generally lost in the penny weeklies, and what we see is merely an approximation of the original design.
worked wood-engraving relied heavily upon the quality of the printing, inking, and the paper on which it was printed. In a field whose chief defining characteristic was its cheapness - its 'pennyness' if you will - such production values could not be considered in realistic terms.24

However, in the hands of a truly skilled engraver - one not constrained by a weekly deadline - the designs of someone like Seymour could take on an altogether different quality. This is exemplified by a publication such as *The Political Almanack for 1836*,25 which included thirteen illustrations by Seymour, all of which were engraved by John Orrin Smith.26 An annual publication, not reliant upon topicality to the same extent as a weekly or monthly title, the Almanack benefited from a greatly extended period of production. An illustration such as *November* (fig. 41) is a very fine piece of engraving, using a skilful combination of parallel wavering and tapering black-and-white lines (subtly suggesting variations in depth and form) to construct the background scene - a foggy street at night. The entire surface of the woodblock was very densely worked, with great subtlety and considerable skill - a level of craftsmanship which is consistent throughout the volume.

Similarly, the difference which careful inking and printing, and the use of fine quality paper, could make to an image was considerable. This can be seen in a set of proofs of wood-engravings which appeared in *The Ballot* between November

---

24 William Ivins has emphasised the importance of good paper and careful printing when producing a wood-engraved image: "The prime factors involved, in addition to the finely reticulated surface of the woodblock, were the paper, the ink, the method of inking the block, and the press." He describes the mass of indifferently-produced wood-engraved imagery which flowed from the presses in the nineteenth century as, "a typical case study of what happens when a new process or technique is introduced and is not rapidly put to use by a man of genius." *Prints and Visual Communication* (1969), pp.102-4.

25 *The Political Almanack for 1836*. An octavo volume, costing 1s6d.

26 John Orrin Smith (1799-1843) was one of the most prominent and prolific engravers of the early Victorian period, and ran a thriving workshop in London. He was noted for his animal and landscape engravings, and also produced many illustrated books, including editions of Shakespeare and the Tales of the Arabian Nights. He worked extensively for the periodical press, illustrating several early issues of *Art Union* (later *The Art Journal*), and - in collaboration with W.J. Linton - the illustrations for the early *ILN*. His work was known in France, and he engraved for several French publishers. The young Henry Vizetelly was apprenticed to him, and he noted that Smith was, "not only a great enthusiast in his profession, but had the knack of inspiring those associated with him with much of his own zeal." His work for the satirical press does not seem to have been extensive, although he was instrumental in publishing the early sketches of John Leech. Engen, *op.cit.*, pp.242-3. The very amount of biographical detail available in itself marks him out as exceptional within this field.
1831 and January 1832. They formed part of a series entitled ‘Sketches From the Church’ which was illustrated each week with an anti-clerical cut at the head of the third page of the paper. These were competently engraved images in comparison to the majority of those which appeared in the unstamped quarto periodicals. The line is controlled and ordered, with elaborate hatching and a fair degree of detail and tonal variation. The proofs are uniformly well-inked and printed on good quality paper, giving a clear, crisp quality to the lines, which have printed as a solid, sharp black (fig.42). The periodical itself, however, was printed on standard newsprint, in an edition of several thousand copies. Thus, the same degree of attention could not be given to the inking and printing processes, with the result that much of the clarity of the proofs was lost. The images in the paper itself printed as a dull, broken grey, with much of their detail having been obscured (fig.43). They are still legible, certainly, but have undoubtedly lost much of their definition in the course of a large print run, during which little attention could be paid to the inking of the blocks. In 1839 The Penny Satirist acknowledged the limitations of such large-scale production when it devoted its entire front cover to reprinting cuts from William Strange’s Life of Napoleon Bonaparte (fig.44). The illustrations were accompanied by an apology for the inferior production values which inevitably resulted from an extended print run: “We deem it necessary to inform our readers that, in consequence of the rapidity with which we are compelled to print off “THE PENNY SATIRIST”... the above Engravings appear at a great disadvantage to what they do in the work itself.”

Quite apart from these questions of production values, an artist’s creative identity could be obscured in other ways when working for the cheap press - especially when the work was of a radical nature. The images in series such as The Political Playbill, John Bull’s Picture Gallery and Lloyd’s Political Jokes were all produced anonymously, with only the names of their respective publishers appearing at the

---

27 The Ballot, a four page Sunday broadsheet costing 7d, was published by Thomas Wakley - a moderate radical publisher and later M.P. for Finsbury - between January 2nd 1831 and November 4th 1832. See Hollis, op.cit. pp. 81-91,117-9, 252-3 & 277; Wiener, op.cit., pp.72-3 & 267-8. The set of proofs is part of the British Museum’s collection of satires (BM 17332-41), but the print room does not have copies of the periodical as such. A set is preserved in the British Library Newspaper Library, Colindale. The Ballot, although not a satirical periodical as such, occupies an important position in the history of 1830s graphic satire, as it was actually the first paper to incorporate satirical cuts on a weekly basis. The first appearance of ‘Sketches From The Church’ predates the launch of Figaro by six weeks.

28 Published in weekly numbers at a penny, and collected in monthly parts at sixpence.

29 The Penny Satirist, Vol.3, No.127, September 23rd 1839. It claimed, in the same issue, that its circulation at the time was 50,000 copies.
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bottom of each issue. Even the authorship of *The Political Drama*, which has traditionally been attributed to Grant in its entirety, is questionable, as it was rarely signed. Grant’s initials appear on only thirty-nine of its hundred and thirty-one issues, while only two others carry any identifying marks whatsoever. Number fifty-seven is signed by the otherwise entirely obscure ‘Oakum’, while the final issue (No. 131) contains the signature of Joe Lisle who, like Grant, had worked for both Tregear and Gans in the early ’30s. Whether the remaining issues were drawn by Grant (or someone else entirely) is impossible to establish categorically. A survey of the entire run of the series suggests that Drake, as publisher, was relying upon several different engravers, and their contrasting styles and techniques inevitably disrupt any aesthetic unity which the prints might have retained had they all been the work of a single hand. Even the issues signed by Grant often display an obvious disparity in their manner of execution from one example to the next, making any real conclusion about authorship impossible. It is quite likely that he drew many (or even all) of the unsigned issues as well, but the variance of their appearance makes any definite attribution on purely stylistic grounds problematic. Only three issues (18, 25 and 27) can be regarded as ‘pure’ Grant, as they identify him as both designer and engraver.

But this degree of anonymity was not restricted to the most overtly radical publications. Relatively few of Seymour’s cuts for *Figaro* and *Asmodeus* carried his initials. Indeed, in the latter, the signatures of the engravers - especially Walker

---

30 At the time, such issues were most likely immaterial to the people who bought this type of print, but they can have significant implications for scholars today. As Michel Foucault has pointed out, an identifiable name can be, "functional in that it serves as a means of classification. A name can group together a number of texts and thus differentiate them from others... the fact that a number of texts (can be) attached to a single name implies that relationships of homogeneity, filiation, reciprocal explanation, authentication, or of common utilization, (can be) established among them." "What is an Author?" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practise* (1977), pp.113-38 (p.123). In other words, an identifiable name allows the establishment of an *oeuvre* (and its situation within a canon) in the mind of the scholar, connoisseur, or collector, which itself creates a kind of value which anonymous work is often (although not always) denied. Similarly, Roland Barthes has put forward the idea that, "the explanation of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end... the voice of a single person, the author 'confiding' in us." "The Death of the Author" in *Image, Music, Text* (1977), pp.142-48 (p.143).

31 Whether he signed the print in the capacity of designer or engraver - or both - is not indicated. His name does not appear in the directories of the period, nor in Engen’s *Dictionary of Wood Engravers*.

32 It is possible that Drake himself engraved some - or even many - of the prints in the series. The initials ‘GD’ appear several times on examples of radical satirical prints (although not in *The Political Drama* itself). Whether this was George Drake is uncertain. Celina Fox tentatively suggests G. Dorrington, but it is impossible to be absolutely sure in this regard.

33 No.18 - the first issue of the series to contain any signature whatsoever - is signed "CJG Del. & Sc.", while Nos. 25 and 27 are signed "CJG, Esq. Inv. & Scul". the vast majority of the other signed prints in the series contain only the initials "CJG", with only a single example (No.28) identifying him as "CJGRANT". Likewise, only one issue (No.123) contains Grant’s initials in conjunction with those of an engraver ("MAA Sc.").
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and Armstrong - appeared with much greater frequency. The apparently arbitrary presence of signatures implies a general acceptance that any contribution to a journalistic enterprise of this nature was an act of collaboration within a broader editorial framework, and that any claims to authorship were secondary to the existence of the title as a whole. During its early years, even the full-page cartoons in \textit{Punch} were rarely signed by anyone other than Ebeneezer Landells, their engraver. In the five years after 1843 (when the term ‘cartoon’ was first employed on a regular basis) an average of only sixteen cartoons carried the artists’ signatures each year - less than a third.\footnote{In 1843, sixteen signatures appeared; in 1844, twenty; in 1845, sixteen; in 1846, eighteen; and in 1847, only nine.}

Anonymity, however, was only the most obvious manifestation of the diminution of artistic identity imposed by the cheap press. Perhaps more significant was the reversal of the status of words and images which had been effected by the shift from the single sheet tradition to the satirical periodical. In single sheet caricature, the primacy of the image had been paramount. By definition, in a single sheet print, the image effectively \textit{was} the object. It existed primarily in relation to itself, and its meaning was made entirely by the information contained within it. Illustrations in periodicals, however, were generally related to a much longer text, which accompanied an image rather than forming an integral part of it. As such, the demands upon them as bearers of information were substantially reduced. They functioned as a summary of, or an addendum to, a primary text, and were not required to contain all the relevant information themselves.\footnote{Of course, single sheet satirical prints also relied upon words (titles, word balloons, etc.), but in a very different way. In a single sheet print, the words became a part of the image, but in a periodical, the text - whether a descriptive caption or a longer article - existed separately from the image.} And as the amount of visual information which an image contained was reduced, it became increasingly reliant upon the words which accompanied it to give it meaning, which was now made only in relation to the words which surrounded it (and from which, in physical terms - as a woodblock placed alongside letterpress type - it was entirely separate). As Peter Wagner has emphasised, when separate words and images are combined in this manner, “the text of the... caption both clarifies and limits our reading of the picture.” Indeed, he deems the term ‘legend’ to be a more accurate descriptor than the more familiar ‘caption’, on the basis of its broader meaning as an “invented story,” because the caption/legend ‘invents’ the meaning of the image.
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it accompanies.\textsuperscript{36} The use of a caption or title immediately focusses the spectator’s attention on a single aspect of the image as a whole, and serves as an indicator that this particular aspect is the most important, reducing any other possible meanings or interpretations to a secondary or marginal status. In this way, what Wagner terms a ‘hierarchy of meaning’ is established by the words as a means of drawing the reader into the image along a specifically-delineated path.\textsuperscript{37}

Thus, while the periodical format appeared to unite words and images, it could actually contribute to their separation at the same time. If an image only functioned in relation to the words which accompanied it, then those words could easily be altered in order to change the meaning of the image. Images were united with ‘text’ in a general sense, but ceased to function in relation to any one definite text, thus - at least potentially - achieving a plurality of meanings which separated them from any essential relationship to whatever words surrounded them. This is best illustrated by the way two very different periodicals - both edited by Gilbert Abbott à Beckett in 1832 - used the same illustrations by Robert Seymour in completely different contexts.

In March 1832, à Beckett appeared before a magistrate, charged as editor of the unstamped \textit{Figaro}, after one of its vendors had been arrested.\textsuperscript{38} The following week’s issue featured two cuts directly related to the incident side by side on the front page, illustrating an article entitled \textit{Figaro V. The Blue Devils} (\textbf{fig.45}). The first of these, \textit{Horrors of Limbo}, depicts a ragged, emaciated youth imprisoned in a cell. Beyond this immediate information, however, the image has no context until the reader absorbs the content of the lead article, from which it may be inferred that this figure represents the unfortunate vendor following his arrest. Similarly, the accompanying image, \textit{The Police Force on Duty}, although clearly depicting the metropolitan police engaged in a baton charge, allows no more specific interpretation until read in conjunction with the section of the article dealing with the repressive measures of the same ‘Blue Devils’. Although the second cut was not in fact related to the event in question, the juxtaposition of the two images, combined with the extended editorial, no doubt had the desired rhetorical effect. The following month, however, both images appeared again in the April issue of \textit{The

\textsuperscript{36} Peter Wagner, \textit{Reading Iconotexts} (1995), p.11 & notes.
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{ibid}, p.30.
\textsuperscript{38} Fox, \textit{loc.cit.}, p.226.
Comic Magazine (which would actually have gone on sale at the end of March, at almost exactly the same time as the issue of Figaro in question). Here, though, they were presented several pages apart, isolated on single pages, with different captions, and with no lengthy text relating to them (figs. 46-7). Without any accompanying textual polemic to give them a specific meaning, the images, although identical (better printed, perhaps, but otherwise unchanged), existed only in relation to their captions, and so became simple verbal-visual puns: 'strong room for improvement' and 'the staff at headquarters' (my italics).

For the majority of Figaro's 70,000 readers, such considerations probably had little importance. From a 'connoisseurial' perspective, however, the issues raised in this chapter are rather more relevant. And thinking back to the 1889 Royal Institute exhibition, which included no examples of wood engraved satire whatsoever, they had significant implications for the subsequent reputation of this kind of illustration. At the time, however, the appearance of wood engraved reproduction was so familiar to the eye - so conventional - that it could be taken for granted, its technical particularities remaining largely implicit. Only once did Figaro make any acknowledgment of the difference between Seymour's original drawings and the finished engravings which it published. On April 23rd 1836, three days after his suicide, the following announcement appeared on the back page of the paper:

"DEATH OF OUR ARTIST

We stop the presses, with deepest regret, to announce the death of our highly talented artist, SEYMOUR, whose unrivalled genius imparted such a raciness of humour to our pages. We have fortunately by us a few more of his sketches, which will appear in our subsequent Nos., and have secured the services of another gentleman of first rate

---

39 Figaro was primarily a political journal, unstamped, and sold at a penny to a moderately radical lower and lower-middle class audience. The Comic Magazine, however, was monthly publication costing a shilling, and was more typical of the genteel humour of the small octavo 'gift books' or annuals which proliferated during the 1830s, and which it resembled very closely when bound in its semi-annual volumes, "elegantly half-bound in Morocco, and gilt edged", which were sold for 7s6d. Figaro, being a weekly publication, relied on the topicality of its content, so its front page cuts almost always dealt with an issue which had been in the news at some point during the past seven days. In contrast, The Comic Magazine was conceived as much more family-oriented publication, inviting contributions from humorists such as W.T. Moncrieff, Thomas Dibdin and Louisa Henrietta Sheridan, who provided comic songs and rhymes which had no basis in the past month's events, which is itself indicative of how far removed it was from the world of politics and occasional personal abuse featured in Figaro.

40 The circulation figure was suggested by Marion Spielmann. op. cit., p.273.
Over the following two weeks it proceeded to do something rather unusual. It published Seymour's final sketches as promised, but not perhaps in the form which its readers would have expected. Rather than reworking the sketches into a finished form, Figaro's final tribute to Seymour was to publish them in a version which attempted to retain his original line in its exact form. Therefore, what it actually published were wood-engraved approximations of his schematic, preparatory, pen drawings, right down to the reproduction of his original handwritten word balloons (figs.48-9). In effect, this was an attempt to imbue wood-engraving with an autographic quality similar to that of lithography. Thus, Figaro's final tribute lay in its attempt to display as 'authentic' a part of Seymour's creative personality as possible. Whether this actually did his reputation any favours is open to question, but it did implicitly acknowledge that the images which had been appearing in the pages of Figaro for the past four years were somehow not the real Seymour, but only the distant echo of his authorial voice.

None of this was expressly stated, of course, but it is suggestive of an implicit recognition of the constraints of weekly periodical illustration. Both the immediate and long-term consequences of this subjugation to an anonymous editorial voice, and a reproductive technique which obscured any true authorial identity, were profound. It marked the decisive point at which English graphic satire became a part of the journalistic sphere, as opposed to being an individual, autonomous aspect of visual culture in general (and print culture in particular), as it had been during its Golden Age and the Regency period. This context would neither encourage nor permit the evolution of a talent such as Gillray or Rowlandson, whose work had thrived on the freedom and spontaneity allowed by the etched single sheet print. Even the development of lesser, although no less individualistic and expressive, talents such as Richard Newton would not have been possible within the reductive and conventional confines of the periodical page. Not even a talent such as George Cruikshank could overcome the restrictions of wood engraved periodical illustration to produce any genuinely memorable work after the 1830s. While his collaborations with William Hone in 1819-21 were undoubtedly influential on the form, they are now best remembered as clever appropriations of popular forms rather than for their illustrations as such (with the possible exception

41 Figaro in London, No. 229, 23rd April 1836, p. 68.
Moreover, none of his finest work of the Victorian period - *The Bottle*, *The Drunkard's Children*, his plates for *The Table Book*, or his etchings for *The Comic Almanack* - was executed on wood, but in reproductive techniques which allowed the fullest expression of his individual talents. Despite producing literally thousands of wood engravings throughout the period, the vast majority of these are now obscure, and tell us little, if anything, about his development as an artist.

II

Collaboration and Plagiarism; The Recycling of Satirical Images in the 1830s

While the graphic satire trade was clearly undergoing significant changes in regard to its geographical situation within the metropolis and the reproductive technologies on which it would rely, it was also experiencing wider changes in the construction of its community and the working relationship between its constituent elements. Collaboration of one kind or another would become an increasingly integral part of the creative process during the 1830s. This manifested itself not only via the use of ideas submitted to publishers by amateurs (although this practice continued as well), but also through a new emphasis on the close working relationship between the most prominent artists of the period, the technical necessity of relying upon the assistance of outside specialists (whether lithographic printers or wood engravers) to translate an original image into a reproducible form, and an increasing tendency for ideas to be re-used by different artists and publishers without acknowledgment. Imitation and repetition of styles, formats and individual images became commonplace, along with an increasing tendency towards anonymity and pseudonymity. In combination with one another, all these factors contributed still further to the diminution of individual creative identity within the graphic satire industry discussed above.

The close-knit interrelationship of the artistic community during the 1830s was most clearly demonstrated in the frequency of collaboration between some of the most

---


prominent artists of the period. Some, such as Grant, apparently began their careers by supplying designs for prints - often uncredited - which would then be drawn up in a finished form by a more established artist. Although the earliest single sheet prints to bear his signature did not appear until August 1830, Grant was providing William Heath with ideas as early as May of that year, the results of which were published by McLean (fig.50).\footnote{The print in question (fig.50) is part of a pair entitled Drunkards on Parade (the other depicts a soldier). There is an impression in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (discovered in Grant's own guardbook), which includes a handwritten note identifying Grant as the print's designer - an attempt on his part to reclaim the authorship of the image. There seems to be little reason to dismiss this evidence. See Fox, ed., op.cit. (1992), p. 563 and Richard Pound, C.J.Grant's Political Drama; A Radical Satirist Rediscovered (1998), pp.22-3.} But he also collaborated with other artists. His most frequent co-author in 1830 was Henry Heath (who, like Grant, was producing most of his work for Gans at the time), although he also produced at least one print in conjunction with 'Sharpshooter'.\footnote{The Grant/Heath collaborations are: WANTS! Dedicated to the King's Ministers; an Obliging Neighbour (sic); H-\textit{T} at the Levee - Or the POLISHED Courtier! (all 1830). The Grant/'Sharpshooter' print is \textit{Going! Going!} (Nov. 12th 1830).} Other forms of collaboration, however, are rather more perplexing, and tend to obscure the different roles of individual artists, posing unanswerable questions about the authorship of specific images.\footnote{Indeed, some would argue that these questions are unnecessary. Nevertheless, the very fact that such puzzles remain is itself an indication of the diminished role of the 'authorial voice' in caricature of the period.}

In February 1831, Gans published a print entitled \textit{The School of REFORM} (fig.51) - a pen lithograph by Grant. It depicts the Whig Prime Minister, Lord Grey, as a schoolmaster attempting to teach a class of Tory ministers (with Wellington as the Dunce) the "conjugation of the Verb TO REFORM". The image is an adaptation of a French print by Decamps,\footnote{\textit{Classe de Français Me. Contrarius (dans sa Chaire)}, published by Gihaut on 21st September 1830. For Grant's knowledge of French caricature, see Pound, op.cit, pp. 46-49. Grant's version is BM 16586, 'TF's is BM 16587.} which immediately seems to situate Grant as \textit{translator} rather than \textit{author} of the image. But even this status is further confused by the existence of an almost identical print - a crayon lithograph - also published by Gans, but signed with the monogram 'TF' (fig.52).\footnote{TF appears three times in the final volume of the \textit{BMC}, Nos. 16587 (\textit{The School of REFORM}), 16843, \textit{(John Bull SINKING into the PROFOUND} - an image which bears some similarity to Grant's work in stylistic terms), and 16948 (\textit{The Latest Job}). This second version is not dated, but was, presumably, contemporaneous. The differences between the two are subtle, but suggestive: Grant's print is more overtly caricatural - more directly related to the older traditions of the single sheet print - whereas TF's is more reminiscent of the HB manner of political 'portraiture', with the element of caricature considerably reduced (although the figures of the Tories are made more
obviously childlike). This suggests one of two explanations. It is most likely that a first edition of the print sold out, by which time the lithographic stone from which it was printed had been ground down and re-used. This would have necessitated the re-drawing of the image in order to print a second edition (most probably the undated version). However, in light of the stylistic differences between the two, it is possible that Gans issued two versions simultaneously in order to appeal to two different audiences - those who preferred the older conventions of caricature, and those who had embraced the more contemporary, 'realistic', style established by HB. In either case, however, the issue of authorship and creative identity would have been superseded by the more immediate demands of commerce. We can assume, though, that Grant considered the image his own, as he produced a very similar version (replacing Grey with the Devil) for *The Political Drama* some four years later (fig.53).49

The exact relationship between Grant and TF remains unclear, but it seems to have been linked to their simultaneous employment by Gans. That same month, they both produced versions of another print - *Tommy Grey with the Tail of His Order!!!* (figs.54-5)50 - an attack on the apparent nepotism of Grey after he became Prime Minister in November 1830. Both versions on this occasion were pen lithographs (although again Grant’s version is dated, while TF’s is not) but, rather than introducing any overt stylistic differences, both appear identical at first glance. Each individual pen stroke is reproduced with an almost obsessive fidelity. In both versions, furthermore, the signatures are concealed almost imperceptibly amongst the dense layers of shading which fill the lower left hand corner of the image, further obscuring the identity of both artists. In this instance, then, there can be no question of an appeal to the taste for two distinct styles. In fact, both prints are actually copies of an image by William Heath, published by McLean on 15th February (fig.56). Less than a year before this, however, McLean, Heath and Grant had been collaborating on prints of their own. Thus, they were clearly familiar with one another on a personal and professional basis, and it may simply be that this sharing of ideas was tacitly approved of by all parties concerned.

---

49 *The Political Drama* No.109 - *The School for Tory Tory Rogues*, published towards the end of 1834. It is not an exact copy, but we can assume that Grant was referring back to the earlier versions (although the *Political Drama* print is not signed).

50 I am indebted to Nick Lazenby for bringing these, and several other images discussed during the course of this study, to my attention.
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Such frequent borrowings, imitations, and copies (whether intended as allusive references or outright plagiarism) were characteristic of the period, and seem somehow inevitable in a trade which was becoming increasingly reliant upon the imitation of successful formats, and in which individual style was beginning to take second place behind a rigid adherence to a proven formula. This phenomenon would have its most obvious impact in the periodical press, towards which graphic satire was drawing ever closer during the period. Indeed, it is no coincidence that these changes should manifest themselves alongside the new importance placed on periodicity, which itself demanded the subjugation of an authorial voice to the weekly or monthly repetition of a familiar format.51

Gans was not the only publisher to adopt these methods, however. King also issued alternative versions of the same image by different artists. He published at least one print - Public Robbers Consulting Under Their Favourite Tree - in two editions (figs.57-8). One was a pen lithograph by Grant, the other a crayon lithograph by 'JCW' (which also included Grant's initials, barely perceptible, at the bottom right hand corner, obscured by lines of shadow cast by the foliage). Apart from the different reproductive media, there is little to distinguish one from the other, and they may again be examples of a first and second edition. Certainly, the image was popular enough to also be translated into wood engraving and published as a broadsheet by Drake shortly after the passing of the Reform Bill in June 1832 (fig.59). The image is almost identical, but the differences in format and technique are fundamental. An image which originated in the middle ground print shops has here been translated for an audience more familiar with the conventions and material characteristics of penny prints and broadsheet street literature.52

This too was common practice during the period, and is a firm indication of the expanding audience for graphic satire at the time. Images originally published by Gans or Tregear at a shilling or two (and thus beyond the means of the average working man) were frequently copied and sold in a cheaper format by the specialists in penny wood engravings. Once again, such practices pose questions

51 As Margaret Beetham has pointed out, "since the periodical depends on ensuring that the readers continue to buy each number as it comes out, there is a tendency in the form not only to keep reproducing the elements which have been successful but also to link each number to the next." loc.cit., p.26. The implications of this are discussed in Chapter Seven, in regard to the many imitators of Figaro in London, but imitation and repetition were common at every level of the trade throughout the period.

52 For a discussion of this image and its relationship to contemporary execution broadsides (especially in regard to the gallows motif), see Sheila O’Connell, The Popular Print in England (1999), pp.143-44.
about the relationship between the various artists and publishers of the period - especially that between Drake, Tregear and Grant. Drake was the most prolific pilferer of images between 1832 and 1834, and it is immediately apparent that the great majority of the prints he plagiarised had originally been published by Tregear and drawn by Grant. Kick’d Out or Billy Putting His Foot In It (fig.60) is a case in point. Originally produced as a crayon lithograph for Tregear, it was quickly copied and issued as a wood engraving by Drake. His version is unsigned, undated and reversed, but follows the original composition very closely, albeit in a schematised and simplified form (fig.61). Curiously, however, one of the most striking of Grant’s lithographs which Tregear published - Taking the Boromongers Home (c. June 1832, fig.62) - appears never to have been recycled by Drake, even though it achieved a remarkably wide currency in different forms at the time. Chubb adapted it as a wood engraving for the sixth issue of John Bull’s Picture Gallery (retitling it Old Nick’s Gatherings!), while the Manchester publisher J. Kiernan published a reversed version as a broadsheet under the title The Gatherings of Old Nick (figs.63-4). There was even a Welsh version, engraved by James Cope, an artist who copied Grant’s work on more than one occasion (fig.65). The precise dating of the different versions is problematic, but it seems reasonable to assume that Chubb’s version followed Tregear’s, and that the two reversed regional variations came slightly later - probably based on Chubb’s wood-engraving rather than Tregear’s lithograph. Whatever the case, it is a striking example of such an image gaining popular currency throughout the country.

Despite this apparent plagiarism, by 1833 Grant was signing his name to Drake’s own publications simultaneously with those he was producing for Tregear. But their relationship remains a mystery. Was there some kind of official commercial agreement between the three, whereby Drake paid Tregear a fee for the use of his images; or was the arrangement solely between Drake and Grant, with the latter claiming a fee from both Drake and Tregear for the same designs? Indeed, for a short period in 1833, Grant produced two distinct versions of The Political Drama; one wood engraved (for Drake) and the other lithographed (for Tregear). Although the numbering of each series was different, the images used in both were almost identical, which must imply that there was some degree of collaboration between

---

53 Tregear was Grant’s principal publisher between 1831 and 1833. The relationship apparently ended following a quarrel, at which point Grant transferred his services almost exclusively to John Kendrick. See Notes and Queries, 4th series, V, (1870), pp. 209-10.
In all these instances, however, there is a perceptible difference in the style of the prints, even when they are almost identical in compositional terms. The line of the wood-engravings is sparser and more angular, and they lack the dominant soft tonality and rounded forms of the lithographs. Thus, the distinct versions can be differentiated in terms of their mode of representation, which in this instance is related to the style employed by each. This in turn is defined by the technique of reproduction (the effect of a lithograph, as discussed above, being different to that of a wood engraving). The principal difference in this instance is related to the contrasting effects achieved by a tonal and a linear technique. In *John Bull, Or and Englishman's Fireside*, for example, the shadows around the figure's legs (below the table and the grate of the fireplace) are rendered in graduated tones of grey, rather than being more obviously constructed via tapering black and white lines, as in the wood engraving. Moreover, the grainy quality of the lithograph means that the image is pervaded with a more evocative sense of the gloomy half-light of the sparsely-furnished room, whereas in the wood engraving this is suggested by solid areas of deep black, contrasted with waverling parallel lines.

Thus, while the lithographs could be seen as striving towards some sense of 'realism', the wood engravings are more obviously schematic, each style being considered 'appropriate' to the levels of acculturation expected of their respective audiences, whose perceptions and expectations had been shaped by their social and cultural backgrounds. In highlighting this distinction, I do not mean to imply that Grant's lithographs are 'realistic' images *per se* - they are, after all, cartoons - but rather that the inherent qualities of lithography as employed by him here (tonal and chiaroscuro effects, less reliance on outlines, etc...) have a 'painterly' quality which implies a degree of 'realism' not found in the wholly linear, apparently crudely carved, wood engravings. It was for this same reason that John Doyle (the portraitist) used crayon lithography in his *Political Sketches*.

So what insight does all this give us into graphic satire of the 1830s? I would argue that the issues explored in the above chapters - the increasing prominence

---

54 It seems probable that the wood-engraved versions were the first to appear. the first issue of Drake's series is the seventh of Tregear's; the second is the sixth; and the fourth is the eighth. Moreover, the seventh issue of Tregear's series states that it is the "second edition". Whether this is in relation to the wood engraving or to another lithographic version is uncertain, but the former seems most likely.
of the publisher's name; the numerous instances of collaboration; the recycling of popular designs; and the apparent freedom with which images were translated into different media and disseminated throughout different milieu - all point to a definite diminution of the graphic satirist’s authorial voice in the 1830s (and what we must assume was an acceptance of this situation on the part of the artists themselves). The implications of this would be significant for the development of satirical illustration in the decades to follow, making it that much easier for their work to be subsumed within the body of a periodical, which so often functioned as a combination of anonymous elements, none of which held any obvious precedence (in 'authorial' terms) over the others.

In a sense, we can think of the 1830s as a period in which graphic satirists - whether working in lithography or wood engraving - were gradually coming to terms with the changes being experienced in the print trade as a whole and the periodical press in particular. However, while artists and publishers made every attempt to adapt to the new reproductive technologies, their efforts did not enable them to establish a convincing and durable tradition of satirical illustration to replace that which had disappeared in 1832. The decade was one of experimentation and numerous false starts, none of which endured for more than a few years at a time. Only once the absorption of graphic satire by the periodical press was fully realised, becoming rigidly conventionalised in the pages of *Punch*, would a readily-definable tradition emerge to replace that of the Georgian era. As already emphasised, we can view the experimentation of the 1830s as symptomatic of the need to accommodate these new technologies and the constraints they placed upon the creation of images. More than this, though, it was the result of a desire to establish new formats - most of them utilising the conventions of periodicity to some extent - which influenced the form and style of graphic satire during the period. Subsequent chapters will focus upon the most important of these formats, and the ways in which they shaped the images they contained.
As already stated, the early 1830s was a period of rapid change and development in the history of English graphic satire. New formats emerged to take the place of the single sheet print, which had fallen into decline after 1832, and these were characterised by a radical restructuring of the way in which satirical images functioned on the page. Single-image etched sheets gave way in part to those containing multiple lithographic images of a more basic nature - simple jokes and verbal-visual puns - which were issued on a monthly or fortnightly basis. These can be considered as an analogous development - a response even - to the expanding periodical press, which functioned via the regular repetition of a familiar format and a broadly miscellaneous content.¹

Throughout the Golden Age, the individually-issued single sheet print had remained the most important - and the most prevalent - form in which satirical imagery was disseminated and experienced throughout the metropolis and, increasingly, across the nation as a whole.² There were at the time no

¹ See Gray, loc. cit. for an alphabetical listing of satirical and comic periodicals of the nineteenth century. The vast majority of the titles he lists appeared after 1830, although a number of important examples - most notably The Satirist (1808-14) and The Scourge (1811-15) - are significant predecessors of those that appeared in the Victorian era.

² According to Diana Donald, "all the evidence relating to satirical prints corresponds to the picture which is beginning to emerge of eighteenth-century British production and consumption of goods as a whole: an admired but ever changing fashion was set by London producers and their customers, was widely exported to the provinces and overseas, and was also emulated - in fact extensively imitated, pirated and adapted... (The) metropolitan themes of the caricatures... were the key to their countrywide and indeed international success." op. cit., pp.19-20.
overwhelming principles governing their production - no hard and fast rules about the size of each image, the time at which they would appear or the style they would adopt. Thus, the caricaturists of the Golden Age were not so subordinate to the formal and temporal limitations which restricted the output of their Victorian successors; they were not subject to the rigid conventions of a regular format, the pressures of a weekly deadline, or the demands of an audience which expected a new cartoon every seven days, regardless of whether a ready subject presented itself or not.

As a commodity, however, the single sheet print had its limitations (although, of course, its conventions were defined as much by these limitations as they were by its strengths). Chief amongst them, perhaps, was their prohibitive cost, but it was also significant that a single image was generally all that each sheet contained. The form itself was thus restricted to voicing a single aspect of a broader discourse (which was, of course, its intention). From the late eighteenth century onwards, however, certain printsellers and publishers had gradually come to recognise these inherent limitations, along with the much broader potential appeal of a form which permitted a greater range and variety of content. This recognition would contribute to a fundamental transformation in the nature of graphic satire as a whole.

Murray Roston has identified a broad change in nineteenth-century commodity culture, from a system founded on the relationship between individual craftsmen and their customers, to one in which the retailer played a more important intermediary role in the kind of product he provided, placing greater emphasis on offering as wide and diverse a selection of goods as possible. It was this desire for novelty and variety (on the part of publishers in particular) which fuelled the

3 There were, however, occasional exceptions. Gillray, Newton, Bunbury, Woodward and Williams all issued single sheets which either contained several images linked by a narrative, or which formed parts of narrative sets. See David Kunzle, The Early Comic Strip: Narrative Strips and Picture Stories in the European Broadsheet from c.1450 to 1825 (1973), pp.357-88 for examples of such prints in the late eighteenth century. The 'Catchpenny' prints of Bowles and Carver in the eighteenth century could also be considered as exceptions to this trend. Several of these demonstrate an awareness of caricatural traditions, although their function can be seen as somewhat different to the single sheet satirical print. For the most part these were sheets of multiple tiny images on topics of broad social interest, small pictures of miscellaneous objects, animals and characters from juvenile stories. They were probably intended for trimming and pasting onto other objects, rather than for preservation in their entirety. They were cheaper (and emphatically ephemeral) publications, as opposed to the more exclusive hand-coloured etched single sheets of the Golden Age. See Catchpenny Prints: 163 Popular Engravings from the Eighteenth Century, Originally Published by Bowles and Carver (1970).

changing market for graphic satire in the early Victorian period. Increased production, facilitated by the widespread use of lithography and wood engraving, along with a steadily increasing audience, inevitably led to increased competition amongst publishers and a search for novel formats with which to attract a strong customer base. And, as David Kunzle has pointed out, "the search for new formats... led to a search for new themes, which should be correlated with the popular literature of the period such as Dickens, whose early work with its episodic, knockabout comedy has, structurally and aesthetically, certain comic strip like qualities." Indeed, it was in structural terms - the layout of the page and, increasingly, the interrelationship of various individual images - that we find the greatest transformation in the nature and function of satirical images of the 1830s.

This process of transformation had its roots in the eighteenth century, when a number of experiments with the form of graphic satire can be identified, each of which represents an attempt to go beyond the boundaries of the single sheet print. As early as the 1760s, The Oxford Magazine (1768-1773) had regularly incorporated emblematic satirical prints as frontispieces to each number, and can thus be regarded as an important stage in the development of the illustrated satirical periodical. It was one of the earliest publications to combine the separate, but directly related, traditions of verbal and visual political satire on a regular basis, even though the two were kept quite distinct within the pages of each issue.

Another significant development was the publication of caricature albums from the 1770s onwards. The most famous (or at least the best documented) of these was Darly's Comic-Prints of Characters, Caricatures, Macaronies & c., published in January 1776. This was a large folio-sized volume, containing dozens of prints (originally published between 1766 and 1775), with a decorative title page at the front (fig.72) and a portrait engraving of Matthew Darly himself at the rear. The thematic, stylistic and formal uniformity with which it was conceived represented a

---


6 The Oxford Magazine was a Wilkesite Journal. For an account of the metropolitan press' role in the Wilkes affair see George Rudé, Wilkes and Liberty: A Social Study of 1763 to 1774 (1962) pp.155-59. For satirical prints on the same topic see Donald, op.cit., pp.50-60. See also BMC, Vol.IV, pp.xli-xliv and Vol.V, p. xcviii, for other illustrated journals during the period.

7 In this sense, the volume also anticipates Thomas McLean's imposition of his own identity over the work he commissioned from others - most notably his retitling of William Heath's The Looking Glass as McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures. See below for more details.
very deliberate move away from the autonomous, individual single sheet print, towards a format which combined a greater number of images within a single framework. This trend would find yet another outlet in the 1780s, when two of the period's most prominent print dealers - Samuel Fores and William Holland - originated the enterprise of hiring out bound volumes of their satirical prints. For a shilling per night, a miscellany of caricatures could be taken home and perused either in private or - more commonly - as part of the entertainment of a larger social gathering. It was also Holland who, in 1789, organised some of the earliest caricature exhibitions. In a kind of travesty of the Royal Academy's summer exhibition, he filled the walls of his 'Museum of (Graphic) Genius' on Oxford Street with a colourful array of prints by the likes of Newton, Woodward and Byron, charging an entrance fee of one shilling. These exhibitions (alongside those of Fores in Piccadilly, who was quick to emulate a successful formula) again imply a desire for an experience which offered something more than a single satirical image as a source of amusement. Thus, with Holland's second exhibition it was announced that, "Admirers of Humorous Prints May now find entertainment for many hours in Holland's Caricature Exhibition Rooms... which have been considerably improved this winter by the addition of above a thousand scarce caricatures and other humorous Prints and Drawings". The stated purpose of the exhibition was to "(hold) the mirror up to nature, and (show) the age and body of the time its form and pressure," which evokes precisely the kind of 'revelatory' imagery adopted by later satirical periodicals such as The Looking Glass. The implication seems to have been that such 'revelation' could not be achieved so easily within the confines of a single image, but only via a more comprehensive display of visual material.

Furthermore, Holland deliberately advertised the exhibition as being suitable for a broad audience, in terms of both class and gender, taking pains to divorce it from the perception of graphic satire as a purely homo-social, scurrilous, lewd and scatological form of entertainment. Once again this parallels the approach of The

---

8 Donald, op.cit., p. 4.
9 David Alexander, Richard Newton and English Caricature in the 1790s (1998,) pp. 7-9. The very first exhibition, however, was actually organised by the Darlys as early as 1773. Donald, op.cit., pp. 4-5.
11 The motto of The Looking Glass during its early issues was, "None may see themselves but by Reflection - in this Glass you may."
Looking Glass or Punch in the 1830s and '40s. In both instances, the primary intention was to cultivate the largest possible audience without giving offence:

"some defamatory characters, envious printsellers and others, having insinuated to many of the female sex, that a number of the prints exhibited, were of that complexion that would suffuse the cheek of modesty with the blushes of aversion, the Proprietor assures the female world, there is not a print in the collection of an indelicate nature, but all of that description that may with propriety be blended with the chaste humour of Hogarth, Bunbury, Rowlandson, and Byron."

Another principal character who sought to cast the net of graphic satire into new waters in the early nineteenth century was Thomas Tegg. A well-established print dealer with a shop on Cheapside, he had served the mercantile middle classes in and around the heart of the City for some years. In this capacity, he was the first caricature dealer to recognise the benefits of stripping graphic satire of its inherently exclusive characteristics. With limited regard for the content of his prints, his most significant innovations would come in the area of format. He eschewed the use of fine paper in favour of cheaper alternatives; he paid little attention to the quality of his prints' colouring; he gave preference to simple - and therefore swiftly-executed - designs; and he relied heavily upon old stocks of worn copper plates, which he was able to obtain cheaply (often as bankrupt stock), rather than commissioning new designs from established artists. Although he sold these prints individually - at half the standard price - he also compiled them in periodically-issued parts (consisting of three or four prints each). At the end of each year these could be bound into volumes, along with a specially-issued title page, frontispiece and tailpiece, just as would be the case with a standard text-based periodical.

13 Tegg's output, quite apart from his cheap reprints of satirical prints, included a wide range of books intended for a lower-middle-class audience. These ranged from works of moral instruction (A Present for an Apprentice, To Which Is Appended Franklin's Way to Wealth (1838), The Book of Utility, Or Repository of Useful Information, Connected With the Moral, Intellectual, and Physical Condition of Man (1822) to history books, song books, and at least twenty collections of Tegg's Prime Jest Book. He also produced a Handbook for Emigrants (1839), which may well have prefigured his own eventual departure for Australia, where he opened the first bookshop on the Continent.
14 Donald suggests that Tegg "pioneered the idea of periodical publication" of this sort. op.cit., p.4. The suggestion of 3-4 prints per part was made by Elizabeth Fairman, Curator of Rare Books at the Yale Center for British Art in New Haven, which owns three bound volumes of Tegg's prints. I am grateful for her advice in this regard.
The series was entitled *Tegg's Caricature Magazine*, and ran from 1807 to 1814, most probably in weekly parts. The completed first volume (dated September 1st 1807) consisted of 156 prints, and a new frontispiece by Woodward which announced the collected edition as *The Caricature Magazine or Hudibrastic Mirror By G. M. Woodward Esq.* (fig.73). The frontispieces of the collected volumes are revealing, as they give some indication of the role Tegg hoped his publication would play amongst its various audiences. That which opened the second volume shows two groups of figures engaged in reading individual issues of the *Magazine* (fig.74). The first group represents “Country Observations on the Caricature Magazine”, while the second shows “Town Observations”. As pictured here, however, the difference is one of class as well as geography, coded in terms of dress, behaviour and language. Both groups feature male and female participants, emphasising the *Magazine’s* suitability for a broad, non gender-specific public, but the men of the “Country” group are depicted as somewhat backward in this regard by their attempted exclusion of the solitary woman from their small social circle. The implication is that they remain rooted in a resolutely homo-social world, retaining the perception of satirical imagery as a masculine preserve. “Come John”, says the woman, “let me look, don’t keep it all to yourself”, to which the first male responds dismissively, “Don’t be in a hurry, well these be the drollest things ever sent into our country.” The attention of the group is distracted by the novelty of the *Magazine*, and their rural oafishness is emphasised by their sense of wonder at what they have before them. “There be one exactly like our exciseman”, says one figure, clearly impressed by the idea that such a likeness was conceivable, while the other adds, “I wonder how they think of all those things.”

By contrast, the town group is a good deal more reserved. The male-female ratio is equal, and all sit together around a drawing room table, with no-one excluded from the perusal of the *Magazine*. “It certainly is amusing,” comments one extravagantly-coiffured and elegantly-dressed lady, while the second asks, “Pray sir, have they commenc’d the second volume?” Her companion replies, “Just got the first number ma’am from Mr. Teggs (sic).” This is all much more matter-of-fact: the consumption of such a commodity is here portrayed as a simple matter of routine, and a regular aspect of social intercourse. The ‘Town’ group is relaxed, seated and reserved, whereas the ‘Country’ group is standing and animated - as if
too excited to sit, impatient as they are to devour such an unfamiliar novelty, involving themselves physically in the act of reading. They hold the magazine up to the light to enable closer scrutiny, sharing each copy between them, and point eagerly at the especially amusing parts. In this formulation, Tegg's Magazine is presented as a genuinely new commodity - something which has quickly established itself as the norm in the city, and which is slowly spreading out beyond its confines to become a pastime for the nation as a whole. More than this, however, it depicts the reading of a satirical periodical - rather than a single sheet print - as an inclusive activity, open to all regardless of class or gender, and as such constitutes an important precursor of the Victorian satirical press which, from The Looking Glass onwards, defined (and consciously presented) itself as a form of entertainment suitable for family consumption. The inclusion of female readers was thus extremely significant, and implies a desire to move beyond the eighteenth-century perception of graphic satire - and comic journalism in general - as an exclusively male preserve. As Tegg was quick to realise, the achievement of a genuinely new source of entertainment for the public would require a radical rethinking of both the material characteristics and the content of satirical imagery, as well as a novel and appealing format.

