

James Gillray's *The Shrine at St Ann's Hill* and the Rights of Man

Jørgen Riber Christensen is associate professor of digital aesthetics at Aalborg University.



James Gillray, *The Shrine at St Ann's Hill*, etching, 36 x 26 cm, published by Hannah Humphrey, Saint James, London, 26 May 1798.

The Shrine at St Ann's Hill

A formal and content-based analysis of Gillray's print can be the centre of circles that ripple out to contexts that throw light on both historical and modern attitudes to human rights. The methods of this analysis are selected with this aim in mind. They are from visual semiotics and traditional art history (Barthes, 1964; Christensen, 1991; Kristensen and Christensen, 1989, Arnheim, 1954/1974; Panofsky, 1939/1972).

First, a formal analysis of the visual language. The composition of the plate is surprisingly discordant as three compositional patterns are in conflict, and they interrupt one another. The image is divided by a vertical line running in the middle; but there is no symmetry, as the left half is dominated by a diagonal shape (the cloud) from the top left corner reaching only halfway down towards the bottom right corner. This diagonal is met by another conflicting diagonal shape (the kneeling figure) from the bottom left corner towards the top right corner.

The composition also has a horizontal form. Just as it was divided vertically, there is a semblance of a division two-thirds down (the horizontal lines of the altar), but again this is only at the left-hand side of the picture. The spatial organisation is also contradictory. Apparently, the room is created by linear perspective with orthogonal lines, which go into the background to meet in a vanishing point. These lines can be seen in the masonry and in the altar; but there is no consistent use of this method, and this formal disruption of space is answered by the floating heads in the cloud that do not seem to belong to the room itself, but to some other dimension. The cloud vision is also a light source that shines on the figures on the altar, but again this supernatural light source is responded or contradicted by another, the one shining on the right hand side of the kneeling figure. The overall scene itself is gloomy and sombre. Even the construction of the body language of they figure repeats this double system as it is seen from the side and from the back at the same time. The overall conclusion of the formal analysis is that the visual language in itself has connotations of conflicts and contradictions. When we turn to an analysis of the content of the image, we may wish to examine if these connotations are repeated in the denotative content.

The use of verbal language is prominent in the etching. Here Barthes' terms anchorage and relay (Barthes 1964) may be employed. Anchorage is a verbal text that is placed outside the picture frame and which the sender uses to anchor and control the audience's understanding of an image. Here it is "Shrine at St Ann's Hill", and to the contemporary reader of this anchoring caption it meant James Fox's house at St. Ann's Hill to which he retired during his retirement from Parliament 1794-1801 (Mitchell 1992). The verbal text inside the picture frame is in Barthes, terminology called relay. As such the relay text does not control the overall meaning of the image, but it is on the same level of significance as the other pictorial elements. The main part of relay text is found on the tablets on the altar, "DROITS DE L'HOMME" etc.; but there are also combinations of relay and anchorage as anchorage text inside the image becomes relay. This is the case with the name tags on the busts of Robespierre (sic.) and Napoleon Bonaparte (sic.), and on the book in Fox's pocket the title "New Constitution" can be seen. Gillray has chosen to anchor the two portrait busts, but not the six winged heads, and not

the kneeling James Fox, and this brings us to Panofsky's iconographic method, which basically is about identification of content of images. There are three steps in this method: the pre-iconographic, the iconographic and the iconological (Panofsky 1939/1972, 3-17). The first is about the recognition of the pure shapes and lines in an image as mimetical representations of objects and figures from reality, e.g., people or houses. The iconographic step in the reception of an image consists of combining these elements into a narrative, i.e. the subject of the image. The final step, the iconological one, is analytical and in it the specific designing of this narrative is interpreted. This also entails an analysis of the image's visual language and style so that this particular version of the subject is related to its historical and functional context and the values of this context, which Panofsky writes rest on "the political, poetical, religious, philosophical, and social tendencies of the personality, period or country under investigation" (Panofsky 1939/1972, 16). As it will appear below, in this case these represent Britain in the time of the French Revolution.

Now the pre-iconographic and the iconographic descriptions will be combined, as the pre-iconographic description basically is a verbalization of the subject of the image. Gillray's print "The Shrine at St Ann's Hill" depicts Charles James Fox in a stone crypt praying on his knees in front of an altar or shrine with emblems of revolutionary France. Fox was the radical supporter of the American and French Revolutions, the rival of Pitt the Younger, an outspoken opponent of George III, champion of liberty, and his last political achievement was the abolition of the slave trade in 1807. He was also at the receiving end of many satirical prints of Gillray's, easily recognizable with his opulence, his characteristic eyebrows, and his unshaven, swarthy complexion, the stock emblem of a Jacobin villain. The title of the print refers to his house at St. Ann's Hill. The altar in front of Fox is draped with a cloth on which are embroidered crossed daggers, possibly a reference to The Day of Daggers, an event during the Revolution in 1791 when the Marquis de Lafayette arrested 400 armed aristocrats at the Tuileries. As such the daggers are a parody of the fleur-de-lis, the heraldic emblem of the French monarchy. On the altar itself there are three pedestals. The one in the middle is with the revolutionary bonnet and its tricolor cockade. It is inscribed with EGALITE, and there is a skull at its base. The pedestal to the left has two hands nailed to its post and it supports a bust of

Robespierre, and the pedestal to the right supports a bust of Napoleon Bonaparte. At the back of the altar there is a large, blood-dripping guillotine, and from it are suspended two tablets, resembling those Moses brought down from the mountain, with the heading *Droits de l'homme*. However, just as the guillotine on the altar is at the traditional position of a crucifix, the Rights of Man have been supplanted with a parody of the Decalogue or the Commandments: "I. Right to Worship whom we please. II. Right to create & bow down to any thing we chuse to set up. III. Right to use in vain any Name we like. IV. Right to work Nine Days in the Week, & do what we please on the Tenth: V. Right to honor both Father & Mother, when we find it necessary. VI. Right to Kill. VII. Right to commit Adultery. VIII. Right to Plunder. IX. Right to bear what Witness we please. X. Right to covet our Neighbour[s] House & all that is his." From the top left corner of the image a shaft of celestial light and clouds descend, and inside it are the winged heads of six members of the Foxite opposition, the Duke of Norfolk, Lansdowne, Bedford, Tierney, Lauderdale and Nicholls, all with French, revolutionary bonnets.

A description of the stylistic features of the etching can be an entrance to an iconological contextualization that relates it to its specific historical period. As we have seen it in the analysis of the etching's visual language, there are also discordant features in its style. On the surface the situation depicted is a devotional one. A character is kneeling in a chapel in front of an altar with the Decalogue on Moses' stone tablets (Exodus 31:18), and the character's prayer has resulted in the miraculous appearance of a group of heavenly cherubim, which in traditional Christian iconography are shown as infants' heads with one set of wings. The daggers on the cloth may be a reference to the attribute of St. Lucy, who was martyred with this weapon. The anchorage caption of the etching establishes this early understanding of the image as a representation of a religious scene with the words "Shrine" and "St Ann", the latter being the mother of the Virgin Mary. The hanging drapery at the top of the image with its prominent tassel, however, belongs to another coding system than the religious, as this kind of draperies were a stable iconographic element in Baroque representational royal or noble portraits, and in this way there is a stylistic movement away from religion to power relations and politics. The location or room itself with

its crude masonry points to yet a third set of connotations as the gloomy room is dungeon-like. This stylistic confusion can be regarded as a kind of eye-opener to the audience of the etching in the form of an interpretational imperative, and this imperative is to understand it iconologically, i.e., in its contemporary political context and as satire. The visual language, the style and the iconographic content of the image are all dynamic and transgressive as they all move between different spheres without regard of their borders. The contradictions and conflicts both of the visual language and the iconographic setup of the print as well as the stylistic confusion are all instrumental in asserting that the French Rights of Man represent a danger to Britain.