The next significant step towards the multi-panel sheets of the 1830s came in 1826, when George Cruikshank self-published Phrenological Illustrations - the first of several folio-sized ‘scrapsheets to appear over the next eight years. These all consisted of six etched sheets, bound in a paper wrapper, containing a variety of whole-page images and smaller vignettes - simple jokes and puns of a broadly

---

15 This perception was slow to disappear, however, as emphasised by the negative reaction of the metropolitan press to the idea of a humorous publication edited by a woman in the 1830s. See Tamara L. Hunt, loc.cit. (passim.). Later still, Marie Duval, illustrator of the original Ally Sloper cartoons in Judy (from 1867), was forced to conceal her identity - and her role in creating one of the most enduring comic characters of the nineteenth century - behind that of her husband, Charles Ross. This was, once again, the result of a residual perception that satire and comedy were unsuitable pastimes for a 'respectable' lady. See David Kunzle, loc.cit. (1986). Despite this, however, it has been demonstrated that, from the 1830s onwards, women were active as editors and critics within certain areas of the periodical press. "In these capacities they gradually rewrote the rules, gradually altered the consciousness of their age." D.J. Trela, 'Introduction' to VPR, Vol.29, No.2, 1996, p.89.

16 As Donald has pointed out, his experiments prefigured nineteenth-century graphic satire to a considerable extent: most notably his emphasis on social satire, domestic mishaps, provincial bumpkins and Irish or Scots stereotypes. They were also an important move towards the primacy of the captioned joke. (op.cit., p.5).

17 It was published by Cruikshank, but sold by James Robins, S. Knight and George Humphrey. The cost of these sheets was six shillings plain or eight coloured - a considerable sum. Subsequent works in this format were published by Charles Tilt at only 2s6d plain or 3s6d coloured. See Richard Vogler, Graphic Works of George Cruikshank (1979), pp.141-143 and Patten, op.cit., pp. 307-19.
social-satirical nature (figs.75&75a). The format was unprecedented in English graphic satire, and proved popular enough to be quickly imitated by other publishers.18 McLean, Ackermann and Tilt all offered similar titles, by artists such as Seymour, whose The Omnibus appeared in 1830, and Henry Heath, who produced several examples such as The Art of Tormenting, Tit-Bits and Sayings of the Ancients Illustrated by Doings of the Moderns, in 1830 and '31 (figs.76-79).19

These publications were not periodicals as such, although Cruikshank's Scraps and Sketches (1828-32) and My Sketch Book (1834-36) were both intended as continuing works, the latter stating that it was, "to be issued occasionally", and - as with periodicals - they could be bound into specially-issued boards at a later date. They were nevertheless another definite move away from the single sheet format, and towards the broader form of entertainment - the 'polite' drawing-room miscellany - epitomised by so much Victorian 'light literature'.20 They represented a shift from the specific to the all-embracing, from a single topic of limited interest to a microcosm of contemporary urban life, accessible to 'all'.

The intended function of these 'scrapsheets' - especially those not issued as parts of a series - was very different to that of the single sheet print. Like Tegg's Caricature Magazine, they were marketed as a form of social entertainment - something other than an image for display or preservation in a print draw. Tilt, for example, explicitly advertised them as, "AMUSEMENT for winter evenings and the fire-side circle", and also as being, "designed for the Drawing-Room Table or Scrap Book."21 Thus, the enjoyment of such commodities was situated not only in reading and looking, but also in a more physical sense; in redefining them by trimming, rearranging, selecting and discarding individual images. It was a selective form of reading and looking, akin to the consumption of a periodical.

---

18 The only real precedent for this type of publication could be found on the continent. The French called them macédoines (meaning 'mixture' or 'salad'). Kunzle, op.cit. (1990), pp.20-21.
19 The title of The Omnibus was a specifically contemporary reference. George Shillibeer's omnibus had been introduced to the streets of London in 1829, and was much commented upon at the time, carrying with it associations of unexpected encounters, especially with those of a different social class. The title is thus intended to evoke similar ideas, presenting itself as a novel and vital aspect of the 'modern' urban experience, containing something of interest for everyone - a role which many periodicals of the period were eager to fulfil, often using similarly allusive titles.
20 The term 'light literature' is used by Donald Gray to describe the mass of mildly amusing and diverting prose works which formed such an important aspect of Victorian culture. See 'The Uses of Victorian Laughter' in Victorian Studies, X (1966) pp.145-76 (p.145).
21 Advertisement on the back cover of Sayings of the Ancients Illustrated by Doings of the Moderns.
Chapter Four

The term 'Scrap Book' was itself an invention of the 1820s, but the vogue for such compilations continued throughout the nineteenth-century, and embraced a broad range of material. Valentines, nursery rhymes, fairy stories, character types, animals, flowers, alphabets, and many other subjects were all common scrapbook material. Printed as individual sheets (generally lithographs or chromolithographs), they consisted of multiple images which could be trimmed and rearranged as the individual saw fit, often in a decidedly decorative manner (fig. 80). Individual scrap book compilations could thus be more diverse from page to page than might be expected. They were not necessarily restricted to only one type of picture, nor just to images per se, but could consist of a wide variety of printed pictures and text, depending on individual whim and fancy. Surviving examples are scarce, but as can seen, in (figs. 81-2), any number of publications could be adopted as scrapbook fodder. They could combine social satire with generic romantic or sentimental portraiture and extracts of text from newsprint periodicals.

It is with the scrapbook that we reach a crossover point between the periodical press and the multi-panel sheets of the 1830s - a point which emphasises the varied functions which such publications could play, as well as their obvious kinship to the periodical press in general. While it seems unlikely that The Looking Glass itself - as an expensive commodity, designed for the collector - was widely adopted by the compilers of scrapbooks, cheaper imitations (in particular Every Body's Album and The Caricaturist) certainly were. King, for example (as publisher of the latter), was quickly persuaded by public opinion to offer his series in two distinct versions; one to accommodate the adherents of the scrap book vogue, and another for those who preferred to compile a collection of complete copies. While it was at first issued only as a four page periodical, printed on both sides of the paper, by its second number it was advertising the fact that;

"Many persons on the publication of the First Number expres'd a regret at the whole not being printed upon one side of a sheet (our object being to continue it in it's present Form. i.e that of a Newspaper) for Album"

22 The OED gives its first appearance as 1825, although a number of publications had appeared in the preceding two years which included the term in their titles (see BMC, Vol X, p.xix).


24 I am grateful to G.J Saville for loaning me the scrapbook from which these illustrations are taken. Surviving examples are scarce today, often having been broken up by print dealers.
This statement points to the dual function which this type of publication played, and highlights just how far their original intention had been distorted by their audience. Moreover, it highlights the somewhat ambiguous status of this form of graphic satire. *The Looking Glass et al.* walk a fine line between the newspaper and the single sheet print; between the periodical (intended for collection, binding, and preservation on the library shelf), and the scrapsheet (destined for dismemberment, rearrangement, and pasting into a blank volume). Both involved a process of redefinition on the part of their audience, but the status implied by each is very different. The former implies a level of cultural value via its claims to durability and posterity, while the latter is emphatically ephemeral, with no suggestion that it formed anything more than a momentary diversion. However, while the multi-panel format was originally conceived as the former - a visual analogy to the standard newsprint paper, intended to be consumed and understood as a single entity - it ultimately became a source for individual images of a random nature, which could be reorganised according to the fancy of each individual reader.

II

*The Northern looking Glass; The Multi-Panel Print as Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers*

*The Caricaturist* is a case in point. The series itself - launched in August 1831 - was published by King and drawn by Grant. It was smaller than *The Looking Glass* (9.5 x 13.5 inches) and cost only 1s6d. It consisted of four pages (one sheet, printed on recto and verso - the cause of such consternation amongst the scrapbook adherents, as mentioned above), and was executed at first solely in

---

25 *The Caricaturist*, No.2 September 1st, 1831.

26 As Gleeson White suggested in 1897, "it seems to me that a fine book should be preserved intact. There are but comparatively few of its first edition, and of these few a certain number are doomed to accidental destruction in the course of events, so that one should hesitate before cutting up a fine book, and not be hasty in mutilating a volume of Once a Week or The Shilling Magazine." "*English Illustration: 'The Sixties',*" p.7. This is a statement which explicitly equates periodicals (when bound in volumes) with "fine books", and once again attests to the redefinition in status which such a practice involved - the way it altered the perception of the same object, from the ephemeral to the permanent, from the trivial to the serious.
crayon lithography (fig.83). Its format was ostensibly based on that of a newspaper or quarto weekly journal and, as such, the contents of its early issues were broken down along the following lines: Page 1) 'Home and Local News'; Page 2) 'Foreign Correspondence'; Page 3) 'Literary Review', 'Fashions for the Month', etc.; Page 4) 'Fine Arts', 'Music', 'Public Announcements'. Only the Home and Foreign News pages were topical, the remaining sections consisting of simple jokes and puns around the theme suggested by the title of the column, making it ideal material for a scrapbook.

The intended relationship of this format to the periodical press is emphasised by a multi-panel cartoon in issue two (LITERARY REVIEW - The London Press, or a File of Newspaper Readers) which features individual portraits of stereotypical readers of specific papers and journals; from The Times and The Morning Chronicle, to The London Gazette, The Ballot and Bell's Life in London (fig.84). The latter is lampooned again elsewhere in a separate cartoon - Approaching Dissolution of Bell's Life (Blackguard's Journal). This is both a mocking swipe at the paper's occasionally raffish content and a commentary upon the large sheets of small comic cuts - The Gallery of Comicalities (fig.85) - which it had then been issuing for a year and a half.

"Weel Doctor Black how's yr Patient"
"A leetle Relieved Sir. He hath just now Vomited up all these 140 comic prints" (he holds up a copy of The Gallery of Comicalities)
"Weel Done. Now keep him as much as ye can from the Air of Fleet St or 'twill surely Dispatch him"

The cartoon is a pointed comment on the popularity of these 'recapitulation' sheets

27 By its tenth issue, however, it had doubled the size of its pages and was drawn in pen lithography. The only copy I have seen is printed on only one side, however, implying that it was still being published in two distinct versions.
28 No.2 (September 1st 1831), for instance, contained cartoons about the war in the Netherlands and events in Russia and France.
29 The recapitulations of cuts issued by Bell's can be seen as another example of the new emphasis on a concentration of small images characteristic of the period. Published twice a year from 1831 to 1840, they were four-page broadsheets costing 3d, consisting entirely of small cuts reprinted in vertical columns from the weekly issues of Bell's life in London and Sporting Chronicle (1822-86). They achieved a phenomenal circulation during the period - selling in the hundreds of thousands - and were instrumental in familiarising people with the conventions of wood-engraved satire (restricted dimensions, simplified images, and so on). See David Kunzle, 'Between Broadsheet Caricature and 'Punch'; Cheap Newspaper Cuts for the Lower classes in the 1830s' in The Art Journal, Vol.43 (1983), pp.339-46.
30 The Caricaturist, No.2, September 1st 1831. The final comment is a veiled stab at The Weekly Dispatch.
(which sold in the hundreds of thousands) and the eagerness with which so many people were - literally - consuming them at the time. But it is also a guarded swipe at the growth of periodical readership in general - a theme which Grant would take up more emphatically towards the end of 1832, in his mock 'Frontispieces' (see Chapter Five). The reference to Bell's Gallery might also be read as a half-conscious nod to a format which had obvious similarities with the multi-panel prints themselves, both in terms of its page layout and its relationship to the newspaper as such. Grant would make this relationship explicit in 1835 when he titled another of his multi-panel sheets The Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers and Every Body's Album (fig.86a).

However, the 'pseudo-newspaper' format was not actually originated by The caricaturist, or even by McLean's Looking Glass in 1830, but almost five years earlier by a largely forgotten Glasgow-based publication; The Glasgow Looking Glass. In early 1825, William Heath had temporarily left London, heading north to produce a series of panorama paintings in Glasgow, where he soon became acquainted with John Watson, the owner of the city's only lithographic press. Together they conceived the idea of Europe's first wholly illustrated satirical periodical (a title traditionally credited to McLean's later production). Printed and published by Watson, and launched on June 11th that year, each fortnightly issue consisted of four folio-sized pages and appeared in two versions - a "common" impression selling at a shilling and a "best" impression at 1s6d. It was sold through a network of bookdealers across the north of Britain (and later further south, when both Ackermann and George Humphrey became its London agents) but the best impressions were routinely reserved for subscribers. With number six (August 18th), the paper's offices were relocated to Edinburgh, where - apparently - Heath was attempting to escape his creditors, and the title was changed to The Northern Looking Glass, Or Lithographic Album.

From its first issue the layout of the pages was clearly intended to mimic the format of a newspaper. Its images were arranged in columns, each separately-titled,

31 The term 'best impression' probably refers to the paper quality rather than the clarity of the printing, as this would not have been such an issue with a lithographic publication. I know of two complete sets: one in the BM, which is plain and seems to be the "common" impression, and one at the Yale Center for British Art in New Haven, which is the "best" and is also hand coloured.

32 The Northern Looking Glass, No.7 (September 3rd, 1825). Ackermann became the London agent from No.6 onwards.

approximating those found in text-based periodicals; 'Politics', 'Poetry', 'Fashion', 'Music', 'Fine Arts', 'Advertisements', and a series of 'Occasional Essays on Taste' (flgs.87-89). These were rarely topical, generally consisting of simple visual jokes or puns related thematically to the title of each 'column'. Additionally, the first issue presented a visual 'Prospectus' on its title page, as was conventional practice with the premiere of almost any new text-based periodical (fig.90). This consisted of a long vertical column depicting the full range of the paper's proposed contents: from politics (politicians, bishops, monarchs, a radical orator and emblematic figures such as Britannia and the British Lion); to social satire (a range of character types such as Scotsmen, manual labourers and doctors); to the arts (painters, actors and writers); and leisure (sportsmen, animals, a stage coach, a pack of cards). It also incorporated images which were metaphorically suggestive of the broader sweep of contemporary events, including a fleet of ships, a timepiece, a weather vane, and so on. In other words, just as Every Body's Album would do, it presented itself as a microcosm of contemporary life, being all things to all men.

Overall, the title contained a broad mixture of general-interest and regionally-specific material, both satirical and documentary in nature, such as depictions of Glasgow Fair and the crypt of the city's cathedral (flgs.91-2). But its primary focus of interest was most likely the novelty of its format and its predominantly visual programme. The series quickly gained a metropolitan audience - a West End audience - who, it might be assumed, would be less interested in goings-on in Glasgow or Edinburgh if they were presented in a text-based format. Heath, moreover, already had an established reputation in London as both a caricaturist and a military portraitist. It therefore seems likely to assume that his name itself was also a selling point in this instance. Despite the interest in local affairs demonstrated by the series, it also included the sort of material more commonly associated with Heath - from character studies of social types to satires on fashion and scenes of military life. From the very beginning he seems to have courted a broad public, being aware of the dual function of the title: as a periodical it had to be topical, and to appeal to its stated niche market (the residents of Glasgow and 'the North' more generally); but as a work intended for posterity, it had to have a broader appeal, containing material which could find a wider relevance both beyond the geographical boundary of the north, and beyond the immediate point at which each issue was originally published.
For the first two issues the series contained no text at all, apart from the titles and captions of the individual images, while the back page remained entirely blank. Only with the third issue was this blank sheet finally filled with a page of lithographic text (although this only became a regular feature with issue six), including a Correspondence section, political news, ‘Sporting Intelligence’ and so on (fig.93).34 It was at this stage - after No.4 - that the paper began to downplay the extent to which its images mimicked the form of a newspaper, and the layout became more varied and adventurous, with the introduction of marginal vignettes and a greater degree of variation in the shapes and sizes of the images arranged on each page. There was even the occasional full-page illustration, such as My House in Town (fig.94), a cross-section of a Glasgow townhouse, showing the range of social types which inhabited each storey - a familiar motif of the nineteenth-century illustrated press, especially on the continent, although this example is particularly early.35 It did, however, retain one critical aspect of text-based periodicals, which made it unique amongst the multi-panel prints; the serialised narrative.36 The earliest of these had been a four part story - Shipping News - which appeared in Nos. 2-5, and charted the voyage of a steamboat from Glasgow to Liverpool. Later on, though, Heath provided a more extended tale - Life of a soldier - which ran from issues 9-16, with two images per episode, accompanied by a textual elaboration on the back page (figs.95-6).37

The handwritten lithographic text continued to be a feature until the eighth number, when lithography was suddenly abandoned in favour of etching,38 and the text

34 In No.3 it was stated that, “we intend occasionally when matter presses to give a fourth page.” No. 4 also included text, while No. 5 remained blank, from No. 6 onward it became a regular feature.
35 No. 15 (January 23rd 1826). See Kunzle, op.cit. (1990), p.9, for a discussion of this type of image (more common from the 1840s onwards) and its relationship to the apartment building as a metaphor for social mobility.
36 Once again, this is an instance of the multi-panel format imitating the conventions of text-based journalism. As Graham Law has pointed out, “almost from its beginnings, the newspaper has contained material other than news... [and] increasingly often... that ‘other’ material was serialised fiction.” Serializing Fiction in the Victorian Press (2000), p.3.
37 How much light this may shed upon Heath’s own purported military career is uncertain, although the series certainly pulls no punches in its negative description of army life. In one episode, a character is sent abroad to engage in a foreign campaign. Although he is happy to escape (having fathered an illegitimate child at home), “scarce has he landed at the place of his destination, when he is led into action, and falling, severely wounded, at the first onset, is left on the field by his companions to enjoy that honour and glory, so much descanted upon by his friend the recruiting sergeant.” The Northern Looking Glass, No.12, 12th December 1825, p.45.
38 A direct reversal of the development of McLean’s Looking Glass, as discussed below. The later series switched from etching to crayon lithography after only seven issues, at which point Heath left.
page was subsequently printed from standard letterpress type (fig.97). This change, significantly, incurred a rise in the cover price to 1s6d (Common) or two shillings (Best), and the abbreviation of the title to The Northern Looking Glass. This number also saw the beginning of sequential page-numbering from issue to issue, again following a standard convention of periodical literature.

Like other periodicals, The Northern Looking Glass also offered its readers the opportunity to ‘redefine’ the fortnightly parts into a more lasting format. With the seventh issue (September 3rd 1825) it was announced that, “a neat cover, in which the successive numbers may be inserted as published”, was available from Watson and other booksellers, in no less than three different versions; a “Common” edition for 1s6d, a “Superior” edition at four shillings and a “Best” edition (printed on India paper) at five shillings. The best impressions were, again, reserved for subscribers. Furthermore, in the tenth number, it was stated that the first eight parts were now available in coloured impressions, at six shillings each. This kind of connoisseurial approach to collecting and preserving the paper is indicative of the status which both Watson and Heath hoped the new format might achieve, and again implies that this format was not intended as fodder for the scrapbook. Even after the paper had ceased publication it was still being redefined in the minds of its creator and publisher who had the remaining stock bound in boards and reissued as Heath’s Comic Looking Glass; Or, Mirror of Mirth: Exhibiting an Entertaining Series of Nearly Four Hundred Humourous Caricatures and Burlesque Sketches, a title which refocussed the regional emphasis of the original title onto its creator - Heath himself - and thus transformed it from a largely anonymous fortnightly periodical into a book with an identifiable author. As with the wrappers, this volume was issued in different versions; a standard edition at twenty-five shillings and a fine edition, “On Large Paper with Extra Plates, Elegantly bound in Cloth with Gilt Leaves,” at two guineas - a considerable sum.

39 The advertisement says “earliest” impressions, but this can be read as a mere convention. The lithographic process - unlike etching - generally involves no deterioration of the printing surface through the course of an edition. The varying quality of lithographic prints is instead dependent upon the proper preparation of the stone and adequate inking prior to each impression being run through the press. The allusion to “earliest” impressions, then, is a concession to the ‘connoisseurial’ sector of Heath’s intended audience, for whom the term might still connote ‘best’. Nevertheless, the early years of lithographic printing witnessed much experimentation, and a considerable number of technical problems had to be overcome. Tom Gretton has brought my attention to a number of early examples of lithographic prints which did experience some deterioration in image quality due to the then-imperfect technology of fixing the inked image onto the stone. Whether this was a problem for Watson and Heath is difficult to determine without a close comparative study of several examples of their series.
The paper itself ceased publication in March 1826, with its seventeenth issue. This contained a farewell address in which Heath drew attention to the unique format he had established:

"The Editor of The Northern Looking Glass regrets the necessity of announcing to his Friends and the Public, the discontinuance of his paper: and can only console himself that this circumstance cannot fail at adding to its novelty, at least one other attraction - that of wit: - For, since brevity is the soul of wit, and tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes - it has been brief."  

Its end can most likely be regarded as the result of Heath and Watson's precarious finances, as that same issue announced the sale "by private contract" of "the whole of the stock, consisting of Copper Plates, Impressions &c.," adding that, "it is presumed it will be found well deserving of the attention of Booksellers, Printsellers etc." Although a novel format, it had proved short-lived. But the memory of its format remained, and would be considered worthy of revival in the following decade.

III

The Looking Glass and the Relationship Between Artist and Publisher

Heath himself returned to London, where within a month he was producing theatrical portraits for West End print dealers. It was, presumably, shortly after this that he became acquainted with McLean, who by the late 1820s was beginning to establish himself as a prominent dealer in satirical prints. By 1828, certainly, he had become Heath's principal publisher, issuing all of his 'Paul Pry' plates in the final years of the decade. It is more than likely that McLean knew of Heath's work on The Northern Looking Glass via its circulation in London through the shops of Ackermann and Humphrey. Indeed, McLean had recently purchased a large

---

40 The Northern Looking Glass, No.17.
41 Ibid. It should also be borne in mind that the mid-1820s was a period of economic depression throughout the nation, and this may well have accounted for the series' sudden demise in 1826. A period of security and spectacular inflation in early 1825 was followed a reversal in the spring and severe financial panic. The resulting depression lasted until the very end of 1826. See Arthur Gayer, W. Rostow and Ann Jacobson Schwartz, The Growth and Fluctuation of the British Economy, 1790-1850: An Historical, Statistical, and Theoretical Study of Britain's Economic Development, Vol.I (1975), pp.171-210.
42 BMC, Vol X, p.xliii, No.4.
portion of Humphrey's old stock, which may well have included some stray copies of the now-defunct title. Whether it was the artist or the publisher's idea to revive the format is uncertain, but McLean may well have had a decisive hand in the decision, sensing the potential rewards of a novel format to rival the folio 'scrap sheets' then being produced by Cruikshank and others. By all accounts, McLean was a forceful personality (it was, apparently, he who had originally persuaded the otherwise reticent Doyle to publish his Political Sketches), and certainly it was not long before he stamped his own identity very prominently on the new series.

At first, however, Heath's identity prevailed. The first issue of The Looking Glass was published on 1st January 1830 (fig. 98), and announced on its title page that it was, "Drawn & Etched by William Heath - Author of The Northern Looking Glass - Paul Pry Caricatures - and various humorous works." It was, in other words, Heath's enterprise, and traded on his established reputation. Like The Northern Looking Glass, it was a four page publication, printed on both recto and verso. It was, however, slightly larger than its predecessor (each page measuring 11.5 x 16.5 inches), printed on a heavier paper stock and published monthly rather than fortnightly. It was also considerably more expensive, selling at three shillings plain or six coloured.

The first few issues drew very closely from the structure of the early Glasgow Looking Glass, organising its illustrations into separately-headed sections, such as 'The Leading Article,' 'Police Intelligence' and 'Advertisements'. In contrast, though, it never introduced a page of text to elucidate or expand upon the topics covered in the images. Heath did not repeat the 'Prospectus' idea from the first issue of The Glasgow Looking Glass, but the first title page of the new paper contained the greatest concentration of images of any page he drew during his seven month tenure - thirteen in all - which immediately announced the emphasis on the visual in a striking fashion, quite at odds with the single sheet print. This pattern, however, was immediately broken on the second page, which contained only two images, before being re-established on the third, which contained no less than ten. Finally, the back page featured only three images, which created a logical kind of rhythm, and provided a varied reading experience for the consumer (fig. 99).

---

44 Everitt, op cit., p.238.
Broadly speaking, this pattern - two pages containing between six and eleven images and two containing between two and four - was repeated each month throughout Heath's tenure on the title, although not always in the same alternating rhythm. The breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1830</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1830</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1830</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1830</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout Heath's run there was not a single full-page image, indicating that he - and we must assume that the basic layout of each issue was left in his hands - was eager to continue a format which differed substantially from the single sheet print. As with the etched issues of *The Northern Looking Glass*, his line remains crisp and clear throughout, lending clarity and definition even to the smaller images.

Exactly why Heath was removed from the series after the seventh issue remains unclear. It was suggested in Chapter Two that McLean, following the success of *The Political Sketches*, was keen to give preference to lithography in his most important publications, but that Heath was reluctant to make the change to the new technique. Certainly this remains the most plausible explanation. As publisher, McLean's chief priority was financial gain, and lithography would undoubtedly have offered a means of expanding the circulation of the series and thus maximising his profits. If this is so, it would imply that *The Looking Glass* had experienced a steady growth in sales over the first seven months to something - potentially at least - approaching 2000 copies, or the maximum number of impressions which could reasonably be pulled from a copper plate before it became illegible. This would mean that *The Looking Glass* was far outstripping the
average circulation of etched single sheet satirical prints, and this must be attributed primarily to its novelty and its exploitation of the periodical format as a means of stimulating the desire to acquire a complete run of the series.

Whatever the case, when the eighth issue appeared on August 1st 1830, Heath was no longer its author (fig. 100). The title, at this stage, remained unchanged, but it was now announced as being, "designed and Drawn on stone by R. Seymour." However, while The Glasgow Looking Glass' switch from lithography to etching had entailed an increase in price, The Looking Glass' reversal of this change did not produce a comparable reduction, and the price remained static.

Seymour, unlike Heath, worked happily in the crayon technique, just as he did in the majority of his single sheet prints for McLean, and he relied only very occasionally upon an outline in pen to give particular definition to an image. Like Heath, however, he announced his arrival with a concentrated display of a dozen images on the title page, although in contrast he continued this pattern unbroken throughout the issue, with a further ten images on page two, nine on page three and six on page four. This was a departure from Heath’s more varied layout, and for a time it appeared that Seymour would continue in this vein, minimising the number of pages incorporating only two or three images, perhaps keen to stamp his own identity on the title. As the year progressed, the image to page ratio broke down as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1830</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1830</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1830</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1830</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1830</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 Eirewen Nicholson has suggested that first editions of satirical prints In the Golden Age tended to have a print run of between 500 and 1500 copies, and it was rare for one to go into subsequent editions. Until the introduction of lithography, it seems plausible to assume that these figures remained quite stable, except during periods of heightened interest in political affairs, such as 1820 or 1830-32. loc.cit., pp.9-11. The evidence for such figures Is unreliable, however, and it is difficult to state categorically how many copies of any satirical image were printed at a given time.

46 The only examples in which Seymour experimented with a combination of both techniques came in Nos. 35 and 36 (November and December 1832), but he quickly abandoned the notion and returned solely to crayon.
Whereas Heath had mostly settled on somewhere between eighteen and twenty-two images per issue, Seymour’s early efforts tended to contain around twenty-six or-seven, with a maximum of thirty-seven. He retained some element of his own style at first, but increasingly began to slip into the HB manner, especially as Volume Two progressed. An issue such as No.12 (December 1830) can be seen as transitional. While the first page is more characteristic of Seymour’s older style (densely-worked, detailed, and tonally varied), the images on page two have more of the ‘portrait’ style about them (figs. 101-2). As the series progressed, the lighter tones and sparse background detail characteristic of Doyle came to prevail, giving a much greater sense of empty space in later issues.

With the conclusion of the first volume, McLean suddenly began to assert his own identity as publisher over that of Seymour’s as artist. From issue Thirteen (January 1st 1831), the series was prominently retitled McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures Or The Looking Glass, and Seymour’s name was entirely removed from the title page. Indeed, as Heath had never signed his illustrations for The Looking Glass, and Seymour would only do so very occasionally, this effectively cast McLean in the role of author as well as owner and publisher of the series. His was now the only name - apart from various lithographic printers - to be directly associated with it. Thus, it seems that McLean may well have begun to take a more active role in the formation of each issue, as his retitling of the series coincided with a gradual transformation in the layout from month to month, and the steady reintroduction of the conventions of single sheet satire in the HB manner.

It is known that McLean invited the contributions of amateurs, paying a guinea for suggestions, which would then be drawn up by one of his stable of artists, and it is possible that he persuaded Seymour to incorporate an increasing number of these designs - which would have otherwise seen the light as single sheets - into The Looking Glass. Indeed, in the preface to Volume One, McLean explicitly stated that, “As it is now so fully established in public favour, arrangements are made for the contributions of men of the first eminence”, which may imply an invitation for

---

47 The only instance of Seymour’s initials appearing in the series was a single image in No.58 (October 1st 1834), fig.104.

48 Indeed, Randall Davies, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th edition), under the entry for ‘Caricature’, suggested that some of the designs were actually by HB, although he gives no source for this.

Certainly, as 1831 progressed, an increasing number of full and dual-image pages made their way into the title, reducing the emphasis on a varied visual display established in the early issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1831</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1831</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1831</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1831</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1831</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1831</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1831</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1831</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1831</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1831</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1831</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1831</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of images had now reduced to twenty, although this figure is somewhat misleading, as it takes into account exceptional instances (such as numbers 15 and 21), and shifts the emphasis from the later months of the year in which full page images such as *The Colossus*\(^{51}\) (fig.103) - which were, in effect, HB-style single sheets - were becoming a more regular feature. In the following year, these full pages were given increasing emphasis, as they began to appear with greater frequency on the title or back page, while the average number of images per issue dropped again to eighteen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1832</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1832</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1832</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{50}\) *The Looking Glass*, Vol.1, Preface. It could equally imply the involvement of Doyle.

\(^{51}\) *The Looking Glass* No.22, October 1st 1831 (BM 16793).
By 1833 two thirds of the individual numbers featured a full-page image - always on the front or back page - while the overall average number of images per issue was now only sixteen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1833</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1833</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1833</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1833</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1833</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1833</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1833</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1833</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1833</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1833</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1833</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1833</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This gradual transformation only became decisive in 1834. That year saw considerable changes for *The Looking Glass* in terms of both layout and content. While the focus on full-page images increased markedly (with all but one issue now containing at least two), the style of these images was moving away from the standard realism of the HB manner. Seymour was reintroducing a freer and more overtly caricatural mode of illustration, similar to his earlier work, although he had
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transformed this idiom into a highly worked, and finely detailed form of lithography which contrasts sharply with that of Doyle (fig.104). An image such as Returning Fra the North; Or The Effects of Unco Gude Living, for instance, is a notable departure from the HB manner. The physical exaggeration is overt, and the tones are softer - altogether less sketchy, with skilful use of chiaroscuro effects. The tonal range is greater, and the details are carefully delineated. This is also the only image in the series to feature Seymour's signature.

It is difficult to explain this sudden change, but it might be helpful to consider it in the context of his other activities at the time. At this stage, Seymour had been illustrating The Looking Glass since mid-1830, but he had also been designing the weekly cuts for Figaro in London since the end of December 1831. In August 1834, however, he had quarrelled with Gilbert Abbott à Beckett, the paper's editor, and had refused to produce any further work for him for the remainder of the year (an episode recounted in detail in Chapter Six). à Beckett, for his part, had begun a sustained campaign of vilification against Seymour's work and reputation, which he continued until the end of the year. Under such circumstances it seems plausible to suggest that Seymour would have been keen to reassert his artistic identity by the most direct means at his disposal, and to throw himself with renewed vigour into his work for another publication - at the very least to refute à Beckett's claims that he was artistically bankrupt. It is perhaps significant that the only instance of Seymour's initials appearing on an image in The Looking Glass occurred during the exact period that à Beckett was regularly lambasting him in print. In such a context, this might imply that Seymour was feeling some considerable frustration about his work routinely appearing under McLean's name - a situation which gave him even less recognition than he had received in the early years of Figaro, in which he was, at least, prominently mentioned in the prefaces to the annual volumes. The changes which The Looking Glass was undergoing can be readily gleaned from the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1834</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 The Looking Glass, No.58, October 1st 1834.

53 Although the image in question appeared in the October issue, it would have been drawn during September, less than a month after the quarrel between the two men began.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1834</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1834</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1834</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1834</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1834</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1834</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1834</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1834</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1834</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1834</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1834</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of images per issue had now dropped sharply to only eleven - or less than three per page. Clearly then, the conventions of single sheet satire were, all of a sudden, swiftly reasserting themselves in the pages of a publication whose original intention had been to offer a novel alternative to them. Of course, this too has to be put into the context of the market for single sheet satire during the period. When *The Looking Glass* began, in January 1830, this market had still been relatively buoyant, and would, in fact, reach new heights over the next two and a half years in the lead up to the Reform Bill. In such a situation the success of *The Looking Glass* was founded on its novelty - its immediately apparent departure from the still dominant traditions of Georgian political Caricature. However, after the collapse of the market for single sheet political satire in late 1832-early '33, *The Looking Glass* suddenly found itself without a dominant tradition against which to define itself. Indeed, during the period 1832-'34, a number of publications had appeared which based themselves on the multi-panel format established by McLean and Heath, which meant that *The Looking Glass* was no longer unique amongst the metropolitan print trade. That this rise in the number of multi-panel publications coincided with *The Looking Glass*’ renewed emphasis on the full page image implies that McLean and/or Seymour were trying to redefine and re-establish the series as something other than the norm.

This re-emphasis continued apace into 1835, with only one or two exceptions (such as Nos. 62 and 66):
The average number of images per page remained fairly static in relation to the previous year, but 1835 was notable for the appearance of issue seventy (fig. 105) - the first to consist entirely of full page images. In a sense, this was not too far removed from the semi-regular batches of *The Political Sketches* which McLean continued to publish at intervals.

More significant changes were imminent, however. 1835 was the last complete volume on which Seymour would work, as his suicide in April 1836 meant that he could have completed at most four issues of the final volume. The layout after his death remained fairly static, however, maintaining a general pattern of two full-page images per month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1835</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1835</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1835</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1835</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1835</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1835</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1835</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1835</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1835</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1835</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1835</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1835</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1836</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1836</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1836</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1836</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1836</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1836</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following Seymour's death, McLean's overriding influence over the series seems to have diminished, and change was more obvious in terms of style, technique and subject matter. From issue eighty (August 1836) onwards, the use of pen lithography became increasingly common, either by itself (as in an image such as *We'll All Have Six Shots a Piece at'em* (fig. 106)) or in combination with the crayon technique (as in *High Life* in the lower right corner of fig. 107).55

Seymour's replacement on the series was (in certain issues at least) Henry Heath. He had never worked for McLean before, but had made a career (at least partially) out of imitating the style established by HB.56 Here, though, his style remains his own. In contrast to Doyle, he relies to a far greater extent upon physical exaggeration and physiognomic distortion for overtly comic effect, as well as incorporating the kind of knockabout humour which would become more familiar in the mid-Victorian 'funnies' (fig. 108). He worked competently in crayon lithography, achieving quite subtle effects of form and tone in images such as *The Patent Travelling Squirt* (fig. 109).57 This image - which depicts figures being shot out of enormous pumps in the direction of their various destinations - is also indicative of a broader change in the focus of the title's principal subject matter which Heath brought about. The final volume saw a much greater concentration upon the advance of urban-industrial society, and a diminished emphasis on the moderate political humour of earlier years. Flying machines, steam travel, mass

54 *The Looking Glass*, No.81, September 1st 1836.
55 *The Looking Glass* No.80, August 1st 1836.
56 Indeed, the fact that Heath succeeded Seymour has, up to now, gone largely unremarked by historians of graphic satire, who have tended to focus only on the early issues of the series - particularly those which appeared before the end of 1832 (and were thus included in the BMC). Everitt suggests that Seymour was "assisted by Heath", but goes no further. His late involvement with the series could easily have gone unnoticed but for the fact that his 'HH' monogram appeared on a single image in the penultimate issue (No.83), and that he was able to include a feature entitled "Heath's British Beauties" on the title page of No.84. Apart from the single instance of Seymour's initials in October 1834, these were the first allusions to any creative identity, other than McLean's, to have appeared since December 1830.
57 *The Looking Glass* No. 83, November 1st 1836.
advertising, urban expansion: all were tackled in the final months of 1836. *The London Lions* (fig.110), for example, presents a nightmarish vision of the future city, consisting of suspension bridges and elevated railways, the sky crowded with airships and flying carriages. Overwhelming the scene is a mass of advertising hoardings; a pointed comment on the rise of commodity culture and the apprehension engendered by the rapid advance of industrial and technological innovation. As Alex Potts has emphasised, “the industrial landscape and the big city became during the earlier nineteenth century the two most potent visual symbols of the new economic order that was transforming the fabric of western society. London in particular, the ‘great emporium of the world’, was viewed as the epitome of the vast and teeming metropolis.”

It is interesting to note that Heath should bring the series around from a primarily political focus to one which showed a much greater interest in the world of urban experience at this time. Not only does the timescale coincide with the increasing prominence of Dickens’ work (from 1836 onwards), it also follows on from Grant’s exploration of similar themes in *Every Body’s Album* throughout the course of 1834 and ’35. We know that the two men must have known one another (having collaborated on prints in 1830 and ’31), and it seems possible that Heath’s interests were - when given the opportunity to express them - rather closer to Grant’s than Seymour’s had been. Certainly, will shortly be seen, Grant made full use of the ‘multi-panel’ format’s potential to present a vision of contemporary society which was characterised by instability. He evoked the increasing speed and overwhelming nature of urban-industrial life by separating it into numerous quickly digested fragments, spread across a single page, and carrying the eye from one to another in quick succession, only occasionally allowing it to rest on a more detailed image. The multi-panel format was ideally suited to this form of fragmentation when used in a certain manner. But William Heath and Seymour had tended to use it to present a smaller number of completed images in their own right, whereas in Grant’s prints the images are only ‘finished’ in relation to the others on the sheet. Perhaps Henry Heath, in the final months of *The Looking Glass*’ life was attempting to use the format in a similar way. He was restricted however, by the established pattern of the series, which had always finished each image by surrounding it with

---

a border, thus separating it from those surrounding it. This tended to limit the reading of each image to the information within that smaller frame, and thus diminished the sense of ‘fragmentation’ which Heath was able to achieve.

Whether McLean envisaged Heath as a permanent replacement for Seymour is unknown, but it seems more likely that he had already decided to terminate the series following the completion of the final volume.\textsuperscript{59} To have ended the series immediately following Seymour’s death would have robbed him of the considerable remuneration which he could realise from the subsequent sale of the completed annual volume for 1836. With its increased sense of permanence, this would have had a much longer shelf-life than the individual monthly parts. Whatever the case, the series came to an end with its eighty-fourth issue, without giving any explanation of the circumstances surrounding its demise. It is significant that, whereas \textit{Figaro} had given Seymour a relatively prominent obituary notice in April (having re-established its connections with him following à Beckett’s departure as editor), \textit{The Looking Glass} gave no indication whatsoever that its artist of six years’ standing had passed away. While \textit{Figaro} had drawn attention to its search for a suitable replacement, McLean gave no indication that anything had changed, and it seems probable that he settled upon Heath as someone who could reproduce an idiom not too far divorced from that of Seymour (which was itself based on that of HB).

Despite the changes found in the final issues, the overall development of \textit{The Looking Glass} demonstrates how McLean, as publisher, had been able to usurp the format originated by William Heath and make it - in name at least - his own. Whereas earlier caricature compilations - from the Darlys to Thomas Tegg - had given prominence to the role played by individual artists (with Tegg in particular drawing attention to the identities of Rowlandson and Woodward), the 1830s saw a move towards artistic anonymity and the increasingly prominent role of the publisher’s name as the principal site of identification for the commodities they produced. This phenomenon was, it seems, inherently linked to the increasing focus upon periodicity as a means of stimulating sales and maintaining an audience. As has been repeatedly stressed, one of the defining characteristics of the periodical was - and is - its emphasis on homogeneity and continuity of form, and the maintenance of consumer-product identification on a daily, weekly or

\textsuperscript{59} And was thus relatively indifferent about Heath’s inclusion of his own name in the last two issues.
monthly basis. As McLean must have been aware, graphic satire was, at the time, a decidedly unstable profession for many, and he had no guarantees of retaining the services of any one artist for an extended period of time. Thus, it seems likely that he chose to impose his own identity (and perhaps even his own aesthetic preferences) on the periodical he published. This would explain William Heath's early departure from the series, in what we can assume were acrimonious circumstances (considering that his other work for McLean also ceased at around the same time), and the introduction of an artist - Seymour - who had already proved himself as a capable imitator of the lithographic style favoured by McLean.

With this in mind, it might seem odd that the structure of the series altered so considerably during its run. What this highlights, however, is that the basic material characteristics of the title (which remained unchanged throughout), and the continuing presence of McLean's name, ultimately overrode the importance of the layout as the most significant identifying factors - just as a reliance on the name of a publisher as a means of creating consumer-product identification played an important role for the producers of the 'character' prints. However, not all graphic satirists saw their own identities eclipsed by that of their publisher. C.J. Grant, for one, was able to adapt the multi-panel format to his own purposes, while retaining full authorial recognition for his efforts. In so doing, his experiments with imaginative page layouts would take his individual projects well beyond the ultimately formulaic limitations of The Looking Glass.
Chapter Five

Narrative and Thematic Continuity in the Multi-Panel Prints of C.J. Grant

I
Parody and the Periodical; The Satirical Frontispieces, 1832-33

While the most interesting thing to note about the course of McLean’s publication was the slow but steady rejection of the format it had initiated, the multi-panel prints of C.J. Grant reward a closer examination in terms of the manner in which they utilised that format to create a cohesive narrative or thematic structure running throughout each individual print. Whereas The Northern Looking Glass and The Looking Glass had both begun as visual approximations of a newspaper, and were structured accordingly in their earliest issues, this element of their intended function quickly took on a secondary role before disappearing altogether. Nevertheless, this is still an indication that the multi-panel format was developed as a direct response to the growth of the newspaper and periodical press, and this was made even more apparent in a number of Grant’s works from the early 1830s (although by this stage they might be said to represent a reaction to both the periodical press and the early years of The Looking Glass). This can be seen most clearly in his earliest experiments with the format which, between 1832 and ‘34 were explicitly presented as parodic approximations of familiar periodical titles.

On one level, these mock ‘frontispieces’ fall directly within a tradition of parodic journalism stretching back to the eighteenth century and continuing well into the nineteenth.¹ Hone and Cruikshank’s A Slap at Slop and the Bridge Street Gang (1821), Alfred Bunn’s A Word with Punch (1847) and Gordon Thompson’s Fun’s Academy Skits (1881-2) can all be situated within this same tradition of satirical journalism. Each of them appropriated certain aspects of an established and

familiar format, and distorted their original function while retaining their principal visual conventions, using these to reinforce a specific satirical point. However, Grant’s purpose in his frontispieces was (with two exceptions) a more general one. They were directed less specifically at the failings and pretensions of a specific publication, and more towards the habits and tastes of the new reading public as a whole, and the ways in which they were manipulated and exploited by the periodical press itself.