In its initial movement the rhetorical argumentation of the print rests on the transference of the Rights of Man or *Droit de L'homme* from a political sphere into a religious one. The setting of the print is a shrine with an altar, as its anchoring caption says; Fox's body language is the one of prayer, and the members of the opposition are represented as cherubim in a revelation. The reformulation of the *Droit de L'homme* is double. First of all they are changed into the Ten Commandments, and then again into a travesty of them that says the exact opposite. In this way the French Revolution is described as Godless. The altar is a composite selection of what the British Loyalists abhorred. The next step in the rhetorical argument is also one of transference, in this case national as British politicians bow to the excesses of the French Revolution and France, with which Britain was at war. Fox and the opposition are in this way described as traitors to their nation. The sum of these two argumentative transferences is that The Rights of Man are discredited on two counts. They are unchristian, and they belong to the enemy France, only. Not to Britain or to the rest of the world.

The immediate context of the image is the British reaction to the French Revolution, and when this context is widened it becomes one that resonates today, i.e. the question whether human rights can be regarded as universal or not. The followings pages of the article will discuss these two contexts.

British Responses to the French Revolution

This part of the article will concentrate on the forms of expression that the British responses to the French Revolution took. Gillray's

etching is one of these responses. They must, however, be seen in conjunction with the debate already going on about constitutional reform, and obviously the American Revolution of 1776 played a role. It was primarily an extension of the franchise to Parliament that the demands for reform of the Whig constitution centred around, and this demand was not imported from revolutionary movements abroad, but it grew out of the socio-economic development of the Industrial Revolution in Britain itself with its new moneyed, commercial and industrial interests, as opposed to the Whig aristocrats of landed property that was in power (Cole 1938/1971, 110; Dickinson 1974, 146). When this demand was combined with the revolutionary thoughts as they, for instance, were expressed in the first article of Declaration of the Rights of Man: "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights", this demand soon became for universal suffrage, and sometimes this demand was not limited to universal male suffrage. Gillray's "The Shrine at St Ann's Hill" from as late as 1798 is a graphic response to the French Revolution and its Rights of Man, but as we shall see this satirical etching is just as much directed at the internal British political situation, and this combination is repeated again and again in the other political texts and documents of the period. There were the pamphlets for the French Revolution and for political reform in Britain, and extra-parliamentary publicness was founded in Corresponding Societies centred in London, Norwich, Sheffield and Manchester, which held meetings, corresponded with each other and with French revolutionaries, and published pamphlets and weekly newspapers. As it was in many other places, the most important pamphlet of these was also printed by the Sheffield Society. Here the first part of Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* had 1,400 subscribers (Thompson 1963/1974, 164); but also more modest and less classical pamphlets were circulated. For instance *An Address to the Nation from the London Corresponding Society, on the Subject of a Thorough Parliamentary Reform* from 1793 demanded that "equal Representation obtained by Annual Elections and Universal Suffrage" was adopted (Reprinted in Dickinson 1974, 194-197).

The pamphlet warfare's perhaps most eloquent expression was opposed to constitutional reform and it abhorred revolution. On the surface Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* from 1790 is a powerful collection of arguments against revolutions as



James Gillray, *Smelling out a Rat - or The Atheistical Revolutionary disturbed by his Midnight Calculations*, 36 x 26 cm, published by Hannah Humphrey, Saint James, London, 2 December 1791.

such and against the French in particular. Burke's ideology cannot simply be dubbed reactionary and stale. It must be remembered that Burke was a supporter of the American Revolution, initially also of the French, and his conservatism may as well have been directed against the modernity of the societal changes caused by the imminent Industrial Revolution with its liberalism as by the political changes of the French Revolution. When he writes that "the age of chivalry is gone" (Burke 1790/1973, 170) he does not only refer to the fall of the French monarchy with its feudal foundation and to the treatment of Marie Antoinette, but he continues in the next sentence: "that of sophisters, oeconomists, and calculators has succeeded".

Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* was one of many replies to *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, which in itself was a reply to the dissenting minister Richard Price's "A Discourse on the Love of Our Country" (1790) with its praise of the French Revolution: "the dominion of kings changed for the dominion of laws, and the dominion of priests giving way to the dominion of reason and conscience", and its warning: "Tremble all ye oppressors of the world!" (in Dickinson 1974, 174-175).

Gillray's satirical print "Smelling out a Rat - or The Atheistical Revolutionary disturbed by his Midnight Calculations" shows Richard Price being caught red handed composing his revolutionary tract by an enormous Edmund Burke. On Price's wall there is a framed picture of the beheading of Charles I titled, "Death of Charles I, or the Glory of Great Britain." Here seven years before

“The Shrine at St Ann’s Hill” as in other of Gillray’s early prints with the French theme Gillray was more nuanced in his views, and as can be seen in “Smelling out a Rat” this print is as much an attack on Burke’s alarmism as on the revolutionary Price (Hill 1965, 41-43; Bindman 1989, 32). Draper Hill sums up the part of Gillray’s production that had France as its subject between the 20th of November and the 8th of April 1793, and ten of these were anti-Republican, two neutral and two criticized the British reaction (1965, 43-44).

In his *Rights of Man* Thomas Paine responded to Burke point by point, e.g.: “All hereditary government is in its nature tyranny” (Paine 1791-2/1969, 194). Paine reprinted the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in his own similarly titled *Rights of Man*, adding some pages of commentary to them. Paine had to flee from England to France before publication, he was condemned for sedition in absentia, and effigies of him were burnt by Church and King Mobs in provincial towns. In 1791 Mary Wollstonecraft explicitly gendered the debate about the rights of “man” with her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. The boost which the constitution debate in Britain got from France spread from political discourses into literature, but government repression intensified culminating with Habeas Corpus being suspended in 1794, transportation sentences to Scottish radicals, and in the 1795 and 1796 two acts were passed, the Treasonable and Seditious Practices Act and the Seditious Meetings Acts. Radical writers became careful. William Wordsworth had been provoked by an attack on the French Revolution made by the Bishop of Llandaff. The bishop had referred to the guillotine as “the altar of Liberty... stained with the blood of the aged, of the innocent, of the defenceless sex, of the ministers of religion, and of the faithful adherents of a fallen monarch” (reprinted in Dickinson 1974, 216); but Wordsworth never published or sent the letter he had written in reply to the bishop. The guillotine as the blood-stained altar of the French Revolution is an emblem that is also used in Gillray’s etching. William Blake’s poem *The French Revolution* from 1791 cloaked or disguised the historical events in cosmic symbols, and he avoided prosecution. The weakening of radical support for the French Revolution in Britain was not only caused by repression. Much support was lost when war broke out between England and France in February 1793, and even more during the Reign of Ter-

ror from September 1793 to July 1794 with its thousands of guillotined victims. In the poem "Does Haughty Gaul Invasion Threat" from 1795 by Robert Burns the invasion threat puts a damper on his progressive views, but does not silence them, and he seeks to reconcile the revolutionary spirit, even though it is related to France, with his patriotism: "For never but by British hands, Maun British Wrangs be righted!" and "But while we sing 'God save the King', We'll ne'er forget THE PEOPLE" (reprinted in Dickinson 1974, 230-231). Burns' poem illustrates the challenge in this period in Britain of upholding demands for democracy and representation in conjunction with feelings of nationalism and patriotism.

An Aesthetic and Political Publicness

The forms of publicness about the French Revolution and the Rights of Man presented above are not alike despite shared content. There are discourses that are political in nature, and there are discourses that may be termed art and are of an aesthetic nature. Gillray's satirical etching combines these two discourses in form and content, and a look at a copy of *The Times* from Saturday, July 30, 1791 can illustrate how these forms of discourses co-existed in the British response. On the top of the front page there is an advertisement:

FRANCE IN AN UPROAR!

Mr. ASTLEY, Sen. being in Paris during the Attempt made by their MAJESTIES of FRANCE to escape, begs Leave to lay before the Public an entire new Sketch, consisting of Music and Dancing, called

The ROYAL FUGITIVES ;

Or, FRANCE in an UPROAR !

ROYAL GROVE,

ASTLEY'S AMPHITHEATRE,

WESTMINSTER-BRIDGE...

In the above Sketch will be comprised the following Incidents :

1. The Preparations for the Escape.
2. The Sentinel bribed, &c.
3. The Escape from the Thuilleries.
4. The Manner in which it was discovered.
5. General Alarm of the Citizens.

6. The Decree of the National Assembly proclaimed.
 7. Their Majesties known by the Post-Master.
 8. The Alarm given at Varennes.
 9. The Royal Carriage, &c. stopped at the Bridge.
 10. The Passport demanded by the Governor.
 11. The King discovers himself.
 12. The Messenger arrives at Paris with the News of their Majesties being taken.
 13. A View of the National Assembly.
- The whole forming a most interesting Spectacle, as Authentic as Striking.