The first thing to note about them, however, is that they bear no resemblance to the weekly issues of the journals they set out to satirise. Rather, they represent an ironic commentary on the redefinition of the ephemeral weekly periodical into the form of a ‘book’; they are, ostensibly, frontispieces to collected volumes of particular periodicals (or types of periodical), rather than imitations of specific titles as such. But their critique works on more than one level. It also seems likely that they were a commentary of sorts on the scrapbook phenomenon, which saw a good many prints and periodicals dismembered and pasted into volumes. The multi-panel format which characterised Grant’s ‘frontispieces’ was precisely the kind of object frequently adopted as a scrapsheet, even if it was not intended as such, as was the case with his own Caricaturist. Thus, the mock frontispieces occupy a somewhat ambiguous position. They walk a fine line between making the ephemeral permanent (as they imply, albeit ironically, the value of binding individual issues of periodicals into volumes) and making the permanent ephemeral (as they are themselves presented in a format more appropriate for scraps). Either way, they seem to mock the involvement of certain individuals with print culture as commodity and entertainment, as opposed to bearer of opinion, information and enlightenment. In so doing they align themselves with a wider radical critique of the ‘passive obedience’ supposedly engendered by certain examples of the periodical press during the period. Their form is thus analogous to their content.

We should begin - as did Grant - with the exceptional prints - the ones which

---

2 For Hone and Cruikshank’s collaborations see Marcus Wood, op.cit., ch. 4 & 5, pp.155-263 and Patten, op.cit., Vol.I, pp.121-86. For Alfred Bunn, see Spielmann, op.cit., pp.227-232. No literature is available on Thompson, but his work forms an important part of the vogue for parodies of the Academy in the Victorian era, and refers specifically to Blackwood’s Academy Notes - an annual illustrated guide to the Royal Academy’s summer exhibitions. Thompson mimicked the format almost exactly, but comically exaggerated the illustrations to poke fun at the most notable paintings of the year.

3 And, indeed, scrap books themselves often included a specifically-designed frontispiece pasted into the front.
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focused on a specific title - as the themes and conventions they established are carried through into those which followed it. Moreover, the subject itself - The Penny Magazine - was undoubtedly the ultimate symbol of the dual functions of distraction and enlightenment which formed the core of the debate surrounding cheap periodical literature in the 1830s. This would be the underlying notion which united all the subsequent prints.

The earliest frontispiece appears to have had its genesis in a single sheet lithograph which Grant produced for Tregear in September 1832. This print - The Penny Trumpeter (Sept. 20th, (fig.111)) - was published during the immediate post-Reform period, in which the old single sheet caricature print was rapidly declining, but still some months before the advent of The Political Drama in mid 1833, at which point Grant would ally himself and his work more directly with the sustained campaign of the unstamped press. As such, it forms an interesting link between these two distinct phases of his career, and remains one of the key satirical images of the 1830s. The print depicts Brougham as a kind of 'Pied Piper' figure, distributing copies of The Penny Magazine from a large sack on his back. In the background stands the office of the SDUK (represented as a temple of learning, constructed of books labelled 'history', 'chemistry', 'geography' etc: 'useful knowledge all') and a rubbish pile consisting of discarded copies of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

The image would appear again - in a reduced form - in the Frontispiece for The Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol. 1

---

4 The Penny Magazine was one of the principal topics of radical caricature in the years 1832-34. Its main instigators were Brougham and Charles Knight, who published it under the auspices of The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. The paper sprang from a desire on Brougham's part to 'improve' the reading matter available to the working classes. Without breaking the law, however, he could not produce a cheap (unstamped) newspaper for the working man, and so fell back upon a vehicle for 'useful knowledge' (which, in Cellina Fox's terms, effectively meant, "a thinly-disguised propaganda for Whig Reform and political economy, lightly scattered between snippets of encyclopaedic knowledge"). loc.cit., p.239. She identifies three main characteristics which made radicals hostile to the paper: "It represented mechanical expansion, moral elevation and monopoly" (ibid., p.238). But more than this, it was widely perceived in radical circles as a form of 'political pacification' (the term was William Cobbett's) on the part of Brougham and the SDUK - a means of distracting the lower classes from the political issues which would truly have a bearing on their future and the improvement of their lot. The paper's great success was another bone of contention. Printed by steam power, and distributed across the country by steamboat, canal, railway, quick van and the mail, with 29 wholesale agents and innumerable retail outlets, it sold over 200,000 copies in single issues and monthly parts, at its peak. The nature of its principal audience - be it working or middle class - has been the subject of some debate amongst scholars. See Anderson, op.cit., pp.50-83 for a reasoned account of the journal's history and position within the Illustrated press of the period.
The figure of Brougham as *The Penny Trumpeter* is almost identical to the larger print, although it lacks the latter's immediacy on such a small scale, and it therefore seems unlikely that this print should have been the inspiration for the larger Tregear version. Rather, its presence in this context implies that - like *The Penny Magazine* itself - it was a pre-established point of reference for Grant's intended audience and, as such, its size could be reduced quite drastically while still retaining the full signifying force of the original. Certainly, its position at the centre of the page, surrounded by a decorative border of mock heraldic emblems, instantly focuses the image of Brougham as the ideological and thematic heart of the print, around which its wider concerns revolve. Indeed, his image appears five times in all, establishing a pattern of deliberate repetition which would form one of Grant's most important rhetorical strategies throughout all his multi-panel prints - a technique which was otherwise unavailable in either the single-image/single-sheet print, or within the framework of a sparsely illustrated periodical.

The 'Penny Trumpeter' is flanked by Brougham dressed as the 'Schoolmaster at Home' and 'Abroad', above whom he floats (as a witch) 'Diffusing Useful Knowledge' by scattering copies of *The Penny Magazine* from his broomstick. This latter image seems to equate the questionable value of the SDUK's 'Knowledge' with the kind of superstition and gullibility which characterised the old traditions of folkloric oral culture (and which the 'March of Intellect' had supposedly banished). Surmounting all these is a full-face portrait - not overtly caricatural - superimposed over the 'Rod of Equity', one of the many symbols of oppression which litter the print and its sequel. These five Broughams rise up from the centre of the print in a narrow pyramidal structure - a compositional device which draws the eye of the reader first to the central image of Brougham, and then upwards to the top of the pyramid. At this point - the central theme having been established - the eye is once again freed to read downwards in a more conventional manner. The division of the

---

5 The print is undated, although Dorothy George places it at around October 1832 (*BMC*, Vol.XI, p........). It seems more likely, however, that it would have appeared in December, to coincide with the completed first volume of *The Penny Magazine* itself.

6 The reference is to Brougham's famous speech of 1828, in which he spoke of the 'Schoolmaster' being 'abroad', and his determination to control the sort of knowledge diffused by 'thrashing' it into the 'scholars'.

7 James, op.cit. (1976), Ch 1, pp. 17-27, charts the impact of the growth of reading on older forms of popular superstition and oral culture. He says that the nineteenth-century saw, "a change in the type of literature available, and a new climate of rational enquiry within which the ability to read assumed a different meaning... the increase of the reading habit did in this context disrupt the traditions of the 'pre-industrial' world, and introduce new patterns of thinking and sensibility" (p.18).
page into a series of evenly-structured panels (even though they do not have a
direct narrative continuity) somehow demands an act of reading similar to that
involved in scanning a page of text; from left to right and top to bottom.
Surrounding the central pyramid are eight rectangular panels, each labelled with
one of the scholarly disciplines which constituted the 'temple of knowledge' in the
Penny Trumpeter lithograph: Astronomy; Geography; Natural History; Navigation;
Botany; Agriculture; Mathematics; Mineralogy. Each of these is linked
thematically with the others, all of which depict the disastrous potential of the
distractions of 'useful knowledge' and its disruptive effect upon the harmony and
order of nature and society: young boys sit upon unused and discarded globes
within the closed confines of a classroom, reading about geography instead of
experiencing the world outside for themselves; an oarsman rows his boat straight
into another, while he and his passenger sit engrossed in an article on navigation;
a gardener crushes a miniature greenhouse underfoot while reading about the
correct principles of botany, and so on. Even the world of nature is distorted: a
large hog, dressed in academic robes lectures on mathematics to a litter of piglets,
while the moon and the stars gaze in self-absorbed interest at an article on - what
else? - astronomy.

Finally, the reader reaches the bottom tier of the print - a series of five smaller
panels, all but one focusing on a single figure. Unlike the panels above (which
mainly depicted people distracted from their occupations by reading about them
when they should have been practising them with more care and attention), these
smaller panels provide simple ironic contrasts between the lowly status of the
reader and the lofty subjects to which they aspire, and about which they read:
Thus, a chimney sweep devotes himself to divinity; a delivery boy to physics; a
jack tar to literature. etc. So, as the panel format shifts, so too does the treatment of
the subject: while the larger panels implied that the Penny Magazine's 'knowledge'
was unnecessary, the smaller ones portray it an inappropriate, although both
suggest that it is dangerously distracting and disruptive.

Grant was clearly constructing a definite pattern within this print, using variations in
its layout to unite certain themes and to lead the reader's eye across the whole in a
logical and coherent manner. Although each individual image is included within a
border, the structural and thematic logic of their composition reinforces the sense
that they must be read and understood in relation to one another. The tiny size of each image limits the amount of information which it can contain, and thus the overall meaning of the print must be established by presenting numerous facets of a broader theme. In this sense, the print is very different to McLean's *Looking Glass* (or even Grant's own earlier work on *The Caricaturist*), which effectively functioned as a series of larger, separate, and self-contained images. Thus, Grant settled upon the notion of 'fragmenting' a particular topic; constructing his treatment of it layer by layer and piece by piece, rather than relying upon a single, visually-striking statement which filled an entire sheet. The format he established in his manner was, it seems, entirely his own. Although it may well have stemmed from an awareness of McLean's *Looking Glass*, Grant took the potential use of the multi-panel format one step further, setting an important precedent for much of the work he would produce over the subsequent two year period.

It was six months or more before he returned to this innovative format. During this period he continued to produce work for Tregear, albeit at a steadily diminishing rate, turning out a few single sheet prints in the final months of 1832, before devoting himself more fully to the various lithographic series which dominated the mid '30s, such as *Tregear's Flights of Humour* and *The Political Drama* (the first issues of which appeared sometime before April 1833). By July of that year he had begun an association with John Kendrick, which would last until the publisher's death in late 1834. But in May he created a sequel to the *Penny Magazine* frontispiece for King who had published a small number of his pro-Reform prints (as well as *The Caricaturist*) over the preceding two years (Fig. 113).

Like its predecessor, this second frontispiece used a striking central image to establish its theme. In this instance, Brougham is shown using his broomhandle to ram copies of *The Penny Magazine* down the throat of a labourer, who sits helpless in the stocks. Once again, this central image is surrounded by various types of related vignettes (similar to those in Vol.1), organised in descending tiers of symmetrically-arranged panels of different sizes. Each section is united by the size of its panels and the theme of their content. The topmost tier places Brougham's mock heraldic emblem at its centre, with his profile at its far left, and his foot standing on a pile of newspapers labelled 'Cheap Politics' at the far right corner beneath the caption, 'Government Stamp'. The meaning of the latter is doubly
ironic: it symbolically represents the suppression of the Unstamped press with a metaphorical verbal-visual pun, which it places in the exact position reserved for the red Home Office stamp on officially sanctioned periodicals. Thus, just as Henry Hetherington had done on the cover of The Poor Man's Guardian (fig. 188), Grant was exploiting the symbolic value of the stamp as an icon of governmental repression, while aligning himself - and the print - with the cause of the unstamped press. In so doing, he was symbolically turning a single sheet print into a periodical, a process which he expanded upon through the regulated organisation of the page as a whole and its subdivision into numerous panels which, in turn, are divided into separate sections (or columns). In effect, this again formed a visual approximation of a newspaper, not unlike the early issues of The Northern Looking Glass, but much more concentrated and systematically organised than Heath's work. Certainly, this type of print demands a much closer reading than a standard single sheet, which presents only a single larger image. It involves the reader on a similar level to the periodical page, using the repetition of an idea or theme as a rhetorical device, rather than making a single bold and visually striking statement on a greater scale.

While the frontispieces which Grant produced for Lacey and King had a clearly defined political message, those published by Kendrick were more immediately concerned with the social phenomenon of the periodical press itself, and its rapid expansion during the 1820s and '30s. They appear to have been published monthly throughout the second half of 18338 which suggests that, although not sequentially numbered, they were conceived as a series of sorts; an idea borne out by an advertisement on one of them, offering "all the other comic frontispieces."9 Certainly they are united by the consistency of their format, which is similar to that of the Penny Magazine frontispieces, and by the print medium used in their production (pen lithography).10 Similarly, they all relied upon the same broadly symmetrical layout, and all used the same plain upper-case lettering for their titles -

8 The examples cited here were published in July, September and October, and it seems probable that there should have been one in August as well, although this has yet to come to light. Similarly, it is possible that other examples may have appeared before July and after October.
9 Frontispiece to the Sporting Magazines (October 1833). This offer was repeated in Frontispiece to Chambers's Information for the People The Edinburgh Journal & Historical Newspaper (June 21st 1834).
10 The one exception to this is a second version of the first Penny Magazine frontispiece, all but identical, except that it was executed in crayon lithography. The reasons for this remain obscure. Both versions are signed by Grant, and both were printed by Lacey, which may imply another instance of a first and second edition. Although in this case, unlike those discussed in Chapter Three, Grant did not cede its production to another hand, implying that the accuracy of the design held greater significance for him.
a formal unity which, again, gives them the sense of being a series.

The earliest example appeared in July. This was the *Frontispiece to the "Doctor" - The Lancet; Medical Gazette; Gazette of Health; &c* (fig 114). Like those which would follow, it was not aimed at a specific title, but at an entire genre of contemporary periodical literature; in this case the medical journal. Once again, the central image establishes the main theme - the venal and destructive nature of medical profession in general - showing an apothecary imploring a doctor;

"Oh Doctor Doctor give me aid!  
My Brain's on fire, my bowels ache  
In making up some patient's pills  
I took a couple in mistake!!"12

On either side of this are three tiny images, following the course of a patient's illness; from 'very ill', to 'worse', to 'worser', and finally 'worserer' (death). Grant's black sense of humour finds full expression in the surrounding vignettes - fourteen in all - which present verbal-visual puns on a variety of ailments ('Miss Carrying', for example, depicts a husband carrying his drunken wife home on his back, while 'The Cramp' shows a rabbit poacher getting his leg caught in the jaws of a man trap). At the bottom right hand corner (again, the logical end of the sequence, if read from top left) we see the ultimate conclusion to any illness - a funeral procession (or "a coffin fit"). In Grant's scheme of things, there is no escape from the inevitable, whether one follows the medical magazines or not; ultimately, they are just one more distraction.

The *Frontispiece to the Cookery Books* (fig 115) is similar in form - a central image and a rhyme (about the superiority of British cooking to French) - surrounded by twenty-two vignettes depicting the personifications of certain well known dishes ('Norfolk Dumplings' are obese children, and so on). As the quantity of individual images increased, however, they were subject to an ever-greater abbreviation of detail. In October, the *Frontispiece to the Sporting Magazines*13 (fig 116) incorporated no less than thirty-four images, many of them no larger than a single

---

11 Which then then included titles such as *The Monthly Gazette of Health* (1816-33), *The Medical Examiner* (1829-30) and *The Lancet* (1823-present). Grant specifically mentioned the first two of these in the title of the print.

12 For a discussion of Grant's repeated treatment of the theme of patent pills, see Pound, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-17.

13 A reference to *The Sporting Magazine* itself (which ran from 1792 to 1870), amongst others.
square inch, and did not even include a larger central panel to give the page a focus. Inevitably, the smallest of these are virtually illegible. Indeed, Grant himself seems to have been well aware of this, alluding to it in December's frontispiece, in which he appears to parody himself and the format he had established. The Frontispiece to Chambers's Information for the People The Edinburgh Journal & Historical Newspaper (fig.117) incorporates thirty-seven panels in all, varying in size from two square inches to less than a square centimetre. But the layout is still logical in a certain sense. The largest images are, again, in the centre, with the principal panel depicting John Bull shackled to a millstone labelled 'National Debt', with figures representing the monarchy, clergy and army sitting on his back. Surrounding it are a range of vignettes, labelled with the titles of the various columns which a miscellany such as Chambers' contained (Astronomy, Poetry, Domestic Economy, and so on). As the reader approaches the bottom right, however, the panels begin to diminish in size, fading almost into non-existence at the end of the page, where a series of 'Scotch Flats' (depicting figures on different floors of an Edinburgh tenement) are so briefly sketched as to be barely discernible (fig.117a).

What was the point of this? Perhaps none, but it seems so deliberate a compositional device that it invites conjecture. It is possible that Grant was, quite simply, bored with the format - fed up with the need to conjure up so many mediocre puns on a monthly basis - and was parodying himself as the series reached its end. However, taking into account the broader themes and function of the frontispieces as a critique of the periodical press, and society in general, it would be plausible to view this descent into illegibility as a satirical swipe at the reading public's willingness to be distracted by the trivial and the inconsequential. This would bring the series full circle; from the earliest attacks on The Penny Magazine, to a final restatement of Grant's principal theme, before the frontispieces

---

14 A satire of Chambers' Edinburgh Journal (1832-53) and Chambers' Historical Newspaper (1832-35) which, like The Penny Magazine, were often castigated by radicals for the brand of 'useful knowledge' which they provided. As Louis James has pointed out, Chambers' Edinburgh Journal was one of only a handful of middle-class periodicals to gain considerable popularity amongst the new "mass public", albeit only briefly. William and Robert Chambers had been booksellers in a poor quarter of Edinburgh, and set out with the intention of providing, "a meal of healthful, useful and agreeable mental instruction", for a wide variety of readers, especially the working classes. Their journal achieved a circulation of 80,000 copies within a few years, and was widely read in London coffee houses. Its success changed the magazine, however, and by 1841 it had become steadily more middle class. op.cit. (1963), pp.16-17.
themselves faded away into obscurity.\textsuperscript{15} Whatever the case, there do not seem to have been any further frontispieces following Chambers's.\textsuperscript{16}

II

Fragmenting the Modern Experience;
Every Body's Album, 1834-35

Grant, however, was far from finished with the multi-panel format itself. Within a month he had begun his longest-running series of this type, maintaining his association with Kendrick, who had published all the frontispieces during 1833. The first issue of every body's album and caricature magazine (fig. 118) is dated January 1st 1834. It was a fortnightly publication - a single sheet, printed on one side, measuring approximately 17 by 12 inches, costing sixpence plain or a shilling coloured.\textsuperscript{17} With its publication Grant began the most productive two-year period of his career. The Political Drama continued its weekly schedule throughout 1834 and well into 1835, and he also worked on at least half a dozen lithographic print series for Kendrick and Dawson, as well as turning out occasional ephemeral designs based on popular formats such as playing cards or almanacks. However, the existence of Every Body's Album, and the obvious importance which Grant felt it held within his oeuvre, is one of the most interesting developments in graphic satire during the decade for a number of other reasons. It forms a direct contrast to the virulently anti-authoritarian work he was producing for Drake at the same time, and in so doing raises important issues about the role of the artist in a trade caught squarely in the middle of the wider ideological and commercial battles being waged for the minds - and the income - of the steadily increasing reading public.

Grant alludes to his precarious position within the trade in the very first issue. A small vignette beneath the main image (entitled 'A Pair of Obstacles' (fig. 119)) makes it patently obvious that he was aware of how such a publication might be

\textsuperscript{15} Not before inspiring imitations, however. I am aware of one frontispiece by William Newman, which precisely follows precisely the pattern established by Grant. It is quite possible that there were more at the time, but, for the time being, this must remain uncertain.

\textsuperscript{16} A third Penny Magazine frontispiece was advertised (published by Lloyd rather than Kendrick), and, although I have yet to see a copy, I am assured that it was indeed published. I am indebted to Brian Maidment for this information.

\textsuperscript{17} The frontispieces were smaller - 11.5 by 8.5 inches - which meant that Grant now had a much larger framework within which to work. If he was frustrated with the restricted dimensions of the frontispieces, it is possible that Every Body's Album was deliberately conceived as a replacement which would provide greater scope for experimentation with layout.
received by his different potential audiences. The figures in the image are tiny, but Grant is practised enough to be able to imbue them with the necessary contrasting characteristics with great economy. The first figure, in plain coat and breeches, with untidy hair, bandy legs and a sloping gait is the familiar stereotype of the lower classes. Clearly intended to represent an itinerant vendor of cheap literature, he suspiciously holds up a copy of *Every Body’s Album* at arm’s length, and disdainfully remarks, “Eh What! Sixpence! and in this Penny Age. Prodigious! - Get it up at a penny with 19 to the Dozen & then it may do.” The other figure, the proprietor of a ‘respectable’ bookshop is the epitome of the comfortable middle classes: plump, upright, in full-length trousers. He reads the same issue - equally suspiciously - through a monocle, commenting, “Sixpence! Peh peh to little to little (sic). must mark it Half a Crown or it’ll never pay. besides it’ll ruin the trade.” The identification of the vendors of his publication - the intermediaries between the work and its audience - as ‘obstacles’ is a knowing commentary on the trade in the mid ’30s and can be read as a mild stab on Grant’s part at the artist’s subjugation to the commercial interests of the marketplace. But it also indicates an awareness that a cross-class market for graphic satire did indeed exist, and that to exploit that market it was imperative to settle on a format which would satisfy the expectations of both lower and middle classes - audiences which, at this point, Grant was having to serve separately with his two distinct versions of *The Political Drama*: one wood-engraved at a penny, the other lithographed at sixpence or a shilling.

Certainly the subtitle included on the first three issues of the *Album* indicates a desire to address all interests and to be all things to all men (‘An Original Pictorial Comical Satirical Sentimental Caustical Whimsical Philosophical Topographical Theological Pastoral Rumbustical Moral Periodical’). But the implication is that it will achieve this through its content alone, rather than by adopting a format which would make it accessible to the lower classes, and the subtitle was probably intended more as a satirical comment on the miscellaneous nature of so many periodical titles at the time. The fact remained that *Every Body’s Album* cost at least sixpence, and Grant remained either unwilling or unable to commit himself to pursuing a cheaper venture of a similar nature. He was poking fun at the commercially-driven conventions of the industry, but was himself still constrained by them.
When analysing the content of the series, it becomes clear that Grant's various targets were split fairly evenly between the world of politics (not, however, the radical politics espoused in *The Political Drama*) and that of the emergent culture of leisure and commodity consumption stimulated by the ongoing industrial revolution. Of the larger cartoons in each issue, ten were devoted specifically to political issues (fig.120), while seventeen focussed upon various forms of leisure and consumption. Within this latter category, the consumption of alcohol was the most frequent topic, followed jointly by the increasing dominance of steam power over leisure activities and travel (fig.121), and the increasing amount of leisure time available to the lower classes. The remaining large cartoons touched upon specific forms of leisure or commodity culture, from the 'manias' for patent pills, cigars and prosthetic limbs (fig.122) to activities such as sailing, fishing, musical soirées and Christmas festivities (fig.123). But the one theme which seems to unite them all is a sense of uncertainty and instability in the face of the modern industrial age. Humankind, it is implied, is ill-equipped to deal with the changes it is bringing upon itself, and the series presents a parade of follies in a society crippled by its own self-interest. Its title can thus be read as both all-embracing and universally mocking: both for and about 'Every Body'. Even Grant himself was not immune, nor the periodical press in general. Both were summarily dismissed by the resignedly self-deprecating motto, "Excuse us pray if we do our best, - To make as much Waste Paper as the Rest!" This theme was reiterated in issue thirty-four's main cartoon - *A Few of Our Contemporaries, Or The London Press Gang* - which features a series of punning takes on the titles of the numerous metropolitan newspapers being published at the time (fig.124).

Throughout the series the world which Grant depicts is that seen from the point of

---

18 Numbers 2,4,6,10,14,21,22,23,25,26 and 33.
19 Numbers 1,4,13 and 14.
20 Numbers 3,14, and 37.
21 Numbers 20,32 and 35.
22 Numbers 5,12,31 and 38.
23 Numbers 16,18,15, and 24.
24 In a certain sense, Grant's treatment of leisure in an imaginary 'everyday' context anticipates Henri Lefèbvre's famous *Critique of Everyday Life* (1978), in which he defines leisure in modern capitalist society as something which must, "break with the everyday", which explains the, "increasing emphasis on leisure as distraction: rather than bringing any new worries, obligations, or necessities, leisure (offers) liberation from worry and necessity." *op.cit*, pp.33-4. But he qualifies this by emphasising the idea that creating an imaginary picture of leisure implies a desire to belittle 'real life' as such, which implicitly reveals, "the secret of the everyday - dissatisfaction." (p.105). Certainly, a sense of dissatisfaction with the everyday can be detected throughout Grant's work on the *Album.*
view of the 'respectable' lower orders. It is very much the world of the man caught 'in between', and this may well reflect his perceptions of both his own social status and his role as an artist at the time. His claim at the bottom of the first issue that he was "Author Artist! Editor" makes it apparent that he aspired to a degree of personal involvement with this enterprise which was denied to Heath on The Looking Glass or to Seymour on Figaro, and the subsequent development of the Album seems to confirm this. He gradually constructed a peculiarly individual world which often revealed a strongly personal ideological agenda in the midst of a more familiar vein of frivolous squibs, excruciating puns and meaningless decorative motifs. Once again, this kind of 'fragmentation' contributes to the manner in which each issue functions. As society in general was increasingly being exposed to images of itself, and the way in which the world as a whole was changing, prints such as these can be read as visual approximations of the overwhelming array of sensory stimuli with which urban-industrial society was confronted on a daily basis. As Alex Potts put it; "A new order was creating a new kind of environment, and to most... commentators who made a point of describing their responses, the experience was unprecedented and also deeply contradictory... The huge scale and dimensions, the ceaseless 'movement' and 'restless activity' of (London)... would strike people as both amazingly exciting and profoundly alienating."25

Although the format of the Album remained static throughout its lifespan, the layout often varied considerably from issue to issue. While the first three issues conformed to a regular pattern of a large principal cartoon occupying the top half of the page, with a dozen or more smaller vignettes clustered below it, each subsequent issue breaks with the example set by its predecessor. Thus, while the periodical press as such sustained itself through the employment of a coherent and largely unchanging set of conventions from week to week, Grant seemed to be exploring the commercial possibilities of thematic and visual variety and novelty within a firmly established formal framework.26 The fourth issue of the series breaks the pattern of the first three by situating the principal cartoon in the centre of

26 Indeed, Every Body's Album was not conceived as a visual approximation of a newspaper, as both Heath's Looking Glass series had been. In January 1835, however, Grant produced a single edition of the Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers. This consisted of two pages, printed on the same side of a single sheet, and folded down the middle. It cost 8d, and was projected as a fortnightly publication, although it does not appear to have been continued. Its appearance seems to be related to Grant's own uncertain position in the wake of Kendrick's death at the end of 1834, and the subsequently precarious status of the Album.
the page (fig. 125), providing wide margins above and below, and narrower ones at either side (which he filled with smaller images). He makes effective use of the greater space afforded by the wider margins to introduce a number of more complex and highly worked scenes in which background detail is carefully delineated and lengthy passages of speech are incorporated, while the narrow margins are used for single-figure compositions and decorative motifs with little or no text whatsoever. Thus, while the individual elements of the page as a whole remain the same as those found in the preceding issues, they now begin to be arranged in a manner which breaks up the page in a less static way, while still making logical, economic and visually-stimulating use of the available space, just as he had done in the earlier series of frontispieces.

Subsequent issues were all shaped according to Grant's fancy in any given week, and often have the spontaneity of a sketchbook. Occasionally he would abandon the principal cartoon entirely, relying instead upon a greater number of smaller images. However, an example such as 'A Subscriber to the Penny Magazine' (in No. 8), effectively becomes the focus of the sheet (despite being a similar size to those surrounding it) by virtue of both its spatial positioning at the very centre of the sheet and by its thematic position at the very heart of the artist's oeuvre over the previous two years (fig. 126).

The slightly arbitrary nature of the Album's content could well reflect Grant's awareness of the afterlife which could await such a publication in the realm of the scrap book. There is no way of accurately gauging the extent of this fashion, but, as Dorothy George has pointed out, their popularity undoubtedly had a considerable impact upon the survival rate of the multi-panel sheets (and, as a result, the subsequent lack of attention which they have received from scholars).27 There is certainly something in this argument, but I am not convinced that it applies so much to The Looking Glass as it does to the Album, as they were two quite different commodities. The former, at 3 shillings plain or 6 coloured, was clearly intended as a product to be preserved and bound in its complete form. It was a luxury item, produced expressly to exploit a collector's market. The latter, however, at sixpence or a shilling, was a product aimed at the newly-expanding audience for graphic satire - an audience which placed less value on the conventions of the exclusive, connoisseurial print culture of the affluent middle classes or the aristocratic

collector, and whose experience was more directly rooted in the ephemeral and miscellaneous nature of the cheap periodical press. The *Album* was still well removed from the radical unstamped press, which continued to thrive in 1834 and '35, but it was certainly within the reach of the artisan and professional classes whose expectations it appears, for the most part, to address.

The miscellaneous nature of the *Album* made it an ideal product for the selective scrapbook culture of the period. Certain issues seem to have been designed expressly to be trimmed and clipped: to have their various elements separated and reordered in whatever form each individual felt most appropriate. In light of what was said earlier, however, it remains uncertain as to just how far Grant approved of this market, and how far his apparent acquiescence to its conventions formed a part of his broader critique.

It seems that the smaller images - the single figures, illustrated puns and decorative motifs - were those most commonly trimmed for inclusion in scrapbooks. In contrast, the larger images often turn up separately in print dealers' shops to this day, suggesting that they were also trimmed, but kept as small 'single sheet' prints, independent of the format in which they originated. In this way, a single publication could conceivably operate on more than one level and serve more than one audience, allowing not only for selective reading, but for selective preservation as well. Louis James is quite correct in saying that each separate element of a periodical has to be understood in the context of all the others which surround it and give depth to its meaning. But that idea is diminished in an instance such as this, in which specific elements could be removed, preserved, and arranged with others, from any number of different sources, while others could be discarded and entirely forgotten. Thus, the *Album* presents a choice. I have argued that its intention was to present a 'fragmented' view of a disordered society, which would imply that each sheet was intended to function as a complete work. But this very fragmentation itself made such sheets ripe for plucking by the adherents of the scrapbook craze (just one more of the 'manias' which Grant lampooned throughout

---

28 However, it is always uncertain in such circumstances whether the trimming was carried out by the original owner, or by the print dealer himself.

29 James, *loc.cit.*, pp.349-350. As he points out, "the most common plunder of the Victorian periodical has been the cartoon. Here surely, one might think, is an item that can stand on its own. This is not necessarily true." (p.350). One only has to glance through the mutilated copies of *Punch* on the shelves of the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale University to see the extent to which this has been so.
the series). So even the images found in Every Body's Album could be easily recontextualised according to an individual's own designs. The fact that it often consisted of an apparently arbitrary (sometimes almost nonsensical) range of images - from whimsical fantasy, trivial nonsense and simple decoration, to more scathing political and social satire - could even suggest that it was expressly designed with the scrapbook in mind. Whether this was the case or not, its format certainly demonstrates an acute awareness of the trend. That Grant could quite happily incorporate a single sidelong image within an otherwise entirely upright page (fig.127) suggests that he acknowledged the potential independence of individual images in the 'afterlife' of a scrapbook, where the sidelong image could easily be re-situated in an upright position, and its original illegibility could be instantly rectified without having to turn the page on its side.

But the world portrayed in The Album was not a friendly one. Grant's images are frequently imbued with a violent frenzy - a reflection, perhaps, of the highly individualised style he was then employing in The Political Drama - and this infuses the series with a sense of unease quite at odds with the 'soft' tonality of crayon lithography as used by Doyle in the Political Sketches or Seymour in The Looking Glass. This unsettling effect is heightened by the violence of much of Grant's imagery. Death, dismemberment and dislocation run rampant throughout the series; a soldier's legs shatter beneath him as his rifle recoils; men are called 'to arms' by a character who himself has only a single remaining limb (flgs.128-128a); boats capsize, drowning their passengers (fig.129); the dead rise from their graves (fig.130); a club meets with the express purpose of committing suicide (fig.131); politicians are transformed into a pack of crazed apes (fig.132); and a bride reveals herself to be a mass of prosthetic limbs on her wedding night, while her horrified husband gazes on (fig.133). And throughout all this, the Devil maintains a frequent presence in the margins, most often as a small silhouetted figure, frequently accompanied by grinning skulls, devilish monkeys or witches riding broomsticks, all of which add to the palpable sense of menace which pervades the series upon closer examination (fig.134). The overriding impression is one of discord: a disordered society, constantly on the brink of collapse, in which self-interest - whether that of politicians or of the public at large - is the driving force and in which catastrophe lurks around every corner. In this sense, Grant's fragmented view of contemporary life mirrors that of many
chroniclers of the 'modern condition'. Marshall Berman has characterized the "modern voice" as one which contains, "fast and drastic shifts in tone and inflection, (with a) readiness to turn on itself, to question and negate all it has said, to transform itself into a great range of harmonic and dissonant voices, and to stretch itself... into an endlessly wider range, to express and grasp a world where everything is pregnant with its contrary."30 Those who attempt to capture the modern experience are, "moved at once by a will to change - to transform both themselves and their world - and by a tenor of disorientation and disintegration, of life falling apart."31 This description seems to fit Grant's fragmentary approach in the Album extremely well.

Within this chaotic framework, however, his standpoint can be seen as a moral one, firmly in tune with the principles of self-improvement which informed the radicalism of Cobbett, Place, Bentham and others (the Spencean Ultra-Radical is a symbol of violence and disorder, as reprehensible in his own way as the policeman or the magistrate, fig.135).32 The world of chaos depicted in the Album is only rarely the inverted 'world-upside-down' found so frequently in The Political Drama; it is a picture of society in which everybody assumes some level of responsibility for the disorder in which they exist, and are thus implicitly exhorted to improve their collective misery by first improving themselves as individuals.33 Personal vices such as tobacco and alcohol are always depicted in negative terms, but so too are broader problems such as electoral corruption. At every level, though, it is the individual's willingness to debase himself which informs Grant's critique of

31 Ibid., p.13.
32 The image of the 'Ultra Radical' in fig.135 finds a parallel in Grant's Political Drama No. 12 (fig.207), in which he is defined as, "not a true and honest radical, but a scum of the rabble, a ragamuffin ruffian, (with) everything to gain and nothing to lose." For a discussion of Spencean radicalism, see David Worrall, *Radical Culture* (1992), pp.1-5.
33 As Donald Gray has pointed out, one way in which Victorians 'used' laughter was, "to ridicule in order to correct, or at least to unsettle things and ideas which those who laugh take very seriously". Although he goes on to emphasise that this form of humour took a decided second place to that intended,"to furnish a holiday from taking things and ideas seriously." loc.cit. (1966), pp.146-7 & 154. Grant could be said to veer between these two modes of humour here, especially if one were to isolate specific images; to free them from their broader context. In general, though, I would argue that the function of the series as a whole falls into the former category.
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The didacticism is rarely as overt as that found in much of Cruikshank's later temperance-related work, but it undoubtedly underlies the entire run of the series to some degree. In effect, the *Album* forms part of a wider critique of the rapidly developing urban-industrial commodity culture which was, in certain circles, provoking such anxiety at the time. It depicts a society driven to distraction - and frequently to *destruction* - by its fascination with the metaphorical spectre of steam power and its often bewildering effect upon the life of every individual. Cruikshank had been moving in a similar direction with his 'scrapsheets', which had also included a range of images depicting the advance of urban-industrial society in distinctly disquieting terms; infusing bricks and mortar and steam-driven machines with a life and consciousness of their own (fig.136) - the kind of 'demonic animism' which Dickens would make his own over the following decades.

Grant explored another aspect of the overwhelming modern experience in one of his most innovative pieces for the series - *Adventures of the Buggins's to Gravesend. V. Margate - & back again* (No.14) - a piece of social satire recounting the unfortunate experiences of a lower-middle class family on a seaside outing. This cartoon was notable for its use of sequential narrative - an early example of

---

34 In No.1 (January 1st 1834) the main image depicts *The Drunkard's Progress* - *from the Pawnbroker's to the Ginshop from thence to the Workhouse thence to the Gaol & ultimately to the Scaffold*. In No.4 (February 14th 1834) the central image shows the *Interior of a Temple of Juniper*, with statues representing Poverty, Dispair (sic), Disease, Insanity, Blasphemy, Plunder, Murder and Death, mounted on enormous barrels of gin. No. 12 (June 15th 1834) depicts *The Cigar Mania* as a craze which spreads through all ages and classes, creating a thick haze of fog which obscures the world, and thus renders society incapable of functioning on a day to day basis. No.26 (January 15th 1835) shows *A Specimen of British Elections* - a pair of images depicting 'Open Bribery and Intimidation' and 'Corruption and Venality'. And so on.

35 In this sense, his critique was radical in intent, and thus forms a parallel to his work on *The Political Drama*. As George Paton has pointed out, humour, "can be judged conservative or radical if, in its implications, it tends to reinforce the arrangements of society as it stands, or it protests against current arrangements." He goes on to suggest that radical humour, "may be said to illustrate 'emergent culture', with its continuous creation of new meanings and values, new practices, new significances and experience." 'The Comedian as Portrayer of Social morality' in Powell and Paton eds., *Humour in Society* (1988), pp.206-33 (pp.208-9). Grant's humour in the *Album* is certainly related to the 'new' experience of urbanized culture, and treats its subject in decidedly contemporary terms. Rather than imagining a rose-tinted past, it expresses doubt and fear about the future, situating the root of these fears firmly in the present, using 'steam' as an emphatically contemporary metaphor for the 'modern' world.

36 'Demonic Animism' was a term coined by Dorothy van Ghent to describe Dickens' use of anthropomorphic imagery in his novels. Murray Roston has encapsulated her argument in the following terms: "In an era of growing materialism, the Victorian, she argued, felt engulfed or overwhelmed by the plethora of articles encroaching upon him, the products needed for the fast-moving existence dictated by the machine age or the possessions requisite for establishing social standing. Accordingly, people became transformed into objects, and objects, in that interchange, take over the role of people." Roston, *op.cit.*, p.73. Philip Collins has reiterated this idea in terms more directly relevant to Cruikshank: "He (Dickens) was fascinated by the spectacle of the countryside retreating before the invading army of bricks and mortar', and by the temporary state of those edges of the city". 'Dickens and London' in Dyos & Wolff eds, *The Victorian City, Vol.II* (1973), pp. 537-57 (p.538).
the comic strip - which allowed him to explore a specific topic in greater depth than would have been possible within the confines of a single image (fig. 137). The format he used in the story was, in many ways, a logical extension of the already cramped, crowded and chaotic compositions he had been employing since the frontispieces. Rather than reducing it to a single moment in time, however, the strip format afforded him the opportunity to explore an event whose significance lay in the fact that it occupied an entire day - a day of leisure - and all the attendant rituals which formed a part of it. By extending the story's scope in this manner, he was able to depict the rhythmic flow of the day as it proceeds: from the excitement and anticipation of the its beginning; through the increasingly unfortunate series of events which form its middle part; to the despondency and disillusionment which accompany its tragic end. The situation is taken to its reductio ad absurdum for comic effect, but it seems likely that Grant was tapping into a common vein of disillusionment with the experience of leisure on a tight budget - and a tight schedule - with which his audience could well have sympathised, as it may have directly reflected their own experience.

There is an implicit acknowledgement throughout the tale that leisure for the lower classes - especially when it constitutes a form of social aspiration - involves the expense of a great deal of effort (effort which the middle classes, with access to more comfortable means of transport and the aid of domestic servants, did not have to tolerate). As David Kunzle has

---

37 What marks this story out as exceptional is its highly developed use of the form and visual language of the comic strip - a genre which had barely reached its infancy on the continent in the mid-1830s, and which was virtually unknown in Britain. Grant, however, with his combined use of sequential images (confined within panel borders or frames), word balloons, and the progression of the narrative in short period of time, was using a format which resembles the 'modern' comic strip more closely than anything which would appear in England until the final two decades of the century. Rodolphe Töpffer had drafted his earliest 'picture stories' in 1827, and had even lithographed one - The Story of Monsieur Jabot - in its entirety in 1833, but their influence would not be widely felt in Europe until several years later. The 1833 edition of Jabot was privately published, not being released commercially until 1835, after which he produced The Story of Monsieur Crepin in 1837 and The Loves of Monsieur Vieux Bois in 1839. Despite receiving lavish praise from the likes of Goethe, however, Töpffer never achieved lasting success in England, which makes it all the more remarkable that Grant should have stumbled upon the comic strip form at this early stage. See Kunzle, op. cit. (1990), pp.38-9 and Thierry Groensteen, 'Töpffer: The Originator of the Modern Comic Strip' in Lefèvre and Dierick eds., Forging a New Medium; The Comic Strip in the Nineteenth Century (1998) for details of Töpffer. For the language and conventions of the comic strip, see Scott McLoud, Understanding Comics, pp. 3-22. For an account of the development of the comic strip in the nineteenth century, see Dierick and Lefèvre eds., op. cit. (passim).

38 For a discussion of the potential difficulties involved in the lower-class experience of leisure in the 1830s and '40s, see James Walvin, Leisure and Society, 1830-1950 (1978), pp. 2-17. Peter Bailey has also drawn attention to the fact that, during the industrial revolution, "the demands of mechanised factory production and the accelerated growth of big cities led to a radical restructuring of the temporal and spatial patterns of economic and social life... (leisure) had not only been reduced but relocated in the life-space, forming a separate and self-contained sector in an increasingly compartmentalised way of life... severe material constraints often made a mockery of leisure's putative freedom." Leisure and Class in Victorian England; Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control, 1830-1885 (1978), pp.4-5.
"Travel (was) a dominant mode of the comic strip, especially in the first generation (up to the 1850s), when... tourism, much of it organised by Thomas Cook and his like first became a lower-middle-class recreation. Thus the tour quickly became a metaphor for social aspirations and mobility... that could turn into nightmares of frustration... As in dreams, the process of travelling (or of getting stuck or lost) is often the subject matter of the comic strip... it became part of the struggle for an identity within society, within triviality, mundanity, and even ugliness, which were now perceived as ultimately inescapable".39

From the very beginning of the day, the family are under pressure: the pressure of the clock and the necessity to squeeze all their leisure into a short period of time (just as they themselves are squeezed into the crowded panels of the strip); the physical pressures of travel (which, literally, weigh heavily on the shoulders of the son, who is forced to carry the family's lunch on his back, and on the group as a whole when they eventually board the dangerously overcrowded and unstable steamboat); financial pressure, which is exacerbated when they are overcharged for their passage; and, finally, the double humiliation of falling into the sea and arriving home to find that their house had burned to the ground a mere hour after their departure - the strongest possible indication that they should never have ventured forth in the first place.