On the second page there are news reports. One is about violent anti-revolutionary riots in Sheffield, which the dragoons had been unable to suppress, and there is a report from France describing the French as barbaric and savage atheists: "From being over-scrupulous in religion, they fell into an open and avowed contempt of all divinity... Atheists in their hearts, and rebels in their conduct." It may be mentioned that the same sentiment is found in Gillray's satirical print. A royal proclamation by George R. follows on the same page offering a substantial reward for information about the publishers of "a certain scandalous and seditious paper" that was printed in Birmingham. Interestingly, part of the paper is reprinted in the royal proclamation. It praises the French Revolution and argues that conditions in Britain are also ripe for revolution. On the third page there is a long and detailed report about the proceedings of the National Assembly only five days old.

Gillray etching is part of the on-going debate in Britain about the relationship between the interior constitutional debate and the link between the arch enemy France and the ideals of the rights of man. The etching is just one of the many satirical prints of the period. During the 1780s and 1790s the business of graphic caricature thrived as never before and never again (Donald 1996, 142), and one may suggest that they represent a form of publicness that combined political publicness with cultural publicness, so that artistic phenomena became political in the form of graphic caricature prints. This publicness was extra-parliamentary, and it was for and also by the un-franchised. The publicness outside Parliament was on the move, and in 1792 its voice was heard in the House of Commons

when Fox referred to it in a speech: "It is certainly right and prudent to consult the public opinion...one thing is most clear, that I ought to give the public the means of forming an opinion" (in Habermas 1962/2009, 65-66).

The satirical prints were one of the expressions of this public opinion. Public opinion now was a force to be reckoned with in Parliament. The number of satirical prints was so large (Donald 1996, i) that they were a mass medium, and because of their distribution and mass production they did not belong to the art institution, though they were sometimes exhibited in galleries. What the prints won in distribution and dissemination, and also in profits from their sales at home and abroad, they lost in artistic status. Caricature is not even mentioned in Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses on Art* (1769-91), whereas Reynolds places history painting at the top of the hierarchy of artistic genres. The turbulence of the political and cultural climate in Britain during the period of the French Revolution and the changes it produces are reflected stylistically, and also in the forms of publicness in which it was found. The florid and high rhetorical style of representative publicness is seen in Burke's *Reflections of the Revolution in France*, which in itself is the very eulogy of feudalism and its representative publicness. The style of the satirical prints is ironically related to this heroic, representative style in the way that it is mock-heroic and burlesque, and when Reynolds writes that the painter must improve on the appearance of his heroic subject: "The painter has no other means of giving an idea of the dignity of the mind, but by that external appearance which grandeur of thought does generally, though not always, impress on the countenance, and by that correspondence of figure to sentiment and situation which all men wish, but cannot command." (Reynolds 1997/1769-91, 60) The satirist on the other hand caricatures his characters through the ludicrous exaggeration and distortion of the characteristic features of a person while retaining a recognizable likeness, e.g., through the use of the so-called nut cracker profile with a hooked nose and a jutting chin that almost meet.

The publicness, which combined political matter with aesthetics, as it is found in the period and of which the many satirical prints are examples can be explained in several ways. One is specifically based in the political debate about parliamentary reform and the extension of the franchise. The factions of the bourgeoisie