As Eric Hobsbawm has pointed out, industrial society brought with it, "the tyranny of the clock, the pace-setting machine and the complex and carefully timed interaction of processes",40 and this is amply reflected in the comic strip form - itself a response, at least in part, to the changing perception of time and motion which accompanied the rapid expansion of industrialisation. David Kunzle has

40 Eric Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire: Economic History of Britain Since 1750 (1968), p.88. E.P. Thompson has made a similar point. He emphasises that an increasing awareness of time has influenced the way we think about work and leisure - a process which came to a head in the nineteenth century under the demands of urban-industrial capitalism and its reliance on the clock as a means of regulating labour. He argues that many of the "arts of living" were lost at the time (The ability to, "fill the interstices of (one's) days with enriched, more leisurely, personal and social relations."). Indeed, the periodical itself is based on the regulation and compartmentalization of time. See "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism' in Past and Present, No.38 (December 1967), pp.56-97.
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formulated this idea in the following terms;

"The comic strip, with its frequent stops and starts... and its physical freneticism - which often escalated into bizarre and terrible accidents and extreme violence between people - mirrored the (feared) railway experience, which was a metaphor for life... The very style of drawing was fragmentary, increasingly so as the century progressed and new shorthand codes, new abbreviations, new abstractions were devised. This tendency affected not only caricature and popular culture but all the arts at every level... Learning to live with appearances and a fragmented reality, the social commuter assembled the shards of experience into a new aesthetic." 41

It was this kind of 'fragmentation' of everyday experience which the multi-panel print was ideally suited to reproducing. Even when not employing the comic strip as such, Grant used the format to create the impression of a distorted and disrupted world - unstable and overwhelming - with which many people were struggling to come to terms. He married form and content in a manner which (although perhaps to some extent intuitive) appears entirely logical and deliberate in retrospect. His experiments prefigured the comic strips of the later Victorian age - those found in Fun, Judy, Funny Folks and Ally Sloper - which portrayed even more directly the increasingly chaotic quotidian existence of the urban lower-middle classes.

In this sense, Grant's Album was very different from The Looking Glass. McLean's series was - until its final year - a primarily political publication and, in terms of the content of individual images, it remained rooted for the most part in the older traditions of political satire, never really exploring the possibilities of the format it had established. Indeed, in retrospect, the efforts of McLean and Seymour seem like something of a lost opportunity. In relation to what had gone before, the multi-panel print was a significant innovation. In terms of what it could express via the narrative or thematic unity of multiple images, it had enormous potential as a rhetorical tool; it allowed an individual subject to be explored and expanded upon via a rhythmic system of statement and restatement, reprising certain themes throughout the course of single page. But The Looking Glass relied, throughout its run, on individual images, isolated from one another except in regard to their

broadly political content. In effect, they were often reminiscent of single sheet prints on a much reduced scale. This may well account for the gradual return to larger, full-page, images which characterised the later years of the series.

But the multi-panel format would have a more immediate effect in the 1830s. As the simplification of images became more commonly accepted within the satirical press - as the more complex compositions of Georgian and Regency caricature gave way to the conventions of the simple caption cartoon - we find a concurrent development within the single sheet print as such. The mid-1830s are notable for the preponderance of prints which function in a similar way to the smaller cartoons found in the multi-panel prints (verbal-visual puns; comic encounters; character types; and so on), all without background detail, and reliant upon a brief caption to give them their meaning. But on a much larger scale. Dorothy George was wholly dismissive of this type of print in her conclusion to the BMC, describing them as, “degenerate coloured etchings or lithographs... which seem to be ancestors of the comic postcard. Such things have an interest for the social historian (but) they have little to do with... comic art.” Nevertheless, they remain one of the most characteristic developments of the period, prefiguring the mild social humour of Leech and other Punch cartoonists, as well as demonstrating the increasing prevalence of the captioned cartoon, which would itself become one of the defining elements of Victorian illustrated satirical periodicals.

In terms of format and content, these prints were all of a similar type. They routinely featured either a single character with no discernible background setting, with a one line caption below, or two characters with both a caption and a verbal exchange (figs.138-8a). For the most part, they were issued in sequentially numbered series and retained a consistency of format and other material characteristics throughout their run. The title and issue number of each series generally appeared above the image, in simple hand-written upper-case text. The titles themselves generally included the name of the publisher, or consisted of a generic name which gave an indication of the whimsical, inconsequential form of humour which they contained. Tregear apart, one of the most prolific publishers of

43 The reason for numbering prints in this way was twofold. Firstly it lent an overall sense of unity to a series, which made the collection of all the parts that much more appealing. Secondly, it was very convenient for the publisher and retailer in terms of fulfilling reorders.
44 Where this absent, it has generally been trimmed - most likely for inclusion in a scrap book.
such series was Spooner, whose *Spooner's Magic* reached at least seven issues. His other series, such as *Sam Slick's Oddities, Funny Characters, Scenes in Life and Eccentricities* likewise appear to have been relatively short-lived affairs, but his *Notions of the Agreeable* at least equalled, and perhaps exceeded, the lifespan of *Tregear's Flights of Humour* (figs. 139-139b). Hodgson was another specialist in this area. His *Funny Ideas* (fig. 139c) was a series of crayon lithographs in the style of *Tregear's Flights of Humour*, while *Matters of Taste* was a pen-lithographed scrapsheet. Dawson - who took over Kendrick's business after his death - continued to produce similar series with Grant, albeit no longer under Grant's own name. He did at least allow Grant to sign all his own work, and titles such as *Whim-Whams* and *Dawson's Magic* both carry the artist's name prominently (fig. 139d).

Unlike the more familiar type of satirical print, none of these series contained a printed border, and only occasionally featured an artist's signature. The border is an important device for 'finishing' an image, and its absence in this type of print implies that they were not intended to function alone; that they were not complete in and of themselves, but were intended to be read in relation to others of a similar type. Thus, the image would only be 'finished' when supplied with a broader context - either as part of a scrapbook, or in an album of similar prints - the border (or frame) being supplied by the edges of the page onto which it was pasted, or by the images which surrounded it. In this sense, the conventions of the multi-panel print were reversed. Whereas the former presented numerous, simple, small images from which the individual scrap-collector could pick and choose, separating them from their original context, the 'character' sheets presented individual images of a similar nature, but on a much larger scale, which were intended to be brought

---

45 The highest number of *Sam Slick's Oddities* which I have come across is No. 9, while *Funny Characters* reached at least No. 16. *Notions of The Agreeable*, however, is well represented in the BM's collection of Supplementary Satires, with the highest number they possess being No. 94.

46 *Whim-Whams* began in August or September 1835, and ran for at least four issues. It was followed in October by the first issue of *Dawson's Magic*. The latter does not appear to have survived for long, however, with no issues beyond the second (November 5th) having come to light as yet. Indeed, this series appears to have been the last collaboration between the two, perhaps having led to a similar falling out as that between Grant and Tregear.

47 Tom Gretton has identified two basic sorts of framing device for individual images: "First is the vignettled picture, in which the edges of the picture are undefined, so that the scene or object depicted sits in white space, while framing responsibility is devolved onto the the book or the page... The other treats the picture as a block of inked paper in its own right... The first (way of doing this) is to make an image which is emphatically rectangular; one which occupies its edges and corners. The second is to set a frame around the picture". 'Pictures and Texts in Nineteenth-Century Illustrated Magazines; Modes of Separation and Equality'. Unpublished.
together with others of a related type. In a sense, then, the purchaser was invited to construct something akin to a 'multi-panel print', albeit spread throughout the pages of a book.

And yet the multi-panel print itself did not survive beyond 1836. *Every Body's Album* ended with its thirty-ninth issue (in August 1835) and Grant, from that point onwards, would concentrate his energies within the emergent Chartist press. With the demise of *The Looking Glass* the following year the format would fade from view entirely for several decades. Only in the 1860s, as satirical and comic papers began to rely more and more on illustration (and the comic strip truly came into its own), would certain of its conventions be reprised, albeit in an altogether different form.
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*Figaro in London* and the Conventions of the Penny Satirical Periodical in 1832

When constructing a brief history of the nineteenth-century comic periodical, Donald Gray identified three archetypal examples which he felt best illustrated the key stages of the medium's development. The first of these was *Figaro in London* (1831-39), the second was *Punch* (beginning in 1841 and continuing to this day), and the third was *Ally Sloper's Half Holiday* (1884-1923).ⁱ Each of these titles represented a key stage at which the material characteristics and conventions of several prototypical publications merged to create a new format which was somehow appropriate to the immediate period (and social milieu) which spawned it. Thus, while *Punch* was an expression of the dominant 'respectable' middle class values of the early Victorian period, *Ally Sloper* was a product - an icon even - of the expanding leisure culture which was making an impact amongst the lower classes in the latter part of the century.² Both, in other words, were products of broad social trends, rather than responses to specific events. *Figaro*, however (as well as the host of imitative titles which it spawned), was rather different. Along with the unstamped press in general, it has been identified as a direct response to the growing political interest amongst both the lower and middle classes in the lead up to the Great Reform Bill of 1832.³ The purpose of this chapter, along with that which follows it, is to examine the conventions of the format established by *Figaro*, and to highlight the standardisation of format, content and style which was inherent in the medium of the periodical itself.

*Figaro* (fig.140) was the first illustrated weekly satirical paper to sell for a penny,

---

3 *BMC*, Vol XI, p.xviii. More generally, Richard Altick credits the first Reform Bill with creating a mass reading public devoted to newspaper and periodical reading. *The English Common Reader* (1957), p.322. The whole question of cause and effect in this regard is far from simple, however, so such a statement is wide open to disagreement.
and as such was instrumental in broadening the audience for political satire - both verbal and visual - by virtue of its price alone. It was possible to sell the paper so cheaply because it counted itself amongst the unstamped press, and so did not pay the fourpenny tax to which all news-bearing weekly periodicals were legally liable. Thus, it emerged - at least partly - from the same publishing milieu as the radical journals of Henry Hetherington and Richard Carlile, but unlike their titles it was never a direct expression of a lower class point of view. Rather, it was a product of two distinct worlds: the radical printing and publishing milieu of Holywell Street and Paternoster Row, and the genteel-bohemian world of literary clubs and theatrical societies inhabited by its editor, Gilbert à Beckett, and the other middle class littérateurs who would eventually go on to found Punch in 1841.

_Figaro_ is regarded as an important stage in the medium's development largely because the conventions it established were so quickly adopted by so many other titles, becoming the standard format for the satirical press in the reform era. And _Figaro's_ success played an instrumental role in the broader transformation of English graphic satire, as it fundamentally altered expectations about the role of satirical illustration by placing it in a context where it was largely subordinate to a dominant text. More than any great innovation on à Beckett's part, however, what this points to is the generally emulative nature of the metropolitan press during the period, and the speed with which successful conventions could become standardised throughout the trade. In the context of the penny satirical press in particular, this can be attributed to the dominance of the relatively small circle of men who produced these papers, most of whom emanated from the Holywell Street and Paternoster Row milieu. Between them, William Strange, George Cowie, Benjamin Steill and George Berger published the greater part of such titles.

---

4 For a full discussion of the history of the stamp tax, and the lead up to the situation in 1830-36, see Wiener, _op.cit.,_ pp.1-19. Following the repressive 'Six Acts' of 1819, any news-bearing publication appearing more frequently than every twenty-six days was liable to pay the fourpenny tax. The intent of this measure was explicitly stated at the time: it aimed to drive out of circulation, "pamphlets and printed papers containing observations upon public Events and Occurrences, tending to excite Hatred and Contempt of the Government and Constitution of these realms as by law established, and also vilifying our holy religion". The penalty for any violation was set at £20 - a considerable sum. The tax on newspapers was first imposed as long ago as 1712. At that stage it was a halfpenny, but throughout the eighteenth-century it was increased gradually until, in 1797, it reached three and a half pence. In 1815 it was raised again to fourpence. The official red stamp was applied only to those journals whose publishers paid the tax, so differentiation between stamped and unstamped titles was possible at a glance. This "slave-mark", as Richard Carlile called it, restricted the circulation of most newspapers to upper-income groups - those who could afford the minimum price of six or seven pence for a daily or weekly paper. As Wiener has pointed out, "in the midst of such concomitants to industrial change as rising literacy and accelerating cultural expectations, a restrictive policy of this nature was short sighted." _op.cit, p.3._
while a constantly changing list of printers included the oft-recurring names of Thomas Richardson, J. Viar, C. Hicks and W. Molineaux. Robert Seymour was by far the most prolific draftsman for these papers, working for both Figaro and The Devil in London, although (in the latter in particular) his work alternated with that of William Horngold on a regular basis. However, while Dorothy George has identified the penny periodicals of 1832 as of a refuge for caricaturists of the late 1820s (who had been put out of work by the declining market for the satirical print), this does not actually seem to be the case. It certainly formed an additional means of income for Seymour, (who continued to work for McLean until 1836), but most of the artists whose names appear with any regularity were entirely new to the field of graphic satire. They had apparently begun their careers within the sphere of serial journalism, not that of the single sheet print. Some, such as Kenny Meadows and William Newman, would go on to find employment with Punch or the Illustrated London News, while others, such as William Horngold and J.H. Jones, quickly faded into complete obscurity. The work of all these men, however, was given a decidedly homogeneous appearance by the restricted space in which they had to work and the routine engraving of the same few men, such as W.C. Walker and George Armstrong, both of whom were employed by a number of penny satirical papers.

When the first issue of Figaro went on sale, two weeks before Christmas 1831, its editor, Gilbert Abbott à Beckett, was a mere twenty years old. His career in journalism up to that point had been less than spectacular, limited to the co-creation, along with his brother William and his friend Henry Mayhew, of a number of short-lived periodicals during their years at Westminster School. Of these, The Censor: An Entirely Original Work, lasted all of sixteen issues in 1829, while The Literary Beacon (a review of literature, art and drama), survived for only four months in 1831. A third paper, Cerberus, published by Hetherington (an associate of Mayhew's brother Thomas), is now even more obscure, never having


6 They are not even mentioned in Mark Bryant and Simon Heneage's comprehensive Dictionary of British Cartoonists and Caricaturists (1994).

7 Nos. 1 - 2 1, 18th June - 21st September, 1831.
As the son of a barrister and - according to family legend - a direct descendant of Thomas à Beckett, the young Gilbert was typical of the moderately wealthy, public-school educated, middle-class milieu which formed the editorial and literary backbone of the emergent Victorian Periodical press. His precocious desire for a literary career mirrored that of his contemporaries - men such as Douglas Jerrold, William Thackeray, Mark Lemon and the Mayhew brothers. He would become acquainted with all of these figures over the following decade, and alongside them would become a founding member of the *Punch* table. Over the next twenty-five years, before his early death from typhoid fever in 1856, à Beckett wrote more than fifty plays, as well as being a leader writer for both *The Times* and *The Morning Herald*, a contributor to the *Illustrated London News*, the creator and editor of numerous comic journals, and the author of two 'Comic Histories' (of England and Rome). Both of the latter enjoyed considerable popularity throughout the Victorian era, each going through several editions before finally fading into the literary limbo which is now home to so many products of nineteenth century 'light literature'. Even during the early 1830s à Beckett's editorial duties were by no means limited to *Figaro* alone, and he actively used the paper's announcements section to publicise his other journalistic ventures. Never mentioning himself by name, he used the pseudonym of *Figaro* as a means of creating a sense of continuity between the various journals he edited. In late 1832, for example, *Figaro's Monthly Newspaper* was prominently advertised as being "conducted by the editor of *Figaro* in London", while a year later *The Wag* was promoted as a 'NEW PAPER

---

8 *Cerberus* is not mentioned in the BUCOP. Spielmann records that it was started with, "a consolidated share capital of three pounds", but came to an early end after à Beckett's father found some forty-three libels in the first four columns of the first issue, and intervened to stop his son having any further copies printed. *op.cit.*, p. 272. See also Ann Humphreys, *Henry Mayhew* (1984), p. 28. The division of editorial duties on these papers is uncertain. Humphreys states that à Beckett and Mayhew were co-editors, without mentioning William à Beckett, while Spielmann records that they were the product of collaboration between William and Gilbert, not mentioning Mayhew at all. Tracing the History of *Figaro* is somewhat problematic, as no archival material survives from which to construct an accurate picture of its growth and decline. Biographies of à Beckett and Mayhew inevitably focus on their contributions to *Punch*, while histories of *Punch* are generally vague in their descriptions of its development. For want of any more concrete evidence, the most helpful way of tracing the journal's history is through the advertisements and notices which appeared within its pages and those of *The Comic Magazine*, which was also edited by à Beckett. But one has to be cautious in this regard, as not every announcement necessarily reflects reality - especially when they concern circulation figures. The most extensive biography of à Beckett is that written by his son: Arthur William à Beckett, *The à Becketts of "Punch": Memoirs of Father and Sons* (1903). See also Spielmann, *op.cit.*, pp.272-80.

9 The use of 'Figaro' as a journalistic pseudonym had several precedents. As early as 1785, an anonymous work had been published in London entitled *The Novelties of a Year and a Day, in a Series of Picturesque Letters on the... Spanish, French and English Nations...* by Figaro.
Chapter Six

BY FIGARO IN LONDON', which literally united à Beckett and Figaro in a single person. The same is true of a sixty-four page pamphlet, Epigrams by Figaro in London, which reprinted many of his puns and squibs from the pages of Figaro and The Comic Magazine.10 à Beckett and Mayhew also collaborated on a broadsheet journal - The Thief - in 1832 which, as its name suggests, made a speciality of re-printing features from other publications, and also included illustrations by Seymour.11

Throughout his life, however, à Beckett juggled these literary interests with a parallel career as both a barrister and a metropolitan police magistrate - precisely the kind of authoritarian figures which he was apt to ridicule in the early years of Figaro's existence. With this in mind, it seems logical to consider Figaro more as the product of youthful exuberance than of any deep-rooted commitment to the kind of radical politics espoused by Hetherington, Carlile, Cousins or Drake.12 Genuinely radical politics was never the focus of Figaro. Despite being an unstamped paper, it was not of the same nature as the journals published by Hetherington or Carlile, nor even the more radically-inspired titles issued by Strange,13 who remained as Figaro's publisher throughout its lifetime.14 Figaro was liberal, certainly, but it was a 'safe' form of liberalism - safe enough, certainly,
for the Duke of Gloucester to declare himself an ardent admirer of the paper.\textsuperscript{15} Although pro-Reform, it was opposed to universal suffrage and the payment of M.P.s, reflecting the political ideology of its editors - first à Beckett and then Mayhew, who succeeded his friend at the editorial helm in January 1835.\textsuperscript{16} Rather, à Beckett was part of the "genteel-bohemian" culture of literary clubs and societies which proliferated from the 1830s onwards, and of which Punch would eventually become a benchmark. While it was sold in part by street vendors, like the majority of the Unstamped, it was also widely available in the more 'respectable' metropolitan bookshops, and achieved distribution to provincial booksellers via a network of official London agents.\textsuperscript{17}

With à Beckett's background and subsequent career in mind, it should quickly become clear that Figaro was conceived from the outset as a predominantly literary venture, rather than as a deliberate attempt to continue the traditions of Golden Age graphic satire. Its ostensible model was the Parisian Figaro, as stated in the first issue's address to the public:

"The great success of the Figaro published in Paris, and the extraordinary popularity of the plan on which it is conducted, have induced us to establish a similar periodical in London, which we humbly hope will be received with as much approbation as our sparkling, sharp-flavoured, and highly-relished prototype." \textsuperscript{18}

In terms of its format and material characteristics, however, à Beckett's Figaro drew more from the conventions of the cheap English illustrated press, which had established itself in the 1820s, than it did from any French model. Indeed, its

\textsuperscript{15} à Beckett, \textit{op.cit.}, p.46.

\textsuperscript{16} Humphreys, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{17} Hollis, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.108-23 for details of the sale and distribution of Unstamped papers. From its earliest issues, the title page advertised the fact that it, "may be had of all booksellers". Advertisements in Figaro and related publications frequently carried notices to provincial booksellers. The announcement of the imminent publication of Seymour's Comic Scrapsheet, for example, stated that, "Country booksellers are requested to send their orders immediately to their London Agents".

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Figaro}, No. 1, December 10th, 1831, p. 1. à Beckett clearly kept a close eye on journalistic developments in Paris. Figaro's model originated there, as did that of \textit{The Thief} (Le Voleur was another Parisian publication). Ten years later, Punch itself would model itself (ostensibly) on Philipon's \textit{Le Charivari}. The Parisian Figaro was a liberal paper which focussed its attacks on the ministry rather than the monarchy. It began as a literary journal, but soon turned into a political daily. It was condemned by the Correctional Tribunal for, "suggesting that the king had suffered from an affliction of the eyes when he chose his new ministry", but was not prosecuted, as juries were then more willing to acquit small journals than large daily newspapers. See Irene Collins, \textit{Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1871} (1959), pp. 57 & 76.
success was, to a certain extent, made possible by the fact that it was launched into a pre-existing market for cheap illustrated periodical literature. Although the two most famous examples of early Victorian quarto penny periodicals - *Figaro* itself and the SDUK's *Penny Magazine* (1832-45) - did not make their initial impact until 1832, the market for journals of a similar format had begun to take shape more than a decade earlier.

The graphic codes and conventions of format which would dominate this area of the press until the 1860s were established as early as 1820 by *The Mirror of Literature, Amusement and Instruction* (1820-45, fig. 141) which, as Brian Maidment has pointed out, "represents a key periodical for understanding the transitions from polite to mass culture during these decades." Along with similar titles, such as *The Portfolio* (1823-29) and *The Hive* (1822-24), *The Mirror* was a sixteen page octavo weekly, costing twopence. Despite their smaller page dimensions and greater page count, these titles were enormously influential in terms of their basic layout. The pattern which they established for the front page of an illustrated periodical consisted of two columns of text beneath a centrally-placed woodcut, separated from the masthead by a horizontal band containing details of issue number, date and price. Maidment has emphasised the extent to which this conventional layout held sway between 1820 and 1860, acknowledging the "tediously similar" appearance it gave to the periodical literature of the era, and attributing its ubiquity to an "apparently unquestioning acceptance of the nature of a title page in so many levels and varieties of discourse in the early Victorian period." Certainly, the periodical press during the period thrived on imitation rather than innovation, and the numerous satirical journals which appeared in the wake of *Figaro*’s success make an interesting case study in its fundamentally emulative nature.

Having said this, however, although the basic layout of the octavo journals of the

---

19 Brian Maidment, *Into the 1830s*, p. 5. See also Simon Houfe, *Dictionary of British Book Illustrators and Caricaturists, 1830-1914* (revised ed., 1981) and James, *op.cit.* (1963), pp.12-13 for the importance of the periodicals of the 1820s in establishing a broad market for cheap illustrated periodical literature.

20 Maidment, *op.cit.*, p. 9. "Such a format may derive from newspaper layout, but it is also the characteristic broadside page. The almost unanimous acceptance of this page format is fascinating and open to various interpretations. Only with the octavo monthlies of the 1860s, which separated out the illustrations from the text in imitation of the older genteel copperplate tradition (exemplified in, say, *The Comhill or Once a Week*), did this format begin to falter. From tract to penny journal, from serial fiction to *Punch*, the double column, integrated illustration, and black letter title holds sway." This is somewhat overstated. à Beckett’s *Comic Magazine*, for example, separated certain images as whole pages, blank on the verso, as did *Punch*, in its full-page cartoons.
1820s remained the primary model for the title pages of Figaro and its kind, the penny satirical periodicals of the early '30s did not adhere to the format with absolute rigidity. Images were often set in only one column, rather than being centrally placed, and could appear either above or below the text. In certain instances, they did not appear on the title page at all, but inside the paper instead. With Figaro, for example, there was no standard pattern for the location of images on a weekly basis and, as it became better established, the role of illustration occasionally achieved a more central role altogether, especially when an issue was given over to one of its seasonal 'political pantomimes', which made a feature of the numerous cuts which accompanied the text.

But beyond the illustrations themselves, the majority of such titles retained a remarkably coherent structure from week to week, which reflected the standard format of the penny quarto press as a whole. In this respect, considering its adherence to such a conventionalised format, it should be stressed that from its outset, the material characteristics and layout of Figaro signified 'cheap periodical' as much as, if not more than, they did 'graphic satire', and in doing so it inevitably reduced the status of Seymour's designs by making them subordinate to the broader sweep of the periodical's weekly content. It should be stressed at this point that Figaro was never solely a political, or indeed satirical, periodical. Like so many of its contemporaries it inherited (again from the cheap periodical press of the 1820s) a broadly miscellaneous nature. A number of the journals of the '20s had established the medium of the periodical as a repository for a wide range of knowledge and information, rather than focussing on just a single topic, paving the way for the 'Useful Knowledge' titles of the 1830s (such as The Penny and Saturday Magazines) as well as for the more expensive illustrated miscellanies of the 1840s, such as Lloyd's Weekly Gazette and The London Magazine.

à Beckett was clearly aware of the appeal of a varied content, and quickly established Figaro as a vehicle for his own interests in literature and the world of the stage, quite apart from the political leaders which were the focus of every issue. The address to the public in the first issue laid out the proposed format in quite literal terms:

"The Figaro in London will consist of four departments, each of which will occupy generally about one page of
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By and large, this basic format would remain in place for more than five years. The exact length of these sections was never entirely static, but broadly speaking each issue was broken down along the following lines: the lead article occupied the title page, frequently stretching into the first column of page two; 'The Interpreter' took up the remainder of page two, occasionally extending over to page three; 'Brevities' filled most of page three, which generally also included the beginning of the 'Theatricals' section; while page four (the back page) contained the remainder of the 'Theatricals', notices to correspondents, announcements, and the occasional advertisement. In terms of content, the 'leading article' was invariably political in nature, while 'The Interpreter' focused more on social satire (lampooning social aspiration, the hypocrisy of the 'rising' middle classes, and so forth). The 'Brevities' section, as the title implies, consisted of short jokes, squibs, rhymes and puns - the staples of the kind of humorous literature of which à Beckett and his peers were so fond - and the 'Theatricals' section listed performances at the principal West End theatres, and generally also included reviews and 'backstage' gossip. The 'spirited and unbiased' nature of this section was its raison d'être effectively providing à Beckett with a forum from which to vent his spleen against any figures from the theatrical world who had incurred his displeasure. It rejoiced in its scathing commentaries, and styled itself as "the terror of bad actors, brainless authors, and venal managers."

This emphasis on the theatrical world within a publication of this type may seem somewhat incongruous today, but at the time it was by no means unusual. As Anne Humphreys has pointed out, "though drama would seem outside the journalism label, in the early Victorian period it was not so obviously separate. Minor comedy was closely connected to popular journalism of the period in subject, the drama."21

---

21 Figaro, No. 1, 10th December, 1831, p. 1.
22 Figaro never had to rely to any great extent on advertising revenue. The early issues contained one or two brief announcements of new publications, but never took up more than half a column. Only in its later years - from 1836 onwards - did it begin to feature more advertisements for items such as beaver hats and a wide array of patent medicines. At most, though, these generally only occupied about half of the last page.
23 Figaro, No. 58, 12th January, 1833, p. 7.
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treatment, and in authorship.24 Certainly, à Beckett and Mayhew wrote several
dozens plays between them, frequently combining their dual interest in politics and
theatre in the annual "political pantomimes" which appeared in both Figaro and
mayhew's The Devil in London. Later still, the Punch circle would make the writing
and performance of plays a major aspect of its social activities.25

Significantly, no mention whatsoever was made of the role of illustration in the first
issue. Indeed, for its first two numbers, it contained no cuts at all with the exception
of the masthead. This featured a depiction of the character of Figaro, from the
series of late eighteenth-century plays by Caron de Beaumarchais, wielding his
razor before a group of dummies with the heads of prominent Tories.26 The image
Corresponds to the character's role in The Barber of Seville (1784), the most
notorious of the three plays, whose critique of authority had provoked the wrath of
the censors in France.27 Below this were two quotations on the nature and
purpose of satire - one from Lady Montague and the other from Croker's New Whig
Guide - which would appear every week until 1833.28 Clearly, then, while Figaro
was conceived from its outset as a satirical/literary periodical, the idea of illustration
- the notion of it as a vehicle for graphic satire - was of secondary concern. There
was, at the time, no precedent for an illustrated satirical weekly penny journal of
this type, and it seems that this was not a role which à Beckett had initially
envisaged Figaro fulfilling. The Ballot had begun its 'Sketches from the Church' a
month or so before Figaro first appeared, but Wakley's journal was a broadsheet

24 Humphreys, op cit., p.14. As late as 1850, à Beckett produced a play entitled Figaro in London; a Farce, in
two acts (London, G.H. Davidson, c.1850).
26 The image of Figaro in the masthead closely corresponds to the description given in the Cast of Characters at
the beginning of the play: "Figaro: Barber of Seville; dressed as a Spanish Dandy. Head covered by a hair
net;... silk scarf loosely tied at his neck; satin waistcoat and knee breeches with silver-edged buttons and
buttonholes; broad silk belt; garters tied with tassels hanging down each leg;... white stockings and grey
27 The Marriage of Figaro (1775); The Barber of Seville (1784); The Guilty Mother (1792). These tales of sexual
intrigue and moral hypocrisy - in which the dubious morals of the aristocracy are played off against the
cunning and intelligence of the servant, Figaro - were obviously ripe for adoption by the satirical press.
Figaro became a symbol of anti-authoritarianism, reversing the status of master and servant by making the
Count Almavia reliant upon him, and by emphasising the discrepancy between his master's private and
public faces. The resonances of this in the immediate post-reform era were considerable. As John Wells
points out, "a play that enraged the sympathies of the audience for the servants against the masters was a
threat to stable government, and historians mark the first night of The Marriage of Figaro as a major
28 "Satire should be like a razor keen, / Wound with a touch that's scarcely felt or seen. - LADY MONTAGUE."
"politics! Pasquinades and Political Caricatures are parts (though humble ones,) of Political History. They
supply information as to the person and habits, often as to the motives and objects of public men, which
cannot be found elsewhere." - CROKER'S NEW WHIG GUIDE.
Sunday paper, stamped, and costing sevenpence. In contrast, the majority of unstamped papers were unillustrated.

However, this situation changed decisively with the third issue. A notice appeared on the final page announcing the involvement of Robert Seymour, and promising more frequent illustrations in subsequent issues: “Our subscribers will notice that we have presented them this week with an additional caricature...We therefore have much pleasure in announcing that the success we have experienced has determined us (at a very heavy loss) to offer on Saturday next SIX ADDITIONAL CARICATURES! By that highly gifted and popular artist Mr. Seymour. FOR ONE PENNY!”29 The image in question was a small (3 x 3”) portrait of Cumberland and a bishop, standing dejectedly at the bar of ‘public opinion’ - a comment on the defeat of the second reading of the Reform Bill (fig.142). The description of the cut as an “extra caricature” again gave the sense that it was something exceptional - something separate from the regular format of the periodical - but at the same time it acknowledged the importance of illustration as an element of appeal and as a means of stimulating sales. The following week, almost an entire page was devoted to depicting the characters of a “Grand Political Pantomime” (fig.143), a feature which would become a seasonal fixture of the title, providing a Beckett with an outlet for his theatrical aspirations.

After this issue, cuts continued to appear at the rate of one per week (occasionally two), but only became a dominant feature with the annual ‘Pantomimes’ which appeared every December and the various other seasonal events - such as Valentine’s Day and May Day - which it also celebrated on an annual basis (fig.144). Less frequently, it would also offer more illustrations to commemorate elections. The general implication was that more than one or two illustrations was an additional bonus. They were offered only at times of celebration, rather than on a routine basis, again adding to the sense that they were not integral to the regular layout of the periodical itself. Nevertheless, two months after the paper’s launch a Beckett had a small prospectus printed up and bound into copies of his Comic Magazine. This included a very prominent “Specimen of the Engravings” above a number of positive comments from other metropolitan newspapers (fig.145), thus making it abundantly clear that illustration now played a more central role in the journal’s programme.

29 Figaro, No. 3, 24th December, 1831, p. 12.
The allusion to Figaro's success in issue three was more than mere exaggeration and, as is implied in the announcement above, it may have accounted to some extent for the decision to illustrate the paper on a regular basis. The early issues sold out quickly, and soon had to be reprinted to meet the increasing demand for back copies which accompanied the steady increase in circulation. After five weeks it was announced that the second issue would be reprinted, "to meet the immense demand for the completion of sets," while the first was, "nearly out of print, but we believe a few copies may be had of Mr. Strange." By late January 1832 all issues were back in print, and by early March the first two had been reprinted again. By June of that year "the immense sale of the 'Figaro'" was commented upon in an advertisement in The Comic Magazine, which went on to state that, "in obedience to the eager demand made of the publishers for back Numbers, no less than eleven have been re-printed in one week."

It was here that the periodical format came into its own as a means of stimulating sales, not only of new issues, but of old ones as well. From its beginning, Figaro—as with so many nineteenth-century periodicals—was conceived as a part work, with the pages being sequentially numbered from issue to issue, rather than beginning again at page one every week. The logic of this was simple enough. Although it made no difference to the weekly content, it implied that in possessing only a few issues of the run, one was not obtaining the entire work, thereby stimulating the desire for completion and increasing the demand for back copies. This market was further exploited via the compilation of the weekly issues on a semi-annual and annual basis which, like the individual parts themselves, enjoyed considerable popularity. Figaro was issued in twice-yearly volumes, "stitched... in a neat wrapper," priced at two shillings, as well as in annual volumes, bound "in boards, with title pages, prefaces, and all the paraphernalia to make a perfect book," at five shillings and sixpence. The first of these semi-annual volumes...
went through four editions in the space of a month.\footnote{It was first issued in June 1832, and in July it was recorded that, "the Half-Yearly Part... has been bought out with an avidity unparalleled in the annals of public enthusiasm, and, though three editions have been exhausted, a fourth is ardently called for." The Comic Magazine, No. 4, July 1832.} The actual size of the editions is now impossible to gauge, but it has been estimated that, at its peak, the weekly circulation of \textit{Figaro} was some seventy thousand copies\footnote{Spielmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p.273.} - a considerable figure for the period, even for a metropolitan journal. At the end of 1832, à Beckett could confidently proclaim that, "ever since our first appearance in London, we have been "\textit{Figaro here! Figaro there! Figaro every where!}" We did not presume to hope for a more favourable reception than has been attended our prototype in Paris, but we have the flattering satisfaction of knowing, by a return lately made of the circulation of French newspapers, that \textit{Figaro in London} sells more than four times the number of its namesake in the French capital!"\footnote{\textit{Figaro in London}, Vol. 1 (1832), preface. This could, of course, be simple exaggeration.}

The response to \textit{Figaro} in the press was also favourable. \textit{The Times} described it simply as, "a new publication, which promises to be a worthy competitor with its Parisian namesake,"\footnote{\textit{The Times}, December 9th 1831.} while \textit{The Metropolitan} was rather more expansive, contrasting it favourably with more scandalous contemporaries such as \textit{The Age} and \textit{The Satirist}:

"Two or three numbers of this paper have been sent us, full of wit and satire, which is confined within just limits. It is not a vehicle of scandal, or inventor of gross falsehoods on individuals in private life, it does not attack defenceless females, to gorge debased appetites; and shews (sic) up, in good colours, those works which do. The Figaro is a satirical publication, very ably conducted, and an exposcer of presumption, knavery, and folly of all kinds."\footnote{\textit{The Metropolitan}, June 1832.}

The images, however, never seem to have been a topic of comment in the press. They were subsumed within the body of the periodical itself - they were, in a sense, a part of its typographic layout - so they did not warrant any distinct notice in themselves. In some ways, though, this is hardly surprising. So many of the images contained in \textit{Figaro} and its imitators were extremely simple in conception and related directly to an accompanying article, of which they they effectively became an extension (or even a part). \textit{Portraits of the Political Burkers (Figaro...}
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No.3, (fig.142), for instance, only contains two elements; the upper half of the figures, and the 'bar' at which they stand. Some sense of depth is vaguely suggested by the sketchy black lines which emanate from behind the figures, but there is no background detail as such. The image is stripped to its essentials, and while its meaning may be broadly inferred from the dejected expressions of Cumberland and the bishop, and their exposure to 'public opinion', there is no space to expand upon or explain the issue within the image itself. The context of the cartoon is provided solely by the text, which explains that, "the above wretches will be readily recognised, but if there should be any doubt as to their identity, it will be cleared by a perusal of the following CONFESSION OF A BISHOP!" There follows a lengthy article which, as is implied, takes the form of a mock confession by a bishop who voted against the Bill.39 The presence of a bishop apart, however, there is little else to link the text to the image.

But whatever this type of image lacked in complexity was made up for in the sheer quantity of cuts which appeared over the years. All told, Seymour produced around 300 designs for Figaro between 1831 and his death in 1836, although relatively few of these were actually signed.40 Between these dates, his association with the paper was broken only by a falling out with à Beckett in August 1834. According to Henry Bohn, à Beckett was in dire financial straits at the time, due to one of his less successful "theatrical speculations", and was unable to pay Seymour a sum of £40 which he was owed for his designs.41 Certainly, the falling out between the two men seems to have been sudden. Seymour refused to supply any more designs for Figaro until he was paid, but left à Beckett no time to organise a replacement, with the result that the issue for August 16th, 1834, (No. 141) appeared without any illustration (the first time this had happened since December 1831). Although the following two issues featured cuts (both by

39 Figaro, No. 3, December 24th, 1831, p.13. The text refers specifically to the Bishop of London, which may imply that the second figure in the image is Charles James Blomfield (1786-1857), who held the office at the time. Blomfield, however, was not one of the bishops who had voted against the Bill in October 1831, and actually gave his support to it in March 1832 (See Brock, op. cit., p. 279). If it is intended to be Blomfield, it is a rather mis-directed attack, and it thus seems likely that he was simply being used as a representative figurehead for the clergy as a whole.

40 Seymour's initials appeared for the first time on the cut in issue 7 (June 21st, 1832), and thereafter appeared on average only 20 weeks a year.

41 Henry G. Bohn, 'Biographical Notice' in Seymour's Humorous Sketches (1868) The dispute with à Beckett is recounted on pp. viii-x. It is likely that this "theatrical speculation" was his part interest in the running of the Fitzroy theatre which, according to Arthur à Beckett, was draining the greater part of the profits his father was realising from Figaro at the time. "It has been said that the easiest road to ruin is by the copyright of a paper or the lease of a theatre. My father was interested in the Fitzroy and editor of Figaro in London, and ultimately was forced to sever his connection with both. op. cit., p.52.
Seymour), the dispute was not yet over. Arthur à Beckett gives a more detailed account of the falling out, attributing it to a fundamental difference in the social background and personalities of the two men, and to Seymour’s frustration at having to tolerate editorial direction from someone ten years his junior (and only a short time out of public school):

"He (Gilbert à Beckett) had come from Westminster with that contempt for those who were not public school men that young men possess until they have turned five-and-twenty. So unfortunately... (he) was inclined to treat Seymour in a kind of "Hail fellow, well met!" spirit that was distinctly repugnant to the artist's feeling... However, editor and cartoonist still had to meet to arrange the weekly cartoon... At last Seymour could not stand (his manner) any longer, and there was a quarrel. He told the youngster that he would no longer discuss with him the subject of the cartoon, and would send in what he pleased."42

The result of Seymour's stand against à Beckett was published in issue 143 (August 30th 1832, fig.146). It was a straightforward comment on Brougham’s indifference to attacks against him in The Times, depicting him slicing through a copy of the paper with his sword-like nose. à Beckett, however, took advantage of his position as editor to blatantly insult this autonomous effort, using the leading article to publicly humiliate Seymour, and offering a reward of £100 to any reader who could interpret the image:

"The above caricature is so purely hieroglyphical that we decline any attempt at explaining it. The artist must have been under some strange and baneful influence which we cannot possibly attempt either to enter or elucidate. We suspect that he was labouring under some frightful stagnation of his vital functions, and the result has been a vivid affair which we can only describe as a pictorial frenzy. The fact is that our caricaturist has been so long and deeply impregnated with the horrible aspect of political affairs that his mind has at last become in some degree impressed with a hectic extravagance that has now vented itself in... the awful sketch which heads this present number."43

43 Figaro, no. 143, August 30th 1834.
Implicit in the statement that this cartoon was "purely hieroglyphical", and impossible to explain, is the sense that it actually had an existence beyond the broader framework of the periodical as a whole; that it was an autonomous image in its own right, and thus did not belong in a paper of this type. It was, to put it simply, too complex - an implication which is most decidedly not borne out by the image itself. Unsurprisingly, Seymour produced no further work for the paper during the remainder of the year, while à Beckett began a vindictive campaign against his reputation in the 'Notes to Correspondents' column. In response to the (presumably self-concocted) question, "how is it Seymour can't write his own name?", for example, à Beckett unleashed an extended passage of childish invective:

"We reply! Upon the same principle that a turkey can't quote Metastasio - Ignorance, gross and beastly ignorance! We are told that in the year 1815, a subscription was raised among a few friends of civilisation, and enemies of idiotcy (sic), to teach Seymour to spell; but his hard and obstinate bit of brain rebounded from the process in its infancy, and the result was, he never got beyond words of one syllable. Poor man, now that he is deprived of our benevolent and condescending patronage, we understand he is obliged to speculate on his own account in miserable caricatures, which don't sell, and which of course are not worth purchasing. The fact is, Seymour never had an idea of his own, though he was sometimes happy in the execution. But it is a well-known fact, that the ideas for the caricatures in Figaro were always supplied to him by the Editor, Seymour being a perfect dolt except in the mechanical use of his pencil." 44

Although Marion Spielmann felt that, "all this was meant more than half in fun: it was too violently personal to be serious," 45 Seymour's lengthy absence from the paper suggests that the quarrel was in earnest - on the artist's part at least. But whatever the actual cause of this antipathy, it was clearly a personal dispute

44 Figaro, No. 154, November 15th 1834.
41 Spielmann, op.cit., p.273. Arthur à Beckett put it rather more succinctly: "Seymour was pompous; my father was not blessed with the organ of veneration... The successful artist met the the typical public school boy, and the result was a quarrel." Indeed, perhaps more out of loyalty to his father than from any truly objective point of view, he went as far as to say," I have always felt that Seymour treated my father - the boy of one-and-twenty - badly. The Quarrel led to my father's resignation of what was his livelihood." op.cit., pp.41-2.
between Seymour and à Beckett alone, and while it may have reflected Seymour’s frustration at having to compromise his artistic autonomy to an editorial voice, it did not preclude his return to the world of periodical illustration when he found an editor with whom he could work more comfortably. Thus, only a month after Henry Mayhew took over the editorial reins of *Figaro*, Seymour’s exile came to an end and he was reinstated as the paper’s regular artist with issue 165 (January 31st 1835). Indeed, Mayhew went to great lengths to praise the work of “THE TREMENDOUS SEYMOUR” in the announcements column on a regular basis, thereby giving some acknowledgement to the role which the artist had played in constructing the paper’s identity and reputation, and also suggesting an awareness of the commercial advantages offered by the association of a regular, well-established name with a periodical title (despite the fact that his actual cartoons were almost all unsigned). It also seems likely that Mayhew was trying to consolidate the initial success of the enterprise built up by à Beckett by reintroducing a familiar aspect of its early years.

To backtrack a little, in December 1834 à Beckett had suddenly resigned his position as editor. Under the heading ‘Singular Announcement’, he devoted the entire title page to a final address which spoke emphatically of his disillusionment with the burden which *Figaro* placed on his time and energies, and his growing indifference to the role which he had carved out for it.