of the period, which were not represented in Westminster, found other outlets than the purely parliamentary ones for political expressions, and the contemporary mass media were employed (Habermas 1962/2009, 65). In the history of the development of the public sphere this is, however, not unique, as political material in the form of news was turned into a commodity by early merchants (Habermas 1962/2009, 15). The important point is that the thriving caricature print business took the form of mass media so that we are actually dealing with an early form of mediated, political publicness here. Another, not conflicting, explanation is the political setup in Britain, in which the monarchy, Parliament and some fractions of the ruling classes, including landed and to some extent moneyed interests, were in some kind of a balanced relationship. In this system remnants of the old feudal representative publicness, which was just as aesthetic as political in its expressions of power relations (Habermas 1962/2009, 8-10, 36), may have influenced the fusion of the aesthetic with the political in a publicness that was bourgeois. As we have seen it above in the discussion of Reynolds's *Discourses on Art* there is the difference that the high style of traditional representative publicness in its bourgeois echoes is debased to caricature, and the members of the Royal Academy by and large avoid topicality and the French theme (Bindman 1989, 30-31). A more general explanation may be the overall development of the structure of publicnesses, in which a clear-cut division of discrete spheres is more an ideal than reality, and that in this historical period of European upheavals the political debate was so pervasive that it also took on aesthetic forms. In this connection it is of some significance that Habermas (1962/2009, 30) in his "blueprint of the bourgeois public sphere in the eighteenth century" in the field "Public sphere in the political realm" has both the "world of letters (clubs, press)" and the "market of culture products". This middle field which connected the civil society of the bourgeoisie with the state also connected politics and aesthetics in its commercialization of political texts as e.g., the Gillray caricature prints.

Prehistory of Human Rights: The French Revolution

The first article of the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights from 1948 is "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity

and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood." The first article of Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (*Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*) is "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good." Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen was adopted by the French National Constituent Assembly in 1789. The near identity of the wording of the two points to the connection between 20th century Human Rights and the 18th century Rights of Man adopted during the French Revolution. This article explores how the Rights of Man were received outside France, in Britain. As it has been seen in the article, already at this time the contradiction or at least debatable feature of human rights was apparent, namely the question whether they are universal or not. Today Human Rights may be regarded as a Western phenomenon that are imposed on the rest of the world in the same way that Western ideology and religion have been exported during the historical period of colonialism and imperialism: "the idea of universal human rights is Western in origin" (Hunt 1996, 3-4), and Hunt continues to state that this ideal did not arise only independently in the Enlightenment debate and out of questions about natural law, but it was a "reaction to contemporary political conflicts". Yet, Hunt emphasizes the universal applicability of human rights. In "Human Rights and a Post Secular Religion of Humanity," Daniel L. Malachuk summarizes the positions for or against the universalism of human rights, and he calls the advocates for the universalism of human rights "foundationalists for whom there are universal, rationalist foundation for human rights," and "the anti-foundationalists, who maintain that human rights are contingent, fluid and relative" (in Porsdam 2012, 3). His conclusion is that the anti-foundationalist group is the more influential of the two. This article aimed at illustrating how the Rights of Man may have arisen out of a foundationalist or universal position as a result of the general spirit of the Age of Enlightenment, but certainly also that the reception of them in Britain at the time was anti-foundationalist to use Malachuk's term, i.e. they were regarded as a French ideological weapon.

However, universalism is not the only problem of Rights of Man or human rights. Some other questions, primarily about who had the right to possess human rights or rights of man as they were

called gave rise to passionate debates: How about the poor and illiterate, how about women, how about black slaves, how about the relationship between the state and religion and how about members of other religions, in particular Jews, and curiously, how about executioners and actors? Many of these questions were answered in the negative. In America slavery persisted after the Declaration of Independence, and in France the adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in 1789 was only four years prior to the Reign of Terror. Gillray's etching and its context was viewed in the light of these contradictions, in particular it is apparent how the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen was regarded as anything else than a principle of universal applicability in Britain. They were understood as a manifestation of belligerent and aggressive French revolutionary nationalism and foreign policy, and the rights of man were connected to revolutions, the American and the French, and to the violent overthrow of governments and monarchs. Samuel Moyn, in his *The Last Utopia. Human Rights in History*, distinguishes between modern Human Rights and what he calls "the construction of precursors after the fact" (Moyn 2010, 12), and by this construction he means the Greek and Roman Stoic thinkers, medieval natural law and the proclamations and documents of the American and French Revolutions. Moyn substantiates this argument stating that the precursors', e.g., the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen's, contemporary debate became "zones of struggle over the meaning of citizenship" (Moyn 2010, 13), whereas modern human rights were all inclusive in their universalism and utopian, transnational ideal. The contradictions mentioned above inherent in the Rights of Man and of the Citizen and in Human Rights are to some extent, but to some extent only, explained by Moyn, when he sees a transformation of eighteenth-century Rights of Man, which he subsumes under "revolutionary nationalism," into the universalism of modern Human Rights.