“*Figaro in London* is about to commit, as it were, a literary suicide, that is to say, the individual who projected it, and has solely conducted it from its first appearance, three years ago, to the present time, is about to discontinue his labours in this publication... the weekly execution of our editorial task is an irksome interruption to other business of a more important kind. Another reason... is candidly this, we have become thoroughly tired of furnishing, week after week, for three successive years, a series of trifling comments on political and other matters; indeed, when we have felt the tediousness of writing, we have often thought it most marvellous that the public, by its undiminished patronage of *Figaro*, has proved itself to be never tired of purchasing and reading it. Indeed, so profitable is it to the moment, that the publisher, we believe, intends continuing the title, though we must be understood as having ceased all connection with any thing that may
Towards the end of this lengthy address, à Beckett gave some intimation of his wider reasons for abandoning *Figaro*. Arthur à Beckett has suggested that, by the middle of 1834, his father's obligations as a barrister and his involvement in running the Fitzroy theatre were distracting from his role as editor, but more specifically than this, he appears to have felt uncomfortable with the conflict of interests arising from his dual role as both dramatist and dramatic critic, a fact which gives some indication as to where his primary interests and ambitions were located at the time:

"Many persons have advised us to continue *Figaro*, if it be merely for the sake of its unrivalled theatrical influence, but it is our unwillingness to benefit by this accidental advantage, which is one of our chief causes for resigning it. Since we have dabbled in dramatic authorship, we have found it quite repugnant to our wish to speak unfavourably of dramatic pieces." 47

The following week, he set an even more emphatic seal upon his resignation in the preface to the collected volume for 1834: "This - the third volume - closes the publication as far as its projector and original Editor is concerned - who is no longer responsible for any thing that may appear in any periodical bearing the title of *Figaro*." 48 It is difficult to account for the rather bitter tone of à Beckett's final address to his readership. By all accounts - his own included - *Figaro* was still a remarkably buoyant enterprise in financial terms. During the six weeks after he abandoned the editorial chair four of the issues edited by Mayhew had to be reprinted (within a month of their first appearance), while issue 164 - an "election special" - was reported to have sold 200,000 copies in the space of a week. 49 Strange himself was offering a shilling for any copies of issue 163 less than a

---

47 Ibid.
49 Nos. 162-165 (January 10th-31st) had all been reprinted by February 7th (as stated in No. 166) The circulation figure for No. 164 was given in No. 165. It could, of course, have been simple exaggeration, but there would be a certain logic to such a topical issue achieving a wider distribution than was normal. The election in early 1835 was the object of intense public interest, with the Whigs, under Melbourne, out of favour with the king, and the Tories, under Peel, vainly trying to hold together a minority government. See Philip Ziegler, *Melbourne* (1976), pp.181-92.
month after its publication.\footnote{Figaro 167, February 14th 1835, p. 32.}

So Figaro was clearly still in a healthy state in the mid 1830s - successful enough, certainly, to support a number of supplementary publications. In January 1835, the third part of the annual Figaro's Caricature Gallery was announced. This was a single page broadsheet, published "on a large sheet of Double Demy, about the size of the Times,"\footnote{Ibid., No. 162, January 10th 1835.} costing twopence, and reprinting dozens of Seymour's cuts. Many of these dated back as far as 1832, which indicates that the paper still maintained a considerable stock of old (or perhaps stereotyped) blocks.\footnote{As early as 1832, Strange had been reprinting issues of Figaro from stereotyped pages. It was announced in that year that the first semi-annual volume of the series would be ready "as soon as sets can be completed from the stereotypes." \textit{The Comic Magazine}, No. 3, June 1832. Whether the individual cuts were also stereotyped for later use in publications such as Figaro's Caricature Gallery is uncertain, however. Strange might simply have re-used whichever old blocks had survived.} In late 1835, Figaro's Comic Almanack for 1836 went on sale, again illustrated by Seymour, while in January 1836, the first of six editions of Seymour's Comic Scrapsheet appeared, each of which was a large sheet containing around twenty cuts reprinted from Figaro. Also, in early 1835, Mayhew published a thirty-two page pamphlet, A Short Account of a Short Administration, with fifteen cut by Seymour, which was credited to 'Figaro in London' - the pseudonymous title which he had inherited from à Beckett.\footnote{A Short Account of a Short Administration. By Figaro in London (London, 1835), printed by George Cowie, who from 1835 onwards was also the printer of Figaro itself. The pamphlet included 15 cuts by Seymour, engraved by George Armstrong, and cost 6d. It was an account of the four month period in 1834-5 which culminated in the general election to which Figaro devoted its double issue (see above, n. 52).}

Apparently unwilling to tamper with a successful formula, Mayhew retained the same layout as that established by à Beckett, with the result that Figaro's appearance went unchanged for more than seven years.\footnote{The only exceptions were the occasional "double issues", such as No. 162 (January 10th 1833), which ran to eight pages and included four cuts.} The only perceptible difference during this time (itself a sign of its longevity) was the occasional re-engraving of the masthead illustration (fig.147) which, having been printed hundreds of thousands of times over the years, may have eventually become worn.
or cracked.\textsuperscript{55} It was first replaced in January 1835, after one hundred and sixty issues (fig. 148), and while the original masthead had been unsigned, the second featured the initials of the engraver - George Armstrong. This was used exclusively until May that year, when a third version was introduced (fig. 149). This was used until October, at which point it began to be used interchangeably with Armstrong's second version until the paper's demise in 1839 (which would certainly imply that the second version was still in reasonable condition).\textsuperscript{56} All three versions were almost identical, which again emphasises the extent to which periodical titles relied upon the continuity of their format, and the importance which was placed on retaining at least one prominent and unchanging element on the title page from week to week.

Unfortunately, this maintenance of continuity was thrown into difficulties by Seymour's suicide in 1836. Although the autographic quality of his designs had unquestionably been diminished by the engraving process, and their scope was limited by the spatial restrictions of periodical illustration, he remained one of the three most prominent graphic satirists of the period (along with Cruikshank and Doyle). In such a context, his name - however occasionally it appeared - counted for as much as, if not more than, his work itself. After his death, there was no artist of a similar status available to fill his shoes, and Mayhew clearly had trouble finding a regular replacement. The announcement that the paper had, "secured the services of another gentleman of first rate talent," which appeared in Seymour's obituary notice was premature.\textsuperscript{57} It has been suggested that Robert Cruikshank was Seymour's replacement, but there is no way of verifying this.\textsuperscript{58} Certainly, he had worked for a number of the penny journals in 1832, and had provided cuts for \textit{Figaro} itself for six weeks after Seymour's dispute with à Beckett,\textsuperscript{59} but by 1836 he

\textsuperscript{55} If we can believe Bewick, however, a block of boxwood could print almost indefinitely without wear (1,000,000 impressions, according to his testimony). This could imply several things: either that the image was originally engraved on some cheaper alternative to boxwood (such as beech), and eventually cracked under the continual pressure; or that the blocks were somehow misplaced or lost, necessitating an almost identical replacement (in order to maintain the paper's established identity). We know nothing about this aspect of the paper's production, so the question remains open to conjecture.

\textsuperscript{56} The actual reasons for this re-engraving remain obscure. If Strange was using stereotyped pages to reprint issues (see n.52), it would have considerably reduced the strain on each block. However, if the initial edition - which was probably the largest - was printed from the original typeset pages, this could still account for the wear which the masthead suffered. Certainly, by the final year of its life, the masthead block had cracked down its middle, which implies that it was being printed from wood, rather than a stereotype.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Figaro}, No. 229, April 23rd 1836, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{58} Spielmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p.273 & Humphreys, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Figaro}, Nos. 148-153.
had, like his brother George, largely put the world of political satire behind him. Cruikshank was never such a prolific contributor to the penny press as Seymour was. His best-remembered work in this sphere was the single issue of *A Slap at the Times* which he produced for Strange and Cowie in early 1832 (figs. 150-1), and this was actually atypical of the medium. Although it was a four-page penny quarto, it was projected as a monthly series, rather than a weekly, and distinguished itself from *Figaro* and others by featuring three large full-page cuts, limiting its text to the final page.

For the first few weeks after Seymour's death, none of the cuts in *Figaro* were signed, although the signature of the pseudonymous 'Pierce Egan Jr.' soon began to appear with increasing frequency, and he remained the most regular contributor until October 1837. This might suggest Cruikshank's involvement - via the allusion to *Life in London* - but it seems rather unlikely, as his earlier work for *Figaro* had been signed with his initials rather than with a pseudonym. Thereafter, William Newman became the regular illustrator until October 1838, although his contribution was limited to only one cut per week, always on the title page, the remainder of the paper going unillustrated (fig. 152).

Newman was never more than a marginal presence in graphic satire during the 1830s and 40s. He contributed to a few penny journals, and produced at least one 'mock frontispiece' in imitation of those by Grant (See Chapter Five), but the crowning point of his career was probably his brief association with *Punch*, for which he provided six full page cartoons in 1841, and a host of smaller cuts over the course of the following decade. Little is known of Newman beyond this limited body of work. Spielmann records that he was, "a very poor man", whose lowly social origins made him something of an outcast amongst the cliquish, middle class, *Punch* circle: "He was brought onto *Punch* by Landells (the engraver), but, owing to his lack of breeding and of common manners, he was never invited to the

---


61 Cruikshank did, however, use this issue to ally himself with the Unstamped. One of the cuts features a bull being physically suppressed by Wellington and Peel, the latter of whom attacks its tail with a hybrid truncheon/parliamentary mace. Attached to the tail is a packet of papers labelled, "Slap at the Church, Figaro in London, Unstamped." The pair get their comeuppance on the following page, which shows William IV about to decapitate them before Traitor's gate, with an axe labelled "The Bill".

62 The initials P.E. appear for the final time in issue 307, October 21st 1837.

63 Newman's initials first appear in issue 313 (December 2nd, 1837).

64 Spielmann, *op. cit.*, p. 413. In 1846 he produced 87 cuts for the magazine; in 1847, 127 cuts; in 1848, 164 cuts; and in 1849, 121 cuts.
Dinner, nor did any of his colleagues care to associate with him."
Perhaps unsurprisingly, he left the magazine in 1850, and worked for a number of other comic journals - including *The Squib, The Puppet Show, Diogenes,* and *The Comic News* - before emigrating to America in the 1860s.

Despite these changes in artist, however, *Figaro* maintained its regular format during Mayhew's tenure as editor. Indeed, prior to 1838, the only thing which could effect any change whatsoever to its title page was the death of William IV in June 1837, following which it appeared for two weeks surrounded by a black border as a conventional mark of mourning (*fig.153*). In September, 1838, however, it was announced that, within a matter of weeks, "this famed periodical will enlarge to twice its present size - containing eight pages instead of four, at the usual price of One Penny. It will, as usual, possess the same portion of satire 'on folly as it flies', (but) a larger portion will be devoted to Theatrical Critiques and Intelligence throughout the country." This announcement was repeated on the title page for five weeks until issue 359, the last four page issue of *Figaro.* This marked the beginning of great changes in the emphasis of the paper and, in hindsight, can be interpreted as an early sign of its terminal decline.

It seems probable that, by this point, Mayhew had ceased his involvement with the paper, which would explain the shift in emphasis away from politics. Although it had always been an integral aspect of *Figaro's* content, the world of the theatre now came to dominate the paper, the image of which was completely overhauled for the first time in eight years in order to emphasise its new identity, and to divorce it from its past (*fig.154*). The fact that it would effect such a drastic change implies that its fortunes had been declining for some time, and that a complete transformation was perceived as the only way of reviving them, by attempting to consolidate its audience amongst the large theatre-going public, and by diminishing the divisive element of politics. This was a desperate measure for a journal which had survived for so long on the basis of its continuity of format, and implies that the decline in the market for the penny satirical press had finally caught up with it. In comparison with 1832, very few satirical titles had been launched in
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67 *Figaro,* No. 290 (June 24th 1837) and 291 (July 1st 1837).
the intervening years, the most notable recent examples being the Chartist broadsheets - Cleave's *London Satirist* and Cousins' *Penny Satirist* - which were aimed at a very different audience to that of *Figaro*.

As promised, from issue 360 (November 5th 1838) onwards, the paper expanded to eight pages, the greater part of which was devoted to theatrical notices. Also, a new, more elaborate and decorative, masthead was introduced - more in keeping with the elaborate typefaces of theatrical bill posters. Although retaining Armstrong's illustration, it no longer incorporated the quotations about satire and caricature from Lady Montague and Croker's, both of which had appeared on every issue since its very beginning - a clear indication of its changing emphasis. The declining fortunes of the paper were perhaps further suggested by the fact that it was deemed unnecessary to commission a new masthead illustration to replace Armstrong's version from 1835, despite the fact that the block had by this time split from top to bottom, straight down the middle of the image.

The regular layout of the title page was also changed for the first time in *Figaro*'s history. Although it retained the conventional two-column format, one of the two was now given over entirely to a full-length portrait illustration. Generally speaking, these were of leading actors 'in character', although they occasionally included leading ministers as well (figs. 155-7). The change in approach is notable. These were most emphatically *not* caricatural - or even satirical - images, but quite literal, respectful, likenesses of their subjects. Moreover, they were unrelated to any articles within the paper itself, serving essentially as a series of 'society portraits.' Just how far this change in the mode of illustration is attributable to the still-pervasive 'HB tradition' is uncertain, but it is perhaps significant that in April 1839 *Figaro* paid tribute to Doyle by featuring his own portrait on its title page (fig. 158).  

The new format survived for less than a year, the signs of terminal decline becoming more and more apparent as it progressed. Despite a final - and one might say desperate - return to its original layout in July 1839 (fig. 159), the paper limped to an end the following month.  
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69 *Figaro* No. 382, April 1st 1839. This is, as far as I am aware, the only known depiction of Doyle to be published anywhere.

70 *Figaro*, No. 399, July 17th 1839.
labour to look through the last volume of this paper which began so well, and with the prospect of such a successful future”. Bringing a journalist’s eye to the final months of the title, he identified four obvious signs of its fading fortunes:

1. The reprinting of columns from issue to issue became more frequent.
2. The type was made larger, “no doubt to save expense” (as this reduced the amount of original material which had to be produced for each issue, as well as the cost of typesetting the pages).
3. The position of the advertisements was altered, from the back page to an inside sheet; “to the experienced eye a proof that the canvasser has had to offer great attractions to secure a repeat.”
4. The ‘Places of Entertainment’ section on the back page no longer consisted of original commentary on a weekly basis, but became a generic weekly listing of what was playing at each theatre, with spaces left entirely blank if nothing of interest was showing.  

Towards the very end of its life, it appears that Gilbert à Beckett was asked to attempt a resuscitation of the paper’s fortunes - which may explain the brief return to the original layout - but his efforts were half-hearted and led to nothing. It was simply too late to effect such a reversal. As Arthur à Beckett recorded;

“At length, on August 17 1839, it came to an abrupt conclusion. (The final number) contained an advertisement repeated from the last issue, announcing something “next Saturday.” The editor had not taken the trouble to alter it. To this volume there was no preface, and the date of its natural determination had been forgotten. It had every sign of decay and demoralization. So ended Figaro in London, after a career of eight years and eight months.”

What becomes most clear from examining the life of Figaro, is the secondary role played by illustration, and the reduced role of the artist in the creative process. It was a predominantly literary venture, and the editorial bias was inevitably towards
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72 Ibid., pp. 28-9: “For years (Figaro) continued, but fell from its high estate into a rather obscure theatrical print. Quite at the close my father was invited to try to revive it. It was too late, but he was connected with it until 1839, on the best of terms with Henry Mayhew.”
73 Ibid., pp. 58-9.
the text-based elements of its content. This was made most apparent in the dispute between à Beckett and Seymour, when the former could so easily diminish the latter’s illustration in his accompanying article, despite the fact that the image was not substantially different to those which were produced under his editorial guidelines. Indeed, the restrictions on the artist in this type of periodical illustration meant that images had been reduced to such schematised and conventional types that the possibility of producing anything radically different from week to week was simply not an option. Their role was merely to fulfil the expectation that each issue would have an image of some sort to decorate the cover. The identity of *Figaro* rested with the periodical as a whole, of which the weekly cut was a relatively small part, and in which its role was largely a convention of format. Its primary function, despite the occasional hyperbole directed at Seymour’s cuts, was to break up the overall layout rather than to function as an autonomous work in its own right. That à Beckett reacted so forcefully against any change in this system was wholly indicative of the formulaic development of Victorian satirical journalism in the pages of *Punch*. And yet *Figaro* remained a successful journalistic enterprise for several years. As such it inspired numerous imitators, the majority of which followed its conventions very closely. This particular sub-category of the satirical press forms the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter Seven

‘Figaro-mania’;
The Imitators of Figaro
in 1832

I

The emulation of Formats in
the Penny Satirical Press

Less than two months after Figaro’s launch, an article in Bell’s Life in London recorded with some amazement that:

“The penny publications of the present day almost exceed calculation; and no sooner has a new title been adopted than it is immediately pirated by Fresh competitors... Thus we have “Figaro in London” jostled by “Figaro in England” and “Figaro in Paris and London”. Then we have “Punch” put out of countenance by “Punchinello.” “The Omnibus” threatened with “The Cabriolet”, “The Tattler” (sic) with “The Gossiper”; and “The Literary Test” by “The Entertaining News”... None of these speculations come within the provisions of the Stamp Act, but still we suspect that the struggle of most of them can be but of short duration.”

In most cases, this assessment of the prospects of the penny press proved quite accurate. Although around 600 unstamped titles appeared between 1831 and 1836, relatively few survived for more than a few weeks. The unstamped press was such a ubiquitous presence during the period due to the sheer quantity of titles it produced rather than the longevity which a few isolated examples actually achieved. What the above passage most amply illustrates is the extent to which the prevalence of this area of the metropolitan press was derived from the imitation

1 Bell’s Life in London, January 29th 1832.
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and repetition of a few successful formats and ideas. To this day, the publishing industry thrives on imitation and repetition of successful formulas, frequently to the point of saturating the market with derivative versions of one basic format. And it was no different in the 1830s. Figaro's initial success did not go unnoticed within this frequently imitative publishing milieu and, just as à Beckett had modelled his own paper on a successful prototype, so did others base their own publishing ventures on his imitation.

Little more than a month after its first appearance, à Beckett drew attention to the first of many titles which would adopt either Figaro's name or format (or both) as a means of capturing part of the market which it had established. A notice appeared in issue seven to the effect that;

"we have just seen the announcement of a three-penny work which has audaciously pirated our name of FIGARO. We here beg of the Public most distinctly to observe, that we have no connection whatever with such publication, and that the plagiarism is only a paltry attempt to gain a few subscribers upon the high reputation which our name of FIGARO has acquired."3

This was no doubt a fairly accurate analysis of the rival paper's motives, although the main thrust of à Beckett's indignation - as implied by his emphatic use of italics - seems to have been aimed at the fact that the usurper of Figaro's name was a "threepenny" publication, rather than a penny paper (although at that price it was still unstamped). This seems to equate the cheapness of the four page quarto format with the ideological goals of 'respectable' radical culture, with its emphasis on self-improvement through education and - in particular - the provision of cheap and affordable literature which addressed the issues confronting the lower classes during the Reform era.4

It seems likely that the publication to which à Beckett was referring was The Critical Figaro of Paris and London, the first issue of which appeared on January 21st (fig.160).5 Published by Benjamin Steill, it retained the satirical element of Figaro

3 Figaro, No. 7, 21st January, 1832.
4 Wiener, op. cit., pp. 116-23. At 3d, and still unstamped, the rival Figaro could be argued to represent poor value for money in relation to à Beckett's penny paper.
5 I have only been able to track down a copy of the third issue, dated February 4th, which would imply that the title premiered on January 21st. It was printed by G. Odell, of 69, King Street, Golden Square.
in London, but gave greater emphasis to the world of the arts than it did to that of politics, claiming in its subtitle to, "(contain) every thing relative to Literature, the Fine Arts, Music, the Drama, Fashions and Utilities, in the two great Cities, interspersed with Squibs on passing Events." Like Figaro itself, it was a four-page quarto, featuring a single cut on the title page. It had no regular masthead illustration and - unusually - each page was divided into three columns, rather than the conventional two. The remainder of its content was divided between the lead article (pages 1-2); a review section ('Figaro's Critical Razor'), divided into separate departments for books published in Paris and London (pages 2-3); a poetry section (page 3); 'Figaro's Peep into the Playhouse (pages 3-4), which was also divided between 'Paris' and 'London'; and the customary section of 'Squibs' (page 4). Although it gave equal attention to books and plays produced in Paris and London, and was clearly aimed at inhabitants of both cities (its Paris agent being M. Barba, who had a shop close to the Palais Royal),6 it was written entirely in English.

Apparently surviving for no more than three weeks, it seems likely that The Critical Figaro's short life was due to the fact that it was initially sold at threepence, despite retaining all the material characteristics of a penny journal. While its price no doubt reflected the socio-economic status of the audience it was seeking, its conventions of format were perhaps too firmly associated with those of the quarto unstamped, and so it failed to find a niche in either market: one was repelled by the price, the other by the format. It is a telling fact that within three weeks, the price had been dropped to a penny, and the first issue was now also being offered at this knockdown price.7

It was not long, though, before à Beckett's ire was directed just as directly at the many penny imitations which appeared during the course of 1832. The appearance, and subsequent progress, of these titles (which numbered some two dozen or more) was monitored in a regular feature, entitled 'Figaromania', beginning in February, shortly after it became apparent that they would remain a significant presence within the metropolitan and provincial presses for much of 1832.

---

6 Barba was a major publisher of light fiction at the time, issuing many novels translated from the English. His politics were vaguely liberal, which may explain his involvement with a title of this kind.

“A new disease has lately sprung up in the periodical world, for which we hardly know how to find a name. It consists of a strange gout for imitating our work, and we shall therefore call it ‘Figaro-mania’. several cases have recently occurred, and of course a number of deaths, and though the disease is intended to be catching, it has not been found to take. It has lately grown to so great an extent that we think of giving a weekly report in imitation of the plan adopted by the papers with regard to the cholera. For example: Remaining at last report, 10. Deaths - The Patriot, Figaro in Birmingham, The Critical Figaro, The Literary Test, and The English Figaro. New cases, 3. All very desperate, and almost certain next week to be included amongst the deaths. Remaining up to this date, 8. recoveries, none.”

Under the circumstances, à Beckett’s reaction was understandable, as the extent to which these imitations - especially those which emanated from metropolitan presses - mirrored both the format and content of Figaro was considerable. With few exceptions, they employed the four-page, two-column layout, with an unchanging masthead and one (or sometimes two) cuts, generally on the title page, but occasionally inside as well. Similarly, the breakdown of contents was remarkably similar throughout: a politically-inspired leader was followed by a number of shorter topical pieces, a page of puns and jokes, and a page of theatrical announcements and reviews.

Several of these journals maintained the metropolitan focus of Figaro, retaining the suffix “in London” within their titles, and merely changing the ‘character’ of the journal (Punch in London, Giovanni in London, The Devil in London, etc.), while others simply provided alternate versions of the ‘Figaro’ theme (The English Figaro, The Critical Figaro of Paris and London, etc.). The latter was especially prevalent amongst the numerous regional imitations, which preferred to retain the prefix ‘Figaro’, and simply substituted the name of the town in which they were published (Figaro in Chesterfield, Figaro in Nottingham, Figaro in Birmingham, and so on). However, some of these provincial imitations adopted the spirit of à Beckett’s paper in name only. Figaro in Sheffield, for example was an eight-page penny weekly, entirely unillustrated, and consisting predominantly of correspondence and short

---

8 Figaro, no.12, 28th February, 1832, p.48.
articles on local affairs (fig. 161). 9  Figaro in Liverpool was closer to its metropolitan namesake, being a four-page quarto weekly, featuring jokes and puns and a lengthy section of theatrical reviews, although it too was unillustrated (fig.162). Its main purpose - at least initially - seems to have been to satirise the local press. 10

Far more derivative were the metropolitan-based imitations. The same week which saw the appearance of The Critical Figaro also witnessed the launch of The English Figaro, which aped the format of à Beckett's paper much more closely than any other (fig.163). One of the many unstamped political papers to emerge from the Holywell Street milieu, it was published by George Berger and printed by Thomas Richardson, who was also the printer of the early issues of Figaro itself as well as Giovanni in London (fig.164) which was launched the following month. 11

In almost every respect, The English Figaro was a direct attempt to replicate the formula of à Beckett's paper. The masthead illustration was almost identical, featuring the same barbershop scene, and the title page of the first issue was devoted to an explanation of the paper's layout (just as à Beckett had done earlier), under the heading 'Our Arrangement':

“MEN and THINGS.- This department of “FIGARO” will be devoted to light essays, and strictures upon the leading topics of the day.
THE EXPOSITOR - will contain short extracts from various journals, &c.; to which will be appended such comments as “the occasion may call forth.”
SQUIBS and CRACKERS - will “go off” regularly once a week...
THE DRAMA - ... This portion of “FIGARO”, in addition to our theatrical critiques, will, “time and occasion fitting”, contain anecdotes of actors and authors, derived from sources peculiarly our own.” 12

The only obvious departure from Figaro in this programme was ‘The Expositor’, the inclusion of which again emphasises the emulative nature of the cheap periodical

9  It was relatively successful nevertheless, surviving until 1838 - almost as long as Figaro itself. But the British Library has only No. 26, June 8th, 1833.
10  The first issue featured satirical attacks upon the editors of the Liverpoolian press: “There are nine editors in Liverpool, all trying to be witty - and all lacking nothing but the wit.” etc... Figaro in Liverpool, no.1, 14th January, 1832. Almost half of the first issue was devoted to such attacks.
11  The first issue appeared on February 18th 1832.
press during the period, and is indicative of a title which was being produced on a tight budget. This impression is further suggested by the fact that the first issue contained no illustration with the exception of the masthead (as was the case with Figaro). However, while the immediate success of Figaro in London allowed it to make illustration a central element of its layout within a fortnight, The English Figaro did not survive long enough to do likewise. It does not seem to have progressed beyond its second issue, although it claimed in its first to be distributed in both America and "The principal Cities of Europe.""14

Despite these two early failures, new imitations of Figaro continued to appear at intervals for several months, and Holywell Street remained the centre of the trend. In March, The New Figaro (fig.165) was launched, printed by J.Viar (who also printed The Devil in London), and sold by both Berger in Holywell Street and Steill in Paternoster Row. It was illustrated by William Horngold, with five cuts (all engraved by Walker), four of which appeared under the collective title 'The Army of Great Britain' (fig.166). It announced itself as a wholly non-partisan paper, railing against politics in general, rather than any one party, and thus casting its appeal as widely as possible: "We enter into a warfare against HUMBUG of all kinds, and in all places; from the tyranny of Tory oppression, to the humbug of Whiggish delay..." Quite apart from this, however, the first issue's editorial was more broadly indicative of an acute awareness of the precarious situation of any new journal, and went out of its way to affect an air of modesty quite at odds with the tone of Figaro itself:

"If we cannot stand on the broad base of our merit, we are content to fall by our folly; for we know (and so do you, Reader) that the term 'public favour' is a humbug - a fallacy... Every journal, from the ponderous New Monthly', to the penny 'New Figaro' prospers only by the superior excellence of its contents. If we fail, we shall place it to the account of our 'dullard brain', and blame not the gentle reader."15

Any differences were minor, however, and such papers were clearly adopting these less-than-subtle variations on a theme in order to conjure up associations

13 The inclusion of extracts from other journals was not uncommon during the period. Think of à Beckett's own title, The Thief.
14 The English Figaro, No.1, 21st January 1832. This can be read as a standard claim to a wide circulation, and is dubious in the extreme for such a new and unestablished journal.
with the journal on which they were based. In this manner they might hope to clarify any audience expectations as to their basic content, while also implicitly suggesting that a comparable level of quality could be found within their pages, however immediately this might prove to be unfounded upon closer inspection.

However, the very earliest satirical periodical to appear in the wake of Figaro’s success was the only example to differ substantially from the format established by à Beckett. This was Punch in London, launched on January 14th 1832, little more than a month after Figaro itself, and a week before the Critical Figaro and The English Figaro. Its editor, Douglas Jerrold, was part of the same Bohemian-literary social milieu inhabited by à Beckett and Mayhew, and his similar interests are reflected in his journal’s content and tone (if not its format), which were essentially the same as those established by Figaro. Although retaining the familiar two-column layout, it was an octavo journal - half the size - and ran to eight pages instead of four, thus resembling more closely the cheap journals of the 1820s (fig.167). Broadly speaking, it maintained the same combination of a regular masthead and one or two cuts per week, along with the same balance of political and theatrical commentary, jokes and puns.

Being a small eight page paper, its layout inevitably differed somewhat to that of Figaro. The lead article generally stretched from the title page to page three (fig.168), while pages four and five consisted of shorter notices of a political nature. Then followed the regular columns, the order of which was never static, each taking up a little under a page. ‘Punch’s Note Book’ dealt with politics, ‘Punch’s Leisure Hours’ consisted of short fictional pieces, sometimes serialised, and ‘Punch’s Bowl’ contained gossip, hints and notices to correspondents. Its humour was occasionally rather more ribald than that found in Figaro - a product of the homo-social, clubbish world of metropolitan journalism - but its political

---

16 Punch was another appropriate figurehead for a satirical journal. A popular figure of misrule, who had grown out of the traditions of European folk plays and the Commedia dell’Arte, his story was spread abroad via puppet shows during the seventeenth century (first recorded in England in 1662). By the 1820s, Punch and Judy shows were a common sight in fairgrounds, on streetcorners, at pleasure gardens and the races, making the association with carnivalesque licence and the exposure of folly that much more direct in the popular imagination. See Michael Byrom, Punch and Judy: Its Origins and Evolution (1981), pp. 1-3 and Robert Leach, The Punch and Judy Show; History, Tradition and Meaning (1985), pp.7-10 and 48-51.

17 In fact, it used two regular mastheads, the first by Kenny Meadows, from issues 1-6, the second, by J. H. Jones, from issues 7-17.

18 A single example should suffice: "What have you for dinner?" said Matthews to Cooper - "Breast of Mutton" was the reply. "Curse it", said Charles. "I hate all breasts, except breast of woman, and that always goes against my stomach." (‘A Beautiful Paradox’, Punch in London, No. 9, March 1832, p. 66.)
stance was virtually indistinguishable, although Jerrold himself was more firmly committed to radical politics than à Beckett ever was.  

Born in 1803, Jerrold was à Beckett’s senior by almost ten years, and the backgrounds of the two men were very different, although they shared an abiding interest in literature and the theatre. The son of an impoverished actor, Jerrold was introduced to the stage at a very early age, and continued to act occasionally well into his middle age. In his early years he was educated largely by members of his father’s Company, but remained an avid autodidact throughout his life, teaching himself Latin, French and Italian, as well as acquiring an almost encyclopaedic knowledge of English dramatic literature. At the tender age of ten he enlisted in the Royal Navy, in which he served for two years, before returning to London, where he was apprenticed to a printer in Northumberland Street, just off The Strand, in the heart of the metropolitan printing district. From the age of fifteen he was writing plays, contributing essays to journals, and mixing in radical society. In the late 1820s and early ’30s he was a regular contributor to The Ballot and the Weekly Times, as well as being co-publisher of his own Sunday paper. During this period he also achieved his earliest theatrical success, with his play Black Eyed Susan, or All in the Downs, which played for three hundred nights - a phenomenal run - at the Surrey Theatre in 1829. From the 1830s onwards he contributed to prominent journals, including The Atheneum, The Morning Herald, The Monthly Magazine and Blackwood’s Magazine, as well as forming numerous literary clubs and editing Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper from 1852, for which he drew the considerable salary of £1,000 a year. But his most lasting contribution to Victorian journalism came after the launch of Punch in 1841. He was a regular contributor from the second issue until ten days before his death in 1857, creating some of the most famous of its earliest regular features, including the Q Papers, Punch’s Letters to his Son and - most notably - Mrs. Caudle’s Curtain Lectures. As a result of the republication of his Punch features and his theatrical works, his own name became familiar enough to become the identifying ‘character’ of two of his

---

19 In 1823 he and Samuel Laman Blanchard had considered joining Byron’s Greek Insurgents. The most recent biography of Jerrold is Richard Kelly’s Douglas Jerrold (1972), from which much of the following information was drawn. See also Spielmann, op. cit., pp. 284-98.

20 A not unusual practise during the years 1813-15, which saw the climax of the Napoleonic Wars.

21 The play was eventually performed in Drury Lane in 1835, but from its early success onwards he had access to the more prestigious ‘patent’ theatres. In 1830, The Devil’s Ducat opened at The Adelphi, while a year later, shortly before the launch of Punch in London, his Bride of Ludgate opened at Drury Lane. He continued to write plays until 1835 which, although successful at the time, were quickly forgotten after his death.
most successful periodicals - Douglas Jerrold's Shilling Magazine (1845-48), in which he serialised his only novel, St. Giles and St. James, and Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper (1846-48).

In the light of such an active career, Jerrold's four month involvement with Punch in London might be regarded as something of a minor footnote, but this little journal is worth mentioning as an exception to the glut of Figaro-imitations which appeared throughout the rest of the year, as well as its more obvious role as a precursor for Punch as such. The address in the first issue explained the perceived role of its figurehead as someone who, by virtue of having 'travelled' throughout the continent, performing to broad audiences in every great city, was ideally-qualified to reveal the private life of the inhabitants of the metropolis:

"I am by birth an Italian: though by habit and inclination a perfect cosmopolite... wherever civilization has shown itself, my nose has followed peering over its shoulder... Has anyone seen more of the world than Punch? Has anyone mixed in better society or had more celebrated patrons and admirers?... It has ever been my lot to be in the confidence of the greatest men of the time... Then is it not evident that Punch possesses, above all personages, the ampler means of becoming "the best public instructor?" Think of his ability, his universality!"22

The adoption of a character who had unlimited movement "about town" has been central to the satirical press from its earliest days, and clearly illustrates its primary intended function.23 From The Spectator and The English Spy, to Figaro, Punch and Private Eye, the satirical periodical has founded its identity on its ability to observe those aspects of society which are closed to the general public and to reveal them under the cover of ostensible anonymity, thus fostering a sense of "knowing intimacy" between reader and journal.24 Whether revealing the world of politics, the theatre, or the metropolitan demi-monde, this convention was especially prevalent during the 1820s and '30s, when the memory of Pierce Egan's

23 Price records that the title was suggested to Jerrold by a printer called Mills. He also suggests that Jerrold did little work for the journal after the second issue, although he gives no source for this. Given the parallel evolution of Jerrold's Original Comic Magazine and Punch in London (see below, n. 28), there does not seem to be much factual basis in this statement.
24 The term is Donald Gray's, used in reference to Nicholson's The Town (1837-42). See loc.cit. (1982).
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Life in London and John Liston’s Paul Pry were still fresh in the metropolitan consciousness.25

In this regard, Jerrold went one step further than Figaro by introducing a regular column – ‘Punch’s Leisure Hours’ – devoted to fictionalised accounts of his wanderings through London Society, with the explicitly stated intention of becoming “a prodigious ‘favourite with the Town’.”26 The notion that the satirical periodical in some way constituted a microcosm of metropolitan life was further emphasised when the original masthead illustration was replaced after only six weeks. From the seventh issue27 it was changed to an image of Mr. Punch ushering members of a crowd up to a peepshow, through which they are able to view scenes from different aspects of London society; from the king upon his throne and a court in session, to a meeting of a radical society (including an emphatically placed printing press) and a theatrical performance. All the elements, in other words, touched upon within its pages (fig.169).

Jerrold’s journal was short-lived, however, and came to an end in May 1832 after only seventeen issues. The final two consisted entirely of illustrations, several of which had been taken from another journal of Jerrold’s journals - The Original Comic Magazine - which apparently never progressed beyond the planning stages.28 A number of cuts had been commissioned for the series, however, and

25 Paul Pry was a character made famous on the stage by the actor John Liston, in Thomas Poole’s play of the same name, first performed at the Haymarket theatre in 1825. The play itself was based on the character of an American song of 1820. Working around the catchphrase, “I hope I don’t intrude”, he was a figure who explored every aspect of metropolitan society. The play was an instant success, and the character’s words became catchphrases. Even his name became a verb: to ‘Paul Pry’ was to be “impertinently inquisitive or prying” (OED). As such, he was the inspiration for William Heath’s pseudonym in the late 1820s, and for the title of numerous periodicals of the same name. The earliest of these appeared in 1826, and others in 1827, 1831 and 1848-50. The Union List of Serials also lists several American titles of the same name, published in Rochester (1828-9), Washington (1831-36) and New York (1839-40).

26 Punch in London, No. 3, January 28th 1832

27 Punch in London, No. 7, February 25th 1832. The cut was by J.H. Jones, who was the journal’s principal illustrator throughout its run.

28 The title was originally advertised simply as The Comic Magazine, and was first announced in March 1832. Its launch was delayed due the publication of a Beckett’s own Comic Magazine earlier that month. Presumably the latter had objected to such a close imitation of his new project. Undaunted, Jerrold rescheduled his launch for late April, retitling his journal as The Original Comic Magazine (a misleading title, but one presumably intended to imply that it was the first of its kind, in the same way that a Beckett had drawn attention to the originality of Figaro when castigating its imitators). But another postponement followed, the journal being held back until May, by which time Punch in London was on its last legs. The Original Comic Magazine is not mentioned in the BUCOP, and most likely never saw print. Jerrold therefore used those cuts which he had commissioned for the new series to produce two final issues of Punch in London. See Punch in London, No. 10 (March 17th 1832), p.78; 14 (April 14th), p.110; and 16 (April 28th), p.126.
two of these were printed on the title page issue sixteen (fig.170), along with the following announcement:

"We are indebted for the above excellent and truly-ludicrous cuts to the proprietor of a forthcoming novelty, - entitled. ‘THE ORIGINAL COMIC MAGAZINE’. These are a very small portion of the Engravings that are to be given with the first number, price Sixpence. How this is to pay, even at this period, so remarkable for plenty of paper and print for a penny, it gives us wonder as great as our content." 29

The cuts were by Grant, who had apparently been engaged as one of the new magazine's contributors. But at this stage the signs were not good that his work would ever see print in its intended context, as the remainder of that issue consisted (somewhat suspiciously) solely of illustrations reprinted from earlier weeks. 30 This suggests that Jerrold was no longer in a position to commission new work - either text or images - and had to fall back upon that which had already been paid for, regardless of whether or not it had been published before. This impression is given further credence by the appearance of the next - and final - issue, which also consisted solely of illustrations (16 in all), although this time they were almost all previously unpublished. Six of these were by Jones, four by Robert Cruikshank, and one by Seymour (the remainder were anonymous). 31 It seems probable that these were the cuts which had been intended for the first issue of The Original Comic Magazine, and that Jerrold, having paid for them, decided to publish them in the final issue of Punch in London in an attempt to recoup at least a percentage of his expenses. Thus the question, "How is this to pay?" was answered: it wasn't, and Punch in London passed into oblivion along with the embryonic Original Comic Magazine. 32

29 Punch in London, No. 16, April 28th 1832, p. 119.
30 The issue contained 18 cuts in total. It included those from issues 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 14, as well as Meadows' original masthead illustration and new cuts by Kenny Meadows and Isaac Brooks. The following issue (No. 17, May 5th 1832) included the cut from No. 8, leaving that from No. 11 as the only one not to be republished.
31 The majority of the "new" cuts were engraved by W. C. Walker and J. Biggs. Walker was, at the same time, also engraving many of the cuts for Mayhew's The Devil in London and various other satirical papers.
32 Despite this fact, it seems that No. 16 went into a second edition within a week, but even this was not enough to save the publication. Neither was the inducement offered to the trade on a weekly basis, by which vendors and booksellers could exchange any unsold copies of one issue - "if kept clean" - for the next, when it was published. Furthermore, any unwanted back issues could be exchanged for any others which had gone out of stock. An announcement to this effect appeared each week.
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It did not pass, however, without first having inspired its own imitator - at least as far as its title was concerned. Only a week after *Punch in London* was launched, the first issue of *Punchinello!* appeared. In terms of format it was more akin to *Figaro* - being a four page quarto paper - but it is difficult to imagine that the choice of title was not inspired by Jerrold's recent journal. Indeed, *Punchinello!*'s short life (the tenth and final issue appeared on 23rd March) was characterised by a desperate search for an identity which might allow it to find a niche in the expanding market for penny periodicals. The full title of the first issue was *Punchinello! Or, Sharps, Flats and Naturals* which, drawing from contemporary slang, implied the kind of content typical of journals such as *Paul Pry* - descriptive accounts of the metropolitan fast life in the vein of *Life in London*. By issue six, however, it had restyled itself as *A Family Gazette of Fun, Fashion, Literature, and the Drama*, while by the tenth issue it had dropped the "Family" prefix and settled on the less specific *Miscellany of Fashion, Literature, and the Drama*. No mention whatsoever was made of politics, although it regularly covered the progress of the Reform Bill in its lead articles which, as with *Figaro*, appeared on the title page, accompanied by illustrations designed by Robert Cruikshank (fig. 171). Like his brother George, however, Robert soon discovered that this was an area of the publishing trade which was quick to usurp a recognisable creative identity. In late February, an announcement appeared on the title page to the effect that:

"MR. ROBERT CRUIKSHANK has requested us to caution the Public against a set of Imposters, who have been endeavouring to pass off Designs, as his, which he never saw. An Original Engraving by this Gentleman will appear in the *PUNCHINELLO* every week, and we are authorised by him to state, that he is engaged in no other work of a similar nature with the exception of the "DEVIL'S WALK".*

*The Devil's Walk* had been launched a week before this announcement, on

---

33 *Punchinello!* was unusual in combing a two-column title page with three columns on its interior pages. Its layout was further broken up by the comparatively large amount of space which it devoted to advertisements, which often took up much of the back page.

34 According to the *OED*, a 'sharp' was, "keen-witted and alert in practical matters, businesslike, smart; often with an unfavourable implication, quick to take unfair advantage of others."; a 'flat' was, "deficient in sense or mental rigour; stupid, dull, slow-witted."; and a 'natural' was, "one naturally deficient in intellect, a half-witted person."

35 *Punchinello!,* No. 6, February 24th 1832, p.29. For George Cruikshank's problems with plagiarism by Bell's *Life in London* in the 1820s, see Patten, *op.cit.*, Vol.I, pp.300-301.
February 17th (fig.172).\(^{36}\) It took exactly the same format as *Punchinello!*, and likewise issued a statement that Cruikshank was only providing designs for these two periodicals. Ostensibly, "edited by a Member of Parliament", the first issue was published anonymously ("for the proprietors") at 13 Wellington Street, at the eastern end of The Strand, just around the corner from Holywell Street (the same address at which the *Punch* office would be established nine years later). Subsequent issues were published by Steill. Its political stance was resolutely pro-Reform, although politics as such did not dominate each issue. Rather, it featured an extensive 'gossip' column ('Absurdities of the Week'), and several articles which focussed on the 'fast' life of the metropolis - its gambling dens, billiard rooms and so on. As was admitted in the third issue, most of these were lifted directly from Barnard Gregory's notorious paper, *The Satirist*, which made a speciality of documenting this particular milieu.\(^{37}\) *The Devil's Walk*, however - in keeping with its title - did not judge such pastimes harshly (unlike *Punchinello!*, the final issue of which devoted its title page to a moralising account of Charles James Fox's near ruin by gambling (fig.173)).\(^{38}\) Indeed, its editorial point of view was apparently very much in sympathy with that of Gregory. As a notice in issue three put it, without a trace of irony, "it is (the editor's) opinion, that the *Satirist* has been of more essential service to the community than any other journal ever instituted, by its exposure of abuses and of crime... we shall continue to blend our original information with... portions of the journal mentioned above."

Not only did *Punchinello!* and *The Devil's Walk* share an artist in Robert Cruikshank, but they also had exactly the same publisher and printer - Benjamin Steill and W.H. Cox respectively. Where they diverged, in terms of their production, was in the different engravers which they employed to cut Cruikshank's designs. The cuts in *Punchinello!* - mostly engraved by N. Johnson - were fairly rudimentary in execution (fig.174), which was par for the course in this type of publication, but

\(^{36}\) I have only ever come across a copy of No. 3 (March 2nd 1832) which is preserved in Cambridge University Library, although it must have lasted at least a few weeks beyond this, as it was mentioned in *Figaro*, No.11 (March 17th 1832) as one of its increasing number of competitors.


\(^{38}\) *Punchinello!,* No. 10, March 23rd, 1832, p.45.
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those in The Devil’s Walk (which were signed ‘Byfield’)\(^{39}\) display a much greater level of skill (fig.175).

The Devil’s Walk, although short-lived, was the first penny paper to take advantage of the renewed popularity of Shelley’s poem of the same name - then undergoing a popular revival - to establish a place for itself in the market for cheap satirical literature.\(^{40}\) Its efforts, however, were half-hearted, and beyond the title itself, it made little attempt to adopt the spirit of its diabolical namesake. Less than a fortnight after its launch, however, a new paper appeared which, for a short time at least, made a more concerted effort to adopt a mock-demonic tone, and to put this to satirical effect on a weekly basis.

II

The Devil in London

The Devil in London (later Asmodeus in London) first appeared on Wednesday February 29th 1832. Its launch mid-week was unusual, as most similar titles were published on a Saturday.\(^{41}\) In other respects, though, it remained faithful to the conventions established by Figaro. It adopted the standard four-page, two column, layout, although the masthead illustration - designed by Seymour and engraved by W.C. Walker - was quite striking, depicting a prodigiously horned Devil sitting on the dome of St. Paul’s, using the London Monument as an ink well into which he dips his quill, encircled in a frame created by his own impossibly-lengthy tail

\(^{39}\) Probably John Byfield (1788-1841), brother of the noted engravers Mary senior and Ebeneezer Byfield, who was working in Islington between 1832-34. He worked for the noted humorous journalist Thomas Dibdin (founder of Dibdin’s Penny Trumpet, amongst others) and engraved several designs by Robert Seymour, the blocks of which are now preserved in the British Museum. He also produced many engravings for the firm of Pickering-Whittingham Publications. He was known to charge as much as £2-3 for his vignette engravings. See Engen, op.cit., pp. 39-40.

\(^{40}\) Originally published as a broadsheet in 1812, The Devil’s Walk described the experiences of a beau monde Devil, who pays a visit to the earthly plane to review the activities of his faithful ‘agents’ in the metropolis - the politicians, lawyers, courtiers and the Prince Regent. It was closely based on an earlier poem - The Devil’s Thoughts - by Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey, originally published in The Morning Post in 1799. See Richard Holmes, Shelley: The Pursuit (1974), p.106 and idem., Coleridge: Early Visions (1989), pp.240-41. New editions of both poems had been issued in the early ’30s, with illustrations by Robert Cruikshank. The former sold more than15,000 copies, the latter 25,000, in 1831-2. See Patten, op.cit., p.320, and The Devil’s Walk, No. 3 (March 2nd 1832, p.10) The appeal of this premise had enormous appeal in radical circles in the 1830s, and was largely responsible for the preponderance of demonic imagery found in radical caricature of the period.

\(^{41}\) Saturday was given as the day of publication on the title page. In actual fact, though, these journals would generally go on sale on Friday, the first issues of their print run having been printed on Thursday night.
Although its lifespan did not approach that of *Figaro, The Devil in London* was the most successful of its imitators to appear in 1832 (lasting for thirty-seven issues), and benefited considerably from the editorship of Henry Mayhew. Like à Beckett, with whom he had been friends since his schooldays at Westminster, Mayhew was still a remarkably young man in 1832 - only 20 years old - and yet he had already demonstrated a precocious desire to forge his own path in the world of metropolitan journalism and literary life. Born in 1812, the young Henry was sent to Westminster School with the intention that he should follow his father - a London attorney - into a legal career. At the age of fifteen, however, he ran away to sea, making his way as far as Calcutta before returning to London to begin his literary career. With the exception of the few inconsequential journals he co-edited with à Beckett, *The Devil in London* was his first publication of any significance. Despite this fact, some intimation of his future interests - in particular his strong social conscience - was already present in the issues he chose to tackle within its pages. After his own paper ended, but before taking up the editorial duties on *Figaro*, Mayhew - like à Beckett and Jerrold before him - began a parallel career as a dramatist. His first work, a one-act farce called *The Wandering Minstrel*, opened at the Fitzroy Theatre - which was partly run by à Beckett - in January 1834, but he did not graduate to the world of the 'Patent Theatres' until 1838, when *But However* (a collaboration with Henry Bayliss) was produced at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket. However, his most significant contribution to Victorian journalism did not come until the 1840s. He began the decade as one of the founders (and, for a time, co-editor) of *Punch*, and ended it with his monumental social survey of the metropolis for the *Morning Chronicle*. Eventually collected and published as *London Labour and the London Poor* in 1864, the latter was undoubtedly the most significant work of his life and, along with Blanchard Jerrold and Gustave Doré's *London: a Pilgrimage* (1872), remains one of the most enduring portraits of the social deprivation so prevalent in the capital during the Victorian era.

Mayhew resigned his place at the *Punch* table in 1846, and between 1847 and 1850 he wrote six satirical novels in collaboration with his brother Augustus, all of

---

42 The phallic significance of this is difficult to miss, and can be related both to the Devil's potency as a figure in his own right, and to his stated intention to expose vice in society. Such an allusion is also quite appropriate to the Holywell Street milieu - the centre of the trade in pornographic literature - in which *The Devil in London* originated.
which were credited to 'The Brothers Mayhew.'\textsuperscript{43} Between 1850 and '51 he was editor of \textit{The Comic Almanack} (which still endured after almost twenty years), to which he brought a distinctly sombre and serious tone, which reflected his time as Metropolitan Correspondent for \textit{The Morning Chronicle}.

\textsuperscript{44} However, as Anne Humphreys has pointed out, his social surveys only accounted for about four years of his life, and for the remainder of his career he was an ordinary journalist, producing a wide variety of work and taking any freelance jobs which would help to keep him afloat (often adopting the pseudonym of 'Ralph Rigmarole'). Indeed, Mayhew lived much of his life on the brink of financial disaster, producing nothing of genuine interest after the mid-1860s, and by the time of his death in 1887 both the man and his work were largely forgotten.\textsuperscript{45}

It was, apparently, his lifelong financial instability which put a premature end to \textit{The Devil in London} in November 1832. In the final issue's address, Mayhew noted that, "The name of the fell musician is BUSINESS; one of the few professors of the black art, which still are allowed in this enlightened age to exert their influences, and no where with more irresistible influence than in this principal theatre of their damnable occupations, LONDON."\textsuperscript{46}

Despite Mayhew's often precarious finances, illustration played a more dominant role in \textit{The Devil in London} than it did in any of the other penny papers - \textit{Figaro} included - although its cuts routinely appeared on the interior pages rather than the title page as such. While many premier issues remained unillustrated, Mayhew's paper announced its intent with no fewer than six cuts by Seymour (occupying the whole of the third page), under the collective heading 'The Devil's Register of "Want Places"' (fig.177). These constituted a parody of the notices posted by

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{The Greatest Plague of Life, The Good Genies That Turned Everything into Gold} (both 1847), \textit{When to Marry and How to Get Married!, The Image of his Father} (both 1848), \textit{The Magic of Kindness} (1849) and \textit{The Fear of the World} (1850).

\textsuperscript{44} His tenure as editor saw the publication of attacks on the inaccuracy of the 1851 Census due to the number of people who had nowhere to sleep; a series of revelatory pieces about the appalling conditions and poor pay of London needlewomen; and a bitter poem, 'Overpopulation and Malthusian Lamentation', which listed all the classes of society of which England had a surplus (lawyers, actors, artists, policemen and - finally - the underpaid). See Humphreys, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{45} Humphreys, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 5 & 12.

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Asmodeus, Or the Devil in London}, No. 37, November 10th 1832, p.145. Whether Mayhew's unstable financial circumstances had anything to do with the regular changes in the journal's printer is uncertain, but it certainly seems plausible to suggest that this was the case. It had no less than five printers in its first four months of existence: J. Tomlinson of Great Newport Street (No.1); J. Viar of Holywell Street (Nos. 2-8); W.Wright of Holborn (Nos. 9 & 10); Cowie himself (Nos. 11-15); and C. Hicks of Wine Office Court, Fleet Street (Nos. 16-37). The position of publisher was rather more stable. The first nine issues were published by W. Haines of Fetter Lane, but from the tenth number, George Cowie took over and remained in the position until the series ended.
people seeking employment, and featured caricatures of Wellington, Peel, Queen Adelaide, and so on, each with a caption below. The implication was that the changing tenor of the times, in the lead up to the Reform Bill, had rendered the Tories and their supporters redundant. However, although this was an unusually auspicious beginning for the paper (in terms of the extent of its illustration), the ‘Register of Wants Places’ was continued in the following issue with no cuts whatsoever, emphasising the fact that, in the context of a periodical of this type, the main impetus of the humour resided in the punning and allusive captions rather than in the images which accompanied them.

In the course of its life, The Devil in London frequently devoted either one or two whole pages to illustration, occasionally incorporating up to eight or nine cuts in a single issue. Issue four, for example, featured a double-page spread entitled ‘The House of REFORM that JACK BUILT’, with nine cuts by Horngold (engraved by Walker), while issue eleven contained eight, and issue fifteen featured six (flgs.178-9). Mayhew was clearly aware of the appeal of illustrations, and The Devil in London frequently drew attention to the number (and supposed quality) of its cuts. In issue ten, for example, it was stated that, “owing to the extraordinary beauty of the drawings, the embellishments which were to have accompanied the present number, have been postponed to our next, when instead of SIX - EIGHT Engravings will be given, of a class quite unprecedented in cheap periodicals.48

It appears that the unusually large number of cuts featured in the paper was made economically feasible by a mutually-beneficial arrangement between Cowie and the publisher Effingham Wilson. As a result, The Devil in London frequently shared its cuts with Wilson’s publications. The nine cuts from ‘The House of REFORM that JACK BUILT’ were published in an expanded form (as a twenty-four page pamphlet) three weeks after they originally appeared in the journal. Similarly, ‘The Devil’s Register of “Want Places”’ reappeared as The Tories’ “Refuge for the Destitute”, Or Political Advertiser (fig.180). Both were sold at sixpence and, despite having been partially published before, went through several editions,

47 ‘The Political Zoological Gardens’ (Asmodeus, No. 11, May 12th 1832, pp.42-3) and ‘More “Want Places”; Or, “Refuge for Destitute Tories’ (Asmodeus No. 15, June 9th 1832, pp. 58-9. The former did not acknowledge the designer, but was engraved by Walker. The latter was by Seymour, and engraved by Armstrong.

48 Asmodeus, No. 10, May 5th 1832, p. 40. Once again, however, the cuts are described as being “accompaniments” to the journal, rather than an integral part of it, emphasising the notion that they were still perceived as being somehow separate from it.
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including one which combined both pamphlets in a single publication (fig.181).49 Whether the cost of the engravings was shared between Cowie and Wilson, or whether Cowie paid Wilson a fee for their use, is uncertain, but both seem to have benefited from the arrangement: Cowie was able to illustrate his paper with more cuts than was usual, which was an incentive to potential purchasers, and Wilson gained valuable pre-publication publicity for his pamphlets. The cut depicting Wellington as 'Coachman' appeared yet again on the title page of The Halfpenny Magazine No.3 (May 19th, 1832), under the title “The Political Advertiser for Want Places” (fig.182). It thus appears that certain publications recognised the benefits of the wide circulation of images, both as a means of advertising and as a source of cheap illustrations. The Halfpenny Magazine gives full credit to the source of its illustration, but it seems likely that the primary reason for its inclusion here was as a stimulus to potential purchasers of the title itself, via an additional element of visual appeal. Whatever the case, examples such as this point to a network of mutually-supportive printers and publishers working within the milieu of the Unstamped, each willing to help one another in return for favours of a similar kind.

Despite not surviving beyond 1832, The Devil in London was a worthy competitor for Figaro. In fact, it seems plausible to suggest that it benefited from its early demise, in that it never had the chance to sink into the routine and pedestrian mediocrity which characterised the final months of à Beckett's paper. Surviving from February to November 1832, its lifespan covered the most intense period of interest in The Reform Bill, and also the earliest signs of disillusionment which followed it. Indeed, it was alone amongst the penny satirical journals in being prescient enough to recognise that the immediate result of the Bill would be disappointment. The week before the Bill passed (under the heading 'What will the Reform Bill Do?') it suggested that;

"We have no doubt, (although entertaining the most sanguine belief respecting the beneficial consequences to every grade and class of society, ourselves,) that the first feeling of the Nation will be that of DISAPPOINTMENT. The people have been excited towards this measure as being productive of such vast benefit, that they naturally look forward to immediate and certain results... We answer, NO!... REFORM IN PARLIAMENT is but the first stone which

49 The House of REFORM... was into its third edition by early May, only three weeks after its first publication. Asmodeus, No. 10, May 5th 1832, p. 40.
If the penny satirical press can be regarded as a product of reform agitation, *The Devil in London* is perhaps its ‘purest’ manifestation. Unlike any of the other imitators of *Figaro*, it actually fulfilled the primary purpose for which it was created and then sank from trace entirely. The passage of the Bill fell almost exactly halfway through its lifespan, and so it constitutes a concentrated record of the political climate both before and after the events of June 1832.

However, despite adopting the ‘character’ of the Devil, Mayhew was clearly eager to sidestep controversy, taking great pains to maintain a ‘respectable’ liberal facade for his journal, and to avoid any of the connotations of more extreme radicalism which the unstamped press undoubtedly carried with it. Only a month after its first publication, a notice began to appear regularly on the title page, specifically addressed “to Hawkers and Vendors” - the people who were most liable to prosecution for selling the work:

> "The proprietors of this work assure those who vend it, that they have obtained a legal opinion to the effect that it is NOT a newspaper within the meaning of the statute. The utmost caution will be preserved to prevent any article of news appearing; but if any person should be taken up for selling the work, the proprietors will DEFEND him gratuitously by eminent counsel and attorneys."  

This can be read as a conscious attempt to avoid the experience of à Beckett, who only a fortnight earlier had found himself before the dock as editor of *Figaro* after a vendor was arrested for selling the paper. In the previous issue of *The Devil in London*, a fictionalized and punning account of the trial had appeared in the ‘Accidents and Offences’ column, which routinely consisted of disguised references to actual events:

> "A journeyman hairdresser (recently arrived from Paris) who from his grotesque appearance, is well known as FIGURE-ROWE, was charged at Mary-le-bone, with many repeated assaults and robberies on

---

50 *Asmodeus*, No.14, June 2nd, 1832, p.53.

51 *The Devil in London*, No. 4, March 24th 1832, and for the next three weeks.
one Mr. Joseph Miller, a very venerable old gentleman. The case was clearly proved, the articles being found on the prisoner, though much defaced and mutilated. The prisoner, who did not speak very good English, evinced a strong desire to go off, but was convicted, and complained bitterly of the sentence. The magistrate observed that the prisoner’s own sentences were far more punishable.\textsuperscript{52}

This kind of light-hearted raillery between friends who had become professional rivals was only to be expected, but the appearance of the notice to Hawkers and Vendors only a week later suggests that Mayhew was rather more concerned about à Beckett’s prosecution than the above passage implies. Over the following weeks he made several compromises with the format and layout of his journal in order to divorce it from the conventions of the radical journalism practised by Carlile, Chubb, Lloyd and others. The most obvious of these concessions was the change in title, after less than two months, to \textit{Asmodeus, Or The Devil in London} (\textbf{fig.183}). The reason given for the change was that, “many respectable and well-disposed people... think because we are rather diabolical in our title, that we must needs be equally so in our contents.”\textsuperscript{53} Mayhew had clearly become somewhat sensitive about the preponderance of diabolic imagery in the radical press (see above, n.38), and was keen to present a more ‘respectable’ façade. From issue eighteen onwards, the title was shortened to simply \textit{Asmodeus in London}, thus removing the Devil from the equation altogether. This move was further compounded in early June during the very week in which the Reform Bill was finally passed, when it was announced that subsequent issues would be released in two distinct versions: a regular-edition at a penny, and a “fine edition”, on tinted paper, for twopence. This can be seen as a deliberate attempt to adapt the material characteristics of the journal in order to divorce it from the associations of the penny press, and thus to legitimise it in the eyes of a potentially broader middle class audience.

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{The Devil in London}, No. 3, March 12th 1832, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{The Devil in London}, No. 7, April 14th 1832, p. 25. Asmodeus was the demon of vanity and dress, and thus another ideal figure for satirising social and moral hypocrisy. He was referred to in the Talmud as, “the king of the devils.” The association was also a literary one, referring to his role as an expositor of society’s secrets: Asmodeus was the companion of Don Cleofas in Chapter Three of \textit{The Devil on Two Sticks}. According to Brewer, “Don Cleofas, catching hold of his companion’s cloak, is perched on the steeple of St. Salvador. Here the foul fiend stretches out his hand, and the roofs of all the houses open in a moment to show the Don what is going on privately in each respective dwelling.” E. Cobham Brewer, \textit{The Dictionary of Phrase and Fable} (Revised Edition, 1894), p.68.
A further alteration was made to the layout in August, after the first half-yearly part had been completed. At this point, Seymour's original masthead was replaced by one which downplayed the 'demonic' aspect of the journal's character. The new cut, by Kenny Meadows, depicted the figure of Asmodeus pulling back the curtain of a window (in the shadow of St. Paul's) to reveal the goings-on at a society dinner to a ragged-looking John Bull (fig.184). On one level, the change was simply another way of emphasising the satirical periodical's role as a 'guide' to metropolitan society, but it can also be seen as a deliberate attempt to reduce the role of the devil in the iconographic scheme of the journal. As the introduction to the second half-yearly volume - entitled "An Old Friend With a New Face" - stated: "This change has become necessary since the alteration in our title, as by the continuation of our old friend with the hoofs and tails, we were weekly incurring a charge of ignorance." Mayhew apparently felt that the equation between the penny unstamped press and radical literature connoted 'ignorance' in the minds of some. Indeed, he was sensitive to any criticism in the press which accused his paper of any form of extreme radicalism. In September he published a lengthy refutation of a review in The Literary Gazette which had discerned an overtly radical streak in its politics:

"The critic... is pleased to say in reference to our political prejudices, that we are so far republican, that we may "fairly be called revolutionary." We do not care much what we are called, as long as we can express our opinions boldly, fearlessly, and independently, nor should we care about being called revolutionary, if we really were advocates for a revolution, which once and for all we are not."

This cautious approach, combined with the overall quality of the journal (in comparison to the other imitators of Figaro at least), contributed to the short term success of The Devil in London. Like Figaro, its early issues had to be reprinted soon after their initial publication. A month before the first half-yearly part was completed, all back issues had been reprinted, and when the part was finally collected (like Figaro, stitched in a wrapper and sold at two shillings), its first edition

54 An allusion to The Devil on Two Sticks (see n.51), relocating the scene from St. Salvatore to St. Paul's, and recasting Don Cleofas as John Bull.
55 Asmodeus, No. 25, August 18th 1832, p. 97.
56 Asmodeus, No.29, September 15th 1832, p.116.
sold out within a matter of weeks.\textsuperscript{57} The exact circulation of the paper is unknown, but it clearly showed a steady increase in its early months. In the first issue it was stated that, "In response to the numerous applications for Advertisements, none will be received unless the circulation exceeds 10,000,"\textsuperscript{58} although just how quickly it achieved this figure is uncertain. The first issue reputedly went through four editions in the space of a week,\textsuperscript{59} and within a month it was claimed that 130,000 people were, "declaring they are readers of the Devil."\textsuperscript{60} But it was not until June that a call for advertisements was finally made, in the following terms:

"TO ADVERTISERS. Holding in disgust the contemptible quackery by which our contemporaries force themselves into notice, we have never alluded to the extent of our sale - we, however, now announce that our increasing circulation justifies our accepting advertisements, which we intend doing to a limited extent. The following are the terms: SEVEN LINES and under - seven shillings. For every succeeding line. Four-pence."\textsuperscript{61}

Certainly the quality of \textit{Asmodeus} - and in particular the extent to which it was illustrated - suggests that it was a buoyant enterprise until very close to its end. Even the penultimate issue boasted a two-page spread of eight cuts designed by Horngold (and engraved by Armstrong) entitled 'SIGNS OF THE TIMES'.\textsuperscript{62} But all of a sudden things came to a halt. Without any prior warning, the final issue appeared a week later as a single sheet, with no illustration bar the masthead, and a lengthy (albeit veiled) explanation of the journal's demise (fig. 185). Financial trouble was alluded to, but the suddenness of the change in fortune seems to have taken even Mayhew by surprise:

"Last week we were lusty as a young bridegroom... and this week - the next moment of our letterpress life - we are, in the words of that fine old spirit, Jeremy

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Asmodeus}, No. 20, July 14th 1832 (p. 80) and No. 32, October 6th 1832 (p. 128).
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{The Devil in London}, No. 1, February 29th 1832, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid.}, No. 2, March 7th 1832, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Ibid.}, No. 5, March 31st 1832, p. 19. This was most likely intended to represent the number of \textit{readers}, rather than actual \textit{sales}. As James has pointed out, the communal purchase and reading of cheap literature was common practice amongst the lower classes, as was the placing of periodical literature in taverns and coffee house. \textit{op.cit.} (1963), pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Asmodeus}, No. 15, June 9th 1832, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Ibid.}, No. 36, November 3rd, 1832, pp. 142-3.
Taylor, "to be numbered with the weeds and worn-out faces."... Of the many competitors which were in the field... at the time of our first adventure, scarcely one remains. In the crowd of "penny papers", and up to a very late period, in despite of the flatulence of the times, and the cessation of strong political interest, we have kept our footing; but owing to other calls of a more pressing nature, the editor has not been able to give that undivided attention to the work which it demanded.63

The implication was that Asmodeus had fallen foul of the same post-Reform disillusionment with the world of politics which was, at that same moment, putting such pressure on the market for single sheet political satire. This was combined with the annual slackening in the market for political satire which accompanied the prorogation of parliament and the end of the London season. As one editorial in August had put it: "Town begins to assume a dreary look - the opera has closed, the Houses of Parliament nightly present, "a beggarly account of empty" benches. Rotten-row looks disconsolate, and a dandy is quite a curiosity in White's bow window. Politics are "stale, flat, and unprofitable."64 In effect it had - along with the entire brief boom in the penny satirical press - run its course. It had served its purpose in documenting the Reform agitation (which had, in the first instance, stimulated the market), and now had to pay the inevitable price once that market began to fade away. At the very least, Mayhew had the satisfaction of having outlived the crowd of inferior journals by several months, and had published enough issues of his journal to reissue them in the form of a book - The Devil's Memorandum Book, for 1833 (fig.186) - which would stand as a permanent document of the reform year.

It was inevitable that the market established by Figaro could not hope to sustain so many titles of such a similar nature. Although in one sense imitation suggested itself as a reasonable means of stimulating sales, ultimately it was the rigid adherence to Figaro's formula which ensured the swift implosion of the market for the penny satirical periodical. The decline in the market was already obvious by the middle of the summer. At least a dozen titles had been launched between January and April, but only two - The Devil in London and The Original - survived

63 Ibid., No. 37, November 10th 1832, p. 145.
64 Asmodeus, No. 24, August 11th 1832, p. 93.
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beyond the passing of the Reform Bill in June. After this date, the market effectively evaporated. By the end of 1832, with the onset of post-Reform disillusionment setting in, the penny satirical press suddenly found itself as obsolete as the single sheet print. With the exception of Figaro itself (and Figaro in Sheffield), none of the titles launched in 1832 survived into '33. In the preface to the second annual volume of Figaro, à Beckett could confidently announce that, “Rivalry once so frequent we no longer have to contend against; not one of the numerous army of competitors that started against us now continues in the field, and there is not one a-rival but what has taken its departure.”65 The situation was summed up in the final issue of Giovanni in London in an epitaph which could stand for any number of similar titles;

" ‘Twas but one short week since we talked of retiring from business, but ’gad! the times are sadly changed, for business has retired from us... we could have shrunk from the crowded scene of weekly publications and saved ourselves the trouble and expense of this number, and none would have known our exit from this world till the disappointed hundreds, (there was a time when we boasted of thousands!) were seen retracing their steps, some disconcerted, more REJOICED down Paternoster Row."66

66 Giovanni in London No.6, March 24th 1832.
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Print or Periodical?
Radical Wood-Engraved Caricature and the Unstamped Press, 1832-36

Radical culture, by its very definition, exists and functions in direct opposition to prevailing trends of 'official' culture in any given era. John Lucas, in his introduction to Writing and Radicalism, has emphasised the point that, "radicalism is associated with oppositional forces. It means resistance to orthodoxy, to the accepted. It is therefore a term that implies marginality. Radical groups are minority groups, radical opinion is a departure from the norm, from the everyday, from common sense. It gathers to itself a frisson of the disreputable, the outré." Thus, it was perhaps inevitable that the 1830s - bookended by the Reform agitation of 1830-32 and the Chartist activity of 1838-9 - should have witnessed a very definite revival of radical activity, both in the metropolis and (increasingly) further afield.

Governmental repression (especially that intended to counter 'seditious' works) and radical literature will always exist alongside one another. The presence of one

1 While this chapter, like those preceding it, is largely a discussion of format, a broader examination of the content of radical caricature of the 1830s can be found in Fox, op. cit., (1988), especially Chapter Four (pp.120-213), 'The Freedom of the Press, 1830-1836'.

2 John Lucas, ed., 'Introduction', Writing and Radicalism (1996), p.1. However, we must be cautious when dealing with the period under discussion. Historians draw an important distinction between degrees of radicalism in the 1830s; from the middle-class Benthamite reformers, led by Edwin Chadwick, to the working-class proponents of an extreme form of Spencean radicalism. As Wiener points out, "a divisiveness along class lines permeated the reform movements of the 1830s" (op. cit., p20). Similarly, Loweth Prothero points out that, "Radicalism... should not be seen as a uniform philosophy or programme but as a diverse and contradictory array of people, concepts and strategies leading to loose coalitions with broadly agreed outlooks and aims." Radical Artisans in England and France, 1830-1870 (1997), p.22. The publishers and artists discussed in this chapter can be considered to fall somewhere inbetween the two extremes. They produced prints for a working-class audience, well aware of its subjugation by the dominant political order, but unwilling to resort to the 'physical force' radicalism which would later be promoted by Feargus O'Connor.

3 As H.T. Dickinson has pointed out, the 1830s was the last decade in which radical activity was focussed in London. As the century progressed, the industrial cities of the north would become the principal centres of British radicalism. loc.cit. (1992), pp. 223-4.
makes the other a necessary counterweight in the minds of those with an opposing ideology. Perceived injustice of one sort or another will inspire criticism (sometimes violent), which in turn will inspire suppression. While the repressive measures of 1817-19 (Peterloo, The Six Acts, the trials of William Hone, and so on) inspired a host of radical prints, pamphlets and periodicals, (such as Wooler's *Black Dwarf*, Carlile's *Republican*, and Wade's *Gorgon*), their existence in turn forced the government into further direct action to suppress them. Similarly, the restrictions of the Stamp Tax, the confiscation of presses and the routine surveillance of radical gatherings in the 1830s led to an explosion of radical print culture which was itself subject to suppressive measures which inspired further criticism. The relationship is circular.

However, radical print culture of the 1820s was markedly different in character to much of that which appeared in the '30s. The earlier publications had either been primarily text-based (as with the titles mentioned above) or rooted in the more exclusive traditions of the etched, hand-coloured single sheet print (the work of Marks and Benbow for example). Even the Hone-Cruikshank collaborations - costing a shilling for the standard version, or three for the deluxe - were outside the reach of all but the most prosperous of workers. But the 1830s saw the emergence of a new form of radical print culture - the wood-engraved penny print - which was immediately accessible to a much larger audience, and which developed alongside the unstamped press of 1830-36, adopting many of the conventions of periodicity in order to maintain its market niche.

While the radicalism of the Peterloo era had largely disappeared by the mid '20s, the early '30s saw a conjunction of events which would lead to a sudden resurgence of radical activity. The immediate catalyst for this was the renewed journalistic activity amongst the lower-classes following the French revolution of 1830, and the sudden realisation of the restrictive nature of the stamp tax applicable to all news-bearing periodicals. The 4d tax had been introduced in 1815, but it was only in 1830 that it was suddenly (and widely) condemned as a 'Tax on Knowledge', and thus an impediment to the aspirations of the lower

---


6 A point made by Anderson, *op.cit.*, p. 36.
classes which, throughout the period of the “March of Intellect”, had been founded to a large extent upon the perceived value of literacy and education. In itself, this was unlikely to have inspired the rapid explosion of the unstamped press. What was needed was a universal rallying point which could focus the movement behind a single cause. This followed soon afterwards with the Whigs’ renewed calls for parliamentary reform and the continued resistance of the Tories to any change in the franchise whatsoever. The increasing power of the press to oppose the status quo was proved decisively in November 1830, following Wellington’s notorious declaration that reform was neither desirable nor necessary, and the widespread public outcry which followed in both newspapers and prints.7

Franchise reform became the dominant topic of the political press, and in particular the rapidly expanding number of cheap, unstamped periodicals which expressly addressed the experience of the lower classes. Wakley’s Ballot,8 Hetherington’s Poor Man’s Guardian, Carlile’s Scourge (fig. 187), and many other papers appeared, united in the cause of promoting the interests of the working man and denouncing any form of suppression by the state, whether of Whig or Tory origin. What followed has famously been described (in overtly oppositional terminology) as “The War of the Unstamped”, and it was indeed a war of sorts, with clearly defined sides and conflicting aims: the Home Office and the Police Force versus the Press and the vendors of unstamped literature. By and large, though, it was a war of words. The papers of Hetherington, Carlile and their contemporaries were mostly unillustrated, and cannot be classed as overtly satirical.9 The Figaro-style penny papers of 1832 were an exception but, as already stated, they were only really related to the more radical papers by virtue of their refusal to pay the stamp duty, and generally courted a very different audience. Hetherington included a single cut on the cover of each issue of The Poor Man’s Guardian - a mock Stamp placed in the top right hand corner, where the genuine government stamp would normally have been placed (fig. 188) - which, in a sense, can be considered a satirical image, but this was the extent of its illustration.

---

8 Which was not actually unstamped, but, as the title implies, was defined by its support of parliamentary reform, and was united with the Unstamped in terms of its overt anti-clericalism amongst other things.
9 The issue of Carlile’s A Scourge illustrated here (fig. 187) is an exception, and is included for that very reason. The illustration depicts the window of his shop at 62 Fleet Street, where he displayed offensive effigies of bishops and lawyers, hand in hand with the figure of the Devil. For doing so he had been charged with committing a nuisance at the Old Bailey shortly before this issue appeared. The illustration thus constitutes a celebration of his flaunting of authority. A Scourge, No.9, 20th November 1834.
Thus, to find a characteristic visual expression of lower class radical opinion (in terms of graphic satire) we have to look beyond the pages of the unstamped periodical. The period 1832-35 witnessed an explosion of cheap wood engraved satirical prints which took the exclusive conventions of traditional single sheet graphic satire and inverted them to produce a new and characteristic form of satirical imagery; one directly opposed to the polite, rarefied world of politics depicted in HB’s *Political Sketches*. However, while these prints departed from the representational conventions and material characteristics of McLean’s publications, even they adhered to the broader changes in the marketing and commodification of graphic satire which were experienced during the period. Like *The Looking Glass, The Political Sketches* or *Figaro*, the majority of these images appeared as parts of sequentially-numbered series displaying many of the characteristics of cheap periodicals. Indeed, when the unstamped press disappeared almost completely in 1836, the wood-engraved print series went with it. This, perhaps more than anything else, emphasises the extent to which the two were related, and were mutually reliant upon the same market to sustain their own existence.

However, having said that the radical press used periodicity in a similar manner to publications such as *The Looking Glass* or *Figaro*, I must immediately issue a qualification of sorts. Periodicity implies not only sequential numbering, continuity of format and regularity of appearance; it also implies a rooting in time - a chronological document of a particular period, with a special emphasis on contemporaneity. Dates are an important aspect of periodicals. While the radical print series complied absolutely with the first three criteria of periodicity listed above, scarcely any were actually dated, and it is thus somewhat difficult to construct an authoritative chronology of the development of the medium. We do not know exactly when many such titles began, nor how frequently they were published. Short of studying them alongside a contemporary radical paper such as *The Poor Man’s Guardian*, there is not always a satisfactory means of situating each individual issue in time. The best we can hope for is to focus on the treatment of specific, well-documented and widely-discussed topics of the period, and to construct a broadly accurate picture along these lines. Thus, the beginning of *The

---

10 Fox (*op.cit*, pp.170-71) discusses the impact of the New Stamp Act on the serialised radical caricature print.
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*Political Drama* can be placed at around March or April 1833, as its first seven issues focus on the controversy surrounding Sir Andrew Agnew’s Sabbath Bill, which was then being debated in Parliament and widely criticised in the radical press. Likewise, *John Bull’s Picture Gallery* can be placed in the first half of 1832, largely because it plagiarised so many lithographic single sheet prints of the immediate pre-reform period. In this way we can confidently date all the prints which are characteristic of this sub-category of graphic satire between 1832 and 1836, situating its origins in the lead up to the Reform Bill and its demise around the time of the reduction of the Stamp Tax. As such, their scope also takes in a number of other issues and events which were of specific interest to a lower class, politically radical audience: the New Poor Law; the Sabbath Bill, the suppression of the Unstamped and so on. Beyond this, certain themes are prevalent, recurring time and again throughout the prints, and can be considered representative of the medium. Chief amongst these was an all-embracing anti-authoritarianism, which manifested itself in often virulent attacks upon the clergy, the new Metropolitan Police, the Monarchy and Parliament. In so many ways, such prints are the antithesis of McLean’s ethos of inoffensive impartiality. But while McLean avoided controversy by maintaining a decided air of impartiality, the publishers of the radical print series deliberately set themselves in opposition to politicians of both parties, condemning the structure of the state as a whole rather than simply adopting the cause of the pro-Reform Whigs. Thus, all politicians are made objects of equal suspicion, and represent a single homogeneous group of authoritarian bugaboos. Satire has traditionally been the language of opposition, but this form of radical satire was opposing much more than a single political party. Rather, it was opposing an entire social and political order, the heart of which was Parliament, but which touched every aspect of the life of the working man.

Lucas has argued that class began to emerge as an issue of the first importance during the Reform era, and this awareness saturates radical caricature of the period. The image of the working man becomes an archetype in these prints.

---

11 Agnew (1793-1849) was the instigator of a bill which would prohibit all open labour on Sundays, excepting works of “necessity and mercy”, which was widely perceived in radical circles as a restriction on the working man’s right to work. It was introduced on four occasions between 1832 and 1837, when it was finally passed. However, its passage was followed closely by the death of William IV and the dissolution of parliament. Agnew was not re-elected to the new house, and the bill was never put into practice. We can also date *The Political Drama* by comparing it to the lithographic version published by Tregear. This began in April 1833, although it appears to have begun shortly after the wood engraved series.

quite distinct from John Bull (who remains representative of the nation as a whole), but similarly trodden-upon and routinely abused by venal politicians and self-serving clergymen. Moreover, his everyday experience - defined by poverty, hardship and cultural values sharply distinct from those of the middle classes - finds an analogy of sorts in the material characteristics of the radical press. These prints were defined by their cheapness - both literally, in their crude production values, and allusively, through the repetition of words such as ‘Penny’, ‘People’ and ‘Poor Man’, which were expressly intended to evoke a commonality of experience amongst the lower social groups. As such, we can assume the existence of a definite awareness amongst their creators of their role as an oppositional cultural form quite distinct from the middle class press.

The radical penny prints took various forms during the period, although regardless of layout they were almost all of a uniform size, each being a folio sheet of approximately 10.5 X 17 inches. They were all printed on the same thin paper and were sold at a penny. Coloured impressions were occasionally offered at twopence, but these appear to have been exceptional, as surviving examples are scarce. Only Marks’ Parodist made a point of advertising its availability in coloured impressions. In this sense at least, the functional aspects of these prints could be said to outweigh the decorative. Whereas conventional single sheets, right up to the 1830s, functioned as both contemporary commentaries and colourful objects of long-term preservation and display, the primary purpose of the penny print was to offer an immediately topical polemic on a specific issue. While they too were no doubt intended for display and public perusal in the short term, their physical ephemerality generally denied them the permanence of the more expensive, durable alternative. Thus, the extra expenditure for colour was apparently (and understandably) of secondary importance.

Beyond these basic characteristics, a number of differences become apparent in terms of format. Chief amongst these is the varying extent to which each series

---

13 The creation, in a sense, of a “Culture of Poverty” (to use Gertrude Himmelfarb’s term) as a means of expressing difference from middle-class culture. The term was used as the title of a discussion of Mayhew’s London Labour and the London Poor in Dyos & Wolff eds., The Victorian City, Vol.II (1973), pp.707-736. The article is useful for its discussion of identity and image (and the creation of a sense of commonality) amongst the lower-classes, especially those described by Mayhew, although its main focus is on the middle-class perception of the working-classes and how this affected the different ways in which they were treated.

14 Although the middle class press was equally aware of this when it co-opted such terminology for the SDUK’s Penny Magazine.
adopted the conventions of either the penny periodical or the single sheet print. The paper on which both the penny quarto periodicals and the single sheet wood-engravings were printed was of a standard size and thickness. The only difference was that the periodicals were folded once along the middle, giving a maximum of four pages (if the sheet was printed on both recto and verso). This was the basic format of *Figaro in London*. However, the various radical print series which adopted this format differed in terms of their layout. Rather than offering four pages of combined text and images, they generally featured text on one side and either one or two large images on the other. Thus, when folded, their front and back pages consisted of two-column text, while the inside pages opened out into a two-page spread, giving them the dual function of periodical and print (figs. 189 & 189a). Surviving copies, even those opened up and bound into volumes of folio-size prints have always been folded down the centre, which implies that they were sold as periodicals and that the former function was primary, while the latter was an additional bonus, to be displayed once the text had been consumed.\(^{15}\)

This was the format adopted William Chubb for the early issues of *John Bull’s Picture Gallery*, one of the earliest series of this type. The first four issues were arranged along the lines of a standard quarto penny weekly, the only difference being the absence of a date on the title page. But with the fifth issue it switched to the single sheet format, printed on only one side, arranged vertically, and generally with a lengthy text below the image (fig. 190). Despite this, the series retained certain conventions of periodical literature, most notably the regular announcement of circulation figures and the reprinting of past issues in the manner of *Figaro* or *The Gallery of Comicalities*. By the time the seventh issue had been published, the first six had all been reprinted. By issue ten it was announced that “the Publisher of John Bull’s Picture Gallery has the pleasing satisfaction of declaring that, upwards of Twenty Thousand of each Number has been already sold and the demand, even now, for all numbers, is such, that he is continually reprinting the

\(^{15}\) Despite this fact, these series have escaped the notice of historians of the periodical. The BUCOP does not list them, and neither does the Union List of Serials. Even Hollis and Wiener overlooked them in their respective studies of the Unstamped. This represents an interesting reversal of function in more recent times. Such objects are now regarded as ‘prints’ or primarily visual objects, whereas originally the verbal element was the most important - and the most immediately apparent at the time of sale. This raises interesting questions about the relative ephemerality of images and text when they are used to comment upon specific contemporary events.
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This kind of puffery may well have reflected Chubb's background in the Holywell Street milieu of the periodical press, rather than as a publisher of prints as such, and he no doubt felt it logical to extend the hyperbolic spiel of one to the other. It also highlights the somewhat ambiguous status of radical wood-engraved caricature in the print culture of the 1830s. Such series blur the distinctions between prints and periodicals but, once again, also emphasise the extent to which periodicity had become a defining aspect of satirical imagery during the period. Like all these series, whether four-page quarto or single-sheet folio, *John Bull's Picture Gallery* was sequentially numbered. Furthermore, after the series ended (with its seventeenth issue), Chubb reissued all the parts in illustrated boards, thus redefining its status in a similar way to Heath's *Northern Looking Glass* (fig.191). However, the early issues (those arranged as four page periodicals) were not included in their original format. They had their cuts re-arranged to match the format of later issues, while their text was excluded entirely (fig.192). This implies that, while the textual element of the series was seen as ephemeral (and therefore not worth reprinting in this manner), the images were considered to retain some relevance long after their original publication.

Another series to adopt the conventions of a four-page penny quarto paper was *The Political Stage*. Like *John Bull's Picture Gallery*, it combined two pages of two-column text with either a double-page or two single-page images (figs.193-4). The first six issues were undated, but with the seventh (October 31st 1835), it began to include the date each week. Once again, it was product of the Holywell Street milieu, rather than that of Lincoln's Inn, being published by George Jackson, at Number 49. But such series remained exceptional within the wider context of radical wood-engraved caricature.

More common were the various series which appeared as numbered single sheet prints. These generally contained only a single image per sheet, although sometimes a number of related images could be included in order to present several facets of a particular topic. Most of these single sheet images were arranged horizontally - landscape format - and many were densely-detailed, containing several figures, specific background settings and word balloons.

15 *John Bull's Picture Gallery*, No. 10 (BM 17156).
17 Hollis mentions Johnson only once, as printer and publisher of *The Weekly Times* in 1834, following which he was "discharged for embezzlement". *op.cit.*, p.150.
In this sense they were very different from the standard wood-engraved illustrations found in the penny press. A 10.5 X 17 inch sheet obviously offered a considerable degree of freedom to construct a relatively elaborate composition, and to focus on more than just the basic elements of any specific issue. And unlike Figaro or The Devil in London, these images were not reliant upon an accompanying text, although this is not to say that words were not an important part of radical political satire: they most certainly were. Instead, words formed an integral part of the image as such, in the form of the speech balloons which quickly became a characteristic convention of the medium. The penny satirical periodicals of the 1832 had rarely used this device (a convention of graphic satire since the Golden Age), as the wood engraving process was time-consuming enough without the laborious task of carving out a hand-written text backwards. And in any case, the restricted dimensions of the cuts precluded their use, generally limiting an image to only the most basic of elements. However, the artists who worked for the penny print series overcame this restriction in a logical manner - quite ingenious in its simplicity - which once again blurred the distinction between print and periodical. The blocks from which their images were printed were wood-engraved as usual, but the rectangular spaces designated for speech were left blank. Prior to printing, these sections were cut out of the block entirely, thus permitting the insertion of rows of letterpress type into the resulting spaces. As both woodblock and type were of the same height, the text would print as part of the image when run through the press (fig.196). Therefore, the text-image relationship of the periodical was retained, but fundamentally altered. Rather than a separate text giving meaning to an accompanying image, the text now became a central part of the image itself, and the two could function in conjunction with one another.

The most typical - and longest-lived - example of this format was The Political Drama. But before this series began, penny political satire had adopted a number of different forms, although the majority of them were also issued serially. Both William Strange and Benjamin Steill, two of the most important publishers of

---

18 An exception would be the posthumously-published final sketches of Seymour featured in Figaro in the weeks after his death. (See Chapter Three).

19 Exceptions to this rule are few and far between, but do exist. Marks engraved his own speech balloons in The Parodist, while Cowie and Strange's The Barber's Razor (see figs. 219 & 220).

20 It should be noted, however, that two states of the first issue exist - one numbered, the other not. This raises the possibility that Drake had not initially intended to continue it as a series, only deciding to do so after the print met with some success, demanding a second edition. This could then have been 'redefined' as the first part of a continuing work by the inclusion of the number 1 to the title.
Chapter Eight

the Unstamped, experimented with illustrated publications of this type. Strange launched *The Peoples' Penny Pictures* in December 1832 as a folio-sized fortnightly single sheet, printed on only one side (fig. 197). He also produced at least four issues of *The Caricaturist* in collaboration with Steill, which was sold both at their shop in Paternoster Row and at Berger's in Holywell Street (fig. 198). This was also a single sheet (of similar dimensions), printed on one side, but adopting a vertical - or portrait - format. It generally included two images (one above the other) below its masthead. The cuts were designed by "Dank, Esq.", who would later go on to succeed Seymour as the artist on à Beckett's *Comic Magazine*. The series was unique in advertising the identity of its artist (albeit pseudonymously) on the masthead.

More varied in character was the work of J.L. Marks, who reappeared in 1831-2, having apparently left graphic satire behind him in 1826. He produced several series of prints in the early-mid '30s (almost all overtly radical in nature), although none appear to have lasted beyond 1834. He remains an exceptional figure in radical caricature of the period, not only because he self-published his own work, but also because he worked in a variety of media and styles. In certain instances he retained the conventions of his Regency period caricatures, while in others he adopted the style of contemporary wood-engraved satire.