It is the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen that is in focus in this article, but the argumentation of the article also rest on the prehistory – or precursors - in a wide sense of human rights, which contains a combination of natural law, the social philosophy of John Locke, which could be used to combine natural law and rights with human rights, Enlightenment philosophy as it for instance was expressed in *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des*

sciences, des arts et des métiers (1751-1772), the historical events of the American Revolution, and obviously of the French Revolution, but also further back in British history with the Magna Carta (1215) and The Bill of Rights (1689), and legal traditions established through the centuries. The obvious reason that the prehistory is in focus is that Gillray's etching is contemporary to the revolutions of the eighteenth century and that its context is also British history and society.

Conclusion: Universalism of Human Rights?

It follows from the argumentation described above in Gillray's satirical print from 1798 that the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* or the Rights of Man are not regarded as universal. Present-day questions of the universalism of human rights are nothing new. Already the pre-history or pre-cursors of human rights were attacked for being manifestations of partisan ideological and even national interests. In this case they were regarded as purely French, or in other words even though the Rights of Man may have arisen out of a universal ideals from the Age of Enlightenment, they were soon regarded as relativist, i.e. a French ideological weapon as well as they were connected to the interior debate about constitutional reform in Britain. This conclusion was reached in the article by going through a contextualisation of Gillray's satirical print and by an analysis or close reading of the print's visual language, iconography and iconology and its rhetorical movement. A further point was made in the article with the contextualisation of the print within a form of publicness that combined political and cultural publicness. Not only the many contemporary satirical prints were instances of this combined publicness, but it was also seen in the article's example from *The Times* newspaper. In other words, there was an aesthetic quality to this publicness. In this way the article has positioned "The Shrine at St Ann's Hill" in the context of the eighteenth century debate about the Rights of Man and their reception, in the context of a publicness that combined aesthetics and politics, and in the wider context of the question of universalism of Human Right, a question that is of importance today in the age of globalisation.

References

- Arnheim, R. 1982/2002. *Art and Visual Perception*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Barthes, R. 1964. "Rhétorique de l'image," *Communications* 4: 40-51.
- Bindman, D. 1989. *The Shadow of the Guillotine. Britain and the French Revolution*. London: British Museum.
- Burke, E., 1790/1973. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Christensen, J.R. 1991. *Looking into Pictures*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Cole, G.D.H. and R. Postgate. 1938/1971. *The Common People 1746-1946*. London: Methuen.
- Donald, D. 1996. *The Age of Caricature: Satirical Prints in the Reign of George III*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dickinson, H.T. 1974. *Politics and Literature in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Dent.
- Ferguson, G. 1954/1976. *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franklin, A. and M. Philip. 2003. *Napoleon and the Invasion of Britain*. University of Oxford: The Bodleian Library.
- Habermas, J. 1962/2009. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger. London: Polity.
- Hill, D. 1976. *The Satirical Etchings of James Gillray*. New York: Dover.
- Hill, D. 1966. *Fashionable Contrasts: Caricatures by James Gillray*. London: Phaidon.
- Hill, D. 1965. *Mr. Gillray the Caricaturist*. London: Phaidon.
- Hunt, L., ed. 1996. *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Kristensen, J. and J. Riber Christensen. 1989. *Billedanalyse*. Copenhagen: Dansklærerforeningens Forlag.
- Lambourne, L. 1983. *Caricature*. London: Victoria & Albert Museum.
- Mitchell, L. G. 1992. *Charles James Fox*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moyn, S. 2010. *The Last Utopia: Human Right in History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Bellknap.

- Paine, T. 1791-2/1969. *Rights of Man*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Panofsky, E. 1939/1972. *Studies in Iconology Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Porsdam, H., ed. 2012. *Civil Religion, Human Rights and International Relations: Connecting People across Cultures and Traditions*. Cheltenham: Edgar Elgar.
- Reynolds, J. 1997/1769-91. *Discourses on Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rudé, G. 1964. *Revolutionary Europe 1783-1815*. London: Fontana.
- The Times*, Saturday, July 30, 1791. London.
- Thompson, E.P. 1963/1974. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Wilkins, T. B. 1967. *The Problems of Burke's Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wollstonecraft, M. 1791/1975. *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.