The first of his new series appears to have been *The Chronologist*, a series of etchings which survived for at least eleven issues in 1832, and was intended - as implied by the title - as a continuing record of the political state of the nation. In iconographic terms it was quite conventional, calling on familiar tropes of satirical imagery such as a beleaguered John Bull, 'Petticoat Government', and a perceptible strain of xenophobia. It is characteristic of Marks, however, that he was quick to voice the feeling of discontent which followed the Reform Bill. The ninth issue of the series, *THE MAN wot pays the TAXES!* (fig. 199) depicts a ragged

21 The BM has two issues (Nos. 1 and 2, dated December 8th and December 22nd. 1832.
22 *The Caricaturist*, Nos. 1-4 (BM17346+). It was also sold by Clements in Pulteney St., Steill and Strange were only the publishers in this instance, the printer being J. Pickburn of Henrietta St., Covent Garden - a mere stone's throw from Holywell Street. This series was entirely unrelated to *The Caricaturist* published by King in 1831, and described in Chapter Four. It seems likely that Strange and Steill's series appeared after King's, and may well represent an attempt on their part to retranslate a familiar, but more expensive, format for a lower class audience.
23 Once again, the idea of time and its regulation of the working man's everyday existence was used in the context of a periodically-issued series.
24 BM 17203, c. July 1832.
artisan, hands clasped in despair, gazing at his family;

“In what better condition am I now that the Reform Bill has past!” he asks, “I have been obliged (sic) to Rob my family to pay Tax’s and now they (sic) tell me I’m Frenchised, that is I suppose lean, meagre and to live upon frogs.”

He also worked in wood engraving, producing at least twenty three numbers of Marks’ New Caricaturist, consisting of simpler images with a limited textual element. As such, these prints differ markedly from the more common examples of radical satire. They are smaller (only 7.5 x 8.5 inches), hand-coloured, and make use of a much sparser line, with none of the blocks having been especially heavily-worked. The emphasis is very much on a simplicity of line and the immediacy of the message contained within the text. A print such as John Bull - The Pride of the World and the Envy of Surrounding Nations (No.23, fig.200) relies upon a simple exchange between a soldier and a policeman, between whom stands a bewildered John Bull. The former warns him, “STOP, or I’ll run you through,” while the latter orders him to, “MOVE ON, or I’ll break your head.” Despite their simplicity, however, the images are skilfully engraved and retain the characteristics of Marks’ more familiar style, which may well imply that he engraved his own work.

Several of his prints of the ‘30s retain the element of Regency bawdiness so prevalent in his earlier work. In 1834 he launched a lithographic series entitled Popular Subjects, which consisted of larger sheets - 8 x 13" - of thin paper (of a similar quality used in the wood engraved prints), sold at a penny plain. Stylistically they were similar to his etchings of the 1820s (an effect permitted by the use of pen lithography), retaining a strongly caricatural element, and making no concessions to the prevailing trends of the West End print shops. But he was clearly intent on addressing the new lower-class radical audience of the ‘30s, and chose his subject matter accordingly, going out of his way to ridicule any and all figures of authority. In The Working of the New Poor Act (Popular Subjects No.2 (fig.201)), a bishop says to Brougham, “Bless your old cock Harry for this New Act of kindness towards your fellow creature - I assure you that I never could formerly enjoy myself with a little bit of fun but was apprehensive of having a Bastard Child swore against me. Now my boy we are alright.” Brougham responds, “I had the thing in hand a long time before I made it Publick. I’m certain it will be a great
benefit to the Clergy and Nobility. It's a d—d good job old Billy's wife is out of the way or she would never have let him give his assent to it." In the background, women are being freely harassed by lecherous men, one of whom goads another, "go to it Tom. no fear of the Tread mill now."

Marks' work was not characteristic of the majority of radical caricature, although within the broadly similar format its creators adopted, some differentiation in terms of stylistic conventions is certainly apparent. While most of these series relied upon a combination of comic physical exaggeration, abbreviated detail, lengthy word balloons, and an overall sense of 'crudeness' (such as (fig.202)), others attempted something different. The third issue of The Political Play Bill (The Reform Boat in Full Sail), for example, presented a relatively faithful portrait likeness of the Whigs, set in an allegorical seascape, in which the sails of their boat are powered by the breath of John Bull, whose image rises up from behind a cloud (fig.203)25 The King and Queen swim happily alongside, while the bishops who opposed the Bill flounder around on the verge of drowning. The erect postures and correct dress of the Whigs are in direct contrast to the gross exaggeration of Grant's work, and imply a sense of respect for the characters represented, alongside a tacit approval of their aims. The print could almost be described as a wood-engraved approximation of Doyle's Political Sketches. Even the background details - the undulating sea, and the play of light on its surface - are rendered in broadly realistic terms (within the limits of the engraver's ability).

This type of 'realism' was relatively common. Steill's Caricaturist contains figure-types which are deeply reminiscent of Doyle, employing the same 'vaporous' quality identified by Thackeray, and extensive areas of white space (see above, fig.198).26 Lloyd's Political Jokes also featured a realistic form of 'portraiture' in its early issues, although it later began to combine this with with Grant's more overtly comic caricatures (compare figs.204-5). Even The Political Drama included images which invoked certain conventions of realistic representation, especially when it was documenting actual events. Thus, the seizure and destruction of Cleave and Hetherington's presses in 1835 is described in literal terms (fig.214).

---

25 The Political Play Bill was printed and published by S. Wilson, of 140 Fetter Lane, Fleet St. It ran for at least 19 issues. From No.15 it was printed by Hetherington - another sign of the close links between radical caricature and the unstamped press. Each image was engraved on between 6 and 9 blocks, a fact which may be accounted for by their greater level of detail and intricacy.

26 The Caricaturist No.4.
The figures wielding the hammers are not the imagined 'bloody bludgeon-men' portrayed elsewhere in the series (as in fig. 206). They are presented as real figures, and as a very real threat. While the background is schematised - reduced to an emblematic motif - the emphatic focus of the print is the foreground, where the destruction of the presses is taking place. This is rendered with an emotive sense of realism which, we can imagine, would have carried considerable weight within the radical community.

Thus, radical graphic satire could function in more than one idiom. The reality of events could, when necessary, be brought home in literal terms, while fantasy was used as both a means of play (as a form of symbolic role-reversal) and of emphasising any potential threat via extremes of comic exaggeration. But the latter approach was by far the most common. Images such as *Reviewing the Blue Devils, The Bench of Bishops in the House of Lords, The Four Factions, Which Distract the Country*, and *The Whig Radical 'Amended' Address to the King’s Speech (Political Drama Nos. 11, 12, 16 and 77. (figs. 206-9)* are full of the animated form of caricature which is so characteristic of the medium, and which retains its power to this day. In contrast, an example such as *Popay the Spy (Political Drama No. 20 (fig. 210))* is somehow less powerful. It is another attempt at 'documentary' image-making which, although fitting well within the 'journalistic' role of the series, seems stilted and uninspired in relation to its most successful issues.

This aspect of journalistic commentary was further implied by the deliberately political focus of this type of print, which gave them a further kinship with the battles being waged by the Unstamped. *Politics* was a word which the City and West End publishers had largely managed to exclude from their prints by 1833, but it was quite emphatically brought back into circulation by the publishers of Lincoln's Inn

---

27 Popay was a government spy, used to infiltrate radical circles in the 1830s. His activities were known to radicals, however, having been reported in *The Poor Man's Guardian* on July 13th and August 14th 1833. The *Political Drama* print would have been published at around the same time - probably shortly afterwards. See D.J. Rowe ed., *London Radicalism, 1830-1843; A Selection from the Papers of Francis Place* (1970), p.xix.

28 The *Political Sketches* being the obvious exception, although if Doyle's series begun as late as 1833, one wonders if McLean might have suggested another title in light of word's prevalence in the radical prints. The associations might not have been those which he wanted to conjure up.
and Holywell Street. Drake followed *The Political Humourist* (fig. 211)\(^{29}\) with *The Political Drama*, which in turn inspired *The Political Play Bill*, *The Political Stage*, and *The Political Jokes*. On one level this was simply the same kind of product-imitation which led to the 'Figaro mania' of 1832, but it was also a very direct statement of intent on the part of the radical press. Disillusioned with the meagre benefits of the Reform Bill, frustrated by the continuing suppression of the Unstamped and no doubt conscious of the steady de-politicisation of graphic satire as a whole, the prints of 1833-36 seem to represent a deliberate attempt to readdress the subject of politics for an audience which had a number of specific grievances to air; grievances which the middle class press showed little interest in acknowledging.

The adoption of a serial format by Drake and others was significant within the broader context of early nineteenth-century radical culture. The importance of the printed word as a means of social and intellectual improvement had increased steadily with the 'March of Intellect'. In symbolic terms, the printing press had become an icon of enlightenment, empowerment and freedom of speech, and the development of an expressly lower class print culture had focussed upon the cheap periodical - and increasingly the Sunday paper - as a vehicle for all three.\(^{30}\) Joel Wiener has emphasised the point that:

> "a major motivation behind the working-class movement for repeal (of the Stamp Tax)... was the passionate determination to attain "cheap knowledge" or "cheap information". These phrases... became shibboleths during the newspaper agitation... they came to symbolise and articulate a host of ill-defined grievances (and) they provided a symbolic dimension

\(^{29}\) *The Political Humourist* was published by Drake in 1832. It can be placed rather more accurately at around June or July that year, as it includes a reduced version of Grant's *Taking The Boromongers Home* (fig. 62) - an image which gained a particularly wide currency at the time in one form or another. This print, however, does not appear to be by Grant. Although his working relationship with Drake was relatively long, it did not begin in earnest until the first issue of *The Political Drama* in 1833. The print is included towards the end of the final volume of the BMC (BM 17946). *Taking the Boromongers Home* was also alluded to in *The Political Drama* No. 87, which depicts a crowd scene in which a character is examining a copy of the print. It can also be seen in the first issue of Grant's lithographic series *The Reflector*, published by Dawson in 1835.

\(^{30}\) The perception of the printing press as the "Terror of Bad Government" and the "Enlightener of Mankind" was widespread in the period around the Reform Bill of 1832 in particular. See James, *op.cit.* (1976), pp.17-18 for a further discussion of its iconic significance. Linda Colley has also drawn attention to a tradition of radicalism based on communication and the spread of information, highlighting the significance of the term "Corresponding Society" in the eighteenth century as a means of fostering a sense of integrated experience. 'Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain, 1750-1830' in *Past and Present*, No.113 (November 1986), pp.97-117 (p.113).
An issue of *The Political Stage* took up this theme, stating that, "The Unstamped press is creating a most alarming sensation all over the world, and the March of Intellect has turned into an enormous stride." Above this appeared a cut - *The Unstamped Flooring the Stamped Press* (fig.212) - showing a flame-haired imp with a paper attached to his torso (labelled "Unstamped/40,000"), escaping a group of bewigged M.P.s, while Brougham looks on ineffectually from a window, thumping his nose at the scene.

Indeed, Grant, Drake and others clearly associated their prints directly with the unstamped press, even though they were not liable to pay the duty as they were not, strictly speaking, newspapers as such. And yet, in *The Political Drama*, Grant repeatedly depicted his own work as being subject to suppression alongside *The Poor Man's Guardian* and other radical unstamped papers. *Magisterial Justice - A Fact* (*Political Drama* No. 14, fig.213) shows the arrest of a vendor of cheap literature for selling an earlier issue of the series - one which had caricatured the Metropolitan Police as a bunch of murderous thugs. The prosecution of such vendors was an emotive topic, with more than seven hundred vendors of the unstamped (at least half of whom were street vendors such as the one depicted by Grant) having been arrested in London alone between 1830 and 1836. More than this, however, it was an emphatic statement on Grant's part about the relationship between the worlds of the unstamped press (with which, in this print, he explicitly associates his own work), graphic satire, and the lower class radical audience which existed for both during the period. The magistrate laments the fact that, "there is no Act of Parliament to put all Caricatures down, and to imprison the artists, publishers, printers and purchasers." Similarly, *Whig Robbery and Destruction of Property Under the Law* (*Political Drama* No. 100, fig.214) depicts the arrest of Cleave and Hetherington, and the destruction of their presses - an event which occurred in August 1835.35 Hetherington's *Twopenny Dispatch* and

31 Wiener, op.cit, p.117. See his chapter, 'The Symbolic Significance of Cheap Knowledge' (pp.116-130), for more on this theme.
31 *The Political Stage*, No.7, October 31st 1835.
33 The issue in question, No. 11. See fig. 206.
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Poor Man's Guardian, as well as Cleave's Police Gazette, are confiscated alongside Grant's Political Drama and Every Body's Album. In other words, the idea that both print and periodical could be persecuted cultural forms quickly became central to the meaning of radical graphic satire, creating yet another rallying point for the unenfranchised lower classes against the powers-that-be. In such prints, a clear distinction was drawn between the stamped press (representing 'official' culture) and the Unstamped, which was marginalised not only by its illegality, but also - so it was implied - by its veracity. The first issue of Strange's People's Penny Pictures put this in explicit terms:

"My friends and fellow Countrymen,

It is high time you should know what is going on; the Newspapers are too dear for you, or if they are not, they disguise everything which they tell you, with such a lot of fine words, that it would take a team of wagon horses to draw out their meaning. But everybody can understand what a Picture means, particularly when they have it explained to them." 36

While this could be read as an admission that lower class literacy - the education of 'The People' - was not as widespread as both critics and adherents of the "March of Intellect" had been implying, it seems more expressly designed to draw a distinction between 'Radical' and 'Official' culture - between the plain-speaking honesty of the one, and the convoluted, obfuscating verbiage of the other. Moreover, the stamped metropolitan press was widely perceived (amongst the radical press at least) as being the mouthpiece of the authorities. This was emphasised in an issue of The Political Playbill which symbolically depicted John Roebuck, M.P. for Bath,37 attacking those ministers who abused the people via their control of the Press. In Ro-buck's Attack on the Press, or Information for the People (fig.215), he is depicted astride Cerberus, the Hound of Hell, wielding an enormous quill pen ("Roebuck's Lance") against a group of M.P.s (amongst them Cumberland, Wellington, Peel and Brougham). They in turn defend themselves with shields labelled with the names of 'official' metropolitan papers: Times, Standard, Morning Post and Albion. Roebuck shouts them down, saying;

36 The People's Penny Pictures, No. 1, December 8th. 1832.
37 Roebuck was one of a group of middle-class radicals - which also included Place, Hume, Grote, Birkbeck, Wakley and Warburton - who campaigned for the repeal of the Stamp Tax. Hollis, op.cit, p.3.
"Ye vile deceivers of the People of England, hide your contemptible heads, how can you stand against the Truths I proclaim... there never was a press so degraded, so thoroughly immoral, as the stamp press... the cowardice, and the blackest immorality (are) the governing principles of the stamp press of this country."

The notion that the radical press represented Truth, against the duplicity of the 'Official' press, was emphasised time and time again. Chubb in particular regarded himself as a kind of 'Public Information Service' for the people, publishing list after list of the financial benefits reaped by the ruling classes. In 1832 he began publishing The Devil's Menagerie of Placemen, Sinecurists, Pensioners, &c. in weekly penny parts (fig.216). This, he announced, was intended to provide, "a correct statement of the sums of money received in Places, Pensions, and Sinecures of every Pauper on the State List... and their town and country residences are annexed, that the public may know, not only who receives, but where the receivers live." In another advertisement he said that it was intended to, "open the eyes of the public, and show at once the cormorants who devour the vast sums of money wrung from the labours and necessities of the industrious, and now deeply depressed people, in the shapes of taxes, &c. &c. "There is a palpable hint of menace in these statements, especially the revelation that home addresses would be supplied. While this was far from a direct call to arms, the provision of such information does at least (in theory) allow for some form of direct action on the part of individual readers. Indeed, fear of the mob was by no means unrealistic, as Wellington for one was aware. In both April and October 1831 Apsley house was stoned by Reform demonstrators, and in November he chose to cancel the Lord Mayor's Banquet (following his notorious anti-Reform statement), rather than face the threat of an enraged crowd during his journey to the Guildhall.

Several issues of Chubb's John Bull's Picture Gallery performed a similar function, combining a large image with a text below, detailing some aspect of parliamentary

38 The Political Playbill, No. 12.
39 John Bull's Picture Gallery, No. 15.
40 ibid., No. 13. A fourth issue of The Devil’s Menagerie was announced in No. 17, which implies that the project met with some success, at least initially. Whether it continued beyond this point is uncertain.
41 See Brock, op.cit., p.127. Of course, in doing so, Wellington opened himself up to yet more ridicule from the caricaturists. The cancelled feast was the subject of a host of prints in the weeks that followed. For the stoning of Apsley House see Elizabeth Longford, Wellington: Pillar of State (1972), pp.168, 271 & 277.
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expenditure (fig.217). In issue nine it was stated that, “John Bull considers it necessary to publish a list of the Pensions of the Royal Family or Royal Paupers, whichever term it may please you, to show (partly) the trifling sum it costs yearly to maintain the magnificence of a Monarchical President’s Family.” In both cases, the information was provided in the form of a list, presented without commentary, the implication being that sensible readers could draw their own conclusions from the figures. This highlights the extent to which the radical press placed continual emphasis on its own veracity - and that of the written word in general. The provision of simple ‘facts’ in the form of a list was a convincing manner in which to achieve this. It also implies that the periodical could be perceived as a bearer of indisputable information, even when its ostensible purpose was that of entertainment. The following issue included a “Statement of the Gross Produce of Taxes for the Year ending 5th. January 1831, chiefly paid by the industrious class,” taken from the 1831 session of the Annual Finance Accounts. This list, unlike the others, went on to comment that the burden of taxation, “(falls) heavily on the mercantile and manufacturing classes... This monstrous State of our fiscal system is solely owing (sic) to non-representation and consequent monopoly of political power by the Aristocracy, which has enabled them to throw the public burthens on the productive classes.”

The function of Chubb’s publications was to make accessible the type of information which was otherwise restricted to the ruling classes, and interpret it in a context which might arouse the indignation of the working man. This was the role played by his Black List (which listed all the peers who had voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill), and also by the complete pamphlet editions of The Reform Bill and the Boundary Act which he published in 1832. As he emphatically pointed out in his advertisement for the latter, “The King’s Printers have the impudence to charge seven shillings & sixpence for the above!”, while his editions cost only threepence and sixpence respectively. In this way he was constantly appealing to the sense of distance which the lower classes felt from those who governed them, and the subjugation to which they felt victim as a result of the restriction of knowledge. His basic theory was encapsulated - and continually reiterated - in the phrase “The People Forever! Huzza!!” which routinely

---

42 John Bull’s Picture Gallery, No. 9. The total amount given was £210,000.
43 John Bull’s Picture Gallery, No. 10.
44 John Bull’s Picture Gallery, No. 15.
accompanies his announcements of new publications.45

Perhaps inevitably, this sense of distance (of difference) was the driving force behind the thematic content of much radical political satire - an early manifestation of Disraeli's 'Two Nations'.46 Thackeray had voiced this sense of difference in more explicit terms. In reference to the audience for radical literature he said:

"They hate the nobility, for the nobility ride in a gold coach, and themselves starve on foot; they hate the factory-master, for he will keep all the profits to himself; - a policeman to them is a "bloody bludgeon-man" - a kind of ogre invented by Sir Robert Peel to swallow or imprison poor Englishmen, and a newspaper stamp the "cursed red slave-mark", at the name of which the Radical spouter lashes himself into a fury, and the Radical audiences discover that we are the most injured and enslaved people on earth."47

This 'difference' could be portrayed in two distinct ways; the ostensibly literal and the obviously fantastic. Of the two, we can assume that the former was intended to inspire moral indignation, while the latter functioned as a means of momentary gratification, temporarily inverting the established social order and thus providing amusement (and a form of empowerment) at the expense of the authorities.48 This form of Carnivalesque inversion had been a staple of graphic satire for decades (think again of Newton's John Bull farting in the face of George III, fig.1). But it was largely redundant by the late 1830s, and would play little part in the new aesthetic of Victorian visual satire, produced as it was by men who were eager to stress their 'respectable' credentials and to cement their position amongst the affluent middle

45 See, for example, John Bull's Picture Gallery, Nos. 15 & 16.
46 "...between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy... who are formed by different breeding, are fed by a different food, and evolved by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws..." Benjamin Disraeli, Sybil. Or, The Two Nations (1845), p.67.
48 As such it forms a kind of 'symbolic inversion' - which can be defined as, "any act of expressive behaviour which inverts, contradicts, abrogates, or in some fashion presents an alternative to commonly held cultural codes, values and norms be they linguistic, literary or artistic, religious, or social and political... inversion (can) be regarded as as a dimension of deliberate, self-conscious, patterned behaviour." Barbara Babcock ed., The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society (1978), pp.14-15. The notion of Carnivalesque inversion of the social order was most famously defined by Mikhail Bakhtin in Rabelais and his World (1988). He suggested that, "Carnival celebrates temporary liberation from the prevailing truth of the established order; it marks the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions. Carnival was the feast of... change and renewal - it was hostile to all that was immortalized and complete." (op.cit., p.109). For a more recent interpretation of Bakhtin's ideas, see Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, The politics and Poetics of Transgression (1986).
classes. Its renewed impetus in the mid '80s was a direct product of the resurgent radical culture of 1830-32, which like that of the 1790's and early 1820's placed a great emphasis on forms of symbolic inversion, ritual and counter-theatre.49

Thus, we find that images abound of the most significant figures of authority being reduced to the status of the destitute and unenfranchised. The first number of Steill's *Caricaturist*, for example, featured two contrasting scenes, one above the other (fig.218). In the upper tier, with the ironic title *All the Majesty of the British Empire!!!!*, we see William IV and Queen Adelaide, resplendent in their royal raiment, albeit both somewhat ungainly. The king sits awkwardly on his throne, while Adelaide strikes a pose of laboured elegance. The irony is more emphatically reinforced in the scenes below, however, which depict what we might see "should their Most Gracious Majesties ever be reduced (which Almighty God forbid!) to the general level of poor humanity." Here, William is reduced to begging at the feet of Lord Grey, while Adelaide has become a broom girl, desperately trying to offload her wares on to - who else? - Brougham. He shows no sympathy, however, and contemptuously thumbs his nose at her.

Similarly, the first issue of Marks' *Parodist* reduced Wellington - the Ultimate Anti-reformer - to the status of a pauper. In *The Beggar's Petition* (fig.219) he sits dressed in ragged clothes, before a schematic representation of Apsley House, with the Hyde Park Achilles statue visible in the background (a direct contrast to his present condition). A small boy offers him a coin, saying, 'Poor Old Chap!!" Below the image is a verse in ten stanzas beginning and ending with the same lines:

"Pity the sorrows of a worn out hack!
Whose trembling limbs have brought him to the floor.
Whose Tory sins have nearly broke his back,
Give all you have and he will ask no more."50

---

49 As James Epstein has emphasised, the employment of "symbolic practices" was central to radical culture: "radicals were able to employ symbolic gestures in ways that served not only to reinforce but also to alter or subvert meanings apparent within written or verbal discourse." "Understanding the Cap of Liberty: Symbolic Practice and Social Conflict in Early Nineteenth-Century England" in Past and Present, No.122 (1989), p.77. See also, idem., "Radical Dining, Toasting and Symbolic Expression in Early Nineteenth-Century Lancashire; Rituals of Solidarity" in Albion, No.20 (1988); Ian McCalman, op.cit. (1988), esp. Ch 7-10; idem., "Popular Irreligion in Early Victorian England: Infidel Preachers and Radical Theatricality in 1830s London" in P.W Davis and H.J. Holmstädter eds., Religion and Ireligion in Victorian Society (1992); I.J. Prothero, Radical Artisans in England and France, 1830-1870 (1997), esp. Ch. 11, 'The Culture of Radical Clubs', pp.281-311.

50 *The Parodist* No.1 (BM 17188).
The first issue of Cowie and Strange's *Barber's Razor* turned its attention to Parliament as a whole, reducing it to a riotous children's playroom. *The Disorderly House; or The Fighting Parliament* (fig.220) depicts ministers attacking one another with pop-guns and rotten eggs, while others resort to fist-fighting. The startled speaker desperately calls for the Police to restore order, thus emphasising his own ineffectuality in his official role. In this manner, ministers are stripped of all the trappings and associations of their office; dignity, order, reason, responsibility and - most of all - authority.

The theme of a disorderly parliament was a recurrent one, and clearly played an important role in the symbolic inversion of the established order. It was taken up in *The Political Drama* No.49 - *The Drunken Parliament Discussing the Prevention of Drunkenness Bill* (fig.221) - in which the accepted public face of the government is played off against a directly contrasting imaginary 'reality', in which reasoned debate is replaced by inebriated babbling along the lines of, "Rum tum tiddy widdy I go wo" and "cock a doodle do!"

The king himself was another obvious target for this sort of treatment, and was frequently depicted as a child or a puppet controlled by Queen Adelaide. In *Billy's Birth Day!* (*Political Drama* No.36 (fig.222)) he sits, mute, dressed in skirts, upon Adelaide's knee, while a group of Tory ministers skip playfully forwards to present him with their gifts. In *The Royal Mopstick Pro-Rogue-ing the Humbug Parliament; Or, Cross Reading the Speech* (*Political Drama* No.22 (fig.223)), he has become a mere mannequin, behind which hides Grey, who uses a trumpet to mimic the King's voice, while the assembled House of Lords listens attentively. The implication is clear: the King is an impotent figurehead, in thrall to a dominant wife and a manipulative parliament. His authority is thus inverted on every level, from his masculinity and his maturity, to his intellect and force of character. He becomes a thoroughly debased being who - in this last example - can barely be considered as human, let alone as the divinely-chosen ruler of the nation.

The inversion of the accepted roles of figures of authority was inevitably extended to the new Metropolitan Police Force, introduced by Peel in 1829 and, as such, the most visible manifestation of authoritarian rule in London (figs.195 & 206). Just
as the Manchester Yeomanry had been adopted as symbols of the abuse of authority in the aftermath of Peterloo, the Metropolitan Police were continually represented as imbecilic, murderous thugs, brutalised and animalistic, with violence and repression as their driving urges. And yet, whereas post-Peterloo graphic satire had at its root the widely-accepted notion that the Yeomanry had been guilty of a severe lapse of judgment, the anti-Police caricatures of the 1830s can be seen as a reaction against the resounding success of the 'Blue Devils' as a force of order and control. Just as William IV was, in his own way, a popular and successful monarch, the Metropolitan Police fulfilled their purpose very effectively, and it is for this reason that they became such an omnipresent spectre within the radical press. Ultimately powerless against them, the reaction of radical satirists was a conventional retreat to the temporary symbolic inversion of Carnival: a celebration of the idea of a world in which the established order was turned upside-down.

In a sense, the format and material characteristics of these prints was related - analogous even - to the process of inversion contained within the images themselves. While the content of the prints attempted to invert the accepted norms of the social structure, the prints themselves - as objects - constituted a form of cultural inversion which took the conventions of a socially-exclusive print medium and adapted them to create something instantly recognisable as a product of radical culture. In basic terms, the structure of radical satirical prints was no different to that of Golden Age or Regency satire: a single image - occasionally more - framed by a border, below which appeared a bold title and a smaller publishing line. In this sense - and also in terms of the size of each individual sheet

51 See Stanley H. Palmer, Police and Protest in England and Ireland, 1780-1850 (1988), esp. pp.303-15. Palmer's study demonstrates how controversial the new police force was. Its establishment in London in 1829 followed an experimental period of activity in Ireland. It was a civil (rather than military) institution, whose principal function at first was the maintenance of order, not the prevention of crime as such. From its beginning, however, it was perceived by many as being 'foreign' and destructive of historic rights and liberties. And yet, the Met proved itself very effective as a means of crowd control, especially once the system of the 'baton charge' was introduced in 1830 - at the suggestion of Francis Place - as a non-lethal means of suppressing crowds (as opposed to that employed at Peterloo). It is unsurprising that many radicals picked up on this success as a means of criticising the "Bloody Bludgeon men".

52 As Philip Ziegler puts it, "he inherited a monarchy in tatters, he bequeathed to his heir the securest throne in Europe." King William IV (1971), p.294.

53 Babcock relates symbolic inversion to the ancient topos of the 'world upside-down' - she defines it as a deliberate, "turning upside down... a reversal of position, order, sequence or relation (op.cit., p.15). Rosalie Little Colie defines it as, "a more or less familiar environment arranged to contrast with the way the world is commonly experienced." Paradoxa Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of Paradox (1966), pp.13-14. In this manner, established conventions can be challenged and, at least temporarily, reversed, thus briefly empowering the challengers (be they artist or audience).
- there was little to distinguish between Drake's *Political Drama* and McLean's *Political Sketches*. The difference came in the style and content of the images contained within the frame, the reproductive technique (which itself influenced the style), the physical properties of the paper on which the images were printed, and the means by which they were disseminated amongst their respective audiences. The symbolic value of these prints as signifiers of cultural difference was rooted not only in their form and content, but also in their 'underground' status as a type of seditious literature. Once again, Thackeray captured much of the appeal behind such prints in typically disdainful terms:

"In the first place, the very defiance of the law was an excitement to the purchaser; the price, another excitement; and furious attacks upon the law and nobility - upon the factory-owner - upon the magistrate and the policeman - upon all who interfered with the presumed liberties, the amusements, or the pockets of the people."  

This process of definition in opposition to 'official' culture was briefly continued by the pro-Chartist satirical broadsheets of the late ‘30s and early ‘40s. While the quarto weeklies of 1832 had developed within the pre-established conventions of cheap miscellaneous periodicals of the 1820s, papers such as Benjamin Cousins' *Penny Satirist* and John Cleave's *London Satirist* grew out of a very different tradition, albeit one which was increasingly becoming a part of lower class experience; the Sunday paper. It is surely no coincidence that *The Penny Satirist* in particular described itself as "a *Cheap Substitute* for a Weekly Paper" (my italics) (*fig.224*). Once again, the radical press chose to define itself in opposition to a product of 'official' - or middle class - culture.

It was these broadsheet papers which, in the short term at least, would carry on the traditions of radical caricature of the mid 1830s, albeit in a much reduced form. The reduction of the Stamp Tax to a penny in June 1836, although a great help to the stamped press, effectively drove the Unstamped out of business, as it was accompanied by much stricter powers of execution.  

The serially issued prints disappeared alongside the Unstamped, just as they had existed alongside it, and from that point onwards, the work of Grant and his anonymous contemporaries

---

Chapter Eight

would be rooted more firmly in the world of the periodical press as such. While *The Penny Satirist* and *The London Satirist* (in their early years at least) provided a vehicle for the expression of similar ideas, the format itself was inevitably more restrictive. As with *Figaro*, the diminished dimensions of wood-engraved periodical illustration were, for the most part, difficult to overcome, and the majority of the cartoons in both papers were small, simple images, reliant upon accompanying captions for their meaning (figs.225-6). Some larger cuts were published occasionally, their dimensions similar to the single sheet prints (fig.227), but these were exceptional. They were also restricted to Cousins' paper, as Cleave never included them in *The London Satirist*. Cousins, who had himself published numerous radical single sheet prints in the early-mid '30s, was perhaps better attuned to the impact this type of image could make, and was thus more amenable to including them on an occasional basis.

As stated in the introduction, these papers fall outside the bounds of this study, and they have been treated at length by Celina Fox. However, it is worth noting one or two of the points to which she drew attention by way of conclusion. Firstly, these papers were - as is so often the case with periodicals - something of a mixed bag, containing a mixture of, "scraps of useful knowledge, theatre reviews and poetry, 'Quips and Cracks'," alongside leaders on, "both long-standing and topical radical grievances." Similarly, their programme of illustration ranged between radical political satire, mild social comedy, documentary illustration, characters and scenes from Dickens, and an array of cuts borrowed from different publications. This kind of 'split personality' points to one of the inevitable drawbacks of such publications in relation to their inclusion of radically-inspired satirical images. While, on the one hand, they set out to continue the tradition of wood-engraved caricature established by Drake, Chubb and others, this ultimately became only a single element of their wider content, and inevitably diminished the impact of the images they included. Even Thackeray noticed this discrepancy between title and content, noting that *The Penny Satirist* and *The London Satirist*, "have very little reason in

56 See, for example, *The Penny Satirist* No.1 and *The London Satirist* No.55 (*Cabinet Makers Upon the Tramp*), figs. 224-225. The documentary cuts were often a different matter altogether (as can be seen in figs. 6 & 225). They could be highly-detailed and competently-engraved. But these were generally borrowed from other publications (and credited as such). They functioned both as an advertisement for the publication in question, and as an added element of visual appeal in the broadsheet (as well as reducing typesetting costs).

57 Fox, *op.cit.* (1988), Chapter Five - 'From Cheap Politics to Cheap Fiction, 1836-1846' - discusses both *The Penny Satirist* and *The London Satirist* in depth, alongside titles such as Renton Nicholson's *The Town*.

their names. It would be quite puzzling to find out whereabouts the satire lies in either of these publications... (their) columns are filled with extracts from magazines or new novels, and present a very harmless and not unamusing variety." While *The Political Drama* or *John Bull's Picture Gallery* had - like caricature of the Golden Age - retained the *single image* as their primary focus, the broadsheet periodicals functioned as a varied miscellany, with each individual element being subservient to the whole.

Indeed, Cleave in particular soon began to downplay the satirical element of his paper. It had begun in October 1837 as *Cleave's London Satirist and Gazette of Variety*, but by the end of the year its title had been changed to *Cleave's Penny Gazette of Variety*. In 1839 it changed again to *Cleave's Penny Gazette of Variety and Amusement*, and by 1841 it was regularly making space within its pages for, "a succession of Romances of 'thrilling interest'". It admitted at the same time that, "however instructive and valuable in itself... much of the matter selected by us has been 'too heavy'." "Thus", says Fox, "by 1842, Cleave had changed his newspaper from one catering for the political needs of a threatened minority to one which sought a more general readership. It had broadened out to take note and make use of contemporary developments in journalism: to admit the power of steam presses, to contemplate the introduction of light literature and to harness itself behind the... pictorial band-wagons of *Punch* and the *Illustrated London News*."

Thus, while the wood-engraved series of 1832-36 had been able to make their politics and their anti-authoritarianism the focus of their format, the broader demands of a periodical miscellany aimed at a general readership ultimately diminished both their aesthetic and their ideological power. Both *The Penny Satirist* and *The London Satirist* published some fine cartoons in their early years, but these were quickly supplanted by the latest adaptation of Dickens or something similar. By 1838, even Grant was producing documentary descriptions of Queen Victoria's coronation, to which *The Penny Satirist* devoted the whole of its celebratory title page that week (fig.228). This was a far cry from the contempt he had traditionally shown towards the monarchy, and from the treatment dealt out to

60 *Cleave's Penny Gazette of Variety and Amusement*, 27th February, 1841.
61 Ibid, pp. 175-76.
William IV and Queen Adelaide by radical satirists in general. But times were changing, and Fox has emphasised the extent to which moderate radicals such as Francis Place (a friend of Cleave, who sought his advice on the direction of his Gazette) disapproved of the rough and crude quality of Grant’s cuts for the series: “he implied that the whole look of the publication, with its rough woodcuts by Grant, was inclined to make it seem disreputable to those who did not pause to examine the text; it suggested the lingering on of the old unfocussed anger and abuse into a new political reality and the progress of technology.”62 Just how ‘unfocussed’ the abuse of earlier radical caricature had been is open to question, but the main point remains; that the earlier prints and the later periodicals functioned in very different ways. The former courted their sense of ‘disreputability’, while the latter (within a few years of their launch) seemed determined to demonstrate a degree of ‘respectability’ wholly divorced from the transgressive themes of 1832-36. It was the difference between focussed satire and broad amusement.

In April 1846, the title of The Penny Satirist was also changed (to The London Pioneer). In an address entitled ‘Signs of the Times’, Cousins stated that he was doing so because, “the word ‘SATIRIST’ is associated with untoward events which have happened to the proprietor of a paper bearing that title,” and it did not want to be confused with it.63 The paper in question was Barnard Gregory’s The Satirist, one of the ‘scandalous’ titles in the mould of Nicholson’s The Town, and Cousins’ decision to change the emphasis of his own title mirrors that of Cleave.64 It also speaks volumes about the power of word-association upon audience-identification with a specific title. Neither Cousins nor Cleave wanted their papers to appear disreputable, aware as they were of changing tastes, and the financial necessity of courting as broad an audience as possible. Elsewhere in the same issue, Cousins explicitly laid down the situation as he saw it, detailing the dilemma facing the remains of the radical press at the time;

“It now remains to be proved whether the people shall have a cheap press - a penny press - that shall advocate their rights, or whether they shall have to depend on a dear monopolist press, which shifts its

62 Ibid., p.182.
63 The Penny Satirist, 25th April 1846.
64 Although The Satirist - edited by Barnard Gregory - survived until 1849, it was notorious for the regular libel actions taken out against it. These were especially prevalent in the mid 1840s, and it seems likely that Cousins was referring to the most recent of these. See Gray, loc.cit. (1982), pp. 340-41 for details.
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opinions according to the weight of the purse presented for the prostitution of its columns. He is aware his task is a difficult one - that if he introduces too much political, philosophical, or educated matter into his paper, his readers will not be sufficiently numerous to enable him to proceed. If, on the other hand, he inserts too much of what is called "light reading", he runs the risk of losing his best and most esteemed supporters. He will do as the "old man with the ass" did. He will try to please them all - whether with the same, or better, success, remains to be proved."65

"To please them all" was, it seems, the prime purpose of the satirical press as it developed in the early Victorian era, a criterion which had decisively begun to manifest itself in the 1830s. The conventions of radical wood-engraved caricature - however much they had drawn upon certain aspects of the periodical form - had remained largely free from this demand, by virtue of their status as prints rather than periodicals. They made use of the periodical's continuity of format and sequential numbering, but did not become reliant upon the dominance of letterpress text. They thus remained individual, autonomous pictorial statements, unencumbered by any surrounding texts of a miscellaneous nature which might detract from their visual and ideological impact.

65 The Penny Satirist, April 26th, 1846.
Conclusion

"Times and tastes were changing. In England caricature had had a very free time during the Napoleonic episode. But, apart from evolution in manners, changes were taking place in the modes of producing and publishing caricatures which were to have far-reaching effects upon the whole future of graphic satire, its forms, conventions and temper. Wood-engraving began to to supersede copper-plate etching... floods of caricatures of indifferent quality, mostly anonymous, made their appearance. Caricatures dropped in price from a shilling to a penny. Greater simplicity and speed of reproduction foreshadowed a significant change. Caricature was to be taken under the wing of the press."¹

- Sir David Low

With the above passage - used to link the early career of John Doyle in the late 1820s with that of the young John Leech in the early '40s - Sir David Low briefly encapsulated the complex process of transformation undergone by English Graphic satire in the 1830s. Given that this transformation would have profound implications for his own social and professional status a century later (like Tenniel, he was awarded a knighthood for his work) it seems somewhat surprising that he should devote a mere dozen lines or so to describing it. But it is not an easy transformation to explain. At the heart of the issue, though, is the primary factor which Low was able to identify: graphic satire was, "taken under the wing of the press". Although this process has traditionally been seen as beginning with the launch of Punch, it is plausible to suggest that Punch itself would never have established itself without the concentrated period of experimentation undergone during the 1830s. It was here that graphic satire and the periodical press first began to coexist on a regular basis.

In retrospect, the development of graphic satire in the 1830s can be regarded as a

¹ Sir David Low, British Cartoonists, Caricaturists and Comic Artists (1942), p.17.
series of false starts. This in itself is characteristic of a transitional phase between two distinct traditions, and it was instrumental in shaping the nature of the material during the period. As artists and publishers struggled to accommodate the differing expectations of an expanding and increasingly diversified public, they created a range of commodities of widely disparate appearance and intent. This brief period of change and reinvention can be measured by the lifespan of *The Looking Glass* - a publication which was, in many ways, the most characteristic product of the decade. It embodied several of the defining elements of the period, including a regular format, a reliance on serialisation, a simplification of imagery, and a broad, inoffensive content. But by the time McLean finally put the series to rest at the end of 1836, the market for serially-issued satirical prints of whatever sort had effectively evaporated. The only notable exception to this rule was *The Political Sketches*, which would stagger on until 1851. But 1836 also marked a sudden decline in the frequency and regularity of Doyle's output which would never be reversed.2

However, while the 1830s have traditionally been regarded as fallow years for English graphic satire, the period up to 1836 at least should be re-evaluated in the light of the material discussed above. In quantitative terms, these were years of considerable activity, which repudiates the notion that 1832 marked the beginning of a decade-long limbo for satirical illustration. Although the individually issued single sheet caricature undoubtedly fell into decline at this point, the subsequent four or five years produced a number of formats which are unique to the period.3

What is revealed by an examination of the material is the extent to which the basic concept of periodicity came to inform the production of satirical imagery even beyond the pages of satirical periodicals as such. The *Figaro*-type papers are the most obvious example of periodical-based graphic satire, but *The Looking Glass* should also be considered as a periodical, despite the relationship of its material characteristics to the single sheet print. But even single sheet prints were, increasingly being issued in serial format during the period.

---

2 Doyle's annual output began to dwindle in 1836, rapidly so from 1844. By 1848-9 he was producing less than one print per month, none at all in 1850, and only one - the 917th and last part of *The Political Sketches* - in 1851. BMC, Vol.XI, p.xlvii.

3 But, as stated in the introduction, what little attention has been paid to these years has been based on incomplete source material (the collection of the British Museum). While this collection has been considerably expanded since the BMC was completed, it has only recently been sorted into the kind of coherent order which might encourage further analysis.
As the preceding chapters have demonstrated, the consequences of this were immediate, and they were threefold. Firstly, images were increasingly defined in relation to other images, rather than functioning autonomously as individual objects. This was true whether they appeared within the pages of a periodical, in a multi-panel print or as part of a thematically and formally unified series of prints. Secondly, the role of the publisher became ever more prominent as the site of identification for audiences who were persuaded to return to a particular series by its consistency of format and content from issue to issue. This in turn led to an increasing element of caution on the part of publishers, most of whom avoided controversial subjects and drew as much as possible from the most popular and all-embracing topics imaginable (hence an increasing focus on social comedy, as epitomised by the rise of the ‘Character’ prints). Thirdly, the role of the artists suffered considerably. As their individual identities were obscured by the all-encompassing (but largely anonymous) body of a serial publication, any need for stylistic individuality was replaced by the necessity of retaining a coherent appearance throughout the run of a title. Already we can begin to define different styles of satirical imagery in terms of generic types, rather than individual creative characteristics - a phenomenon which would only increase as the century progressed. It is common now to talk about ‘Punch cartoons’ or ‘Vanity Fair lithographs’, a terminology which devolves the identity of the creators onto the publication in which their work appears. It was in the 1830s that this process began, with satirical illustration frequently becoming conventionalised - reduced to a readily definable idiom - whether it be the ‘HB style’, the small cuts which appeared in the penny weeklies, or the generic physical comedy of the Character prints.

In combination with one another, these factors created a form of visual satire very different from that which had prevailed during the Golden Age. While graphic satire in general can be regarded as a limited category of visual culture, a much wider range of styles had prevailed during the Georgian era; from the virtuoso displays of Gillray to the ‘cruder’, but no less characteristic work of Newton; from the animated line of Rowlandson to the static figures of Bunbury; and from the detailed hatching of the Darlys’ social satires to the simple line of Townshend’s political caricatures. But the 1830s saw an increasing tendency towards a homogeneity of format, style and content. A level of artistic independence was replaced by the guiding hand of
Conclusion

a publisher or editor, and the contentious themes of politics, sex and scatology were phased out in favour of the broad appeal of familiar social stereotypes and the world of the 'everyday' as experienced by a broad lower-middle-class audience. Although this trend was not yet fully formed, and we can still identify some diversity of material up to 1836, it was picking up pace throughout the period. The work of someone such as Grant was exceptional, and must be seen alongside the careers of men such as Henry Heath and Seymour, both of whom adopted the style of HB; or of William Heath, who saw his own creation wrested away from him by his publisher within a matter of months.

This situation was aided by the fact that several of the most prominent publishers of the period - Spooner, Hodgson, Kendrick, Dawson - had not been active in the field of graphic satire prior to 1832, and so did not emerge directly from the tradition of single sheet political caricature. Even Tregear and Gans had only established themselves post-1830, and were quicker to embrace new conventions than to retain older ones. But perhaps the most important factor of all was the adoption of graphic satire by the publishers of Paternoster Row and Holywell Street, who were pressmen in the truest sense of the word. It was here that the future of English graphic satire would take shape, not with printsellers such as McLean, Tregear or Gans. Two parallel trends can be identified in the 1830s which informed and influenced one another, but which remained largely separate throughout the decade. The first of these can be defined as 'Typographic'. By this I mean not only a focus on letterpress type, but also the inclusion of wood engraved illustration which, as mentioned earlier, retains a definite kinship with typeset text by virtue of the printing process which they share, and also their inherently rigid, linear, black and white qualities. This tradition embraced both the penny journals and the penny prints.

The second can be considered a more conventionally visual tradition, and remained a part of a more exclusive print culture. This was characterised by the prints of McLean, King, Kendrick and others, the material characteristics of which are more directly related to Golden Age caricature. The first of these traditions was emergent during the '30s, the second was in decline, but both were united in their reliance on serialisation. More specifically, the first was directly related to the journalistic sphere, the second to the pictorial, but both adopted aspects of the
other in order to create and satisfy new niche markets within the expanding market for printed works of all kinds. It is difficult to establish a direct pattern of cause and effect in this respect, but undoubtedly the journalistic and the visual spheres were interrelated during the period. This was demonstrated on one level by the development of the multi-panel print as a 'pictorial companion' to text-based journals, and on another by the relationship between the radical penny prints and the unstamped press. The middle ground between the two was constituted by penny periodicals such as Figaro.

The standardisation of form which is an integral aspect of the periodical press brought with it a related standardisation of the type of imagery which satirical publications contained. In numerous instances artists' work no longer existed autonomously, and was instead subservient to the demands of a broader framework - an issue of a periodical or a series in its entirety - and graphic satirists would gradually re-think the way they made images accordingly. This had a number of implications. Firstly, images became increasingly reliant upon accompanying texts and were often severely restricted in their dimensions. Therefore, a simplification of content and style was inevitable; visual abbreviation became the norm, aided by the inclusion of explanatory captions. This alteration in the status and function of images was noted by Gleeson White in the late nineteenth century, in relation to Punch; "In the London Charivari many of the pictures have always been inserted quite independently of the text. Some have a title, and some a brief scrap of dialogue to explain their story; but the picture is not there to elucidate the anecdote, so much as the title, or fragment of conversation, helps to elucidate the picture."4 But this process of change began in earnest in the 1830s, and not only in regard to the wood-engraved cuts found in Figaro. The same process of reduction and simplification can be found in the Cruikshankian scrapsheets, the Character prints, and The Looking Glass (especially in its early years). Even The Political Sketches, more often than not, featured very simple compositions, elucidated by the briefest of captions. All of these were either etched or lithographed, but each of them was reliant upon the same continuity of format and the relationship of numerous images to others which surrounded them, whether on the same sheet or on others of a similar size and format. Only Grant, it seems, was able to put these conventions to use in a striking and original manner, overcoming their limitations by introducing a thematic or narrative unity in which

4 Gleeson White, English Illustration; The 'Sixties' (1897), p.17.
each individual image on a page contributed to the structure and meaning of the whole.

Secondly, the 1830s saw a marked increase in the sequential numbering of single sheet prints, which again has to be considered in the light of the expanding periodical press. In 1828, *The Political Sketches* had inaugurated a new tradition in the field of political prints, not only in terms of its style and tone, but also in regard to its format. Although published in occasional batches, rather than adhering to a strict periodicity, they effected a fundamental change in the marketing of graphic satire which can be directly related to the growth of serialised publications in the early-mid nineteenth century. As the market for individually-issued single sheets evaporated in 1832-3, we find an increasing number of sequentially-numbered series taking their place. These incorporated the multi-panel prints, the Character prints of the early-mid '30s, and the numerous wood-engraved print series which emanated from the radical press. But virtually all the most important mid-market publishers - Gans, Tregear, Duncombe, King, Kendrick and Dawson - also issued series of prints which took the older conventions of single sheet satire and adapted them to serial publication in one form or another. Thus, it soon becomes clear that this form of periodicity was one of the defining characteristics of graphic satire in the 1830s.

These prints ranged from small etchings such as Duncombe's *Comical Fits and Fancies* (1831) to lithographs such as Tregear's *Laughing Made Easy* and Dawson's *Whim Whams* (1834 and 35). Few of them gave prominent credit to their artists, although Kendrick published several issues of *Grant's Oddities* in 1834, and Spooner did likewise with *Heath's Oddities* at around the same time. These all contained a mild form of social satire, but in 1834 Tregear also began to publish more traditional political prints in serialised form, under the collective title of *John Bull's Nursery Rhymes*. In 1835, Dawson also published several issues of an overtly political series - *The Reflector* - which consisted of densely-detailed crayon

---

5 *Comical Fits and Fancies* lasted for at least ten numbers in 1831.  
6 Even the political references in Duncombe's series are couched in terms of a comic social exchange. In No.9 - *Virtuous Indignation*, fig.229 - a lower-middle-class type addresses the parish beadle: "Of what use is it for a single individual like you to oppose Reform." ; "Call me the Parish Beadle a Individul! then I say Sir you're another." The humour stems from a reversal of each character's authority. The unenfranchised parishioner is portrayed as sensible, level-headed and articulate, while the figure of authority is a boorish buffoon, incapable of engaging in a coherent debate. The difference between this type of print and those which were more common after 1832 is marked.  
7 No.2 was published on 6th March 1834 and announced as "to be continued".
lithographs by Grant. These series were varied in character, but were united by their continuity of format, and each relied upon the repetition of themes and motifs from print to print; the witty exchange, the social stereotype, the comic mishap or misunderstanding, and so on.

By way of a caveat, however, it should be stressed that exceptions to this trend can be found. At the dawn of the Victorian era, Tregear was still publishing the occasional print which, in every way, was more characteristic of Georgian graphic satire. An example such as *The QUEEN BEE in her HIVE!!!* (August 29th 1837, [fig.229]) is immediately rooted in the eighteenth-century tradition of emblematic satire, depicting a pyramidal view of the social structure in the form of a beehive. The Queen perches at its pinnacle, while beneath her the eye descends from the ‘Drones’ (the heads of the Church) to the ‘Common or Working Bees’ (tailors, hatters, weavers, watchmakers, carpenters, etc.) and ‘the LAST’ (cheesemongers, grocers, fishmongers - and, significantly, printers). Below these are the petty thieves, gamblers, quacks, and sham auctioneers, and finally come the “Humble bees’ - the destitute. The theme is reinterpreted in a contemporary context, as is appropriate for the beginning of a new era, emphasising the nation as a centre of industry under its new monarch. It is a representation rather than a condemnation of the present social structure, and thus fits well within the early Victorian tradition of less contentious subject matter. But nevertheless, it is an interesting example of the survival of older visual and material conventions, which already seem antiquated and anachronistic in the light of the developments of the past seven years. This anachronism is further emphasised by the fact that the print is actually an etching rather than a lithograph - a technique not widely used by the trade since 1830-’31.

But such examples are rare, and the prevailing trend remained towards serialisation. However, when putting these developments into the wider context of nineteenth-century graphic satire, it becomes clear that they were short lived. By the end of 1836, Seymour was dead; both George and Robert Cruikshank had left the field of political satire (and the format of the single sheet) behind them; and William Heath had apparently retired from the print trade altogether. He too would be dead by 1840. Both Grant and Henry Heath continued to eke out a living in the

---

8 From the BM’s collection of Supplementary Satires. The print is signed pseudonymously by ‘Timothy Wasp, Esq.’
trade for several years after 1836, but their work became increasingly erratic and infrequent. Heath in particular seems to have had difficulty finding steady employment in the field after this point. *The Looking Glass* did not long survive Seymour; Grant ended *Every Body’s Album* in mid-1835; the brief explosion of Character prints was limited to the years between 1833 and 1835; and the radical wood-engraved series disappeared alongside the majority of the Unstamped in 1836. By this time, even *The Political Sketches* was entering its protracted period of decline. Tilt continued to publish *The Comic Almanack* until 1853, and Bell achieved enormous sales with *The Gallery of Comicalities* until 1840, but the focus of these was on social comedy rather than overt political satire. Thus, most of the established names in the field had moved into other areas by 1836, and almost all the publications discussed above had ceased. This left *Figaro in London* as the only survivor from the beginning of the decade which could still offer any form of spirited political satire.

With this in mind, the longevity of *Figaro* is quite remarkable. While this must have had some connection to the superior quality of its content (in relation to journals of a similar type at least), it seems likely that it had as much to do with the habitual nature of the periodical-buying public and the extent to which this was encouraged by the regular format of the periodical itself. à Beckett was fortunate that *Figaro* had established itself so quickly, thus enabling it - from a very early stage - to survey its many imitators from an elevated position. It had the benefit of being the first of its kind, and this, it seems, carried a great deal of weight with the public. When faced with a multiplicity of similar titles, it might have seemed safest to opt for the best-established as a 'guarantee' of quality. The very fact that *Figaro* had reached a higher issue number, and that it had established a regular format and layout, can be considered instrumental in securing its survival as others fell by the wayside. That à Beckett was astute enough to define the expansion of the market in relation to his own paper ('Figaro-mania') was also instrumental in cementing the notion of *Figaro* as the archetypal example of its kind. Almost as soon as it had established itself, its battle was effectively won. It needed only to maintain a consistent façade in order to retain its core readership. However, while the homogeneity of form and content inspired by *Figaro* undoubtedly ushered in a new era of satirical journalism, it must also be seen as having been detrimental to the field of graphic satire in general.
Conclusion

By the late 1830s - and prior to the birth of *Punch* in 1841 - only the broadsheet Chartist papers (*The Penny Satirist* and *The London Satirist*) remained as regular vehicles for graphic satire. And while these had begun by maintaining the spirit of the penny prints of 1832-6, they would quickly downplay this element of their content in favour of serialised fiction. By this point the future of graphic satire was inextricably bound to the periodical. Throughout the decade this had been the dominant trend in one form or another, whether in *Figaro*, *The Looking Glass*, *The Political Sketches* or *The Political Drama*. But these were all very different types of publication, ranging from the highest to the lowest end of the market. What was needed now was a format which would occupy a middle ground between the extremes - with a broader and more 'respectable' appeal than the radical penny publications, but less exclusive than the multi-panel or single sheet prints, which still cost at least a shilling. This would only come about in the following decade, when the foundations laid in the 1830s were built upon with some determination. By 1841, graphic satire was well on its way to becoming institutionalized in the pages of *Punch* in a manner which both *The Looking Glass* and *Figaro* ultimately failed to achieve.
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7. Richard Newton
   Treason! (etching, 1798)
8. John Tenniel
   The Sunday Question (Wood engraving, Punch, 17th April, 1869)
9. Linley Sambourne
   *Royal Academy Banquet at Burlington House* (wood engraving, *Punch*, 7th May, 1881)

10. John Doyle ('HB')
    *The Lame Leading the Blind* (lithograph, *Political Sketches*, 1832)
11. George Cruikshank
   *March* (etching, *The Comic Almanack*, Vol 1, 1835)

12. C.J. Grant (?)
   *Ready Wit* (lithograph, *Tregear's Flights of Humour*, No. 13, 1833)

15. C.J. Grant

Cleave's Picture Gallery of Grant's Comicalities (wood engravings, c.1836-7)
16. Joe Lisle  
17. Joe Lisle

The World (etching and aquatint, c.1832-3)  
A Designing Character (etching, c.1832-3)
18. Anon.  
*The Anti Reform Eruption* (lithograph, 1831)

19. Anon.  
*The Homage* (lithograph, 1830)
20. Anon.  
The LOUVRE, Or the National Gallery of France - No. 100 PALL MALL, Or the National Gallery of England (lithograph, 1832)

21. C.J. Grant  
A Correct View of the Conflagration of Both Houses of Parliament as Seen from the River at 8 o'clock in the Evening, Oct. 16th 1834 (lithograph, Oct 21st, 1834)
22. Robert Seymour  
*Memoranda of the French Revolution*  
(lithograph, *The Looking Glass*, No.9, September 1830, p.1)

23. Roberts Seymour  
*Memoranda of the French Revolution*  
(lithograph, *The Looking Glass*, No.9, September 1830, p.2)
Caught Napping (lithograph, Political Sketches, 8th March 1832)

Another Ominous Conjunction (lithograph, Political Sketches, 14th July 1832)
26. John Doyle ('HB')  
Votaries at the Altar of Discord (lithograph, *Political Sketches*, 20th April 1832)
27. Robert Seymour
John Bull's Nightmare (etching, January 1828)

28. Robert Seymour
A Pot-Walloper (lithograph, 14th July 1830)
29. C. J. Grant  
The Reform Bill *HALTER'D A LITTLE*  
(lithograph, April 1831)

30. William Heath  
*Poor Mr. Bull in a Pretty Situation*  
(etching, March 1830)
31. C.J. Grant & 'Sharpshooter'  
   Going! Going! (lithograph, 12th November 1830)

32. Anon.  
   The March of Silenus (lithograph, The Fly, No.1, 28th October 1838)
33. Henry Heath
The Political See-Saw! (lithograph, The Satirist, No.3, January 1838)

34. Anon.
J. Liston As Figaro (lithograph, Figaro in London, No.275, 1838)
35. C.J. Grant  
36. Robert Seymour

A Perfect Fright, Or The Ogreman Duke in Ernest (lithograph, September 1832)  
The Royal Galloper (wood engraving, Asmodeus in London, No.31, September 29th, 1832)
Carrion Crows in John Bull's Cornfield (lithograph, July 1832)

Carrion Crows in John Bull's Cornfield (wood engraving, The Weekly Show-Up, No. 3, July 14th 1832)
39. C. J. Grant & G. Tregear

Battle Royal Between the Whig National School Boys and the Tory Charity Crabs (lithograph, May 1832)

40. C. J. Grant (?)

Grand Battle Between the Union School Boys and the Tory Rabble (wood engraving, The Weekly Show-Up, No.3, July 14th 1832)
41. Robert Seymour

November (wood engraving, The Political Almanack for 1836)
44. Anon.  
Scenes From “The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte” (wood engraving, The Penny Satirist, No.127, September 23rd 1839)  
Figaro Vs. The Blue Devils (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No.17, 31st March 1832)
46. Robert Seymour
   *Strong Room for Improvement* (wood engraving, *The Comic Magazine*, No. 2, April 1832)

47. Robert Seymour
   *The Staff at Headquarters* (wood engraving, *The Comic Magazine*, No. 2, April 1832)
Fac Simile (sic) of the Late Mr. Seymour's Sketch for FIGARO (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No. 220, 30th April, 1836)

Seymour's Last Sketch (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No. 221, 7th May 1836)
50. William Heath & C.J. Grant

Drunkards on Parade (etching, May 1830)
Conjugation of the Verb To REFORM

Say after me:
I Should Reform
Then Should Reform
We Should Reform
You Should Reform
They Should Reform

I Can't Reform

The School of REFORM.

The School of REFORM (lithograph, February 1831)
The School of REFORM (lithograph, c. February 1831)
53. C. J. Grant  
The School for Tory Tory Rogues (wood engraving, Political Drama No. 109, 1834)

54. C. J. Grant  
Tommy Grey With the Tail of His Order  
(lithograph, 15th February 1831)
55. ‘TF’

Tommy Gray With the Tail of His Order
(lithograph, c. February 1831)

56. William Heath

Tommy Gray With the Tail of His Order
(lithograph, 15th February 1831)
57. C.J. Grant  
Public Robbers Consulting Under Their Favourite Tree (lithograph, 1832)

58. 'JCW' & C. J. Grant  
Public Robbers Consulting Under Their Favourite Tree (lithograph, 1832)
Desperate Condition of the Tory Gang.

Desperate Condition of the Tory Gang
(wood engraving, c. July 1832)
Kick'd Out, or Billy Putting His Foot In It

Kick'd Out, or Billy Putting His Foot In It
(lithograph, 1832)

Kick'd Out, or Billy Putting His Foot In It
(wood engraving, 1832)
Can't I do what I like with my own?

TAKING THE BOROMONGERS HOME.

62. C.J. Grant

Taking the Boromongers Home
(lithograph, c.June 1832)
63. C.J. Grant (?)  
   *Old Nick's Gatherings* (wood engraving, 
   *John Bull's Picture Gallery*, No.6, c.June 
   1832)

64. Anon.  
   *The Gatherings of Old Nick!* (wood 
   engraving, c.June 1832)
65. James Cope

*Y Tories yn Cael en Cymred Adref at eu Təulu* (wood engraving, c. June 1832)
PROTECTING THE SABBATH

C.J. Grant

Protecting the Sabbath (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 1, c. March 1833)

Protecting the Sabbath (lithograph, Political Drama, No. 7, March 1833)
C.J. Grant

John Bull Or, An Englishman’s Fireside
(wood engraving, Political Drama, No.4, c. April 1833)

C.J. Grant

John Bull Or, An Englishman’s Fireside
(lithograph, Political Drama, No.8, April 1833)
70. C.J. Grant

The Modern Puritan (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.2, c. April 1833)

71. C.J. Grant

The Modern Puritan (lithograph, Political Drama, No.6, April 1833)
Title Page to Darly's Comic Prints of Characters, Caricatures and Macaronies (engraving, 1776)
73. G.M. Woodward
Titlepiece to Tegg's Caricature Magazine, Vol. I (etching, 1807)

74. G.M. Woodward
Frontispiece to Tegg's Caricature Magazine, Vol. I (etching, 1808)
75. George Cruikshank  Wrapper for My Sketch Book Part One (etching, 1834)
75a. George Cruikshank Folio from Scraps and Sketches Part One (etching, 20th May 1828)
THE OMNIBUS.

WHAT SORT OF COMPANY GO IN THE OMNIBUS?
OH! ALL SORTS.

BY

R. SEYMOUR.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY THOMAS McLEAN, 28, HAYMARKET.
May 1st, 1830.

76. Robert Seymour

Wrapper for *The Omnibus* (1830)
Folio from *The Omnibus* (etching, 1830)
80. Various
81. Various

Scrapbook Page (c.1835)
Scrapbook Page (c.1835)
82. Various
83. C.J. Grant

Scrapbook Page (c.1835)
Title Page for *The Caricatuist*, No.2
(lithograph, September 1831)
83a. C.J. Grant
Back Page of *The Caricaturist* No.2
(lithograph, September 1831)

84. C.J. Grant
*LITERARY REVIEW* - The London Press,
Or *A File of Newspaper Readers*
(lithograph, *The Caricaturist* No.2,
September 1831)
85. C.J. Grant

86. Anon.

Approaching Dissolution of Bell’s Life (Blackguard’s Journal) (lithograph, The Caricaturist No.2, September 1831)
The gallery of 140 Comicalities Part One (wood engraving, 24th January 1831)
Pictorial Companion to the Newspapers and Every Body's Album No. 1 (lithograph, 15th January 1835)
87. William Heath

88. William Heath

Title Page for *The Northern Looking Glass*, No. 1 (lithograph, 11th June 1825)
Advertisements (lithograph, *The Northern Looking Glass*, No. 1, 11th June 1825)
The Northern Looking Glass No. 6
(lithograph, 20th August 1825)
Prospectus (Detail of fig. 87)
91. William Heath

Part of the Crypt Under the Chapter House and Choir of Glasgow Cathedral (lithograph, The Northern Looking Glass, No. 7, 3rd September, 1825)

92. William Heath

Glasgow Fair (lithograph, The Northern Looking Glass, No. 4, 23rd July 1825)
93. William Heath

94. William Heath

Text Page from The Northern Looking Glass No.3 (lithograph, 9th July 1825)
My House in Town (etching, The Northern Looking Glass No.15, 23rd January 1826)
The Life of a Soldier (etching, The Northern Looking Glass, No.12, 12th December 1825)

The Life of a Soldier - Text (The Northern Looking Glass, No.12, 12th December 1825)
100. Robert Seymour
Title Page for *The looking Glass* No.8
(lithograph, 1st August 1830)
103. Robert Seymour

The Colossus (lithograph, McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.22, 1st October 1832)

104. Robert Seymour

Returning Fra the North; Or, the Effects of Unco Gude Living (lithograph, McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.58, 1st October 1834)
105. Robert Seymour

A Well Known Antique (lithograph, McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures, No 70, 1st October 1835)

106. Henry Heath (?)

We'll All Have Two Shots Apiece At' em (lithograph, McLean's Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.81, 1st September 1836)
107. Henry Heath (?)  
Title Page for *McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures* No. 80, (lithograph, 1st August 1836)

108. Henry Heath  
Detail from *McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures* No. 82, p. 2 (lithograph, 1st October 1836)
109. Henry Heath

The Patent Travelling Squirt (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.96, 1st November 1836)

110. Henry Heath

The London Lions (lithograph, McLean’s Monthly Sheet of Caricatures No.78, 1st June 1836)

THE PENNY TRUMPETER

C.J. Grant

The Penny Trumpeter (lithograph, 29th September 1832)
FRONTISPICE FOR THE PENNY MAGAZINE
Of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

112. C.J. Grant
Frontispiece for the Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol. 1 (lithograph, c. late 1832)
113. C.J. Grant
Frontispiece for the Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol.2 Lithograph, May 1833)

114. C.J. Grant
Frontispiece to the "Doctor" - The Lancet; Medical Gazette; Gazette of Health; &c. (lithograph, July 1833)
115. C. J. Grant

Frontispiece to the Cookery Books
(lithograph, September 1833)

116. C. J. Grant

Frontispiece to the Sporting Magazines
(lithograph, October 1833)
117. C.J. Grant

117a. C.J. Grant

Frontispiece to Chambers's Information for the People The Edinburgh Journal & Historical Newspaper (lithograph, 21st June 1834)

Detail of fig. 117
118. C.J. Grant

Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No. 1 (lithograph, 1st January 1834)

119. C.J. Grant

A pair of Obstacles (detail of fig.118)
120. C.J. Grant

A Specimen of British Elections
(lithograph, Every Body's Album, No.26, 15th January 1835)

121. C.J. Grant

The Century of Invention. Anno Domini 2000. Or the March of Aerostation, Steam, Rail Roads, Moveable Houses & Perpetual Motion !!!! (lithograph, Every Body's Album, No.3, 1st February 1834)
122. C.J. Grant

The Cigar Mania (lithograph, Every Body's Album, No. 12, 13th June 1834)

123. C.J. Grant

The Jolly Anglers in a High Wind (lithograph, Every Body's Album, No. 18, 13th September 1834)
124. C.J. Grant
A Few of Our Contemporaries, Or The London Press Gang (lithograph, Every Body’s Album, No.34, 15th May 1835)

125. C.J. Grant
Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine, No.4 (lithograph, 14th February 1834)
126. C.J. Grant  
Every Body’s Album and Caricature Magazine, No.8 (lithograph, 13th April 1834)

127. C.J. Grant  
Every Body’s Album & Caricature Magazine, No.10 (lithograph, 15th May 1834)
128. C.J. Grant

Every Body's Album & Caricature
Magazine No. 15 (lithograph, 1st August 1834) Detail

128a. C.J. Grant

Every Body's Album & Caricature
Magazine No. 15 (lithograph, 1st August 1834) Detail
EVERY BODYS ALBUM
& CARICATURE MAGAZINE
Number 16 (lithograph, 15th August 1834)
130. C. J. Grant  
A Dead Robbery (lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.34, 15th May 1835)

131. C.J. Grant  
The Suicide Club (lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No. 22, 15th November 1834)
132. C.J. Grant

Monkeys in the State Conservatory
(lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.33, 1st May 1835)

133. C.J. Grant

The Bridal Night! (lithograph, Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine, No.38, 10th August, 1835)
134. C.J. Grant  
Silhouetted vignettes from *Every Body's Album & Caricature Magazine No.2,* (lithograph, 13th January 1834)  
*A Radical Cure* (detail of fig.118)

135. C.J. Grant
136. George Cruikshank

London Going Out of town, Or The March of Bricks and Mortar (etching, Scraps and Sketches, Part Two, 1829)

137. C.J. Grant

Adventures of the Buggins’s to Gravesend. V. Margate & Back Again (lithograph, Every Body’s Album & Caricature Magazine, No.14, 15th July 1834)
138. C.J. Grant

Lawk What a Shocking Bad Hat
(lithograph, Tregear's Flights of Humour, No. 15, c. 1833)

138a. Anon.

What's the Use of This Here Weatherglass?
(lithograph, Funny Characters, No. 16, c. 1833-4)
139. Anon.  
139a. Anon.

Sam Slick's Oddities No.1 (lithograph, c.1833-4)  
Eccentricities No.1 (lithograph, C.1833-4)
139b. Anon. 

*Notions of the Agreeable No.90*  
(lithograph, c.1833-4)

139c. Anon. 

*Liberality! (lithograph, Funny Ideas, No.2, c.1833-4)*
139d. C.J. Grant
Whim Whams No. 4 (lithograph, 1835)
The Mirror

LITERATURE, AMUSEMENT, AND INSTRUCTION.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28th, 1831.

Sheffield, Yorkshire.

Text about the opening of Figaro in London and a rejected king's speech.

FIGARO IN LONDON:

Rejection of King's Speech.
142. Robert Seymour

Portraits of the Political Burkers! (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.3, 24th December 1831)

143. Robert Seymour

Grand Political Pantomime (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.4, 31st December 1831)
144. Robert Seymour

May Day (wood engraving, Figaro in London No. 22, 1st May 1832)

145.

Advertisement for Figaro in London, (wood engraving, January 1832)
The above caricature is so purely hieroglyphical that we decline any attempt at explaining it. The artist when he conceived it must have been under some strange and painful influence which we cannot possibly attempt either to enter or elucidate. We suspect that he was labouring under some frightful stagnation of his vital functions, and the result has been a vivid affair, which we can only describe as a pictorial frenzy. The fact is that our caricaturist has been so long and deeply impregnated with the horrible aspect of political affairs, that his mind has at last become in some degree impressed with a hectic extravagance that has now vented itself in a caricature, which must take its place by the side of that grand effort to make which an Italian painter crucified his own servant, that he might the more faithfully represent the agony on the cross, which he had...
FIGARO IN LONDON.

They acknowledged their blood, did not quite admit their union. Billy, however, was congratulated by his old master, who actually went to Paris for one of them, and his house has experience pretty well to show for it.

Figaro's second masthead (wood engraving, January 1835)

Figaro's third masthead (wood engraving, May 1835)
150. Robert Cruikshank  
A Slap at the Times, No.1 (wood engraving, 1832)  
The Life and Death Schedules A and B (wood engraving, A Slap at the Times, No.1, 1832)
152. William Newman

153. Anon.
The Expulsion of Cumberland (wood engraving, *Figaro in London* No.291, 1st July 1837)
154. Anon.

Mr. W. Farren as Father Matthias, in "Ask No Questions." (wood engraving, Figaro in London No.360, 5th November 1838)

155. Anon.

Mr. W. Farren, as Father Matthias and Miss Pool, in Farinelli (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No.393, 15th June 1839)
156. Anon. Lord Brougham (wood engraving, Figaro in London, 29th June 1839)

159. Anon.  The Protesting Bishops' Reception by a Gracious Sovereign and Court (wood engraving, Figaro in London, No.399, 27th July 1839)
TO THE HIGHWAY RATE-PAYERS.

Mr. Friends,—If I had clas examined my present system of choosing Surveyors of the Highways under the title of "Shieldsed Money," I should not have been far from applying a proper term. Permit me to say I consider the system as an admirable way of making your surveyors high-sounding to your pockets. Past experience ought to teach wisdom—unless the public good. The greatest thoroughfares have generally been neglected, and not been far from applying a proper term. Permit me to say I consider the Surveyor under the title of "Shieldsed Highways," I should and was much better would your main streets have been attended to, if you beautified and made convenient by being set with square stones, and footpaths flanked, as an enormous expense. How much more would these main streets have been attended to, if you had a paid overseer—and acting under commissioners? You may start at the proposals of paying a surveyor, but tell me if you think much is gained by choosing those who profess to act gratuitously? I say no! The money thrown away on the Cold Pat Lane and Eye Street Roads a few years back by the first, grants, and for nothing serious of your surveyors, would have paid a man competent in such undertakings, and our streets would have been much better attended to. It is the humble opinion of your humble servant, that these things want reforming.

INQUEST ON CULLY.

As all the "New Scotch," both courtesy and civility, have some comment to make on this subject, we do not see why Figaro may not have a word in the way with the rest. Our contemporary, cited contemporarity (how large it sounds!) may do a good deal of work, and as a licence because a jury of Magistrates had dared to pass in a verdict, given categorically, in some of all that a looking, self-possessed officer could do to present it.

THE CRITICAL FIGARO.

PARIS AND LONDON.

Containing every thing relative to Literature, the Fine Arts, Music, the Herow, Politics and Oddities of the two great Cities, interwoven with Sallies on printing Seats. (By Frank S. Friskhagen.)

April 3rd, 1833.
**THE ENGLISH FIGARO.**

**OUR HEADINGS.**

In our usual and complimentary manner, we must beg to observe, that our appreciators of the "French Figaro," will always receive the "French Figaro," with the same respect and estimation.

**OUR STARTING DAY.**

Saturday, January 21, 1832.

**[Peter One Penny]**

**LETTER TO THE SOUTHERN CORRESPONDENT.**

Our correspondent at the South of England, has informed us, that the business of the "Figaro" is becoming more and more successful. We have had many good notices of our newspaper, and we are persuaded that the public will soon begin to take a more active interest in our work.

We have received many letters from our friends in the South, expressing their satisfaction with our paper, and we trust that we shall be able to do our duty by our readers.

**OUR ARRANGEMENT.**

Mr. and Mrs. Turner, in behalf of "Figaro," will be pleased to receive and acknowledge the most creditable impression of the "English Figaro," which they have had the honor to present to the public.

We feel assured that our friends in the South will be pleased to receive and acknowledge our best wishes for the success of "Figaro."}

**FIGARO IN LIVERPOOL.**

**OUR INTENTIONS.**

Our main intention is to give the public a true and faithful representation of the events of the day. We shall endeavor to be impartial and unbiased, and to give our readers a faithful and accurate account of all that is going on in the world.

**OUR ALLEGED.**

Our alleged intention of publishing a weekly newspaper, has been the subject of much discussion. We wish to state, however, that our intention is not to publish a newspaper, but to give the public a true and faithful account of the events of the day.

**OUR STANDARD.**

A second edition of "Figaro," has been published, and it is said to have been received with great satisfaction. We have every reason to believe that it will be received with the same interest and enthusiasm as the first edition.

**OUR COURSES.**

We have endeavored to give our readers a true and faithful account of the events of the day, and we trust that we shall be able to do so in the future.

**OUR TRUTH.**

We have endeavored to be truthful and impartial in our reports, and we trust that we shall be able to do so in the future.

We have been accused of being too severe in our criticism of public men and institutions, but we wish to state that we have always endeavored to be fair and impartial, and that we have never been influenced by personal feelings.

We have endeavored to give our readers a true and faithful account of the events of the day, and we trust that we shall be able to do so in the future.
164. Giovanni in London No 1 (18th February 1832)
165. William Horngold

The State Wagon (wood engraving, The New Figaro, No 1, 17th March 1832)
166. William Horngold

167. Kenny Meadows

The Army of Great Britain (wood engraving, The New Figaro, No.1, 17th March 1832)
Titlepiece to Punch in London No.5 (wood engraving, 11th February 1832)
Titlepiece and Patrician Earwigs; Or, The Reptiles in Cumberland Gardens (wood engravings, *Punch in London* No.11, 24th March 1832)
Every Man to his Post and Making a Deep Impression (wood engravings, Punch in London, 28th April 1832)
171. Robert Cruikshank  
Hatching the Reform Egg! (wood engraving, Punchinello!, No.6, 24th February 1832)

172. Robert Cruikshank  
Shaving A Duke (wood engraving, The Devil's Walk!, No.1, 17th February 1832)
PUNCHINELLO!

A Miscellany of Fashion, Literature, and the Drama.

No. 10.
FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1832.
ONE PENNY.

Gambling.

Virtue has received many a desperate check from the sword of moral censure, but the blow descends by Roane's Caricature, and is the oddest cut of all. There is nothing like a pen to show the effects of such a vice on character! The poet may rhyme ad infinitum about it, and the philosopher may unloose his pretended quills against it, but the pencil of the artist is how poetry in proper nguyện the inevitable results.

The degradation to which great men have exposed themselves by following up this destructive propensity, is aptly illustrated by the following anecdote—

Canute Fox as a Gambler.—Fox played admirably both at whist and at piquet; with such skill indeed, that by the general admission of Brook's Club, he might have made four thousand pounds a-year, as they calculated, at those games, if he would have confided himself to them. But his inclinations were from playing at games of chance, particularly at faro. After eating and drinking plentifully he sat down to the faro-table, and recklessly drew a horse. Alas! indeed, and only once, he won about eight thousand pounds in the course of a single evening. Part of the money he paid away to his creditors, and the remainder he lost again almost immediately, in the same manner. The late Mr. Heathcote, as well known during many years in the first walks of fashion and renaissance, himself an invincible gambler, and an intimate friend of Fox, acquainted him with such severity, though with equal truth, that "a man of fortune, but no Judas in judgment or course to have succeeded in any object during his whole life. He loved only three things, women, play, and politics. Yet at an interval he formed a valuable acquaintance with a woman. He lost his whole fortune at the gaming-tables; and, with the exception of about eleven months, he has remained always in opposition."

Before he attained his thirtieth year, he had completely dismembered every shilling that he could either command, or could procure by the most various expedients. He had even undergone at times many of the most severe privations attended to the grinder that made a gambler's progress; frequently wanting money to defray his common daily wants, in order to meet money, after having his last guinea at the faro-table. He has been reduced for numerous days to such distress, as to be under the necessity of having recourse to the Writers of Brook's Club for assistance. The very Chairman, whom he was unable to pay, used to dun him for the arrears. Can any greater degradation be imagined than to see a man, the thunder of whose eloquence made the enemies of patriotism tremble like down, brought down in private life, by a horrid propensity for the improbable sum of gaming, to a state only one degree removed from begging in the streets! He, who could move a nation with his reasoning—who could point the sword of satire and the artillery of ridicule to the heart of corruption with irresistible effect, to be reduced by a porter for a few shillings!—Horrible!!
174. Robert Cruikshank
John Bull by the Horns (wood engraving, Punchinello!, No. 9, 16th March 1832)

175. Robert Cruikshank
General Cholera (wood engraving, The Devil's Walk!, No. 2, 24th February 1832)
176. Robert Seymour

Titlepiece to *The Devil in London* No. 1
(wood engraving, 29th February 1832)

177. Robert Seymour

*The Devil’s Register of “Want Places”*
(wood engraving, *The Devil in London*, No. 1, 29th February 1832)
The House of REFORM That JACK Built
(wood engraving, The Devil in London, No.4, 24th March 1832)

"THE TORIES'  
"REFUGE FOR THE DESTITUTE," 

POLITICAL ADVERTISER.

WITH TWENTY-SIX ENGRAVINGS (FROM DESIGNS BY SEYMOUR AND HORNGOOD).

AND

The House of Reform that Jack Built.

"There was a King of England, and he was wearisome, wear.  
And he jumped into a toy book, and was cast from his eye.  
And when he saw his cup was all the best,  
He jumped into another book, and lost them in spice."

SHERIDAN SONG.

THIRD EDITION WITH ADDITIONS.

LONDON.

EFFINGHAM WILSON, 88, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

THE TORIES' POLITICAL ADVERTISER, FOR  
"WANT Places."

AS COACHMAN.

A steady first-rate whip. Drives four-in-hand, and has held the reins many years; is well known on the road. No objection to travel, having seen much service abroad.—Drives the Sovereign coach, (Brighton and London) under the late proprietor; was driven off by the present, on running foul of the Reform Coach, his leaders being2 restrictive. Has driven the Opposition twice, but lost his situation in trying to get back to his old place. Had a principal place in the King's Arms, and would have no objection to enter into the public line again. Enquire for Arthur, at the Wellington Arms, near Hyde Park Corner.
The Political Advertiser for "Want Places."

We intended this to be an article of a column or two, but before we were aware our space was filled up. One "Romantic epic" enacted in Spain that we expected, the tragedy, however, will be no less if we take our hand and make the good name which he will find under that head; for with last

Robert Seymour

The Political Advertiser for "Want Places."
(wood engraving, The Halfpenny Magazine, No.3, 19th May 1832)
183. Robert Seymour
Title Page to Asmodeus; Or, The Devil in London No.8 (wood engraving, 21st April 1832)

184. Kenny Meadows
Titlepiece to Asmodeus in London No.25 (wood engraving, 18th August 1832)
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ASMODEUS'S EXIT!

... which success, by a fine translation, is never to be overthrown.

We may say with the author of Asmodeus's Deaths, "Every body loves Asmodeus. He is real, he is current. Nothing was ever so acceptable!" Nor were gratitude worth the name in the present instance.

We dislike egotism, but on the subject of our own death we are fairly allowed a little latitude. The announcement of our own disappearance from the literary stage must not grieve our readers, and those acquainted with the very existence of the present number have already become acquainted with the new and improved method of publishing our periodical. In this respect, we are confident, that one of the most difficult parts of a biographer is to write an account of his own death. We felt, however, the awkwardness in giving an intelligence of our dissolution, our last dying speech short too short to receive the attention it merited and find an adequate expression. We have spared, therefore, but indirectly, an example of the necessity of avoiding the employment of the pen in the last extremity. Last week we were happy in an acquaintance with a gentleman of the name of Mr. Murphy, of the Pen and Pencil, with whom we have had good health and good fortune; and this week, in consequence of our interest in the poetry of his friends, we were fortunate enough to meet the author of that poetical MS. - the poetical phantasmagoria of the Phantasmagoria. It is of the greatest advantages, and their most secret thoughts."
View of Mr. Cartile's House, 52 Fleet Street, London (wood engraving, *A Scourge*, No.9, 29th November 1834)
The *Poor Man's Guardian* No.35 (11th February 1832)
189. Anon.

189a Anon.

The Contest (wood engraving, *John Bull's Picture Gallery*, No. 1, 1832)

190. C.J. Grant (?)  

Present State of John Bull (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, No. 12, 1832)

191. Anon.  

Cover to John Bull's Picture Gallery, Part One (wood engraving, c. late 1832)
John Bull's Picture Gallery, No. 1, Reprinted edition (wood engraving, c. late 1832)
195. C.J. Grant

The Duke of Coldbath Fields Making Choice of a New Ministry (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.45, 1834)

196. C.J. Grant

Church Reform; Or, the BISHOPS Cleansing Their Own Stable (wood engraving, Lloyd's Political Jokes, No.5, c.1836)
197. Anon. 

198. "Dank" sq.

*The Peoples' Penny Pictures No. 1* (wood engraving, 8th December 1832) 

*The Caricaturist No. 1* (wood engraving, c.1832)
The image contains two caricatures:

2. "John Bull - The Pride of the World and the Envy of Surrounding Nations" (wood engraving, Marks's New Caricaturist, No.23, c.1832)

Both images are from the 19th century and depict satirical scenes using humor and visual exaggeration to comment on societal issues.
THE WORKING OF THE NEW POOR ACT.

201. J.L. Marks  The Working of the New Poor Act
(lithograph, Popular Subjects, No.2, 1834)
202. C.J. Grant

The Revolution of the Planets Against the Tax Upon Light (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.8, 1833)

203. Anon.

The Reform Boat in Full Sail (wood engraving, The Political Play Bill, No.3, 1832)
204. Anon.  

Indépendance and Beggary (wood engraving, Lloyd's Political Jokes, 1836)

205. C.J. Grant & Anon.  

Does Adelaide Know He's Out? (wood engraving, Lloyd's Political Jokes, No.8, 1836)
206. C.J. Grant
Reviewing the Blue Devils (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.11, 1833)

207. C.J. Grant
The Four Factions, Which Distract the Country (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.12, 1833)
208. C.J. Grant

The Bench of Bishops in the House of Lords During a Debate Concerning the Church (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 16, 1833)

209. C.J. Grant

The Whig Radical 'Amended' Address to the House of Commons (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 77, 1834)
210. C.J. Grant  
Popay the Spy Addressing a Political Meeting in the Garb of a Brother Mechanic (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.20, 1833)

211. Anon.  
The Political Humourist (wood engraving, c. July 1832)
212. Anon. The Unstamped Flooring the Stamped Press (wood engraving, The Political Stage, No.7, 31st October 1835)
213. C.J. Grant

Magisterial Justice - A Fact (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 14, 1833)

214. C.J. Grant

Whig Robbery and Destruction of the Property Under the Name of the Law (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 100, 1835)

Ro-buck's Attack on the Press, Or Information for the People (wood engraving, The Political Play Bill, No.12, c.1834).

216. Anon.

Cover to The Devil's Menagerie of Placemen, Sinecurists, Pensioners &c. (wood engraving, 1832).
217. Anon

Present State of John Bull (wood engraving, John Bull's Picture Gallery, 1832)

218. "Dank" esq.

All the Majesty of the British Empire!!! (wood engraving, The Caricaturist, No. 1, c. 1832)
The Beggar's Petition.

Pit the mercy of a worn-out back?
Whose trembling hands have brought him to the floor,
Whose tears have daily broken his back?
Great as you are, and he will ask no more.

This won't sit nice my poverty beggars,
Three grey locks where every lock appears,
Here bleached too many hopeless authors alike,
And ended the life of many hopeless ones.

Hard as the fate of the inferior sort,
And heard the applied ike I have to feel,
When 'twas the least of fame, I thought it sure.
Great God! my Orange war left me the price.

From friends, from foes, from place, and from there,
I wonder near in and remembered care.
Nor weakness from the present could want,
Nor he who Westmoreland ever raised.

You leave, ascribed by the Public soul,
With bolts and bars of iron well secured,
With more a most magnificent whole;
But Apo-j can no longer be endured.

That raven, you'll upon the level groan, Where from the hands of country women worn, It hurtful here, and only may be seen To merit the memory of my highest grace.

I wish to teach our sordid vitriolic force, Upheld his shield and made his sturdy way; To trust me with the bold reprobate man Which only can my neighbours claim.

Had I the power to longer should remain The sad occasion of my present evil; But power is gone, and all the past is gone; I may fell heavy to falling off the hill.

Not but the chosen angel to our sense That I might still regain the state I had; But all my friends, of whom I made so many, Disowned, and have left me almost mad.

Pay the surmises of a worn-out back! Whose trembling hands have brought him to the floor, Whose tears have daily broken his back; Give all you have, and he will ask no more.

LONDON:
PRINTEO AND PUBLISHED BY J. L. MARKS,
34, LONG LANE, SMITHFIELD.

Price One Penny Plain; Two Pence Coloured.
220. Anon.

221. C.J. Grant

The Disorderly House; Or the Fighting Parliament (wood engraving, The First Cut from the Barber's Razor, c. 1832)
The Drunken Parliament Discussing the Prevention of Drunkenness Bill (wood engraving, Political Drama, No. 49, 1834)
222. C.J. Grant
Billy's Birth Day! (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.36, 1834)

223. C.J. Grant
The Royal Mopstick Pro-Rogue-ing the Humbug Parliament, Or, Cross Reading the Speech (wood engraving, Political Drama, No.22, 1833)
The Penny Satirist No.1 (22nd April, 1837)
A Trip to Margate (wood engraving, Cleave's Gazette of Variety, No.42, 3rd August 1839)
Irish Clerical Sports! (wood engraving, The Penny Satirist, No.23, 23rd April 1837)
Lord Mayor’s Day: Or, Aldermen Going to their Devotion! (wood engraving, The Penny Satirist, No.30, 11th November 1837)
Coronation of Queen Victoria (wood engraving, *The Penny Satirist*, No.63, 30th June 1838)
229. 'Timothy Wasp Esq.' The QUEEN BEE in Her HIVE!! (etching, 29th August 1837)